

violence of war. They know that we need to support diplomacy and development to avoid future catastrophes.

Our united effort must continue in FY 2018, but the President's budget eliminates the Food for Peace and the McGovern-Dole programs, and reduces funding for disaster assistance. I only hope President Trump and Secretary Tillerson will come to their senses. We must not stand by and watch millions of children and families literally starve to death. We must act, and we must lead.

#### BUDGETS ARE ABOUT PRIORITIES

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, today the President put forth his budget proposal. The budget includes roughly \$2.5 trillion in cuts to programs that help struggling families and elderly and disabled people afford the basics, like putting food on the table, keeping a roof over their heads, and affording healthcare.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, would be cut by \$192 billion over the next decade. Medicaid, the health program for the poor, would be cut by \$800 billion. TANF, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, would be cut by \$21 billion. In 2014, 20 percent of the population of my district, the Virgin Islands, received SNAP. SNAP feeds primarily poor children. In 2013, 19 percent of Virgin Islands' children were covered under Medicaid. Another 27 percent went without any health coverage at all.

Mr. Speaker, budgets are about priorities. Unfortunately, our President's priorities are clear: more tax cuts for the wealthy taking precedence over ensuring that poor children have enough to eat, that people with physical and mental disabilities can make ends meet, and that low- and moderate-income Americans have access to healthcare. The budget would make inequality and poverty significantly worse, while allowing deficits, when honestly measured, to soar. Mr. Speaker, we must reject this budget.

#### HONORING THE HEROES OF OUR ARMED FORCES

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today ahead of Memorial Day next week to honor the heroes of our Armed Forces who have made the ultimate sacrifice and service to our Nation and to thank their fellow soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who were blessed to make it back home to their loved ones.

From the Revolutionary War through the war on terror, more than 1.3 million Americans have given their lives protecting our freedoms. Today, Con-

gress is honoring those lost by passing several bills to help protect our surviving veterans and ensure they are treated with the dignity and respect they have earned. Our bills will ensure that the VA medical centers are meeting compliance requirements, help veterans have better access to nursing home care, increase the rates for veterans' compensation for service-connected disabilities, and more.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better way to celebrate Memorial Day and honor the memory of those lost than by helping our Nation's veterans, who have sacrificed so much to help keep America safe. I urge all of my colleagues to support these measures today and our veterans each and every day.

#### BIG TALK AND BROKEN PROMISES

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

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, today we have a new Trump budget and more broken promises. If you recall on May 7, 2015, the President said: "I was the first and only potential GOP candidate to state there will be no cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid."

Broken promise number one. His budget cuts Medicaid, it cuts Medicare, it cuts Social Security.

In The Washington Post on January 15, 2017, the President said: "We are going to have insurance for everybody. Much less expensive and much better."

This broken promise number two is that he cuts \$1.4 trillion out of healthcare and covers 24 million less people, jacking up insurance rates for countless others.

Broken promise number three to the Farm Bureau at ag.com on April 24, 2017: "I support a strong safety net for our Nation's farmers." Yet he cuts \$50 billion over 10 years from farm subsidies, including critical citrus greening research dollars for central Florida, where I represent.

Then on September 28, 2016, The Washington Times, he says: "I will be the greatest President for jobs that God's ever created." He is cutting the National Institutes of Health, critical research dollars by \$5.8 billion, cutting NASA by \$200 million, cutting National Science Foundation by \$776 million. We see big talk and broken promises.

□ 1230

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 953, REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2017

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 348 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 348

*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. 953) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, 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 Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-21. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such 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 amendments are waived. 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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 gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I found myself listening to the Reading Clerk as he read through the rule. It is a fairly straightforward rule, but it sounded pretty complicated as he was going through it. And I am reminded that

standing to your left is one of the gentlemen that helps us sort through those issues.

As every Member of this institution knows, who was listening to the colloquy last week, Brian Cooper is leaving this House after 35 years of public service, honorable service, showing up day in and day out. My friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, and I, working on the Rules Committee, sometimes go until 2, 3, or 4 in the morning. Well, folks like Mr. Cooper can't go home until the Rules Committee goes home.

So day in and day out, with absolutely no pomp or circumstance, just dedicated public service, Brian Cooper served this institution. I fear this will be the last time he and I are on the floor together while I have control of the microphone. And I did not want to yield control of that microphone without telling how much his assistance has meant to me.

You know, Mr. Speaker, standing in that chair is a powerful responsibility. The burden sometimes is a lot to bear. When you are surrounded by a team of excellence, as you are today, with Ethan to your right and Brian to your left, I know you do that with great confidence. I am grateful to folks who help us to succeed.

Thank you, Mr. Cooper, for all of that service.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 348 is a structured rule. It provides for consideration of H.R. 953, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017. It makes in order two amendments from my Democratic colleagues—one from Ms. ESTY and one from Mr. HUFFMAN.

As you might remember, the House passed a nearly identical version of this bill last year, Mr. Speaker, but, unfortunately, it did not get across the finish line in the Senate, so it did not make it to the President's desk. We are trying again this year. My sincere hope is that we will succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you hear from constituents, as I do, talking about regulatory burdens, and why can't we bring commonsense rules and regulations to Washington. H.R. 953, the bill that this rule would make in order, is an attempt to do that.

This bill prohibits the EPA from requiring unnecessary and duplicative pollution permits for certain pesticides. Now, so often when we start a sentence with "this prevents the EPA," folks think: Oh, there go those Republicans again going after the environment, waiving those regulations that protect friends and family.

Well, as you know, Mr. Speaker, that accusation is never accurate. But, in particular, it fails to address this situation.

For decade upon decade, the EPA has regulated pesticides in this country. If we pass H.R. 953 today, for decades and decades to come, the EPA will continue to regulate pesticides in this country.

As a result of litigation, Mr. Speaker, the courts are forcing the EPA not to regulate pesticides as pesticides, but to

regulate pesticides as pollutant discharges, as if there is something else to do with pesticides other than to spray it.

They are saying that you can't just get a permit to use your pesticide, Mr. Speaker. You can't just read the label and the proper application and get a permit to apply, as indicated on the label. You must also get a permit to discharge a pollutant as if the pesticide is not already regulated as a pesticide itself.

Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense. The good news is I am surrounded by a team of excellence here in the United States House of Representatives and, in a bipartisan way, we have already agreed that it makes no sense.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, we brought a substantially similar measure to the floor, and we passed it under a process called suspension of the rules. It is a process we save for those bills that are relatively noncontroversial. It passed in a bipartisan way, but didn't make it across the Senate floor.

We brought it back again, Mr. Speaker, to this floor. We brought it under a rule, as we are doing today. It passed again in a bipartisan way. We sent it to the Senate, but couldn't make it across the Senate floor.

Mr. Speaker, we added it to the farm bill that we passed here in the House, which, again, passed in a bipartisan way. We sent it over to the Senate and it was stripped out on the Senate side.

Mr. Speaker, we have come together time and time again as a body to move this commonsense regulatory reform forward. It is my great hope that I will get support from both sides of the aisle again today not just on this rule, but on the underlying legislation, and that we will move forward in a bipartisan way again.

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

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

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin as well and echo what Mr. WOODALL said in praising Brian Cooper for his many decades of service to this body. We appreciate all of his years of service. We appreciate all of the years he drove back and forth to work from Baltimore. And we appreciate the incredible patience that he has demonstrated over the years by having to listen to us time and time again.

One of the great joys of serving in this body is that you meet some remarkable people. Brian Cooper is certainly a remarkable person, and he will be missed. And I think on behalf of everybody here, we want to say: thank you.

Mr. Speaker, let me rise in strong opposition to this rule and to the underlying legislation.

My colleague, Mr. WOODALL, just referenced all of the times we passed it, it went over to the Senate, and it didn't go anywhere. Maybe we should take a hint from the Senate that it is not a good bill and we ought to kind of reconsider some of the aspects of this bill.

But here we are again on the House floor with yet another regulatory rollback. It is shameful that the leadership of this House continues to waste precious time on bills that seem to address the concerns of Big Industry over the needs of our constituents, especially as we have so much that needs to be accomplished.

By the way, whatever happened to regular order? Do you remember when committees held hearings and markups?

The Agriculture Committee, on which I serve, did not hold a hearing. It held a markup, but it did not hold a hearing. And the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the committee with primary jurisdiction over this bill, held no hearing and did no markup.

And let's talk about amendments. The majority made in order less than half of the amendments submitted—two amendments—but they blocked through completely germane amendments. Members jumped through all of the hoops, they dotted all of the Is, and they crossed all of the Ts. These were properly drafted amendments, and they were blocked because the Republican majority was afraid to vote on them.

Now, what were these amendments?

Well, an amendment to prohibit the discharge of toxics in such circumstances where they would be harmful to pregnant women or harm fetal or early childhood development. The amendment protects pregnant women and children. Blocked.

An amendment to create an exception for communities that use a source of drinking water where a Federal or State emergency declaration has been issued due to a threat to public health, such as heightened exposure to an identified contaminant. Blocked.

An amendment to ensure existing Clean Water Act protections apply to waters that a State has already determined are polluted by pesticides. Blocked.

They were blocked because they would have passed.

Why are my colleagues afraid of protecting pregnant women, and ensuring clean drinking water?

That is what these amendments were about. They were germane. The only reason why they are not in order is because you chose to block them in the Rules Committee.

I would say to my Republican friends: You are not running this institution. You are ruining this institution. This is supposed to be a deliberative body. Let's start acting like it. And that means bringing germane amendments to the floor, letting us have a debate, letting Republicans and

Democrats debate, and then vote on those amendments.

There is not a single reason at all other than the fact that the Republican leadership did not want these amendments to pass that they were not made in order. That is not the way this place is supposed to work.

And speaking of a bad process, late last week, Billy House at Bloomberg News broke the news that the House may need to vote again on this devastating TrumpCare bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the article by Billy House.

[From www.bloomberg.com, May 18, 2017]  
HOUSE MAY NEED TO VOTE AGAIN ON GOP  
OBAMACARE REPEAL BILL  
(By Billy House)

House Republicans barely managed to pass their Obamacare repeal bill earlier this month, and they now face the possibility of having to vote again on their controversial health measure.

House Speaker Paul Ryan hasn't yet sent the bill to the Senate because there's a chance that parts of it may need to be redone, depending on how the Congressional Budget Office estimates its effects. House leaders want to make sure the bill conforms with Senate rules for reconciliation, a mechanism that allows Senate Republicans to pass the bill with a simple majority.

Republicans had rushed to vote on the health bill so the Senate could get a quick start on it, even before the CBO had finished analyzing a series of last-minute changes. The CBO is expected to release an updated estimate next week.

"Unaware," said Representative Jeff Denham of California, with noticeable surprise Thursday, when advised that his party leaders still hadn't sent the bill over to the Senate. Denham was one of the House Republicans who ended up voting for the measure, after earlier in the week opposing it.

"I am on the whip team and we have a lot of conversations, but we have not had that one. So I am going to look into it," said Denham, a member of the party's vote-counting team.

#### DOWNPLAYING CONCERN

One senior GOP aide downplayed any concern over the potential trouble from the CBO report, depicting it as hypothetical, and saying that leaders will cross that bridge if they need to.

According to several aides and other procedural experts, if Republicans send the bill to the Senate now and the CBO later concludes it doesn't save at least \$2 billion, it would doom the bill and Republicans would have to start their repeal effort all over with a new budget resolution. Congressional rules would likely prevent Republicans from fixing the bill after it's in the Senate, the aides said.

In the Senate, the bill must hit separate \$1 billion deficit reduction targets in the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee and the chamber's health committee. Republican aides said failing to meet those numbers would force the House to fix the bill even if the legislation meets the overall cost-savings target.

If Republican leaders hold onto the bill until the CBO report is released, then Ryan and his team could still redo it if necessary. That would require at least one more House vote of some sort.

Ryan told conservative radio host Hugh Hewitt on Friday that he doesn't think the House will need to vote again on the health law. "We just want to, out of an abundance of caution, wait to send the bill over to the

Senate when we get the final score," Ryan said.

That vote could be cloaked in some kind of arcane procedural move, but it would still be depicted as a proxy for yet another vote on the same bill—and reluctant Republicans will once again be forced to decide whether to back it. Only this time, they would also be saddled with the CBO's latest findings about the bill's costs and impacts.

Republicans had a sizable deficit reduction cushion—\$150 billion—before several amendments were added to the bill at the last minute, including changes allowing states to legalize much skimpier health insurance plans.

#### BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS

It's unclear what assumptions the CBO will make about what states will do with that newly created flexibility. If millions of people sign up for much cheaper, minimal insurance, that could trigger billions—and potentially even hundreds of billions—in costs over a decade because of the House bill's health insurance tax credits.

"We've got to wait for the CBO score," said Greg Walden of Oregon, chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, which authored much of the bill. "To prove that you meet the reconciliation test."

But other senior Republicans weren't aware that leaders had been holding onto the bill.

"I had no idea," Dennis Ross of Florida, another member of the vote-counting team, said Thursday, adding that the prospect of another vote "does concern me."

GOP leaders never said publicly they were planning to hold on to the bill for two weeks or longer.

#### DEMOCRATS' CRITICISM

"Every school child knows that when you pass a bill in the House, you send it to the Senate," said Louise Slaughter, the ranking Democrat on the House Rules Committee. "You don't hide it in a drawer somewhere for two weeks, while you wait for information that you should have had before you passed it."

The speaker and other Republicans urgently pushed their May 4 floor vote, despite a polarized Republican conference, using the frantic final hours to win over holdouts. Even so, 20 Republicans still voted against the bill. After the bill squeaked through, Ryan and other senior Republicans dashed to the White House for an unusual celebration of a one-chamber vote.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure everyone understands that. We thought we were through with it here in the House, but we may not be. After Republicans used emergency procedures on more than one occasion to rush their bill through the House of Representatives, we found out that Republican leaders had yet to send a bill over to the Senate for its consideration. Instead, they have been hiding the bill for nearly 3 weeks.

What happened to the urgency that my colleagues were talking about a few weeks ago?

We heard from our Republican friends that the sky would fall if we didn't act upon TrumpCare immediately. It had to be done right then and there. We couldn't slow down long enough to hear from the nonpartisan experts at the Congressional Budget Office. We couldn't slow down enough so that people could actually read what was in the bill. We couldn't slow down

enough to do hearings or to get estimates on how this massive bill would impact the healthcare of millions of Americans.

I think it has become clear to all of us, Mr. Speaker, that the only reason to rush through this process was to trick their own Members into voting for this disastrous bill. It was to keep their Members from seeing the CBO score before they voted for the bill, because if they had seen it, many of them may not have voted for it. Republican leadership couldn't risk transparency, and they wouldn't let the facts get in the way of passing TrumpCare.

We expect CBO to release their final analysis tomorrow. Finally, we will know how many millions of Americans will be kicked off of their healthcare because of these reckless and heartless Republican policies. We will find out how devastating this bill will be for millions of Americans with preexisting conditions. And we will finally learn just how big that tax cut for wealthy Americans is going to be.

I guess my question to Republican leaders of this House is: What was the rush? If you were going to have to hold up the bill over here until the CBO score was released anyway, why couldn't we just have waited to receive this very important information before we asked the House to vote on this terrible bill?

Oh, wait. I know why the Republican leadership needed to move TrumpCare so fast, so that the bill's namesake—President Trump—didn't throw a temper tantrum. That is what this was all about. So he wouldn't call them out in one of his infamous Twitter rants.

□ 1245

But it wasn't about good legislation. It was a lousy process basically designed to prematurely shove a bill through that is bad for Americans, all for some headline or temporary political gain.

Now, if you have been watching the news lately, you will notice that our 45th President hasn't been generating the best headlines, what with "this Russia thing"—those are his words—constant leaks of information from his staff to the press, never mind the President's leaking of sensitive classified information on national security matters.

President Trump needed a win for himself, even if it is a loss for the American people. As we all know, it is all about him.

Now, I remind my Republican colleagues that they work for the American people, that the ultimate boss for all of us is our constituents, not the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority has made a habit of completely skirting regular order and rushing through legislation crafted behind closed doors with no opportunity for meaningful debate and consideration, and this TrumpCare bill is a prime example.

We had emergency meetings, back-room deals, and fixes to the fixes to the fixes, and what we were left with is a lousy product that we may have to consider again. My Republican colleagues should be ashamed of themselves.

Process matters. We are on the Rules Committee. If you don't believe process matters, you ought to get on a different committee. It matters for the integrity of this institution, and it matters if we are to prevent lousy legislation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few words about the Trump budget that was just released this morning.

We are still digging through the text and combing through the details, but from what we have already seen, it is devastating. Reports indicate that this budget makes the deepest cuts to Federal programs that help the most vulnerable, the poorest of the poor. Mr. Speaker, that is nothing to be proud of.

At a time when our crumbling infrastructure needs repair, our kids need access to affordable education, and our workers need training to move into high-tech jobs, we simply cannot afford to turn our back on these critical investments that will move our country forward. But this budget plan does just that.

Since we are on the floor to talk about an antienvironment bill today, I should note that the Environmental Protection Agency is among the agencies hardest hit by President Trump's ruthless proposal. Through massive cuts to the EPA, the Trump administration is paving the way toward dirtier air and more polluted water. But my Republican colleagues don't seem to be too concerned with that. They have been proposing cuts to EPA for years and years and years.

Mr. Speaker, of all the rotten provisions tucked into this document—and I could go on and on and on—I find the most troubling to be the radical assault on people living in poverty.

You know, it is easy to sit in an office at OMB and concoct plans to throw people off of SNAP and off of Medicaid and kick them out of their housing. This plan does just that. By any reading, by any measure, that is what it does. We are reading about a \$274 billion cut to our safety net, on top of the over \$800 billion cut to Medicaid included in the TrumpCare bill.

These are real people, Mr. Speaker. They are our constituents. They are our neighbors and our friends. Our kids go to school together.

But given some of the proposals I have seen from this majority party, I have to wonder whether some of my colleagues might never have talked with anyone living in poverty. I would say to them, life is very different when you leave your country club. Life is very different. It is very hard for people struggling in poverty. Being poor in this country is hard work, and you ought to know that by now.

My Republican colleagues have made a habit of belittling the poor instead of

trying to understand their struggles. They work hard, Mr. Speaker—often at more than one job—to put food on the table for their kids and to find a roof over their heads. They are exhausted from work and from worry.

We see them every day, serving tables, washing dishes, hauling away trash, cleaning offices, mowing lawns, stacking heavy loads, taking care of people's children, comforting the sick. Theirs are the faces in the bus windows going home from work at 2 in the morning. Theirs are the faces arriving at work at 5 in the morning the next day. They deserve our respect, not the disdain shown to them and to their families in this disgraceful budget.

I would like to remind my colleagues that poverty and hunger in rural areas is often as bad as, and sometimes even worse than, in cities. So I find it highly offensive that this budget slashes our safety net for the very people that President Trump promised to protect, the very people who put President Trump in office.

You know, I heard some of the rationale for this budget from the White House, saying: Well, you know, people who are on SNAP ought to work.

Well, let me just say for the RECORD so it is clear to everybody here that the majority of people on SNAP are children, are senior citizens, are people who are disabled. Of those who can work, a majority of them work. They work, but they earn so little that they are still stuck in poverty.

Why aren't we having a debate about increasing wages in this country? Why is the debate focused on how we make the lives of those in poverty even more miserable?

You know, budgets are moral documents, and this is the most heartless, reckless, and damaging plan I have ever seen. It is immoral.

The President's Budget Director talked yesterday about compassion for taxpayers and for Trump supporters. Well, give me a break. You know, I would tell Mr. Mulvaney I don't think that word means what he thinks it means.

Compassion, that is feeding starving children, helping a father get back on his feet after a job loss, helping a mother get back on her feet after a job loss, cleaning up poisoned water, ensuring everyone has a chance at living a healthy life regardless of how much money they have. That is compassion, not turning our backs on these people.

Tax cuts for the wealthiest among us at the expense of the public safety net is cruel. It is coldhearted and, Mr. Speaker, I am sick of it. I assure you that is not compassionate.

So I hope my Republican colleagues will have the courage to stand up against this administration and do what is right for the American people. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend from Massachusetts I do not have any speakers remaining, and I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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

Throughout his campaign, President Trump made promises that he would not cut Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security. Now we have come to find out that he has broken every one of those promises.

The Trump budget includes more than \$800 billion in Medicaid cuts in the GOP healthcare bill and then adds additional cuts on top of that, with total Medicaid cuts of over \$1 trillion over the next 10 years.

Furthermore, the Trump budget guts Social Security disability insurance which, as of 2015, covered 10 million recipients.

The Trump budget also slashes funding for SNAP, our Nation's first line of defense against hunger, by \$193 billion. That is a 25 percent cut. SNAP is the program that provides people food. That's it—food.

We have 42 million people in this country who are food insecure—42 million. We should all be ashamed of that. And the answer is to cut SNAP by 25 percent?

Oh, and by the way, the average SNAP benefit is \$1.40 per person per meal.

And let's not forget that the Republicans' healthcare disaster takes \$75 billion out of the Medicare trust fund, shortening the life of the trust fund.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I appreciate that. I would like to inquire of the Speaker: Is my friend from Massachusetts working on my yielded time or is he working on his time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is on his own time.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. If the gentleman wants to yield me some of his time, I am more than happy to go on for as long as you would like.

Mr. WOODALL. If my friend would yield, I was advised that I had yielded an abundance of time. I just wanted to make sure that I was not being more generous than you and I would have intended.

Mr. MCGOVERN. So, Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing that, instead of protecting our most vulnerable, President Trump and the House Republicans continually insist on tax breaks for big corporations and the wealthiest Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we need to hold President Trump to his word. Therefore, I am asking that we defeat the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would change the rules of the House to prevent any legislation from being considered if it would result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits under the Social Security Act, if it would increase either the early or full retirement age to receive Social Security benefits.

This would prevent any legislation from being considered if it would privatize Social Security. We would prevent any legislation from being considered that would result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits for individuals entitled to or enrolled for benefits under Medicare or result in a reduction of benefits or eligibility for individuals enrolled in or eligible to receive medical assistance through a State Medicaid plan or waiver.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just simply say to my colleagues that I urge everybody in this House to remember why we came to Congress and who sent us here. Our primary obligation is to the people of this country, and they did not send us here to make their lives more miserable.

When you look at the priorities in the President's budget, when you look at the impact that the healthcare bill, the TrumpCare bill that the House of Representatives passed, when you look at the impact it is going to have on tens of millions of Americans in this country, these bills will devastate people.

So we need to get back to what is important. It is not about propping up the President during his difficulties. It is not about playing to the cheap seats at the Heritage Foundation or some other rightwing think tank. Our primary obligation is to people of the United States. This budget and the priorities of this Republican majority and the priorities of this President undercut the security and the economic well-being of every single person in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" to defeat the previous question and a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to recognize that, if you locked my friend from Massachusetts and me in a room together, it would be over both of our objections, but we would be able to solve about 50 percent of the challenges that face this country.

There is something different that happens in conversation and dialogue when the cameras are turned off than happens when the cameras are on, and of course we are going to keep these cameras here on the floor of the House for as long as you and I are here because the American people have a right to see and a right to know.

But just like Mom and Dad don't want to have all their conversations in front of the kids, and the kids certainly don't want to have all of their conversations in front of Mom and Dad,

there is a role to be played for folks to be able to close the door and sit down and visit with each other and try to make things better.

My friend from Massachusetts is absolutely right. The only job that we have is to make a difference for our constituency back home. Sometimes we legitimately disagree on how to do that. The budget is a good example.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, President Obama, in his 8 years as President of the United States, never once introduced a budget that balanced. He borrowed from our children and our grandchildren in every single budget.

And when I say he didn't introduce a budget that balanced, I don't mean that he didn't balance in year 1, I don't mean he didn't balance in year 10. I mean never, ever, ever looking forward in his budgets did he ever stop borrowing.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a man or woman in this institution who believes that you can run a country that way. There is not one. There is not a man or woman in this institution who doesn't understand that balancing budgets is going to mean hard decisions, and so it is absolutely the right place for the dialog about what those hard decisions should be.

But let us not be confused for one moment. There is no pathway to balance that isn't hard. Borrowing from your children and your grandchildren to pay for what you want today is always going to be easier, Mr. Speaker, than paying for it yourself. We are going to have to have that conversation.

I agree with my friend from Massachusetts. We do not work for the President of the United States in this institution. If anything, he works for us.

I sit on the House Budget Committee, Mr. Speaker, and I promise you, we are promulgating our own House budget, a work product that is going to make this institution proud. I am particularly pleased to be working with Budget Committee Chairwoman DIANE BLACK on that budget, even as we speak.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, it will balance by making commonsense changes to Federal programs, one of which is included in this bill here today.

Take the EPA, for example. Mr. Speaker, I encourage you, if you have not read the comments of our new EPA Administrator, to get into those because what he would tell you, which is absolutely true, is that we have Superfund sites in this country that are so polluted they cannot be utilized for other purposes.

They have been on the Superfund list for decades through Republican Presidents and through Democratic Presidents. They have been sitting on that list. There is no plan to clean them up, no plan to make a difference in those communities, and no plan to serve those constituencies. That is wrong.

Instead of spending its time and resources making a difference for families, making a difference for the environment, what is the EPA having to do?

Respond to court cases that tell it to treat the reasonable and labeled application of pesticides; not as spraying pesticides in your field, but as if you were operating a factory and just having as an effluent, pesticide flowing out of your factory. That is just nonsense.

The reason we produced pesticides is to spray it in fields. We do not need an effluent discharge permit as if we are running a factory, pumping it into our streams. We are not. We are spraying it on our plants to do what?

Address the food needs of this Nation.

My friend from Massachusetts is absolutely right when he talks about hunger in this Nation, Mr. Speaker. He is absolutely right. I dare say that there is not a community in this country that is not affected by hunger. But the biggest advocate we have in the fight against hunger is the American farmer, Mr. Speaker.

There is nobody in the world who does it better; there is nobody in the world who produces it cheaper; there is nobody in the world that has the capability of producing the food to go on the grocery store shelves in America except the American farmer. And these pesticides and herbicides make a difference in getting that food out of the field and onto those store shelves.

We want to do it with strict EPA regulation. That is what is lost in this debate. There is not one Member of this body that wants to repeal EPA regulation. We want to keep that EPA regulation. It is called FIFRA, that regulation that pesticides are regulated under. No one wants to change that at all.

All folks want to do is say: Wait a minute, this is not a factory discharge issue. This is a pesticide issue.

My friend from Massachusetts is absolutely right. I sit on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. Speaker. We did not have a hearing or a markup on this bill, and it was absolutely referred to our committee.

Why, Mr. Speaker?

It was referred to our committee because we have jurisdiction over the Clean Water Act, but this has never been a Clean Water Act issue, except the courts tried to make it one. This has never been a Clean Water Act issue, except the litigants tried to make it one. So when we tried to fix the problem, we didn't waste a moment in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee dealing with the Clean Water Act because this has never been a Clean Water Act issue. It is an ag issue, which is why it went through my friend of Massachusetts' Agriculture Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I don't begrudge anyone the job that they have to do in this institution. We have different constituencies. They ask different things of us.

We all have to come and do our work. But I will tell you what, Mr. Speaker, everything doesn't have to be an us-against-them battle. Sometimes it is just about us. Sometimes there is more that unites this country than divides this country, and that is okay. Sometimes we are able to work together on commonsense solutions, and that is okay.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill came to the House under suspension of the rules, again, that process that we use for things that are noncontroversial, my friend from Massachusetts supported it at that time. He supported it because it is good legislation that is going to make a difference for folks back home. It is going to make a difference in combating hunger in every jurisdiction across this Nation.

When this bill went through the Agriculture Committee, Mr. Speaker, there were no amendments offered. The Agriculture Committee is composed of Republicans and Democrats. It is a place where discussion takes place. It was the markup of this bill, which is when you go and try to amend it and make it better. Not one amendment was offered from either side.

Why?

Because we have discussed this issue, we have litigated this issue, and we have worked together on this issue, and it is a collaborative work product.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman that a number of amendments that are germane were offered in the Rules Committee to protect the health and safety of women and children, and they were not made in order. So amendments were offered and they were blocked. I just point that out for the RECORD.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend. He is absolutely right. When the experts on the Agriculture Committee considered this, when the folks who spend their entire careers on Capitol Hill working on pesticide and pesticide safety considered this, they had absolutely no amendments to offer whatsoever.

When it came to the Rules Committee and the entire House could offer amendments, folks absolutely offered amendments. The Rules Committee, on which the gentleman from Massachusetts and I serve, made two of those amendments in order. We rejected others. You heard my friend's opening statement, Mr. Speaker, that one of the amendments we rejected was to protect pregnant women.

Well, Mr. Speaker, for Pete's sake, I have served with these men and women in here. I have been in this body for 6 years. There is not one Member of this institution who doesn't care about pregnant women. There is not one Member of this institution who doesn't care about children. There is not one Member of this institution who doesn't

care. What we do in this institution is care. And when my friend from Massachusetts supported this bill, when he supported this bill, there were no amendments along those lines.

When the gentleman supported this bill without the amendment dealing particularly with pregnant women and children, I don't believe for a moment the gentleman forgot about those pregnant women and children. I don't believe for a moment he decided he was going to punish pregnant women and children. I believe that he thought those protections were inherent in the base text, and he was right when he thought it, and he was right when he supported it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I would just say that the bill has changed over the years, and I voted against it in committee.

I guess the question is: If we are all in agreement that we want to protect women and children, what was the harm in making in order an amendment that would have done that?

It was perfectly germane, and the Rules Committee decided not to make it in order. I think that is a question that the gentleman hasn't answered.

I appreciate that all the people on the Agriculture Committee are experts, but you know what?

There are other people who know a lot about science, pesticides, and agriculture who were not on the committee. And just because a committee takes action—I mean, if that is the new rule now: if you are on the committee, you can't offer amendments. Well, that is an unfortunate new approach that the Republicans are taking.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, I will tell my friend two things that he already knows. Number one is we do accept amendments from the entire Congress. That is the purpose of the Rules Committee being in existence, and we have added two amendments to this bill for consideration.

When the gentleman supported it in the 112th Congress, we considered no other amendments. That is a change this time. We are going to do that. When it passed the last time we did a rule, no one offered any amendments. This is a change from that time. When we passed it in the Agriculture bill, no one offered any amendments. So it is a change this time. We absolutely are opening up the process more and more with every time the House considers this bill.

But I would also tell my friend something that we are going to have to grapple with as an institution, and that is that I don't need a Rules Committee if what we are going to do is make every amendment that comes to this institution in order.

The only reason we have a Rules Committee is to pick and choose. The only reason we have a Rules Com-

mittee is to set up a timetable on which we can debate and consider things in a reasonable manner. The only reason we have a Rules Committee is because we are not operating under unanimous consent as our friends in the Senate do, though we absolutely could. And I would refer him to my friend, DANIEL WEBSTER, who has some marvelous ideas about how we might do that.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is legitimate for folks back home to wonder what is going on in that United States House. They passed it in a bipartisan way once. They passed it in a bipartisan way twice. They passed it in a bipartisan way three times, and here it is on the floor today, and it is as if the sky is falling and going to open up and swallow everything that is good and decent about this land.

Why is that, Mr. Speaker? Why is that the conversation we are having today instead of the one we had not once, not twice, but three times about how we could use this legislation to improve the lives of citizens across this country?

Perhaps that is just the environment we are in. Perhaps that is just the cards we have been dealt in politics across America today, Mr. Speaker, but we have a chance together as an institution to stand up and say it does not have to be that way. We have a chance together to stand up and say that we can do better than those partisan shenanigans. We can get together on things that are going to make a difference, and the first opportunity you are going to have after this speech, Mr. Speaker, to do that, is in supporting the rule for this bill. The first opportunity we are going to have to do that is in supporting this rule, and then supporting the underlying legislation and sending it back to the Senate one more time. It is the right thing to do, Mr. Speaker, and we have the opportunity to do that together.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for the rule and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO BE OFFERED TO H. RES.  
348 BY MR. MCGOVERN

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

RESTRICTIONS ON CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION THAT WOULD BREAK DONALD TRUMP'S PROMISE NOT TO CUT SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, OR MEDICAID

13. (a) It shall not be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report which includes any provision described in paragraph (b)."

(b) A provision referred to in paragraph (a) is a provision which, if enacted into law, would result in any of the following:

(1) a reduction of guaranteed benefits scheduled under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.);

(2) an increase in either the early or full retirement age for the benefits described in paragraph (1);



(3) a privatization of Social Security;

(4) a reduction of guaranteed benefits for individuals entitled to, or enrolled for, benefits under the Medicare program under title XVIII of 18 such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); or

(5) a reduction of benefits or eligibility for individuals enrolled in, or eligible to receive medical assistance through, a State Medicaid plan or waiver under title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 5 et seq.).

(c) It shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (a). As disposition of any point of order under paragraph (a) or this paragraph (except a point of order against an amendment pursuant to paragraph (a)), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the measure, order, conference report, or rule as applicable. The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.

#### THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Again, hearing the gentleman say that we all want to protect the lives of pregnant women and children, I just want to ask as an inquiry: Is the amendment by EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON that prohibits the discharge of toxins in such circumstances where they would be harmful to pregnant women, or could harm fetal, or early childhood development, which is perfectly germane, is that made in order? Is that part of the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is free to consult the Rules Committee report.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Well, I don't think it is. I would just simply say to the gentleman, if he wants more cooperation, then maybe we ought to open the process up, and actually listen to what the Democrats have to say too.

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 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 191, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 271]

YEAS—229

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)

Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Billirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn

Blum  
Bost  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck

Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Cheney  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins (LA)

Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Lewis (MN)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Noem  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin

Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

#### NAYS—191

Adams  
Aguilar  
Barragan  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)

Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crist  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Ellison  
Engel

Eshoo  
Español  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallogo  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones

Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham, M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern

McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes

Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schradler  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suoizzi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—10

Black Johnson, Sam Tiberi  
Deutch Newhouse Wasserman  
Hice, Jody B. Roybal-Allard Schultz  
Huizenga Simpson

□ 1333

Mr. CRIST and Mrs. DINGELL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 271.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE TERRORIST ATTACK IN MANCHESTER, ENGLAND

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask that all present rise for a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in memory of the victims of the terrorist attack in Manchester, England.

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 189, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 272]

AYES—232

Abraham Amodei Banks (IN)  
Aderholt Arrington Barletta  
Allen Babin Barr  
Amash Bacon Barton

Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Cheney  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallagher  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)

Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzer  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Lewis (MN)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Noem  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce

Perry  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NOES—189

Adams  
Aguilar  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright

Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette

Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Españillat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Crist  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Galleo  
Garamendi  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer

Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey

Lujan Grisham, M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
Maloney, Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard

Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schradler  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suoizzi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—9

Black Huizenga Wasserman  
Deutch Johnson, Sam Schultz  
Gaetz Newhouse  
Hice, Jody B. Tiberi

□ 1342

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# THE BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-3)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

On February 28, I spoke to a joint session of the Congress about what we need to do to begin a new chapter of American Greatness. I asked the Nation to look forward nine years and imagine the wonders we could achieve by America's 250th anniversary of our Independence if we set free the dreams of our people by removing the barriers holding back our economic growth.

This Budget's defining ambition is to unleash the dreams of the American people. This requires laying a new foundation for American Greatness.

Through streamlined Government, we will drive an economic boom that