

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1370, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BLUE CAMPAIGN AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4667, FURTHER SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM DECEMBER 22, 2017, THROUGH JANUARY 7, 2018

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 670 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 670

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1370) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance and develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-52. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4667) making further supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, for disaster assistance for Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, and calendar year 2017 wildfires, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution 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. Clause 2(e) of rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. 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 Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day of the first session of the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress after December 21, 2017—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 4. On any legislative day of the second session of the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress before January 8, 2018—

(a) the Speaker may dispense with organizational and legislative business;

(b) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved if applicable; and

(c) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 5. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the periods addressed by sections 3 and 4 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 6. Each day during the periods addressed by sections 3 and 4 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 7. Each day during the periods addressed by sections 3 and 4 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

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 my friend 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, most of what you just heard from the Reading Clerk you could have heard during the previous 4 hours of testimony that we have been taking in the Rules Committee this morning. I understand there was no other game in town going on this morning, so if folks were tuning in to C-SPAN, they were treated to my friend from Massachusetts, our ranking member from New York, our chairman from Texas, and all the gang there on the Rules Committee as we worked through this.

But forbid the thought if someone else had something else on their mind this morning, I want to go through just briefly what you heard from our Reading Clerk.

This is a single rule that provides for consideration of two measures. The first is the Senate amendment to H.R. 1370. It is continuing appropriations to make sure the lights stay on and the checks go out the door. It makes in order a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of this continuing resolution.

To debate that, Mr. Speaker, we provide an hour of debate divided between the chair and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. I think every Member of this Chamber understands the nature of this legislation, but we provided that time nonetheless.

The second measure is H.R. 4667. It is the disaster aid package.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, this House has been working through, in a bipartisan way, funding our neighbors who have been so dramatically affected by disasters, whether in the Virgin Islands, in Puerto Rico, in Florida, in Texas, or the devastating wildfires in California. This has been a national focus, and billions of dollars have already gone out the door to meet the initial emergency needs. This is an additional appropriations measure.

□ 1230

It comes under a closed rule, Mr. Speaker, but it does self-execute two amendments that had been offered: an amendment by Mrs. MIMI WALTERS and an amendment by Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

It also provides for an hour of debate, equally divided between the chair and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, and it provides for a motion to recommit for the minority.

The rest of what you heard from the Reading Clerk, Mr. Speaker, was that typical language that you hear at the end of the year when Members are going to be traveling, to allow for the housekeeping that takes place here, to allow the House to continue to function as the traditional authorities provided in December and January during the district work period.

With that, Mr. Speaker, again, I think we have exhaustively debated these issues. I urge my colleagues to support the rule. Let's get on to the underlying measures.

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, we are strongly opposed to this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say to my colleagues that this is really a sad day, not only for the institution, but for the United States of America.

It is frustrating that we are here today doing a third continuing resolution. For those who are watching these proceedings, we should be actually passing appropriations bills that fund the government for an entire year. We shouldn't be funding the government week to week, month to month.

Yet my Republican friends have ended up doing just that. They can't seem to get their act together, notwithstanding they are in control of the House of Representatives, they are in control of the United States Senate, and they are in control of the White House. They simply cannot govern. They are lucky that the American people can't sue them, because they would be sued for political malpractice.

The one thing that they are supposed to do is to keep this government running and to keep the lights on, yet we lurch from one crisis to another crisis to another crisis to another crisis.

Today, what they are saying is: Let's kick the can down the road until January 19. You know what will happen then?

Another crisis. Then we will be in the same situation, and we will probably kick the can down the road another few weeks.

That is not the way government is supposed to run. People need certainty, and this Congress has delivered anything but certainty. It has to stop. It is frustrating.

A solution, if I can be so bold as to suggest a solution to dealing with some of the problems that the Republican leadership is confronting, might be a little bipartisanship, might be opening up this process a little bit, might be a little bit more deliberation on the floor of the House of Representatives.

There are a couple of ways they can govern. One is, they can govern in a way where they respect all points of view, where they actually respect the viewpoint of the minority, where they open the process up so the minority can, every once in a while, offer some amendments and offer some alternatives, where they negotiate on spending bills in good faith, where they know they are not going to get everything and the minority knows they are not going to get everything, but they end up in a compromise that is good enough to get bipartisan support.

That is the way things used to be done around here. I don't know why it is so difficult to get back to those days, but if they want the government to run better, that is what they need to do. They have to stop this my-way-or-the-highway approach to every single piece of legislation that comes before this body.

My friends have had more closed rules than any other session of Congress. This is the most closed session in the history of the Congress. That is what this session will go down in history as being: the most closed session in the history of Congress.

They have used martial law, they have used closed rules, they have had emergency meetings, all to try to get us to this point where we are kicking the can down the road for a couple of weeks. That is it.

What we should have been doing is working together not only to keep the government open, but we ought to have been working together to raise the caps.

Democrats want a strong national defense. We also need an equal increase in our domestic budget, which includes critical national security functions and commitments to hardworking families.

My friends ought to know that one-third of the nondefense domestic budget goes to national security, veterans, homeland security, and the State Department's and the Justice Department's counterterrorism initiatives.

I would also say that supporting housing initiatives and investing in education and environmental protection so that our fellow citizens don't

have to drink water that is contaminated with lead is also a part of our national security.

We ought to have been working in a bipartisan way to resolve all of these issues together.

We need to work to fund the opioid epidemic. What we have done in this Congress is given lots of speeches about how terrible this opioid epidemic is. We have talked about the need to support our local communities.

We have done a lot of talking, but what we need to do is appropriate the necessary money so that local communities can implement the strategies to effectively deal with the opioid crisis in their areas. We ought to have been focusing on that.

We need additional veterans funding. Democrats are urging Republicans to join us to provide urgently needed resources to veterans facing a dire shortfall at the VA, meeting our responsibility to ensure that no veteran is left behind or denied the care and opportunities they deserve upon return from the battlefield.

CHIP, the Children's Health Insurance Program, and community health centers are incredibly important to us and people throughout this country. We are calling for immediate reauthorization of these vital initiatives, one that doesn't rob Peter to pay Paul, one that doesn't say we are going to fund CHIP by taking money away from the prevention program that provides monies for immunizations and dealing with issues like lead paint and other issues that affect our kids.

We need emergency disaster relief that is adequate to meet the needs of all the States and localities and territories that have been impacted by these terrible natural disasters.

We need to save Americans' endangered pensions. Millions of hardworking Americans' pensions are at risk, and we are calling for bipartisan action to enact a responsible reform plan to ensure that these struggling pensions will keep on going.

We also believe that we ought to pass the bipartisan Dream Act that we spent a lot of time in the Rules Committee talking about today. Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI; Minority Whip STENY HOYER; and the head of the Hispanic Caucus, MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, spent many hours at the Rules Committee today. Leader PELOSI was there for 2½ hours testifying on the need to pass the bipartisan Dream Act.

We ought to do that before we go home for Christmas. There are 800,000-plus people whose lives are in the balance because, on September 7, Donald Trump decided to end protection for the DREAMers.

Here is what the President I don't think appreciates and what some of my colleagues I think don't appreciate, but we learned about this today in the Rules Committee: we don't have until March to deal with the Dream Act. Each and every day, people are losing

their status. On average, about 122 a day, we are told.

So there are people who are here who had the protections under DACA who are losing their status, losing their jobs, losing their livelihoods, and their lives have been thrown into turmoil.

Why in the world would we do that?

The majority of Americans, overwhelmingly Democrats and Republicans and Independents, all believe we should protect the DREAMers.

We heard in the Rules Committee: Well, we need more committee deliberation. Again, the President took their protections away on September 7. It is now December 21.

What have you been doing?

They said: Well, the Judiciary Committee needs to do more hearings. Well, what have they been waiting for?

The Judiciary Committee recently set up a bill, the concealed carry reciprocity bill, which allows people from States that have almost no standards to issue permits for people to carry concealed weapons to be able to go to any State in this country, no matter what those States' standards may be, basically endangering my constituents.

They brought that to the Rules Committee. They had time to bring that before the Rules Committee and before the House. There was not a single hearing. None.

We had this tax scam bill that we just voted on where 83 percent of the tax breaks go to the top 1 percent of the wealthiest in this country. Remember that bill that the President just celebrated with all my Republican friends?

That came before this House, and there wasn't a single hearing on it. But now we need to have hearings when it comes to protecting the DREAMers.

It is outrageous. These DREAMers are contributing to the betterment of our communities. We should celebrate them. We should value them. They have served in our military. They are out front leading disaster relief efforts, saving lives. They are working in Fortune 500 companies. They are going to school. They are valued members of our community. And we treat them like this?

Come on. If we brought the Dream Act to the floor, it would pass with Democratic support and a big chunk of Republican support. There is absolutely no reason to continue to stall on this issue. All that will happen as a result of our stalling is that more people will lose their status, more lives will be thrown into turmoil.

I would just say to my colleagues: It is the Christmas season. This is a time, if ever, where the spirit ought to take over, and we ought to do something good for the American people, not just for the donors, but for the people.

Giving a tax break to corporations and wealthy people will help with the fundraisers, but what we need is to help these people, these DREAMers whose lives are in the balance. We can't wait.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule, allow us to bring up a standalone Dream Act or an amendment that would allow the Dream Act to be made in order, and I hope that we can get back to regular order.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this time of year folks get rightfully exorcised about the issues of the day.

We all came here to do something for the men and women whom we represent back home. Every time we get to the end of a year, we think: I have got to get it done; I have got to get it done; I have got to get it done. I recognize those passions are going to exist.

I actually don't believe for a minute that my friend from Massachusetts believes my vote in favor of the tax bill had anything to do with fundraising or my donors. He might believe that about somebody in this Chamber—I hope that he does not—but I know he doesn't believe it about me. It just isn't true.

I have been fighting for tax reform since the day I was elected. In fact, I ran for this job to fight for tax reform. We do the American people a disservice when we suggest something nefarious is going on. Sometimes we just disagree, Mr. Speaker, and those disagreements are okay. In fact, those disagreements are expected. Our Founders intended them, and they created this institution to sort those disagreements out. So I hope we won't sell either ourselves or the American people short in that regard.

But I do want to agree with my friend that this is frustrating. It is frustrating to be here for a continuing resolution, Mr. Speaker. Remember that we passed the National Security and Defense Appropriations bill in July of this year. We have waited patiently for the Senate to be able to take it up, and it has not.

We passed all of the appropriations bills, Mr. Speaker, before the end of the fiscal year, back in September, and we have been waiting for the Senate to take those up. It has not. It is an incredibly frustrating time.

Now, my friend suggested a solution would be bipartisanship. I could not agree with him more. It takes 60 votes to move something through the Senate. I just barely have over 50 Republicans. The only way these funding bills are going to move through the Senate is with bipartisan support. For anyone in this Chamber to deny that is going to be to deny the reality of math. Bipartisanship is the solution.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, when my President invited the Democratic leadership down to the White House to work on exactly this issue a month ago. Folks got frustrated with the tweet he sent out that morning and decided they were going to stay home.

I understand the frustrations. What I don't understand is missing out on an

opportunity to build this bridge. It happens above my pay grade, I am going to confess. To the 700,000 people I represent back home, Mr. Speaker, let me go ahead and confess this deal is taking place way above my pay grade.

But it is probably right there at the pay grade of the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, and the minority leader. When folks don't show up to the table for the conversation, it makes it harder to get there.

Is there always a good reason to stay home?

I am sure there is.

Are there more good reasons to be there?

I think the answer is: Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I will advise my friend from Massachusetts that I don't have any speakers remaining this morning. Folks have been exhaustively elucidated by the 4 hours of discussion we had this morning, and I am prepared to close when he is.

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

□ 1245

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

Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of concerns about the way this process is unfolding.

And, yes, the gentleman is right. I am exorcised. I am exorcised that we have gone through all of these gyrations, including being on hold trying to figure out what we were going to bring to the floor all night last night, and we end up with this: basically kicking the can down the road for a few weeks and not dealing with some essential emergency priorities that are a concern to most people in this country.

Again, going back to this tax bill, that is an example of where bipartisanism might have been helpful. I don't recall a tax reform package—I don't even want to call it reform because, basically, it is a giveaway to big corporations and to wealthy special interests—that has been rammed through Congress purely on a partisan basis.

But maybe it had something to do with the fact that Democrats weren't welcome to the table.

Maybe it had to do with the fact that Democrats were locked out.

Maybe it had something to do with the fact that this so-called conference committee was a sham and, when Democrats showed up, a deal had already been struck.

That is not bipartisanship.

And maybe we are a little bit exorcised because, time and time again, when people go before the Rules Committee looking to offer legitimate, germane amendments to try to improve legislation, rather than being able to have the opportunity to offer those amendments on the floor and have a debate, we are shut out all the time.

Again, this Congress, this Republican Congress, this session, has the distinction of being the most closed session in

the history of our country. That is the distinction.

So, yes, we are exorcised. And we are exorcised over the fact that, as we are about to adjourn for Christmas, hundreds of thousands of people, DREAMers in this country, their lives have been thrown into turmoil. These are people who have served in our military. They have led rescue efforts during these recent hurricanes. They contribute greatly to our community. A majority of people in this country want them to remain here, and we can't even get a vote on the House floor, notwithstanding the fact that we all know that, if we brought it to the floor, we would pass it.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority has prioritized their tax scam bill over reauthorizing the Children's Health Insurance Program, community health centers, helping DREAMers, and even funding our government, which brings us to where we are now, days before Christmas, scrambling to fulfill our most basic responsibilities.

But we should be doing more here than just trying to keep the lights on. We also have a responsibility toward the hundreds of thousands of young Americans—they are Americans in every way except on paper—who have been betrayed by this administration. We need to pass the Dream Act, and we need to do it now. Thirty-four of my Republican colleagues have already spoken up and urged Speaker RYAN to help these young people. The majority of this House is ready to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, here is our chance to do just that. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. The bipartisan, bicameral legislation has the support of the majority of this House and would pass if it were brought up for a vote.

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 yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am all in favor of keeping our government open. The difference that I have with my Republican colleagues is that I want to keep it open for everyone.

Here, at Christmas, we think of the children first, but the children are not put first in this underlying bill. The Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) is barely left on life support.

There are children out there right now, some with dreaded diseases or disabilities, and their access to a family physician is not assured because this Congress has not acted on the Children's Health Insurance Program. Instead of Christmas cards, they are about to get cancellation notices.

And there are children who were brought here to America, through no fault of their own, without a visa. They grew up here. They only know this country. They have since passed a criminal background check. They had paid a fee, but their future is uncertain. They are called DREAMers because they have a dream of giving back to America and being full Americans, which they are, in everything but those legal papers.

And we, in Congress, have our own responsibility. It is a responsibility to respond to their passionate pleas. We should not support another partisan Republican continuing resolution or appropriations process that does not assure the future of our 800,000 DREAMers.

I can tell you, from meeting with them personally, I think of a cardiac nurse, I think of a county prosecutor, I think of a number of teachers whom I have met and many students, all of whom are DREAMers, who want to be full Americans. And I think of the groups in Texas like RAICES and TOPS and JOLT and the University Leadership Initiative and a number of others that are working with these DREAMers to secure their future.

Even President Trump, in one of his few reasonable tweets, in September, said:

“Does anybody really want to throw out good, educated, accomplished young people who have jobs, some serving in the military?”

I think the answer here, if given a free vote, Republicans and Democrats, the majority would say absolutely not; we need these young people.

This holiday season is one that you would hope would open closed hearts to see the humanity in these young people. But amidst all the self-congratulatory high-fives and patting on the back yesterday down at the White House, nothing was said about the DREAMers. The Republican leadership has apparently decided to leave town without doing anything for them.

I believe that the Dream Act, the DACA authorization they have now, was terminated by the President just to use them as a bargaining chip. That was way back in September. And since that time, the majority has had ample opportunity to act.

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would just say that all of us as Members of Congress are eager to return to our families as soon as possible across America, but our DREAMers are left with fear and uncertainty about returning to their families and about their future.

These deserving young people should not be used as bargaining chips for a wish list of anti-immigrant policies. Let's reject this rule, enact the Dream Act, reauthorize CHIP, and offer a

truly Merry Christmas and Happy New Year to all of America's children.

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

Mr. Speaker, here, in these cold days outside, it is easy to create a lot of rhetorical heat on the inside. I would argue that legislative light is what we need more often than not.

We brought the Children's Health Insurance Program bill to the floor that my friend from Texas just referenced, Mr. Speaker. We didn't just bring it to the floor; we brought it through committee. We brought it through committee, and we passed it. We brought it to the House floor, and we passed it. We sent it to the Senate, and there it sits.

But when it passed the House floor, my friend from Texas voted “no.” He voted “no.”

Now, do I believe for a moment that is because he hates children? I do not.

Do I believe for a moment that it is because he doesn't want folks to have access to healthcare? I do not. I believe he had legitimate policy reasons for deciding not to reauthorize the program then that he has just taken to the floor and talked about the merits of reauthorizing.

It is okay to disagree on those issues, and it is even okay to highlight those differences. What is not okay is to describe this Chamber as a Chamber that doesn't care. What is not okay is to describe this as a Chamber that doesn't act.

My friend was absolutely right: it is a bipartisan priority to fund the Children's Health Insurance Program, and we did. The Senate has not acted. It hasn't gotten the full reauthorization done. If we pass the continuing resolution today, that funding will continue.

Let's disagree on those things that we disagree about, but let's be honest with ourselves about the legitimacy of those disagreements. Let's try to find more light than heat in this new year.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, my dear friend that just spoke with reference to acting, let me tell you what action was undertaken with reference to CHIP.

Prevention money was used as the pay-for. So, somehow or another, that action doesn't rub some of us in the right way.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Congressional Black Caucus to Speaker PAUL RYAN.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS,  
December 21, 2017.

PAUL RYAN,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: On behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC), I write today to strongly urge you to provide a more permanent solution for close to 9 million children enrolled in the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) and more than 27 mil-

lion people that visit Community Health Centers (CHC's) for critically needed health care. It is completely irresponsible for Congressional Leaders to have created this crisis. Moreover, it is now unconscionable for Congress to head home for the holidays without taking action to right this wrong.

The holidays are a time to reflect on how fortunate we are and help those in need. In that vein, the CBC will not support a Continuing Resolution unless CHIP is reauthorized and fully funded for five years and Community Health Centers are reauthorized and fully funded for two years. Moreover, the offsets for these programs must not harm other vulnerable communities by reducing funding for other programs, such as the Prevention Fund. For this to be the state of play one day after giving away \$1.5 trillion to huge corporations and the wealthy is absurd and offensive.

Close to 2 million children across this country are in danger of losing CHIP coverage in January, with another 1 million set to lose coverage in February. A short term approach to providing these children and their families with certainty is absolutely irresponsible. Without swift reauthorization and fully funded coverage, young lives hang in the balance. Congress' failure to act will set off a chain of dire-consequences for children, as well as their families, communities, and states. A family without insurance is a family more likely to fall victim to financial crisis related to medical costs, such as bankruptcy.

Similarly, Community Health Centers play an essential role in low-income communities as they protect and expand access to critical and affordable care. The Community Health Centers Fund (CHCF) provides mandatory funding for federal health centers, which provide primary, dental, and other supportive care in medically underserved areas. Robust and reliable support for Community Health Centers results in more health centers, an increased number of patient visit, and more available services. These services save lives, especially in communities struggling to provide affordable care to poor, largely minority communities.

The CHCF is even more essential to the more than 27 million people it helps support in light of recent efforts to the dismantle our nation's health insurance market. As you well know, the elimination of the Affordable Care Act's individual mandate will add 13 million uninsured Americans, increase premiums by 10 percent, and make it harder for sick people to get insurance.

The Congressional Black Caucus has been the conscience of this Congress since its inception in 1971. We have provided moral leadership and courageous advocacy for our constituents and for all Americans that have felt disenfranchised or left behind. At the time of year when we are supposed to be most charitable, it is urgent that Congress act to reauthorize CHIP and Community Health Centers and provide robust funding for both. Children and families do not need to spend the holidays worrying about their health. It is time for Congress to do what it is responsible and moral. Accordingly, the CBC will not support any legislation to prevent a shutdown unless these critical programs are addressed.

Sincerely,

CEDRIC RICHMOND,  
Chair.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I lift from it one paragraph that says:

The holidays are a time to reflect on how fortunate we are and help those in need. In that vein, the Congressional Black Caucus will not support a continuing resolution unless CHIP is reauthorized and fully funded

for 5 years and community health centers are reauthorized and fully funded for 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, this morning in the Rules Committee, beginning at 8—I might add, we were noticed that we were going to meet last night at 10, but we did not meet, and then we came in early this morning—the distinguished minority leader and the minority whip, along with the leader of the Hispanic Caucus, appeared and stayed for 2½ hours discussing the fact that we are leaving things on the table, but, more specifically, addressing the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program.

But let's talk about the things that we are leaving on the table:

We are doing nothing about long-term flood insurance.

We are doing nothing about Perkins loans that have expired.

We are not funding or addressing the opioid epidemic.

We are not offering legislation to help save failing pensions in this country.

I talked with some teamsters from Michigan the other day with tears in their eyes concerned about their pensions.

We are doing nothing with reference to long-term, bipartisan reauthorizing for CHIP and community health centers.

We are doing nothing about the FISA reauthorization.

We are not raising the defense and non-defense spending caps.

We are leaving Medicare extension on the table.

And that is just a to-do list that is partial that we are not addressing.

But let me get in the weeds on something that the public doesn't quite understand.

196 people appeared right over here and signed what is called a discharge petition to bring DACA to the floor; 34 Members of the House of Representatives sent a letter to the Speaker. If you combine those numbers, you have 218.

My distinguished Rules Committee chair and I had a colloquy this morning where we discussed that matter.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Florida an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HASTINGS. And the fact of the matter is I believe that it would pass if it were put on the floor.

But do you know what is more important? We had 58 closed rules in this Congress, completely closed. And to put that into context, we averaged 25 closed rules a year in the 4 years the Democrats were in charge.

The Dream Act is a perfect example of this. As Members are well aware, we have tried time and time again to get a floor vote on the Dream Act.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that this CR is the last train leaving town. You have given millionaires and billionaires help. Let's give the DREAMers a Merry Christmas.

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

My friend from Florida is a good accountability partner up on the Rules Committee. I have learned from his intellect, and I have learned from his experience in this Chamber. I value that, and I value his friendship.

When he says that more closed rules have been passed in this Congress than any other, he is absolutely right. He is absolutely right. And that is worth talking about, as my friend does regularly in the committee.

Unfortunately, we usually just have that half of the conversation. What we don't talk about is that many of those closed rules were for bills that were so well worked out in a bipartisan way in committee that there were no amendments offered, that we had already come together in such a collaborative, productive, admirable way that we ought to be bragging about instead of denigrating that we didn't have amendments that were offered.

Other bills, Mr. Speaker, were bills that might not have been so generally agreed upon. But when my friend the chairman of the Rules Committee sends the call out to all 435 Members of Congress and says: If you have any ideas, bring them to the Rules Committee. For many of those bills, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't one idea suggested, not one idea suggested to change the underlying bill.

□ 1300

So did it come under a closed process?

Well, of course, it did, if closed means we ask everybody for all of their ideas and no one had one, so there was no idea to debate on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many ways that we can do better with one another, but I would suggest to my friends that the way to do better with one another is to build that on a foundation of trust, not a foundation of recriminations.

We have an opportunity in this new year, Mr. Speaker, to turn a page in this institution. I want to say, in my time on the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, I have never had a chairman who worked as hard to open the process and hear from Members as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the current chairman.

Time and time again, where other folks would have walked away from the table, the chairman has stayed there to get input, to hear ideas. Time and time again, when the process would have been truncated, he has extended it to make sure folks had a chance to have their voice heard.

I am grateful for that, Mr. Speaker. I am grateful to the chairman for that model that he sets in that committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) to speak on this rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. WOODALL serves not only the Rules Committee and this body in the Republican majority, but he is also our designee to the Budget Committee and has excelled in excess of understanding the intricate details that not only move this great Nation, but the arguments, a balance between them. I appreciate the gentleman very, very much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer some advice that I just received from the Governor of the State of Texas, Governor Abbott, who took time to call me. I also want to address the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my very dear friend.

During that record-setting year, we also made in order over 560 amendments. That is 560 amendments that people came to the Rules Committee, had literally a committee that engaged them on the substance of their ideas, listened to it, believed that that substance had a good place for debate on this floor. Not necessarily every idea should be vetted here. Sometimes it is vetted in committee, subcommittee. Sometimes it is vetted at the Rules Committee, and sometimes we do not make those ideas in order.

This morning was no different. There were a lot of great ideas. As a matter of fact, the minority leader, Ms. PELOSI, came to the Rules Committee for several hours. The gentleman, the minority whip, Mr. HOYER, came a slightly less amount of time, but no doubt came to the Rules Committee and offered us advice about not only what we are doing but presented the arguments about what they were for. They were given unlimited opportunity to discuss that.

There was some limit that we had to offer our challenges back, but it was an open process, and I appreciate Ms. PELOSI and all the members of the committee doing that.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why I came down is to say—and there are lots of stories that go on, but the story that I was just told by the Governor of the State of Texas is that Texas—not unlike the islands of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, the great State of Florida that were in the way of a hurricane—was record-setting rain, 60 inches. It lasted 8 or 9 days. It did incredible damage.

This body has taken time to now study getting money back to those affected areas, and the determination that was made by this body is some \$81 billion. I just found out that the State of Texas has calculated their part of the \$81 billion, and it is less than 15 percent of the total. Less than 15 percent of that total will actually be going to the largest storm in the history of America.

I did not offer a complaint. I was surprised. I would have thought it would be in the 50 percent realm. I would have thought it would have been higher. But what I want to say is that not everybody gets everything they want in this town, not even if they are the

Governor of the State of Texas, with a large delegation like Texas.

It is a difficult time we all go through, and I offered and expressed my confidence to the Governor that I would certainly go look at this. It is the first time I learned of this. Less than 15 percent of the emergency funds that will be presumptively agreed to today, of this huge storm, goes to Texas. I just thought that was worthy of me to take time to come and pass on information that I had not known about, information that I was provided. It tells us how large the need is in this country when the largest storm only gets 15 percent.

So I am a “yes.” I am a “yes” for the other 85 percent that is not going to be in Texas also. I am a “yes” because I have seen the fires in California, I have seen the damage from—and Judge HASTINGS kept us up to date. I have been aware of Ambassador Patrick Rooney, who talked with us about the devastation; and TOM ROONEY in Florida; and certainly Byrne Buchanan, who spoke with us about the damage to the crops—lots of big problems.

I am going to vote for the other 85 percent, too, not just the 15 percent for my home State.

I want to thank the gentleman for allowing me time to share my ideas on the floor. I wish Judge HASTINGS a Merry Christmas.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who spent 2½ hours today in the Rules Committee fighting on behalf of the DREAMers.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I also thank all of the members of the Rules Committee for the exceptional service they provide to the House in reviewing legislation that will come to the floor.

I particularly want to thank my colleagues on the Democratic side for honoring the values of our country by advocating for an amendment to include the Dream Act as we go forward. I would hope that most of our Members would vote “no” on this rule and not allow for the previous question to come forward so that it will allow for the Dream Act to be considered.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee and the distinguished Members on the Republican side, as well as the Democratic side, for the hospitality extended to the Democratic whip, Mr. HOYER; the chair of the Hispanic Caucus, Congresswoman MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM; and to me.

At that meeting, Mr. Speaker, I told the colleagues that we are in a tradition of having great Democratic and Republican Presidents who have been supportive of newcomers to our country and who recognize that immigration is the constant reinvigoration of America.

When people come to our country with their hopes and dreams and aspirations to make the future better for their families, they are identifying

with an American ideal: all of us having the responsibility to make the future better for the next generation. And their commitment, their courage, their optimism, their determination for a better future makes America more American. Every newcomer who comes here with that determination makes America more American.

Among those people are our DREAMers. This is a very discrete group that we are hoping to protect in the Dream Act. Certainly, as our colleagues acknowledged this morning, we have important work to do on comprehensive immigration reform. We have a responsibility to protect our borders, North and South, and anything that flies in, East Coast, West Coast, and through the Gulf. But the fact is that—as was pointed out by our colleague, Congresswoman LUJAN GRISHAM, the chair of the Hispanic Caucus: think of the DREAMers as a discrete piece that needs protection now and not wait for the entire comprehensive immigration reform to be resolved before we deal with this emergency.

Just as we treat CHIP, 9 million children are depending on CHIP, but we are not waiting until we revise the whole healthcare system in order to pass CHIP, nor did we. When we passed CHIP, it was before the Affordable Care Act had passed.

But let me say why it is really important for this to happen now. Unfortunately—and, really, I was pleased that our Speaker registered his disagreement with President Trump when he took the action he did in regard to DACA in September. When he did that and said, “I will give Congress until March to pass a law,” what he didn’t understand is that he was putting these DREAMers at a distinct disadvantage.

Every day, over 100, 120-some DACA recipients, DACA-eligible recipients, lose their status. That means, if they are working or whatever they are doing, they lose their status to do that in our country. Over 10,000 have lost status since the President’s announcement—well over 10,000.

So we can’t wait until March to do this because it had consequences known to us but unforeseen by the White House and by the President. And I don’t think, in his heart, that the President intended to hurt these people in the very cruel way that they are being hurt by the actions that are being taken.

We can’t wait until March. We need action. We need it soon. We need it to be bipartisan. That is what we have been working on—not me; Members, Member-driven bipartisan cooperation in trying to find a path that addresses the concerns that some have about the border—and we all do—and also addresses the Dream Act.

As the President said: Let’s call it DACA.

Okay. We will call it DACA.

So here we are. I said at the beginning of my remarks that we have been blessed in our country by Presidents

who have recognized the value of immigration; that our country would be in stagnation if we didn’t have this constant reinvigoration of visitors to our country.

When President Obama acted because Congress had not acted to protect the DREAMers and their parents, that was really important for him to do because Congress had not acted. However, it is important to note that President Reagan, when he was President and President George Herbert Walker Bush was at that time Vice President, Congress did act through the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. They did act. And President Reagan’s observation was they didn’t go far enough.

So he took further executive action called Family Fairness to protect people in our country, immigrants in our country. Actually, President Reagan and President George Herbert Walker Bush protected a higher percentage of newcomers to our country than President Obama did with his DACA and DAPA action, a higher percentage because they understood the value to our country of newcomers.

President Clinton continued all of that. President George W. Bush was a champion and continues to be a champion on recognizing the value of immigration. He has spoken about it intellectually, with respect, from the heart for people coming to our country, and he has urged us to do so.

He couldn’t get the cooperation of his own party when he was President to cooperate for comprehensive immigration reform, even though when we had the power as Democrats, we supported it. But he could not get the 60 votes in the Senate. But, nonetheless, he continues to be a champion, really, for immigration reform.

And here we have a new President who campaigned on the backs of newcomers to our country and who made immigrants villains. It is a complete change from the Republican Party, from a commitment to valuing newcomers and diversity in our country. It is a complete departure from President Reagan, President George Herbert Walker Bush, President George W. Bush, just to name the Republican Presidents.

So we find ourselves in this situation, but that doesn’t change the fact that we have a responsibility to all of God’s children to treat them with respect, and when we can do something to be helpful, we should.

□ 1315

There is harm that is coming to the DREAMers every day, because they are losing status. Regardless of what some may say, some are being deported. This may be unknown to the President, but it is not unknown to us in this Congress.

I want to thank Congresswoman LUJAN GRISHAM, the chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, and her members. I want to thank Congresswoman JUDY CHU, the chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus; Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE,



who, working with the Congressional Black Caucus, has been a champion in that caucus; and all of the Members on both sides of the aisle who are striving to find a path.

One path that we have open to us is to defeat this rule, to allow the Dream Act to come up, and to put that in the mix as we go forward.

Again, this isn't an issue, this isn't a bill. It is a value, and that is the conversation we had with President Trump. This isn't an issue, but it is a value. This is about who we are as a nation and how we respect who we are as a nation. That is why, I believe, that President Trump will be receptive to signing a bill. He does want—and we are all concerned for—border security. We will work with him on that, but let's start by putting on the RECORD the support of this House for a recognition that we are immigrants, by and large. Unless some of you are Native Americans—and how proud we are of our Native American community in our country and how blessed we are—most of us come from immigrant families.

It was interesting to me in doing some reading on some of this. I am very proud of my own Italian-American heritage. My grandmother was born in Baltimore, Maryland. Her parents were from Venice and Genoa. My father's family from Abruzzo. We are very proud of all of that, which makes us respect the pride that other people take in their heritage.

What was interesting to me in recent days, because I remember—I didn't suffer this, but I know my father and others did: Italians were called “wops.”

Do you know what wops means?

It means “without papers.” That is what they were called: without papers.

These people are without papers, but in every way they are American.

I just want to tell you a couple of stories. One is Fernando Meza Gutierrez. Fernando lives in my district. Fernando's family came to the U.S. Fernando came to the U.S. when he was 9 years old. In high school, Fernando was an AP scholar and received the International Baccalaureate Diploma and the Achievement Award in Foreign Language for French.

Fernando continued to excel academically at Santa Clara University, where he graduated cum laude with a double major in biology and French.

Now a third-year doctoral student at UC San Francisco, Fernando also works at UCSF Helen Diller Family Comprehensive Cancer Center, where he is working hard to provide new insights into many diseases and disorders.

I just want to tell you one other story. Lisette Diaz was just 6 years old when her family brought her to the U.S. from Chile. Growing up in Long Island, Lisette excelled in school and was involved in her community. She went on to attend Harvard, where she received numerous awards and participated in a variety of extracurricular

activities. Lisette recently graduated from Harvard with honors.

Lisette and other DREAMers have so much to contribute to our country, but Donald Trump and other Republicans have made their agenda clear. They want to shut down DACA and DAPA and deport hundreds of thousands of DREAMers and parents of Americans.

That is what DREAMers think. We don't want them to think that. We want them to think that the President understands their value, the value of our DREAMers, and the challenges that they face.

If we don't do something soon, Lisette will be deported back to Chile, a country where she hasn't lived since she was 6 years old.

There are just thousands and thousands and thousands of stories of success, of those serving in our military, attending our schools, teaching our children, working in high-level positions, because they all have that immigrant attitude of hard work, hard work ethic, a work ethic, a faith ethic, a family ethic, a sense of community.

In the sense and spirit of community, let's defeat this rule and allow the Dream Act to come forward.

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

Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot about what isn't in the bill today, and we could actually talk a lot longer about what isn't in the bill. It is a fairly narrowly focused bill, but what is in there, in addition to funding to keep the government operating, is funding for our community health centers that we all care so much about; is funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program—that is a bipartisan issue across this Chamber—is funding for the Special Diabetes Program. Mr. Speaker, that is so important to so many families. I can go on and on and on.

Are there things that are not in this bill?

Of course there are, and I look forward to coming back with my colleagues to address each and every one of those, but there is so much good that is in this bill, Mr. Speaker. If we conclude this debate to pass this rule, we can get on and make those things a reality.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

We are in a critical and urgent time. People's lives are on the line.

On September 5, the President suddenly and cruelly terminated the DACA program. Since that date, 13,000 DACA recipients have lost their status and their protections, and every day that Congress delays a vote, another average of 122 lose their status.

That is why this is urgent, that is why this is important, that is why we need to act now.

Congress should not wait any longer to act. It cannot turn its back on these youths, on these immigrants who are leading productive, positive lives, who are giving back to our communities and contributing immensely to the economy.

Congress has an opportunity today to show the world our values, that we are going to protect DREAMers, that we are going to stand with these young men and women who enrich our country, who only know the United States as their home. The nearly 800,000 DREAMers are our doctors, our nurses, our teachers, our neighbors, and they serve in our military and are protecting us here at home.

But because Congress has not acted and because this Chamber has failed to act on the DACA issue, DREAMers are living in fear and uncertainty of their future. They are afraid to go to school. They are afraid of losing their loved ones at a moment's notice. They are anxious about whether they will be able to continue to earn their paychecks and earn a living.

DREAMers are feeling the pain now. They are experiencing the anxiety now. They are being detained now. These are real people.

Now, I understand their fear and their uncertainty, because, for many of us, this hits real close to home. I have 8,000 DREAMers who live in my district. I also have a family member who is a DREAMer. Many are afraid of being deported to a place where they will be strangers, to a country they haven't lived in since they were children.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 16th time since DACA's termination that Democrats are challenging Republicans to take real urgent action to protect DREAMers by bringing the bipartisan Dream Act to a vote on this floor.

We must stand up for DREAMers. It is the right thing to do. It is what Americans want us to do. They want Congress to protect DREAMers from deportation by an overwhelming majority. It is the moral thing to do.

Again, this is a bipartisan issue. I have talked to many of my colleagues across the aisle who want to see a vote on this. I believe we will pass it overwhelmingly if we could just get this vote.

This is a moment of truth for our Nation. I ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can immediately bring the Dream Act to the floor and provide relief for the nearly 800,000 DREAMers in time for the holiday season.

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

Mr. Speaker, you likely did, as I did yesterday, get a wonderful Christmas card from our friend from California, which I very much appreciated. She was there with her beautiful family. I appreciate the sincerity of her words today.

I will just remind this Chamber that we are having that conversation for

one reason and one reason only. That is because, when Democrats had the White House, the U.S. House, and the U.S. Senate, but—much like Republicans today—didn't have 60 votes to get around the filibuster, instead of President Obama and the Democratic leaders in the House and the Senate trying to find a bipartisan pathway forward that could get 60 votes, they chose to craft an administrative solution, one that I thought was illegal, one that I thought was unconstitutional, but chose to go it alone.

Mr. Speaker, that is not a blame statement. It is an explanation of some systemic challenges that exist in this place.

I can assure my colleagues, and I am happy to have someone disabuse me of the notion, but I have yet to see the issue that we have solved by blaming each other more for it. I have yet to see that pathway to success.

The pathway I have seen is when folks turn the cameras off, when they roll up their sleeves, when they decide they don't much care who gets the credit for a solution, they just want to solve it.

I will put another one on my colleagues' plate, because, again, I don't doubt their sincerity. Raju is one of my constituents. He is here on an H1-B visa. His wife, Manju, is here on an H-4 visa. He came to this country legally 11 years ago. Every few years, he has to renew his visa, which costs thousands of dollars. When his visa expires, when his driver's license expires, he has to go back and do it. He is not complaining. That is what the law of the land said. When he agreed to come here, he agreed to follow the law of the land. He can't start his own business. He can't change employers. He is a captive of the visa program that he came in on. There is no pathway, Mr. Speaker, for Raju and Manju to get the same benefits that my colleagues are arguing so passionately for for 800,000 additional people.

Mr. Speaker, the human stories don't begin and end with the DACA program. Again, a problem that President Obama created; not solved, but created.

I can go line by line by line of folks who are facing similar challenges, and I question where the justice is when I can name constituent after constituent after constituent who has done everything right, who has paid every dime the government has asked, who has applied for every piece of paperwork that the government has asked, who has stood in every line that the government has asked, and there is no pathway forward for them.

Let's not pretend that there is not common ground that we can come together on. Let's confess that perhaps we haven't spent enough time trying to do it.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, all of us are anxious to go home to our families and our celebrations, but more and more Americans are seeing every single day, particularly in the last couple days, just how messed up the values and priorities of the Republican majority really are.

They saw the Republicans go off to the White House and high-fiving and cheering each other for a tax cut that provides 81 percent of its benefits to the wealthiest Americans and that blows about a \$1.5-trillion hole in the budget. That means debt and deficit.

Who is left with the coal in the stocking?

We are looking at 9 million children and their parents who are sick, who have been worrying about how they are going to have the Children's Health Insurance Program. Yes, we extended it now until March. It expired in September, but we didn't have time for those children.

We don't have time for the 800,000 young people who are serving this country right now as DACA recipients. We could pass the Dream Act today. Let's get our values straight. Let's do better than we are.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentleman from Massachusetts that I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close when he is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if the gentleman has any time to share.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentleman that it appears I have committed all of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this has been a painful season for so many of us, from California to Texas to Florida, Louisiana, to Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, and so I am still here begging my colleagues for those who are begging in Texas.

Right now, my local officials are letting my constituents from Kashmere Gardens share in the public view how desperate they are for housing money. So this CR and this emergency supplemental should be separated. But the CR, on the other hand, should be funding CHIP completely. And DACA, the DREAMers, should be protected completely.

I introduced a bill when Hurricane Harvey came for \$164 billion. That is where we should be, and I know that because of the sacrifice and loss and devastation. But also, a DREAMer lost his life trying to rescue my constituents, so, you see, we have a situation that should be corrected across the board. Fix the DREAMers, but provide for the hurricane victims.

I will say that we are going to keep on pushing beyond the \$81 billion. I am glad the \$1 billion that I pushed for for small businesses is in this bill.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we have 300,000 homes underwater. Puerto Rico has no lights in homes; U.S. Virgin Islands, none, no homes. Key West still needs debris picked up.

What my constituents are saying is, because the lights are out, we are forgotten; because DREAMers don't have rights, they are forgotten.

So I am not going to stand here and ignore our children, 9 million of them who need CHIP, or our DREAMers. But I am also going to say that, whatever is in this for us, which is not a lot, I am going to keep pushing and fighting for my constituents. And the money that we are getting, get it to us now—now.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is the Christmas season, so I do want to begin by thanking the gentleman from Georgia and the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS, for always being so polite to me and to other Democrats on the committee.

But I want to say, in all candor, that, in spite of that, we are disrespected each and every day when our ideas are shut out and, in turn, our constituents are disrespected. I represent the same number of people as the Speaker of the House, as any Republican and any other Democrat in this Chamber, and yet, routinely, we are told that our ideas are not welcome.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that every Member of this House, Democrats and Republicans alike, are entitled to basic respect. We have just gone through the most closed session in the history of our country, more than 58 closed rules in this session. Over 1,500 amendments, both Democratic and Republican amendments, were blocked. That is not what we were promised by the leadership of this House.

We are disappointed with what we are dealing with today. We are disappointed with the inaction and lack of support for the CHIP program and the community health centers funding. We think that is inadequate. We are disappointed that more funding isn't provided to deal with the opioid crisis.

I could go on and on and on, but today, we are asking the Speaker to allow a vote to help the DREAMers, men and women who came here as children, who have served in our military, who have been first responders saving lives in these disaster relief efforts, 91 percent who work and pay taxes. They are important. They are valuable. We should celebrate them.

I would say to my colleagues this is a matter of decency. The right and decent thing to do is to help them, not rationalize inaction.

Please, please, for the sake of all that is good about our country, join us in



defeating the previous question so we can have an up-or-down vote on the Dream Act, so we can actually help these 800,000 people, these young individuals who are giving so much to our country. It is the right thing to do.

This is the Christmas season. I hope you are all moved to joining us and to helping these people because, as we have learned, each and every day that we wait, more and more of them lose their status. They lose their jobs. Their lives are thrown into deeper turmoil.

It is wrong for us to go home and not deal with this. The decent thing to do is to vote on the Dream Act.

Vote “no” on the previous question.

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

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

There has been a lot of productivity this week. There has been a lot of work that has gone on this week. I am looking around up there at the dais with you, Mr. Speaker. I see a lot of unshaven faces. I’m not just taking about Josef. I am talking about folks who intended to shave and might not have made it home last night to get that done.

It takes an incredible amount of staff time to do this. So what Mr. MCGOVERN and I do up in the Rules Committee, our staffs have been there past midnight time and time again this week and then back in at dawn.

I wish that more of the American people, Mr. Speaker, could see the hardworking, dedicated staff, the team that goes into making all of this possible, because I think it would make them proud. I think, in a season like this, it would lift them up and make them feel better about who we are as a people and the things that we could accomplish together.

One of those young people, Mr. Speaker, is Nate Blake on the Rules Committee. He is sitting right here behind me. He is leaving us after 5 years of service. I want to put that into perspective, Mr. Speaker.

There is not a staff member up here that can’t leave today and get better hours and more money going anywhere else in town. You will work on Capitol Hill for one reason and one reason only, and that is that you believe, if only you work hard enough and long enough, you would make America just a little bit better.

Mr. Blake is one of those believers. We will miss him on the committee. It is a great honor for me that his very last rule is to be one of mine, and I thank him for his service.

Mr. Speaker, they often say everything’s been said but not everyone has said it. We don’t need to go down that path today. This House has done its job. It has done its job in a collaborative way. It has done its job in a way that the American people can be proud of.

If we pass this rule, we will not only fund the government, send money to the troops, send money to community

health centers, send money to education, send money to courts, send money to the environment; we will not only take care of those funding responsibilities; we will also provide those dollars needed for those men and women spread out from Florida to Texas to California to Puerto Rico to the Virgin Islands. There is a real human being behind each and every one of these dollars that will go out the door today.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues, vote “yes” on this rule so we can get to that underlying legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Rule, and H.R. 4667, one of the two underlying bills made in order.

H.R. 4667 provides \$81 billion in aid to respond to the damage caused by Hurricanes Irma and Maria, and the wildfires in California.

I thank the Speaker and Rules Committee Chairman SESSIONS for acting favorably upon my request to bring this emergency disaster supplemental to the floor for debate and vote as a stand-alone measure.

Ever since the widespread and catastrophic destruction of Hurricane Harvey, I have been working closely with the Texas Governor and the Hurricane Harvey Taskforce to secure the help necessary for the region to rebuild.

I have witnessed firsthand the pain of storm-weary Houstonians who lost their homes, their belongings, and in many cases their jobs.

They are struggling and hurting.

So this is personal to me.

The amount of funding provided in the disaster relief package is very disappointing because it is not nearly sufficient to ameliorate the suffering still being experienced by the people of the communities in the areas affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

Congress has had more than three months to develop an aid package that is commensurate to the challenge faced by the affected states and territories in rebuilding their devastated communities.

Much of this time has been squandered by the Republican congressional leadership’s all-consuming focus on ramming through the Republican Tax Scam legislation that gives 83 percent of its benefits to the top 1 percent, raises taxes on working and middle-class families, takes away health insurance from 13 million Americans, explodes the deficit by \$1.5 trillion and the national debt by \$1.7 trillion, and will be paid for by 5.4 trillion in cuts to vital programs Americans depend on, including an imminent \$25 billion reduction in Medicare funding.

Mr. Speaker, on September 6, 2017, ten days after Hurricane Harvey struck and joined by 44 of our colleagues, I introduced H.R. 3686, the “Hurricane Harvey Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2017,” which provides \$174 billion in disaster relief for the areas affected by Hurricane Harvey, the worst superstorm ever to strike the mainland United States.

The \$174 billion in funding provided by H.R. 3686 represents a comprehensive response commensurate to the challenge; specifically, my legislation provides relief in the following amounts:

1. Housing and Community Development Fund: \$50 billion
2. FEMA Disaster Relief Fund: \$35 billion
3. Army Corps of Engineers—Construction: \$15 billion

4. Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies: \$13 billion

5. Public Transportation Emergency Relief Program: \$33 billion

6. Small Business Disaster Loans Program: \$2 billion

7. Emergency Conservation Activities: \$650 million

8. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration: \$321 million

9. National Aeronautics and Space Administration: \$50 million

10. Legal Services Corporation: \$10 million

11. Army National Guard: \$10 million

12. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil Investigations: \$150 million

13. Coast Guard: \$450 million

14. National Park Service Historic Preservation Fund: \$800 million

15. EPA Environmental Programs and Management: \$2.5 billion

16. EPA Hazardous Substance Superfund: \$7 million

17. Leaking Underground Storage Tank Fund: \$15 million

18. State and Tribal Assistance Grants: \$600 million

19. Employment and Training Services: \$100 million

20. Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund: \$2.5 billion

21. Airport and Airway Trust Fund: \$90 million

22. Federal-Aid Highways Emergency Relief Program: \$6.5 billion

And that is just for Texas and the areas affected by Hurricane Harvey; the damage wrought by Hurricane Irma in Florida, and Hurricane Maria in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands was nearly as great in dollar terms and equal in the level of misery and suffering inflicted on the residents.

Mr. Speaker, on September 20, 2017, Hurricane Maria made landfall in Puerto Rico, along the southeastern coast, near the small town of Yabucoa.

The devastation wrought on that beautiful Caribbean oasis and its 3.5 million inhabitants, our fellow citizens of the United States, is unimaginable, except perhaps to those of us who have lived through and survived similar natural disasters, like Hurricanes Harvey and Katrina.

At least 48 people have died as a result of the storm as rescue and recovery operations proceed, a number likely to rise, especially with so many elderly, sick, and very young persons at risk.

Much of Puerto Rico’s population is still without potable drinking water and large swaths of the population still lack electrical power.

Hurricane Maria destroyed 80 percent of Puerto Rico’s agricultural industry, including banana, plantain and coffee crops, which translates into lost income of approximately \$780 million.

On August 30, 2017, Hurricane Irma struck, inflicting horrific damage on the U.S. Virgin Islands of St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John, the Caribbean nations of Barbuda, St. Maarten, Cuba, and Anguilla, before making landfall in the Florida Keys.

In Florida alone, 6.4 million people were told to evacuate to safety, leading to days of jammed highways and frantic searches for gasoline amid one of the nation’s largest ever emergency evacuations.

At least 124 persons are known to have lost their lives in Hurricane Irma, more than

200,000 Floridians took refuge in shelters, and nearly 6.5 million homes and businesses were without power.

Mr. Speaker, we do not yet know the full extent of the damage and devastation suffered by our fellows Americans in Florida, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico in the wake of Hurricanes Irma and Maria.

But what we do know is that the costs of recovery and reconstruction will be extensive, best estimates place the cost in the range of \$50–\$100 billion.

This puts in perspective the inadequacy of the amount of disaster relief provided under H.R. 4667 and why more, much more, must be done.

Mr. Speaker, right now, at this very moment, approximately 300,000 Texans—in Port Arthur, in Port Aransas, in Houston and Harris County—remain homeless or are living in substandard homes with blue tarp roofs and infested with mold.

Today, residents of the Cashmere Gardens community are meeting with local government officials to highlight their plight and those of other residents in the northeastern part of Houston.

They are angry and frustrated and anxious, and who can blame them?

Mr. Speaker, this is personal to them; and it is personal to me.

That is why right now my highest priority is to ensure that funding that has been made available expeditiously gets in the hands of local governments so that relief can deliver the resources and services so desperately needed.

And I will be working with the Texas General Land Office and HUD Secretary Carson to relieve the emergency housing crisis in my congressional district and state.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the bipartisan leadership of both Chambers, and my colleagues in the Texas congressional delegation for their diligence and commitment in bringing this package to the floor for debate and vote.

I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member LOWEY, and Speaker RYAN and Democratic Leader PELOSI, and their Senate counterparts for the work that has been done thus far and for their assistance in the work that lies ahead.

I also thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member LOWEY, and T-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman DIAZ-BALART, and Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee Chair SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR for including in the legislation before us the following beneficial measures that I requested, including:

1. Authority to establish and implement a \$1 billion pilot program to provide small business disaster recovery grants, modeled on H.R. 3930, the “Hurricane Harvey Small Business Recovery Grants Act,” legislation I introduced on October 3, 2017 and co-sponsored by 16 of our colleagues.

2. \$75 million for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ Investigations account, which is to be used in areas affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, and can be used to finance the \$3 million Houston-Area Watershed Assessment Study I have worked to secure and previously approved by the House.

3. The bill also includes helpful legislative language to ensure that in awarding CDBG-Disaster Relief funds to states, the Secretary

of HUD should to the maximum extent practicable award grants to units of local government and public housing authorities that have the financial and administrative capacity to manage a grant awarded under the program.

Let me describe briefly some of the major provisions contained in the Disaster Relief Supplemental:

1. FEMA Disaster Relief Fund: \$27.5 billion to provide critical funding to assist the ongoing federal disaster response. Allows up to \$4 billion to be provided for Community Disaster Loans (CDLs).

2. Community Development Block Grants Disaster Recovery (CDBG-DR): \$26.1 billion for housing and infrastructure needs, \$13.56 billion for grants to states, tribes, and territories for unmet housing needs and business losses.

3. \$12.5 billion for mitigation efforts to help communities protect against future disasters.

4. This funding can provide for housing elevation, buyouts in the flood plain, water/sewer infrastructure enhancements, public infrastructure hardening (e.g. stormproofing public buildings).

5. Federal Highway Administration’s Emergency Relief: \$1.4 billion to address all current damages to federal highways caused by designated disasters.

6. \$12.11 billion for the Army Corps of Engineers to repair existing damages by natural disasters and for studies and projects to reduce the risk of future natural disasters, \$75 million to expedite studies to help mitigate future disaster damage.

7. 2.9 billion to help displaced students get back to school. Funding can be used for both public and private schools.

8. \$3.8 billion for agriculture assistance.

9. \$1.66 billion for Small Business Administration Disaster Loans to assist small businesses and homeowners repair or replace real estate, personal property, machinery and equipment, and inventory and business assets.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more work to be done in my city of Houston, and across the areas affected by the terrible, awesome storm that will be forever known simply as Hurricane Harvey, and by Hurricanes Irma and Maria.

That is why I am disappointed that only \$81 billion is being provided at this time.

That is why it must be emphasized and understood that this can only be understood as a partial response because much more funding will be needed to provide our fellow Americans in Texas, Florida, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands the help and support they need to restore their communities to their previous greatness.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 670 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 8. 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. 9. 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. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 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;

Suspending the rules and passing S. 1393; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 188, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 704]

YEAS—232

Abraham	Collins (GA)	Garrett
Aderholt	Collins (NY)	Gianforte
Allen	Comer	Gibbs
Amash	Comstock	Gohmert
Amodei	Conaway	Goodlatte
Arrington	Cook	Gosar
Babin	Costello (PA)	Gowdy
Bacon	Cramer	Graves (GA)
Banks (IN)	Crawford	Graves (LA)
Barletta	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Barr	Curbelo (FL)	Griffith
Barton	Curtis	Grothman
Bergman	Davidson	Guthrie
Biggs	Davis, Rodney	Handel
Bilirakis	Denham	Harper
Bishop (MI)	Dent	Harris
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Hartzler
Black	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Blum	Donovan	Hice, Jody B.
Bost	Duffy	Higgins (LA)
Brady (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Hill
Brat	Duncan (TN)	Holding
Brooks (IN)	Dunn	Hollingsworth
Buchanan	Emmer	Hudson
Buck	Estes (KS)	Huizenga
Bucshon	Farenthold	Hultgren
Budd	Faso	Hunter
Burgess	Ferguson	Hurd
Byrne	Fitzpatrick	Issa
Calvert	Fleischmann	Jenkins (KS)
Carter (GA)	Flores	Jenkins (WV)
Carter (TX)	Fortenberry	Johnson (LA)
Chabot	Fox	Johnson (OH)
Cheney	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Sam
Coffman	Gaetz	Jordan
Cole	Gallagher	Joyce (OH)

Katko	Mullin
Kelly (MS)	Newhouse
Kelly (PA)	Noem
King (IA)	Norman
King (NY)	Nunes
Kinzinger	Olson
Knight	Palazzo
Kustoff (TN)	Palmer
Labrador	Paulsen
LaHood	Pearce
LaMalfa	Perry
Lamborn	Pittenger
Lance	Poe (TX)
Latta	Poliquin
Lewis (MN)	Posey
LoBiondo	Ratcliffe
Long	Reed
Loudermilk	Reichert
Love	Rice (SC)
Lucas	Roby
Luetkemeyer	Roe (TN)
MacArthur	Rogers (AL)
Marchant	Rogers (KY)
Marino	Rohrabacher
Marshall	Rokita
Massie	Rooney, Francis
Mast	Rooney, Thomas
McCarthy	J.
McCaul	Ros-Lehtinen
McClintock	Roskam
McHenry	Ross
McKinley	Rothfus
McMorris	Rouzer
Rodgers	Royce (CA)
McSally	Russell
Meadows	Rutherford
Meehan	Sanford
Messer	Scalise
Mitchell	Schweikert
Moolenaar	Scott, Austin
Mooney (WV)	Sensenbrenner

NAYS—188

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

Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus

Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

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

NOT VOTING—11

Bridenstine	Jones	Renacci
Brooks (AL)	Kennedy	Smith (TX)
Foster	Napolitano	Suozi
Granger	Pocan	

□ 1402

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.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 188, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 705]

AYES—228

Abraham	Duffy	King (IA)
Aderholt	Duncan (SC)	King (NY)
Allen	Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger
Amodei	Dunn	Knight
Arrington	Emmer	Kustoff (TN)
Babin	Estes (KS)	Labrador
Bacon	Farenthold	LaHood
Banks (IN)	Faso	LaMalfa
Barletta	Ferguson	Lamborn
Barr	Fitzpatrick	Lance
Barton	Fleischmann	Latta
Bergman	Flores	Lewis (MN)
Biggs	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Bilirakis	Fox	Long
Bishop (MI)	Frelinghuysen	Loudermilk
Bishop (UT)	Gaetz	Love
Black	Gallagher	Lucas
Blackburn	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Blum	Gianforte	MacArthur
Bost	Gibbs	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Marino
Brat	Goodlatte	Marshall
Brooks (IN)	Gowdy	Mast
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	McCarthy
Buck	Graves (LA)	McCaul
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Budd	Griffith	McHenry
Burgess	Grothman	McKinley
Byrne	Guthrie	McMorris
Calvert	Handel	Rodgers
Carter (GA)	Harper	McSally
Carter (TX)	Harris	Meadows
Chabot	Hartzler	Meehan
Cheney	Hensarling	Messer
Coffman	Herrera Beutler	Mitchell
Cole	Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar
Collins (GA)	Higgins (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Collins (NY)	Hill	Mullin
Comer	Holding	Newhouse
Comstock	Hollingsworth	Noem
Conaway	Hudson	Norman
Cook	Huizenga	Nunes
Costello (PA)	Hultgren	Olson
Cramer	Hunter	Palazzo
Crawford	Hurd	Paulsen
Culberson	Issa	Pearce
Curbelo (FL)	Jenkins (KS)	Pittenger
Curtis	Jenkins (WV)	Poe (TX)
Davidson	Johnson (LA)	Poliquin
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Posey
Denham	Johnson, Sam	Reed
Dent	Jordan	Ratcliffe
DeSantis	Joyce (OH)	Reich
DesJarlais	Katko	Reichert
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Rice (SC)
Donovan	Kelly (PA)	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  
Shinkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Troott  
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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1410

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.

### JOBS FOR OUR HEROES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1393) to streamline the process by which active duty military, reservists, and veterans receive commercial driver's licenses, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 706]

YEAS—418

NOES—188

Adams  
Aguilar  
Amash  
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  
Cleave  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crist  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Espallat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge

Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halloran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
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  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Abraham  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Aguilar  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Baretta  
Barr  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Bergman  
Beyer  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bost  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Brooks (IN)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)

Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleave  
Clyburn  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Cook  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Galtz  
Gallagher  
Gallego  
Garrett  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Goodlatte  
Gotthelmer  
Gowdy  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene

Donovan  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Ellison  
Emmer  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Espallat  
Estes (KS)  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Frankel (FL)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Galtz  
Gallagher  
Gallego  
Garrett  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Goodlatte  
Gotthelmer  
Gowdy  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene

Heck  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Higgins (NY)  
Hill  
Himes  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huffman  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (MN)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie

Mast  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Neal  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Norman  
Nunes  
O'Halloran  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Panetta  
Pascarell  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce (CA)  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Russell  
Rutherford

Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schradler  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shinkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Smucker  
Soto  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

NOT VOTING—15

Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Foster  
Garamendi  
Gosar

Granger  
Jones  
Kennedy  
Napolitano  
Palmer

Pascarell  
Pocan  
Renacci  
Smith (TX)  
Suozi

Pascarell  
Pocan  
Renacci  
Smith (TX)  
Suozi

Pascarell  
Pocan  
Renacci  
Smith (TX)  
Suozi

Pascarell  
Pocan  
Renacci  
Smith (TX)  
Suozi

Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Foster  
Garamendi  
Gosar

Granger  
Jones  
Kennedy  
Napolitano  
Pocan

Renacci  
Smith (TX)  
Suozi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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