

record for recent Presidents. Until the media becomes less slanted, they will continue to be a source of dysfunction in our political system.

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, November 14, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 14, 2017, at 9:39 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1679.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 2874, 21ST CENTURY
FLOOD REFORM ACT, AND PRO-
VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF
THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON
H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE
AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FIS-
CAL YEAR 2018

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 616 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 616

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2874) to achieve reforms to improve the financial stability of the National Flood Insurance Program, to enhance the development of more accurate estimates of flood risk through new technology and better maps, to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risks, and to provide for alternative methods to insure against flood peril, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, modified by the amendment printed in part B of that report, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018

for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate; and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

SEC. 3. The Clerk shall not transmit to the Senate a message that the House has adopted the conference report to accompany H.R. 2810 until notified by the Speaker or by message from the Senate that the Senate has passed H.R. 4374 without amendment.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 616 provides for consideration of H.R. 2874, the 21st Century Flood Reform Act, and the conference report to accompany H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

H.R. 2874, the 21st Century Flood Reform Act, reauthorizes the National Flood Insurance Program for 5 years, introduces great private market competition, and provides additional reforms to benefit policyholders and taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, the Office of Management and Budget has said that the National Flood Insurance Program, or NFIP, is not fiscally sustainable in its current form. The 21st Century Flood Reform Act helps transition it to a more sustainable program.

Importantly, the bill will help foster a robust product market for flood insurance, which allows private insurers to compete, in turn, driving down the price of policies while creating greater consumer choice. This is a win for policyholders and taxpayers alike.

Representing Alabama's Gulf Coast, it is important to me and my constituents that they have access to affordable flood insurance through the National Flood Insurance Program or a private insurer.

I appreciate the inclusion of provisions in the 21st Century Flood Reform Act to protect current policyholders while making the program sustainable.

I also appreciate Chairman HENSARLING's willingness to work with

Members whose constituents, such as mine, rely very heavily upon the NFIP to address concerns we raised about the initial version of the bill that passed out of committee.

All in all, this bill is a positive step toward reauthorizing our Nation's flood insurance program, which is currently set to expire on December 8. We must take action to ensure coastal homeowners and others in flood-prone areas have access to affordable insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate to get a long-term reauthorization across the finish line and signed into law by President Trump.

House Resolution 616 also allows for consideration of the final version of the National Defense Authorization Act that was conferenced between the House and the Senate, reconciling the differences between two different versions.

Mr. Speaker, before I go into the substance of the bill, I would like to take a minute to commend the open and regular order process that has taken place from start to finish.

As a member of both the Armed Services Committee and the Rules Committee, I have followed this bill throughout the legislative process and think we should all be proud of the regular order and the fact that a wide range of members played a role in crafting the final product.

I applaud Chairman THORNBERRY, Ranking Member SMITH, and the entire Armed Services Committee staff for their dedication to an open process. I also appreciate the countless hours they have poured into this conference report.

Just as a quick reminder, we considered 275 amendments during the House Armed Services Committee back in June, and another 210 amendments when the NDAA was considered by the full House in July. In total, 485 amendments have been considered in the House, and, just as important, there was a clear bipartisan split between the number of majority and minority amendments.

The conference committee continued this bipartisan and collaborative process under the leadership of four chairmen and ranking members. Once again, this year's NDAA is truly a bipartisan and bicameral bill that provides the best for our military and national security.

Mr. Speaker, this NDAA follows through on our promise to our servicemen and -women and our constitutional duty to provide for the common defense of the United States of America.

The FY18 NDAA conference report authorizes a 10 percent increase in total military spending, reminiscent of the Reagan era defense buildup. The bill authorizes \$626 billion for base budget requirements, \$66 billion for overseas contingency operations, and \$8 billion for other defense activities.

That adds up for a total national defense top line of \$700 billion.

I am incredibly proud to support a top-line number high enough to begin reversing the readiness crisis that has endangered the lives of our servicemembers and made it harder to defend our country.

Over the past 8 years, and under sequestration, our military has suffered. We have planes that can't fly, ships that can't sail, and soldiers who can't deploy, all while the number of threats around the world keep rising.

I want to acknowledge that this top-line number is significantly higher than the Budget Control Act cap for defense. I look forward to continued dialogue with the Appropriations Committee to raise this cap that has crippled necessary defense spending in recent years.

Every day we operate under a continuing resolution or the BCA caps is another day we are failing our men and women in uniform. The FY18 NDAA fulfills the authorization side of the equation, and I am hopeful the appropriations side will follow.

The FY18 NDAA increases the size of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Army Guard and Reserve, Naval and Air Reserve, and Air Guard to repair and restore readiness.

The bill also authorizes construction of 13 new Navy ships, including three littoral combat ships, as we work to grow toward a 355-ship fleet.

In a well-deserved benefit for our troops, the NDAA provides for a 2.4 percent pay increase for servicemembers, which is the amount our troops are entitled to under current law.

Another small but important provision in this bill eliminates the so-called widow's tax, which requires surviving spouses of servicemembers killed in action to forfeit the survivor benefit pension annuity. The financial burden of this tax is something our military families should not bear.

The bill also continues to advance Chairman THORNBERRY's priority of reforming and strengthening the military's acquisition process to make it more effective and efficient.

Importantly, the legislation takes into account the Trump administration's \$6 billion budget amendment to authorize more funding for missile defense threats against North Korea, Navy ship repairs, and more troops in Afghanistan.

Our men and women in uniform all over the world are on a mission to protect and defend the freedoms we hold dear. The way I see it, our mission in Congress is to give these brave men and women the resources they need to succeed. The FY18 NDAA does exactly that and is another step in a multiyear process of restoring our military strength to further protect our national security. Ultimately, this bill is about keeping the American people safe and secure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 616 and both

of the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2810, the Fiscal Year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act, takes important steps towards strengthening our national security and supporting our troops.

The conference report authorizes a total of \$692 billion in discretionary budget authority, \$26 billion more than the administration requested.

I am pleased that it raises military pay by 2.4 percent, an increase from the President's request of 2.1 percent.

□ 1230

It also strengthens our efforts to counter Russia's campaign to undermine our democracy by fully funding cybersecurity and cyberspace operations at \$8 billion and it drops harmful restrictions on funding the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty extension between the United States and Russia. This treaty continues a bipartisan tradition that began under President Reagan, verifiably reducing both countries' nuclear arsenals.

Mr. Speaker, there is one glaring problem with this measure, and that is that the Budget Control Act imposes a \$549 billion cap on defense spending for fiscal year 2018. This bill blows past that by more than \$143 billion. Unless the Senate, the House, and the President come to an agreement on lifting or modifying the budget caps, there is no way that these spending levels can become law. So far, that agreement is not in the offing and it is past time for a bipartisan compromise on realistic spending levels for defense and non-defense spending alike.

While I am glad to see this pay increase for our troops, this legislation does not exist in a vacuum. Later this week, the Republicans plan to bring to the floor a disastrous tax bill that would force military families and veterans to finance tax cuts for corporations and the superwealthy. The bill repeals tax credits that help veterans find employment. It makes education more expensive for veterans and undermines the GI Bill. It makes it more expensive for military families to sell their homes. It eliminates tax relief for veterans suffering from chronic illnesses.

Veterans Day was just a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, and it is no way for the majority to thank them for their service.

Also before us today is H.R. 2874, which is known as the 21st Century Flood Reform Act. Now, everybody in this Chamber recognizes the National Flood Insurance Program is badly in debt, to the tune of \$25 billion. The hurricanes this year, together with the flooding across Louisiana last year, have stretched the program beyond its breaking point.

Unfortunately, this package will cause more harm than good for the communities already struggling to rebuild. It will make flood insurance more expensive for families by increasing premiums.

It also exempts businesses from the requirement to purchase flood insurance even though the vast majority of policyholders with this insurance only purchase it because they are required to by law. This change would take effect beginning in January 2019.

The Independent Community Bankers and a number of other groups oppose this provision. As businesses pull out of the insurance market and the number of participating dwindles, responsible businesses that stay in the market will be forced to bear the burden of greatly increased premiums. I think these are shortsighted changes that will be felt all across the insurance market.

Additionally, the legislation doesn't do enough to update the often out-of-date flood insurance rate maps being used in communities across the country and in my district. Accurate flood insurance maps prepared with the most recent mapping technologies would help constituents in all of our districts better prepare and protect themselves against flooding. Some current maps are so outdated that the maps don't reflect changing landscapes and critical flood mitigation improvements. This bill simply falls short in helping homeowners who want to do the right thing based off the best available information.

We are in the wake of some of the worst hurricanes our Nation has ever experienced, and more of them. We are seeing how vital, affordable, and readily available flood insurance is to so many communities. It is unconscionable that the majority is moving forward with this partisan package of bills, unlikely to ever pass the Senate, because this will only further delay the extension of the program with 1 month left before it expires.

As the majority lurches from crisis to crisis and fritters away precious legislative time with this partisan approach, we will likely find ourselves right back here doing this over again in December.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), the sponsor of H.R. 2874.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding.

First, I want to make a comment about how this process has gone in coming up with this compromise with the amendment on the flood insurance package. We have worked in the Financial Services Committee with outside groups, whether it was the home builders or the realtors or the insurance industry. We have worked with Members of Congress from the Gulf States and

from the East Coast and from the West Coast. We worked with Democrats. We had a number meetings with the ranking member of the committee, all taking in their consideration, which has brought us to a compromise that I don't know that anybody loves, but everyone says is a pretty darn good bill that strives to make needed reforms in a program that hasn't been working well. When we have programs that don't work well, let's try to fix them.

We have a program that, as was just mentioned, is \$25 billion in debt, but that doesn't include the \$16 billion we just gave the program and forgave. So really, it is \$41 billion in debt.

So when do we think through the policies of a program that continues to run deficits, number one, but, number two, continues to incentivize people to live in harm's way?

I was down in Houston and I got to see a family who was talking about their next-door neighbor whose house was burning down. He was telling the story about his neighbor, and as the house started on fire, he sent the kids outside—like you would because your house is burning—as the flood waters are rising. The dad went to go put out the fire, and as he was putting out the fire, he looked out the window and saw his kids were being swept away by a flood. The current was too strong, so he ran outside to save his kids and let his house burn.

What are we going to do in that neighborhood that had been flooded three times in the last 10 years?

We are going to rebuild houses in the same flood plain. This doesn't make sense. Let's think about a reform that is going to improve the program, that helps people get out of dangerous areas and get into better areas that don't flood. Having a flooding house isn't a pleasant place to live.

Not only that, first responders risk their lives to go save people, and they die. We are incentivizing through this policy to allow people to live in these dangerous areas. I don't have a lot of time left, but the reforms are going to, yes, gently increase some of the premiums for the most highly subsidized properties called the pre-FIRM properties. We offer over \$1 billion in mitigation to help families flood-proof their home or get out of their home and go to a better place to live because this improves the solvency of flood insurance. We are helping them with mitigation.

We are helping them with mapping, allowing communities that haven't been mapped to actually map themselves, to pay for it, to take care of their own future and destiny instead of waiting for the Federal Government. We allow for a private market to come in and offer you a premium that might be lower than the Federal Government.

God forbid we offer a family a choice to let the private sector compete with a public offering. My God, if you get a lower price, that is great. If you don't get a lower price, you can stay in the Federal plan.

My goodness, I am going to have some people come up in a second and say: But you could cherry-pick, and that could jeopardize the solvency of the program.

The program is insolvent. It is \$25 billion in debt—actually, \$41 billion, if you include that \$16 billion. It is not a solvent program.

Just think if in Houston and in Florida we had people who had bought insurance in the private market, we would be saving taxpayers money. This is a commonsense bill that makes the program better, that helps families, that empowers communities. Let's stand together. A little bit of reform might go a long way in making government actually work, so I would encourage all of my colleagues on both side of the aisle to vote "yes" for common sense.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation would help thousands of young people who are Americans in every way except on paper.

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 New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there are 2,400 DACA recipients in my district. "We are not one," "no somos uno." There are 30,000 DACA recipients in my home State of New York. "We are not 100," "no somos cien." There are 800,000 DACA recipients in the country. As of this year, there were more than 10,000 noncitizens serving in the U.S. military and an additional 12,000 noncitizens under Reserve status. "We are millions, count us well," "somos millones, cuentanos bien."

DREAMers are veterans, teachers, nurses, college students; and DREAMers are also MacArthur genius fellows. Cristina Jimenez is a MacArthur genius fellow, a powerhouse championship for immigrant youth, and, like me, she is also a CUNY alum and she grew up undocumented.

This is why I urge my colleagues to bring a clean Dream Act to the House floor. H.R. 3440, the Dream Act, would not provide automatic amnesty, as I have heard some of my colleagues incorrectly say. The Dream Act has an 8-year conditional basis of permanent residency status. You have to either work for 3 years, serve in the Armed Forces, or study. You have to keep a clean record, get a background check,

and a medical exam. Then, and only after then, for a few more years, you can apply for citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can immediately bring the Dream Act to the floor and provide certainty, hope, and opportunity for 800,000 talented young people. Our country needs them and we cannot afford to wait another day.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 2874, the 21st Century Flood Reform Act.

This act is near and dear to my heart. That is how I make my livelihood. I am a real estate developer. We build houses. We build commercial projects. All that stops unless reform is made in the Flood Insurance Program. This bill proposes major reforms to one of the Federal Government's most broken programs, the National Flood Insurance Program.

The Government Accountability Office has labeled the NFIP a high-risk program mainly because policyholders often pay premiums well below the actual risk of flooding on their properties.

H.R. 2874 requires FEMA to conduct an annual actuarial review of the status of the NFIP that will allow FEMA to adjust rates appropriately and help maintain the program's financial stability.

Currently, there are 4.92 million NFIP policies providing \$1.23 trillion in coverage to Americans. Many of these properties are what this bill defines as multiple loss properties, where NFIP claims have been filed repeatedly.

This bill requires FEMA to raise premiums on multiple loss properties by 15 percent annually if the premiums do not reflect the full risk. This is just another step toward FEMA improving the financial stability of the NFIP.

Often, with the Federal Government, there are changes and agreements made behind closed doors with little or no public comment. H.R. 2874 requires FEMA to publish an explanation and to hold public hearings in regards to any changes to premiums on policies. This is an excellent example of making the government more transparent and helping policyholders more accountable.

Lastly, the 21st Century Flood Reform Act requires the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study on how we can simplify the NFIP. With our country being battered by hurricanes and heavy rainfall, we need to ensure that the NFIP is placed in sound financial footing for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this all-important legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALONE), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

□ 1245

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New York, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the bill and also to the rule. Just a few weeks ago, we observed the fifth anniversary of Superstorm Sandy. New Jersey's recovery from that traumatic event has been prolonged in part by issues facing the National Flood Insurance Program. Too many of my constituents are still dealing with high premiums and inaccurate flood maps or are still waiting for their Sandy claims appeals to be decided.

We need a long-term NFIP reauthorization that focuses on increasing affordability, investing in mitigation, capping the profits of flood insurance companies, and comprehensively restructuring the claims process—and this bill fails these tests.

H.R. 3823 would undermine the NFIP by allowing the development of a private flood insurance market, opening the door to allowing insurance companies to cherry-pick low-risk properties while leaving high-risk ones in the NFIP. This bill does not do enough to address affordability issues and actually increases rates for some policyholders. It will allow commercial properties to opt out of mandatory coverage even if they are in a high-risk zone, which will further decrease the pool and weaken the program.

Finally, this bill simply does not do enough to improve transparency and reform the claims process. Enactment of this legislation would make flood insurance more expensive and less available, while not actually addressing the program's many problems.

I have actually introduced legislation to tackle NFIP's issues head-on. The bill is the bipartisan SAFE NFIP Reauthorization Act, which would reauthorize the program, cap premium rate increases, authorize funding for more accurate flood mapping, reform the appeals process, and cap the compensation of flood insurance companies.

I also offered amendments to the Rules Committee that would improve this bill, including a 10 percent cap on premium increases, increasing the increased cost of compliance from \$30,000 to \$100,000, capping the profits of flood insurance companies, and other pro-policyholder provisions, but none of these amendments were accepted by the Rules Committee.

I hear my Republican colleagues talk about transparency. In fact, this is the 50th closed rule of the year, an all-time record for closed rules. They blocked both Democratic and Republican amendments. The Rules Committee says in its report this is a closed rule. If it is a closed rule, then how can they talk about transparency or process?

Some of my Republican colleagues who offered amendments that were denied were Mr. DONOVAN of New York, affected by Sandy; Mr. GRAVES of Lou-

isiana, affected by Katrina; and Mr. PASCARELL and I, who went through Superstorm Sandy.

It is incredible to me that we had a number of Democrats and Republicans who really wanted to reform the flood insurance program in an effective way based on their experiences—not some ideology—based on their experiences in the superstorms that we saw that impacted our districts, and the Rules Committee denied every one of those amendments.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I just would point out to the gentleman that the Democrats have highlighted the number of amendments not made in order during the first session of the 115th Congress; however, in the 111th Congress, their majority blocked nearly 3,000 amendments, with roughly 2,400 of those occurring in the first session. So, far be it from the case that Republicans have blocked an inordinate number of amendments. We blocked far less amendments than our Democratic colleagues did when they were in control of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), who is my fellow colleague on the Rules Committee and the Armed Services Committee.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank my colleague, Mr. BYRNE, for his hard work, both on the Armed Services Committee and on the Rules Committee, on this important rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule that will allow for consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

Mr. Speaker, as elected Members of this body, we have no higher obligation or responsibility than to provide for the support and the defense of our Nation. No matter what else we do in this body—and we debate very big, important issues. We debate tax cuts, we debate healthcare, and these are crucial issues, but none of those issues matters if we fail to get the resources necessary to defend this Nation from our adversaries.

For far too long, Mr. Speaker, we have failed to do that. Over the last 8 years, we have seen policies that have failed to provide the kind of resources our Defense Department needs. We have also seen, Mr. Speaker, legislation from this body—in particular, the Budget Control Act—that has caused significant damage to the military.

We have heard on the Armed Services Committee, week after week, briefings from every layer of the military—from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, from the Secretary of Defense, and from the combatant commanders—briefings about the extent to which there is a gap that is growing between our abilities and the abilities of our adversaries. Now, this is a gap that people seem to want to ignore, Mr. Speaker, but we do so at our own peril.

I think that we need, as Members of this body, to think very carefully

about what we are going to say to our children and our grandchildren one day if they say to us: Why didn't you do all you could to ensure for the defense of this Nation? Why didn't you do all you could when you were in a position to provide the resources?

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons we don't do all we can is because we enable the Senate rules. We have gotten ourselves in a situation, through the Budget Control Act and through the way that we do budgeting in this House, where we enable the dysfunction of the United States Senate, and we let the United States Senate be in a position where, in fact, they prevent us from doing what we know is right from a policy perspective.

I am very proud of this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, because what this does, in a bipartisan fashion, is begin to fix that. It begins to remedy the situation. It begins to allow our military to get out from under the burden, the hole that they have been in for the last 8 years.

Funds authorized in this NDAA will ensure that we are able, for example, to modernize our strategic forces. It will also ensure, Mr. Speaker, that we are able to begin to provide funding for the kind of missile defense that we know we need in a situation in which our adversaries have gained tremendous ground.

Mr. Speaker, when we have the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs come before the committee and tell us in public session that, if we continue on the path we are on, within 5 years we will not be able to project our power, every Member of this body needs to stop everything else they are doing and listen to that warning. If we can't project our power, then we cannot defend this Nation.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Wyoming an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. CHENEY. There are many Members of this body, Mr. Speaker, on both sides, who like to quote a former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs that the debt is the biggest national security threat we face. That is only half of his quote. The second half of his quote was that the debt is the most significant threat we face because it prevents us from being able to resource our military.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be here today to stand in support of this rule and to stand in support of the National Defense Authorization Act and the important progress that it allows us to begin to make to rebuild our military and undo the damage of the last 8 years.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this record-breaking closed rule, the 50th closed rule in a year, which is more than any time in any yearly period previously.

I think our rules should be open. I think closed rules are not good for this institution regardless of who does it, and I would urge the majority party to think about open rules so that the legislature can truly work its way.

The legislation itself includes a handful of measures that I authored—I am happy about that—to require reporting on Russia's role in the Balkans, including Serbia's defense relationship with Russia; to enhance congressional oversight of changes made to policies and legal interpretations that govern security operations; a strategy to improve transparency and civilian protection in Nigeria; and a requirement for a Defense Department official to protect cultural heritage, the looting and trafficking of which is a funding source for terrorism. We voted on that here on the floor and it has passed.

I am also pleased that we have included continued support for Israel's missile defense. This system is critical to Israel's security, considering the threats that Israel faces from Iran, Hamas, and Hezbollah.

Mr. Speaker, even though I am ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I am glad to see these measures in this bill because they all belong in this bill. They are related to our national security. Indeed, I strongly support the measures in this bill that provide authorities and resources necessary for our military to carry out its missions.

But, as we have seen again and again in recent years, this defense authorization continues an unsettling trend toward involving the Defense Department in activities outside its core competencies. In my view, we need to preserve and strengthen the important roles of the State Department and USAID.

We wouldn't ask our diplomats or our development experts to do the jobs of our men and women in uniform, so we shouldn't be asking our servicemembers to do the work that has traditionally resided in our civilian foreign policy agencies.

I want to caution against continuing down this road, and I hope that, in the years ahead, we can work to support our diplomatic and development efforts in the same way we support our national defense. After all, America's security depends on all these efforts working together.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New York an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Let me say, in conclusion, I hope that, in the years ahead, we can work to support our diplomatic and development efforts in the same way we support our national defense. After all, America's security depends on all of these efforts working together, and it is important to remember that.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there are fundamental problems with flood insurance. We all know that. The program, by some estimates, has a debt, recently, of up to \$24 billion, and it is going to be compounded by Hurricanes Maria, Irma, and Harvey and the other disasters that we have had this year. We have had extraordinary damages this year.

But what is being missed is that this legislation really doesn't even fix the problem. You can look back over the last 37 years. Since 1980, we have had 218 disasters that have exceeded \$1 billion. We have spent \$1.3 trillion responding to these disasters.

This bill is projected to, perhaps, save \$18 million a year—\$18 million, I will say it again. We have spent \$1.3 trillion since 1980. There are fundamental problems that need to be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, 40 percent of this Nation's population lives in just 10 percent of the land area adjacent to the coast—10 percent. Forty percent of the population lives there, and it is growing. It is going up. We have got to get good at resiliently living in these coastal areas.

Now, let me show you something, and this is what is happening in Louisiana. Louisiana drains, literally, from Montana to New York, and the Canadian Provinces are all coming down.

Mr. Speaker, as we get additional development in the United States, what happens with that water? It comes down to us.

So let me give you a scenario.

Somebody builds their dream home or somebody starts a small business, and they fully comply with the regulations that are in place at the time for baseline elevation. They build a home or business exactly where it is supposed to be. They start getting additional water down from this watershed or maybe from the coast because the Corps of Engineers has caused 2,000 square miles of the coast of this Nation to erode.

So, yes, we are more vulnerable. We are getting more water down or we have the Gulf of Mexico encroaching on our citizens.

Why should our citizens be responsible for that? They have no control over what is happening. They have complied with the regulations and complied with the guidelines at the time of construction.

Mr. Speaker, I view this as a tax. If our citizens are being burdened with additional fees or expense as a result of the government's inability to do its job to properly manage resources and water, then that is not a premium increase; that is a tax, Mr. Speaker.

While I commend people for working on this bill and trying to address this, the fundamental premise of the bill is

flawed. It is fundamentally flawed. You can't charge people for things over which they have no control. You can't charge people whenever they stepped up and did exactly what the government told them to do when they built a home or built a business.

These things aren't portable structures. You can't just pick up a home and say, "I am going to move it." You can't pick up a business and say, "I am going to move it."

But that is exactly what this bill does. It increases the premiums and, in some cases, even kicks them out of their homes and businesses, these dream homes and these lifesaving investments.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself 30 seconds because I was very impressed, yesterday, with Mr. GRAVES and the thoughtful work that he had done. I am sorry his amendments were not made in order, but I appreciate very much his homework on this bill, and I agree with him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy.

I was listening to our friend from Louisiana, and I sympathize with much of what he was saying. I have been working on flood insurance reform for 20 years.

□ 1300

We are caught in a dynamic here where it is never really good enough and there are challenges for people who played by the rules at the time.

The problem is that we are not doing a good job of evaluating, moving forward, and making the changes. It is true that some of this has an impact on Louisiana. I am sensitive to that. But at the same time, there are policies that have been resisted by some of those same state leaders.

We must swallow hard and understand that we are on a path here that impacts people all across the country. We do not have accurate flood maps, and people resist updating them. We have many people who are paying far less than the actuarial costs for their flood insurance. There are millions more who are subsidizing all this because they are paying unfair premiums. We do not invest in pre-disaster mitigation. We will save \$4 in disaster relief for each dollar we invest upfront to protect property and lives.

I am prepared to support the underlying bill. It is not perfect. There are changes that I would make. I understand some of the challenges that people are going to suggest in terms of the impact on some lower-income citizens. I sympathize with that, but the answer is not to continue to keep people in harm's way. The answer is not to rebuild people's homes right back where they are going to be putting their property and their families at risk. We

should not continue to resist reform, because it is hard. Ultimately, that adds to the price tag and it adds to the dislocation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is important that we don't lose an opportunity to start changing this situation.

When the floods came in Houston, I got calls from some reporters because I had been dealing with problems in Houston going back 20 years. This is an example of where we failed to deal with repetitive flood loss and where we have watched unchecked sprawl put millions of people at risk for greater harm.

This bill isn't perfect, but I hope that it starts the process where we can come together as it goes through the legislative process. I hope we can make adjustments to start us along that path, and that we start swallowing hard, making sure that everybody gives up a little.

The Federal Government needs to invest more. People need to stop building in harm's way. We need to do a better job of flood recovery and pre-disaster mitigation. I think this bill represents a good faith start along that path, and I hope we can use it as a foundation for further progress.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS), a very happy Auburn Tigers fan.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 2874.

Homeowners deserve choice; they deserve competition; and, above all, they need to know the true risk their homes face from floods, the most costly of all natural disasters.

I believe the underlying bill allows the freedom to insure against obvious danger that imperils people's homes and their wallets. I am particularly enthusiastic about the inclusion of my bipartisan legislation to facilitate the development of a robust private flood insurance marketplace.

After months and even years of negotiations, we have produced legislation that appropriately balances the need for affordable flood insurance with our responsibility to act as faithful stewards of taxpayer dollars.

Everyone knows that the National Flood Insurance Program is broken. We should act accordingly. We need to fix it. But before we do that, we must agree to proceed.

Less than a month ago, many of us voted to bail out this floundering program, forgiving \$16 billion of its debt. But we knew that it would be irresponsible to merely kick the can down the road. This is the opportunity to make things right.

I believe we need to proceed with the debate because we need to have a rea-

sonable and responsible conversation about fixing this problem before it gets worse. Americans deserve better than a Big Government insurance monopoly that is unable to pay for the risk it insures.

The 21st Century Flood Reform Act will usher in a new era of consumer choice, competition, and affordability by empowering policyholders to purchase the insurance products that best meet their needs.

We are getting rid of the top-down, single-payer approach to insurance where we pretend there is no danger until there is a tragedy.

Giving consumers choice in a competitive marketplace will not only drive down costs, but will also help reduce the unacceptable number of homes that are not protected by flood insurance.

The NFIP can be an important tool for mitigating flood risks and helping families recover from disasters after they strike, but it cannot be the only tool. A Federal program that conceals actual risk through artificially low rates is neither compassionate nor responsible.

People deserve to know when they are in danger. When the Federal Government provides them with information that suggests otherwise, we do more harm than good.

We cannot expect to have educated, thoughtful consumers if we deprive them of the market information that is needed to make the smart decisions. By putting policyholders on a slow path to sound premium rates, we are stepping towards a future where the threats of major floods are confronted before they are realized.

I think we all agree that more needs to be done to mitigate flood risks and incentivize investments in resiliency. We can take the first steps by eliminating the false security that inoculates our society to the dangers of flooding.

Let's remove the blindfold we have placed over the public's eyes. Let's gradually walk back the subsidies that conceal a homeowners risk. It is time for this Nation to confront this threat with clear eyes and a vision for the future. This bill is the first step in the right direction.

In closing, I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Housing and Insurance Subcommittee Chairman DUFFY for their tenacity and commitment to paving the way for a safer and more affordable system for managing flood risks in this country. Flood insurance is one of those rare issues that transcends political boundaries.

I once again urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and also on the underlying bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, the National Defense Authorization Act isn't perfect. Most notably, it blows past the caps implemented under the Budget Control Act. But there are areas of common ground

in this bill, including a pay raise for our military and investments to fill the genuine readiness gaps in our Armed Forces.

I want to point out that they are the result of something that is all too often nonexistent under the majority, and that is regular order. I agree with what my colleague said, to see a bill under regular order is a downright joy. I hope we do more of it.

A hearing and a markup were held for this bill and colleagues from both sides of the aisle were consulted. That is how the Chamber was designed to function, but, today, it hardly functions like that at all.

It is a shame that we don't also see the majority put this model to use for other major legislation like healthcare and tax reform, which we will be rushing through to get to tomorrow.

This is a process that we didn't see for the other measure before us today, which is H.R. 2874. No hearing was ever held on the package in its entirety. It was changed right up until it was considered by the Rules Committee earlier this week in an effort not to get Democrat support, but to get enough support from Members of the majority so that it could pass on a party-line vote.

That is what we see under this leadership: no hearings and rarely any markups.

Legislation to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which would impact one-sixth of our economy, was passed without so much as a score from the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office outlining its impacts and its costs.

This Congress has broken the record for the use of closed rules, which prevents any amendments from being offered by either side on the House floor. It is now the most closed Congress ever.

In fact, one of the rules before us right now is closed. We are even likely to consider the majority's bipartisan tax plan this week—actually, tomorrow—which would increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion, yet under another closed rule and without scoring.

The United States Congress has been called the greatest deliberative body in the world. I think it is time the majority change course and actually allow the great debates about the issues that we face. The legislation we consider would certainly be better for it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I represent a coastal area of Alabama, and flood insurance is extremely important to many of my constituents. It is very important to me to fulfill my job on their behalf to make sure that we have a Flood Insurance Program that is there for many years to come. But we know that it is actuarially insolvent. So we have to make changes in the program.

As the gentleman from Oregon said, change is hard and reforms are hard.

But the gentleman from Florida and, before him, the gentleman from Wisconsin, the sponsor of the bill, made very good points. The reforms we are making in this bill for the Flood Insurance Program will allow it to be successful for years to come and also protect the taxpayers of America. I think we have a responsibility to do that.

The other bill under this rule, the conference report on the National Defense Authorization Act, represents a very important inflection point.

We are now moving to repair the damage we have done to our military these last several years. This is a 10 percent increase for our military so that we can help them rebuild their readiness and the equipment they need to defend us with this ever-increasing matrix of threats, not the least of which is North Korea. We put even more money in this authorization to defend against a missile attack from North Korea.

We are at the beginning of something historic here with this bill, and that is rebuilding the United States military, much like it was done 30-plus years ago when President Reagan was in office.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support House Resolution 616 and the underlying bills.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for her tremendous leadership on so many of these very critical issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and to H.R. 2810, the Fiscal Year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act. This bill authorizes \$700 billion in defense spending for our already out-of-control Pentagon budget. It would also increase funding by \$66 billion for wars that Congress has never debated or voted on. And once again, my Republican colleagues have used off-the-books spending gimmicks to further expand the already-bloated Pentagon budget.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough.

Instead of writing blank checks to the Pentagon, Congress needs to live up to its constitutional obligation to debate matters of war and peace. We need to rip up the 2001 blank check for endless war. We need to stop funding wars without end.

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, we need to do our job.

And this Defense Authorization Act does just the opposite. It allows Congress to kick the can down the road AGAIN, while funding wars with no debate on the costs and consequences to our troops or to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I do have to say that I am pleased by the passage of my amendment, which I co-authored with my good friend Congressman BURGESS, to report on the audit-readiness of the Pentagon. This is a good first step, but much work remains to bring some accountability to Pentagon spending.

So I call on Speaker RYAN to act to actually audit bloated Pentagon spending and to bring forth an authorization so Congress can vote up or down on these wars.

I urge my colleagues to vote 'NO' on the Rule and the underlying bill and reject this wasteful spending.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 616 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

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

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children 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 the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill 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. 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.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

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. BYRNE. 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adopting the resolution, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 189, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 626]

YEAS—234

Abraham	Bost	Collins (NY)
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Comer
Allen	Brat	Comstock
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Amodel	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Arrington	Buchanan	Costello (PA)
Babin	Buck	Cramer
Bacon	Bucshon	Crawford
Banks (IN)	Budd	Culberson
Barletta	Burgess	Curbelo (FL)
Barr	Byrne	Curtis
Barton	Calvert	Davidson
Bergman	Carter (GA)	Davis, Rodney
Biggs	Carter (TX)	Denham
Bilirakis	Chabot	DeSantis
Bishop (MI)	Cheney	DesJarlais
Bishop (UT)	Coffman	Diaz-Balart
Blackburn	Cole	Donovan
Blum	Collins (GA)	Duffy

Duncan (SC)	Kinzinger	Rohrabacher	Lowenthal	Payne	Sinema	LaHood	Paulsen	Smith (MO)
Duncan (TN)	Knight	Rokita	Lowey	Perlmutter	Sires	LaMalfa	Pearce	Smith (NE)
Dunn	Kustoff (TN)	Rooney, Francis	Lujan Grisham,	Peters	Slaughter	Lamborn	Perry	Smith (NJ)
Emmer	Labrador	Rooney, Thomas	M.	Peterson	Smith (WA)	Lance	Pittenger	Smith (TX)
Estes (KS)	LaHood	J.	Luján, Ben Ray	Pingree	Soto	Latta	Poe (TX)	Smucker
Farenthold	LaMalfa	Ros-Lehtinen	Lynch	Polis	Speier	Lewis (MN)	Poliquin	Stefanik
Faso	Lamborn	Roskam	Maloney,	Price (NC)	Suoizzi	LoBiondo	Posey	Stewart
Ferguson	Lance	Ross	Carolyn B.	Quigley	Swalwell (CA)	Long	Ratcliffe	Stivers
Fitzpatrick	Latta	Rothfus	Maloney, Sean	Raskin	Takano	Loudermilk	Reed	Suozy
Fleischmann	Lewis (MN)	Rouzer	Matsui	Rice (NY)	Thompson (CA)	Love	Reichert	Taylor
Flores	LoBiondo	Royce (CA)	McCollum	Richmond	Thompson (MS)	Lucas	Renacci	Tenney
Fortenberry	Long	Russell	McEachin	Rosen	Titus	Luetkemeyer	Rice (SC)	Thompson (PA)
Fox	Loudermilk	Rutherford	McNerney	Roybal-Allard	Tonko	MacArthur	Roby	Thornberry
Franks (AZ)	Love	Sanford	Meeks	Ruiz	Torres	Marchant	Roe (TN)	Tiberi
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Scalise	Meng	Ruppersberger	Tsongas	Marino	Rogers (AL)	Tipton
Gaetz	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert	Moore	Ryan (OH)	Vargas	Marshall	Rogers (KY)	Trott
Gallagher	MacArthur	Scott, Austin	Moulton	Sánchez	Veasey	Mast	Rohrabacher	Turner
Garrett	Marchant	Sensenbrenner	Murphy (FL)	Sarbanes	Vela	McCarthy	Rokita	
Gianforte	Marino	Sessions	Nadler	Schakowsky	Velázquez	McCaul	Rooney, Francis	
Gibbs	Marshall	Shimkus	Napolitano	Schiff	Walz	McClintock	Rooney, Thomas	
Gohmert	Massie	Shuster	Neal	Schneider	Wasserman	McHenry	J.	Valadao
Goodlatte	Mast	Simpson	Nolan	Schrader	Schultz	McKinley	Ros-Lehtinen	Wagner
Gosar	McCarthy	Smith (MO)	Norcross	Scott (VA)	Waters, Maxine	McMorris	Rosen	Walberg
Gowdy	McCaul	Smith (NE)	O'Halleran	Scott, David	Watson Coleman	Rodgers	Roskam	Walden
Granger	McClintock	Smith (NJ)	O'Rourke	Serrano	Welch	McSally	Ross	Walker
Graves (GA)	McHenry	Smith (TX)	Pallone	Sewell (AL)	Wilson (FL)	Meadows	Rothfus	Walorski
Graves (LA)	McKinley	Smucker	Panetta	Shea-Porter	Yarmuth	Meehan	Rouzer	Walters, Mimi
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Stefanik	Pascarell	Sherman		Messer	Royce (CA)	Weber (TX)
Griffith	Rodgers	Stewart				Mitchell	Russell	Webster (FL)
Grothman	McSally	Stivers				Moolenaar	Rutherford	Wenstrup
Guthrie	Meadows	Taylor				Mooney (WV)	Sanford	Westerman
Handel	Meehan	Tenney				Mullin	Scalise	Williams
Harper	Messer	Thompson (PA)				Murphy (FL)	Schneider	Wilson (SC)
Harris	Mitchell	Thornberry				Newhouse	Schweikert	Wittman
Hartzler	Moolenaar	Tiberi				Noem	Scott, Austin	Womack
Hensarling	Mooney (WV)	Tipton				Norman	Sensenbrenner	Yoder
Herrera Beutler	Mullin	Trott				Nunes	Sessions	Yoho
Hice, Jody B.	Newhouse	Turner				Olson	Shimkus	Young (AK)
Higgins (LA)	Noem	Upton				Palazzo	Shuster	Young (IA)
Hill	Norman	Valadao				Palmer	Simpson	Zeldin
Holding	Nunes	Wagner						
Hollingsworth	Olson	Walberg						
Hudson	Palazzo	Walden						
Huizenga	Palmer	Walker						
Hultgren	Paulsen	Walorski						
Hunter	Pearce	Walters, Mimi						
Hurd	Perry	Weber (TX)						
Issa	Pittenger	Webster (FL)						
Jenkins (KS)	Poe (TX)	Wenstrup						
Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin	Westerman						
Johnson (LA)	Posey	Williams						
Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe	Wilson (SC)						
Jones	Reed	Wittman						
Jordan	Reichert	Womack						
Joyce (OH)	Renacci	Yoder						
Katko	Rice (SC)	Yoho						
Kelly (MS)	Roby	Young (AK)						
Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)	Young (IA)						
King (IA)	Rogers (AL)	Zeldin						
King (NY)	Rogers (KY)							

NOT VOTING—10

Black
Bridenstine
Dent
Johnson, Sam

□ 1337

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a
5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—yeas 233, nays
187, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 627]

YEAS—233

Adams	Costa	Grijalva	Abraham	Conaway	Granger
Aguilar	Courtney	Gutiérrez	Aderholt	Cook	Graves (GA)
Barragán	Crist	Hanabusa	Allen	Costello (PA)	Graves (LA)
Bass	Crowley	Hastings	Amodei	Cramer	Graves (MO)
Beatty	Cuellar	Heck	Arrington	Crawford	Griffith
Bera	Cummings	Higgins (NY)	Babin	Culberson	Grothman
Beyer	Davis (CA)	Himes	Bacon	Curbelo (FL)	Guthrie
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Danny	Hoyer	Curtis	Handel	Harper
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Huffman	Davidson	Harris	Hartzer
Blunt Rochester	DeGette	Jackson Lee	Davis, Rodney	Hensarling	Herrera Beutler
Bonamici	Delaney	Jayapal	Denham	Herrera	Hice, Jody B.
Boyle, Brendan	DeLauro	Jeffries	DesJarlais	Higginson	Higgins (LA)
F.	DelBene	Johnson (GA)	Donovan	Hill	Hollingsworth
Brady (PA)	Demings	Johnson, E. B.	Duffy	Hill	Hollingsworth
Brown (MD)	DeSaulnier	Kaptur	Duncan (SC)	Cohen	Connolly
Brownley (CA)	Deutch	Keating	Duncan (TN)	Connolly	Conyers
Bustos	Dingell	Kelly (IL)	Dunn	Conyers	Cooper
Butterfield	Doggett	Kennedy	Bost	Cooper	Correa
Capuano	Doyle, Michael	Khanna	Brady (TX)	Correa	Costa
Carbajal	F.	Kihuen	Brat	Costa	Courtney
Cárdenas	Ellison	Kildee	Brooks (AL)	Crist	Crowley
Carson (IN)	Engel	Kilmer	Brooks (IN)	Crowley	Cuellar
Cartwright	Eshoo	Kind	Buchanan	Cuellar	Cummings
Castor (FL)	Españillat	Krishnamoorthi	Buck	Davis (CA)	Davis, Danny
Castro (TX)	Esty (CT)	Kuster (NH)	Bucshon	DeFazio	DeGette
Chu, Judy	Evans	Langevin	Budd	DeGette	Delaney
Ciçilline	Foster	Larsen (WA)	Burgess	Delaney	DeLauro
Clark (MA)	Frankel (FL)	Larsen (CT)	Byrne	DeLauro	DelBene
Clarke (NY)	Fudge	Lawrence	Calvert	DeLauro	Demings
Clay	Gabbard	Lawson (FL)	Carter (GA)	DeLauro	DeSaulnier
Cleaver	Gallego	Lee	Carter (TX)	DeLauro	Deutch
Clyburn	Garamendi	Levin	Chabot	DeLauro	Dingell
Cohen	Gomez	Lewis (GA)	Cheney	DeLauro	Doggett
Connolly	Gonzalez (TX)	Lieu, Ted	Choffman	DeLauro	
Conyers	Green, Al	Lipinski	Collins (GA)	DeLauro	
Cooper	Green, Gene	Loeb sack	Collins (NY)	DeLauro	
Correa		Lofgren	Comstock	DeLauro	

NAYS—187

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Lowey
Aguilar	F.	Lujan Grisham,
Amash	Ellison	M.
Barragán	Engel	Luján, Ben Ray
Bass	Eshoo	Lynch
Beatty	Españillat	Maloney,
Bera	Esty (CT)	Carolyn B.
Beyer	Evans	Maloney, Sean
Bishop (GA)	Foster	Massie
Blumenauer	Frankel (FL)	Matsui
Blunt Rochester	Fudge	McCollum
Bonamici	Gabbard	McEachin
Boyle, Brendan	Gallego	McNerney
F.	Garamendi	Meeks
Brady (PA)	Gomez	Meng
Brown (MD)	Gonzalez (TX)	Moore
Brownley (CA)	Gottheimer	Moulton
Bustos	Green, Al	Nadler
Butterfield	Green, Gene	Napolitano
Capuano	Grijalva	Neal
Carbajal	Gutiérrez	Nolan
Cárdenas	Hanabusa	Norcross
Carson (IN)	Hastings	O'Halleran
Cartwright	Heck	O'Rourke
Castor (FL)	Higgins (NY)	Pallone
Castro (TX)	Himes	Panetta
Chu, Judy	Hoyer	Pascarell
Ciçilline	Huffman	Payne
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Clarke (NY)	Jayapal	Peters
Clay	Jeffries	Peterson
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Pingree
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Cohen	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Connolly	Keating	Quigley
Conyers	Kelly (IL)	Raskin
Cooper	Kennedy	Rice (NY)
Correa	Khanna	Richmond
	Kihuen	Roybal-Allard
	Kildee	Ruiz
	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
	Kind	Ryan (OH)
	Krishnamoorthi	Sánchez
	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes
	Langevin	Schakowsky
	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
	Larson (CT)	Schrader
	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
	Lawson (FL)	Scott, David
	Lee	Serrano
	Levin	Sewell (AL)
	Lewis (GA)	Shea-Porter
	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
	Lipinski	Sinema
	Loeb sack	Sires
	Lofgren	Slughter
	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)

Soto
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko

Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Black
Bridenstine
Cole
Dent
Diaz-Balart

Holding
Johnson, Sam
McGovern
Pelosi
Pocan

Rush
Visclosky
Woodall

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1344

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 627.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 190, answered “present” 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 628]

YEAS—224

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barton
Beatty
Billirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (TX)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Buchshon
Budd
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clay
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Cook
Cooper

Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curtis
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gowdy

Granger
Cramer
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
Long
Loudermilk

Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meng
Messer
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Noem
Norman
Nunes

O’Rourke
Olson
Palmer
Perlmutter
Pingree
Polis
Posey
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney, Francis
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce (CA)
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus

NAYS—190

Aguilar
Amash
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blackburn
Blum
Blunt Rochester
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownlee (CA)
Buck
Burgess
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crowley
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Diaz-Balart
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Españal
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Foa
Fudge
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)

Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kihuen
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger
Knight
LaHood
Lance
Langevin
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McKinley
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross

O’Halloran
Palazzo
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Price (NC)
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rokita
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smucker
Soto
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Torres
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walberg
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)

Welch
Wilson (FL)

Wittman
Yoder

Yoho
Young (AK)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Tonko

NOT VOTING—18

Black
Bost
Brat
Bridenstine
Dent
Garrett

Gohmert
Hoyer
Johnson, Sam
Larson (CT)
McGovern
Pelosi

Pocan
Rush
Smith (NE)
Turner
Visclosky
Woodall

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1350

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on Rollcall No. 628.

DESIGNATING THE DEMOCRATIC CLOAKROOM IN THE HALL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AS THE “GABRIELLE GIFFORDS-LEO J. RYAN CLOAKROOM”

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 615, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 615

Whereas Gabrielle Giffords was elected to the House of Representatives to represent the 8th district of Arizona in 2006 and served from January 2007 to January 2012;

Whereas Giffords has served the public for over 15 years;

Whereas Giffords was the youngest person ever elected to the Arizona State Senate, serving from 2000 to 2005;

Whereas Giffords was the third woman in Arizona history elected to Congress;

Whereas Congresswoman Giffords was widely known for her middle-of-the-road political views, problem solving ethos, and commitment to bipartisanship and cooperation;

Whereas Congresswoman Giffords’s many achievements and inspirational service in Congress included contributions to the strength of our armed forces, the security of our nation, the health and welfare of our veterans, our progress toward a clean energy economy, and the interests of her constituents in her beloved southern Arizona district;

Whereas Giffords prided herself on being accessible to her constituents;

Whereas on January 8, 2011, while listening to her constituents at a “Congress on your Corner” event in Tucson, a gunman attempted to assassinate Congresswoman Giffords;