

Trail, North Carolina, where he was a 4A State champion wrestler in 2013, when he posted a 61–1 record. His college coach says Michael is constantly improving and that his work ethic, discipline, attitude, and commitment put him in position to compete for the national title.

Mr. Macchiavello is not just a champion inside the ring. He has already completed a bachelor's degree in finance and is working on a master's of arts.

Congratulations to Michael Macchiavello on winning the NCAA Division I National Wrestling Championship. Indian Trail, Union County, and the entire Ninth Congressional District are mighty proud of him. We wish him the best in what we know will be a great success for him in the future.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1625, TARGETED REWARDS FOR THE GLOBAL ERADICATION OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MARCH 23, 2018, THROUGH APRIL 9, 2018

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 796 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 796

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1625) to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to include severe forms of trafficking in persons within the definition of transnational organized crime for purposes of the rewards program of the Department of State, 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 115-66. 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. On any legislative day during the period from March 23, 2018, through April 9, 2018—

(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. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 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. 5. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

SEC. 6. The chair of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the Congressional Record not later than March 23, 2018, such material as he may deem explanatory of the Senate amendment and the motion specified in the first section of this resolution.

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

□ 0915

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, last night, at a late hour, the Rules Committee met, where we had expert testimony that was offered on behalf of the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentlewoman from New York.

I would like to, if I could, express to my friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, the professional nature not only that he but Judge HASTINGS, another member of the committee, represented the Democratic side at a time that is very difficult for them with the passing and loss of a tremendous leader in the House of Representatives, the gentlewoman from New York, Chairwoman LOUISE SLAUGHTER.

Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. HASTINGS not only conducted themselves, in my opinion, in a professional straightforward manner, but represented their party quite well in a time of distress and a time of need. I want to express my complete confidence not only in Mr. MCGOVERN, but also thank Judge HASTINGS for his professional demeanor last night as we worked through very, very difficult issues till late in the night, till early in the morning. And compliments also to the gentlemen, the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for their professional conversations that were had that were in the best interest not only of the House of Representatives but the American people. I want to thank Mr. MCGOVERN publicly at this time for his professional cause and substance.

Mr. Speaker, today we rise in support of this rule and, of course, the underlying legislation. The rule provides for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1625, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018.

Mr. Speaker, this is funding the government for the rest of the year, through September 30. This is an important measure. This is an important measure not only for the American people, but it is important for Members of Congress.

There are a lot of ways that we could stand and say what we are for or what we are against, but the bottom line is that this is a piece of legislation that has been worked on, on a bipartisan basis, Republicans and Democrats, give and take, and has been worked on the other side of the Capitol with the United States Senate.

It is in no way a perfect bill. That, I think, I learned a long time ago, is hard to get through to be signed by the President. But with that said, it yielded amazing results in a process that needed to come to a conclusion.

This 12-bill appropriations package provides funding for fiscal year 2018 at levels consistent with the bipartisan budget agreement and the National Defense Authorization Act.

After years of neglect, this body has taken the important step of reshaping and rebuilding the United States military by providing them \$659.6 billion worth of funding for our national defense. But it is for more than just national defense. It is also trying to give better protection to the men and women who protect us, the men and women who, today, are in cold, lonely, hot, dangerous places around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, a much-needed \$65 billion increase over 2017 fiscal year spending was essential. Mr. Speaker, the numbers speak for themselves. More members of our armed services gave their life in defense of this country in training exercises than they did in combat last year. This is a hardy reminder for Members of Congress and the American people to understand that our men and women not only fight hard, but they train hard. And in that defense, we need to do a better job to make sure that the equipment, the training, and the needs that they have are top flight year-round not just in combat areas, but in training missions where they are preparing to protect this country. Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way to that, and I am proud of the work that we have done.

The agreement ends, I think, the irresponsible practice of pairing dollar-for-dollar increases in defense spending with nondefense. This is a hard fight. This is a hard fight not only Republican-Democrat, but across this country. We have tried to make some balanced decisions. We have tried to err on the side of using money for the best interest of research and development and to move this country forward.

The bill strengthens missile defense. It strengthens and funds new weapons systems for the military. And it heavily increases designated counterthreats around the globe. As you know, Mr. Speaker, we are facing down one of the greatest threats to the world right now, North Korea. Now is not a time to

shy away. Mr. Speaker, we will not shy away. These colors don't run.

It funds additional national security priorities, including nuclear modernization, new nuclear submarines, and other important shipbuilding and aircraft procurement for our United States military. Quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) and her counterpart from the appropriations committee looked at the exercise that is necessary and came up to streamline and make sure that the money that would be given would be necessary and only in defense of this Nation.

This legislation also includes a long overdue 2.4 percent pay increase for our troops. The men and women who care for our veterans know that they need the help, and their service to this country will not be without a thank-you, thus providing a record level of VA funding, while increasing oversight to make sure that the benefits and treatment of our veterans is properly taken care of.

The new Secretary Shulkin of the VA is very concerned about the duty that they have to our veterans, and he has assured us this amount of funding will allow he and the Department that opportunity to fix, correct, and, long term, know that the long-term safety for our veterans and their facilities will be accomplished.

It provides robust funding to fight terrorism. It enhances criminal law enforcement and secures our borders by increasing funding for border security and the enforcement of immigration law. This legislation also includes new infrastructure funding for highways, waterways, airways, railways, and other infrastructure priorities to ensure public safety is taken care of and to promote economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, it provides \$4 billion, the largest investment to date, to combat the opioid crisis. We have spent a great deal of time not only working on this Member to Member, but also State organizations working with their members; Federal law enforcement; and the National Institutes of Health, through the direction of Dr. Shiva Singh, their chief medical officer who spent a great deal of time working with Members of Congress, opioid task forces, substance abuse task forces, and perhaps, most of all, the problems that we have that face this great Nation, where we have addiction problems. These are addressed within this spending bill.

Increase in funding by \$3 billion, certainly the head of the NIH, Dr. Francis Collins, believes that this investment in the National Institutes of Health, including the National Eye Institute and other important parts of NIH, will receive the funding that is necessary to ensure that the men and women of this country who suffer long-term effects of aging and other medical problems, that we can address them and live up to our responsibility.

I thank Dr. Francis Collins and Dr. Shiva Singh for their instruction to

our important Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman TOM COLE for his great work at the NIH—\$2.3 billion in new funding for mental health training and school safety efforts help our children to make sure that our schools are safe.

This is a brief rundown, Mr. Speaker, of the kind of work not only that we have dug in and done on a bipartisan basis, but the kind of work that I believe the American people want, need, and expect.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Rules Committee and my friend, for the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee for his thoughtfulness in the aftermath of the passing of our dear friend, the former chairwoman of the Rules Committee, LOUISE SLAUGHTER. We appreciate his support. We appreciate the support of all the Republican members on the Rules Committee, especially for the Democratic staff, but we are truly grateful for all of his consideration and for all of his remembrances of our friend. We want him to know it means a great deal to all of us, so we thank him.

I also want to take this opportunity to once again wish the chairman of the Rules Committee a happy birthday. I had the honor to be with him at 1:30 in the morning yesterday and to wish him happy birthday then. So we will wish him happy birthday again at 9:30 in the morning, and we wish him many, many more.

Mr. Speaker, you know, here we are, and I am kind of at a loss for words. There is really not a lot to say. We are here, yet again, facing another manufactured and totally avoidable crisis.

You know, what on Earth will it take for the Republican leadership of this Congress to actually step up to the plate and start governing?

Because this process that is bringing us this bill today, I don't think, represents good governing.

We have seen five continuing resolutions. We have seen two government shutdowns in less than 6 months. It is mind-boggling. It takes my breath away.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans control the House, they control the Senate, they control the White House; but the truth is that it turns out that they can't govern. Governing is hard work. It takes skill. It takes compromise. It is not all press conferences and it is not all tweets. It takes leadership.

So I would encourage our Republican colleagues to cut the nonsense and get down to business. We can't keep on embracing processes like the one that we

are seeing unfold today. Give the American people the certainty they deserve, fund this government the right way. But this process that brings us this omnibus today, I think, is disappointing not just to Democrats, but to a lot of Republicans as well.

Now, as lousy as this process was to get here, there are some things in this agreement that we can be enthusiastic about. We are encouraged by increases in spending for domestic priorities, like infrastructure, education, medical research, and support for our veterans, among other things. These are things that are of great importance to Members on the Democratic side.

We are pleased that the negotiators on our side of the aisle worked diligently to remove poison pill riders, and they fought to limit the construction of the President's stupid border wall.

Our enthusiasm is tempered because of what else might be in the bill, what we might not know. It is over 2,200 pages long, and it was posted at 8 p.m. last night. I am not sure anyone in this Chamber has had the chance to actually read the entire text of this omnibus. I don't know how many inadvertent errors may be contained in this omnibus.

□ 0930

I worry what kind of provisions we could find tucked away in this bill in the days and the weeks to come.

This is no way to govern, Mr. Speaker. Our Republican colleague from Louisiana over in the Senate, Senator JOHN KENNEDY, said yesterday that he thinks this whole process is an embarrassment. He said: "As bad as it looks to the American people from the outside, it is worse on the inside."

I don't blame the Appropriations Committee. I have nothing but the highest respect for Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member LOWEY. They did an incredible job, and they and their staffs deserve our gratitude. There were many sleepless nights to be able to produce a product so that we could actually move forward and not shut the government down. They did what everybody expected them to do, and I want to thank them for their work.

And to be honest with you, I don't really blame the Rules Committee. We were given this last night, and we had to come up with a process and a rule to bring it to the floor.

But I do blame the Speaker, and I do blame the Senate majority leader, and I do blame the President, because they are in charge and we shouldn't be at the brink of a government shutdown before we consider spending bills. This should have been done months and months ago.

Mr. Speaker, again, the American people deserve much better. They deserve a Congress that works for them, a Congress that is responsive to their calls for action, a Congress that listens to all voices, both Democrats and Republicans alike.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that this omnibus legislation will ultimately work its way through Congress and to the President's desk to avert yet another Republican-manufactured shut-down.

But I would ask the Republican leadership of this Congress: Let's reform the way we do business around here. I don't believe that those of us in the minority expect to win all the time, but we expect to have our voices heard, and we want and we demand a fair process.

We want enough time to read bills before you bring them up for a vote. That is not too much to ask. Let's work together to bring a little bit more transparency, a little bit more sunshine, and yes, a little bit more democracy into the people's House.

This is supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world. I don't know why it is such a radical idea that we deliberate every once in a while. Instead, we are presented with a 2,200-page bill, and we have been given summaries, but, in all honesty, none of us know what is actually in this bill and whether or not there are some things here that, quite frankly, might be very, very troubling once we begin to read this bill over the days and weeks ahead.

Let's have an honest and open debate. Let's resolve that we are not going to ever go back to this process again where we fund government hour to hour. We need to get back to important issues facing our country and the American people.

Again, I want to express my gratitude to the appropriators and to those who were in these negotiations to try to get us a bill here today, but this is a lousy process, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule. We can't sanction this process.

No matter what you think about the bill, this process is something that we have to stand up and say: This is unacceptable.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I not only accept his advice about process and procedure, but I certainly would join in with him to thank our appropriators, the men and women who, on a bipartisan basis, Mr. Speaker, took time to wander to the other side of the Capitol to engage their colleagues.

I can tell the gentleman, and he knows this probably on a firsthand basis, much was discussed. This was a big process. This was at the end of the year that I do agree with that should have taken place on October 1, not on March 22, that we decided where we are headed.

But the discussion, the decision-making, the ability for both sides, both parties, to deal on the same issues has gotten tougher and tougher.

I support our Speaker and what he is attempting to do. He has opened up the

process. He has tried to make it to where the discussions take place on a bipartisan basis. And the Speaker, I believe, has tried to place before us, as Members of Congress, the opportunity to be heard, to represent our thoughts and ideas.

I didn't win some of the issues that I was for. I held some ideas out about a number of issues that we had been working on that were contained in the bills that came out of the House only to come back months later from the Senate in a different priority, in a different way, and perhaps not exactly what I would have wanted.

It would be easy for me to say, however, that the greater good of what we are attempting to accomplish is why we are here. Ultimately, we have a duty, Mr. Speaker, we have a duty and a responsibility, to ensure that which we finalize is in the best interest of the American people. The overriding concern here is to make sure that the efforts of government, albeit that we as Americans, I don't think, want to get all that we pay for from government, we still recognize that there are people in our midst that need a government—and I do, too—a government that works well and is funded properly.

Mr. Speaker, last night we had an opportunity to hear from a number of my colleagues on the Republican side, a number of Members of Congress who spent hours waiting their time before the Rules Committee, not an unusual intuitive process from a number of our Members who had questions, comments, and concerns.

I promised to address one of them. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) brought forth what was a discussion about what is known as the NICS fix, or, as we refer to it, fixing NICS, a NICS fix.

Well, this is the database that is responsible for holding names and giving approvals for those people who purchase weapons across the United States. I agreed to provide some bit of an answer today and I hope some clarity on the issue that relates back to December of 2017.

I told the gentleman last night that I believed that, while his arguments were important and I supported exactly the underlying ideas, and that is that we do not believe that agencies by themselves should have the ability to deny an American citizen the right, the constitutional right, for them to properly, legally own a weapon, as we do know and remember back during a previous administration, at least two agencies, the Social Security Administration and the Veterans Administration, developed procedures by which they believed were appropriate, but that I think have proven incorrect, to deny people a weapon based upon a criteria that they established.

This fix NICS provision was corrected and is still in law, and, to the best of my ability in double-checking, I would now like to notify the gentleman from Kentucky that I believe it is properly done.

I would not be a part of making a change in the law, as I told him, that would deny an American citizen under these two agencies without lawful consideration of a hearing and with due process, and based upon the law and constitutional requirements of our Constitution to deny someone their right to keep and bear arms.

Mr. Speaker, please consider that I appreciate the gentleman who showed up last night until late, late in the morning, and that he was doing his duty, which I respect and admire, and I am trying to respond back to him.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, said that he appreciated the Speaker's listening to the different opinions of all Members here in the House.

I think the frustration here is not that we can't raise our voices, the frustration here is that we cannot bring things that we care about to the House floor for debate.

The gentleman just talked about the issue of guns. We are living in a country where we have massacres on a regular basis. The American people overwhelmingly want us to bring gun safety legislation to the floor. Things like universal background checks, for example. The leadership of this House will not let us bring those bills to the floor for debate or for a vote. They have shut us out.

So this process that has been endorsed by the Republican leadership is not open. It is very, very closed. In fact, we are on record to becoming the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America. That is not something that I think the United States Congress should aspire to. Maybe that is something that the Russians might want to aspire to, but it is certainly not something that we here in this country want to aspire to.

Everybody in this Chamber has ideas. Everybody represents the same number of people. Everybody should be heard, and important legislation and important ideas ought to be brought to the floor for debate and for a vote.

If you do not want to vote for universal background checks, or if you do not want to vote to ban bump stocks, or if you do not want to vote for an assault weapons ban, then don't vote for it. But it is wrong and it undermines this institution when, on issues like that, we are told: You cannot deliberate on the House floor.

Another issue is DACA. The President of the United States single handedly ended the DACA program, and he threw the lives of hundreds of thousands of people into chaos. It was a cruel and rotten thing to do.

The President's arbitrary March 5 deadline ending this program has come and gone, and instead of leadership and compassion, all we have seen is partisan tweeting. It is maddening, and it betrays our values.

Earlier this month, President Trump tweeted: “Total inaction of DACA by Dems. Where are you? A deal can be made.”

Well, to answer President Trump’s question, the Democrats are right here, offering bipartisan solutions to protect these young Americans.

This is the 26th time that we have attempted to bring a bipartisan bill, the Dream Act, for a vote on the floor. And I am going to ask people to vote against the previous question so we can bring a solution to the floor and protect these incredible young people who have given so much to our country.

But this is the 26th time that we have attempted to do this.

And, by the way, this is not just a Democratic bill. There is bipartisan support for this. And what is particularly frustrating is that the Republican leadership of this House will not let us have that vote.

Why?

Because they know it will pass. They know it will pass. They don’t want the majority to work its will in this Chamber. They have deliberately said: No. We are not allowing you to bring that to the floor.

If you want to help these people, you have to bring a bill to the floor. And if you don’t want to help them, well, bring the bill to the floor and vote “no.” But this is ridiculous. There is bipartisan support to fix this problem, to help these people, to live up to our values in this country.

Again, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act, and this bipartisan, bicameral legislation would help hundreds of thousands of young people who are American in every way except on paper.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleagues: Give us the vote. Give us this vote. If you don’t like it, then vote “no.” But if we were to bring this bill to the floor, I guarantee you it would pass. I think every Democrat would vote for it, and a big chunk of Republicans, maybe even a majority, might vote for this.

□ 0945

I don’t know what the gentleman is afraid of. I don’t know why this is so hard. This is the Congress of the United States. This is the place where these issues are supposed to be resolved; and, instead, all we get from the leadership of this House is obstruction, obstruction, obstruction. They block everything—block everything. Everything is closed. It is my way or the highway. Enough. These people de-

serve better than this institution is providing. They deserve a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding.

Yesterday, the University of Central Florida in Orlando had a unique student body president election. The candidates were Karen Caudillo, my constituent, and Josh Bolona, both Dreamers, beneficiaries of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Act. They ran on a platform of justice and equality, and so did I. Today we celebrate Josh Bolona’s victory on becoming UCF’s first Dreamer student body president.

So what a sad backdrop we have here today. President Trump declared victory for getting \$1.6 billion to start his wall in a tweet late last night—\$1.6 billion to start Trump’s wall. So his wall gets funding, but our Dreamers get left behind. How can I, in good conscience, go home to my constituents and explain this?

I wonder aloud: When will our Dreamers be the priority? When will it be their time to shine? When will they have their moment of opportunity, a reprieve from worrying and from looking over their shoulders every day?

Mr. Speaker, when will the waiting finally stop for them and the living begin? When will the Dreamers finally get to dream?

Every week for 198 days, we have come here to ask our colleagues for their consideration of the bipartisan Dream Act. I remind you of that because it has been 198 days since the President put hundreds of thousands of Dreamers at risk of losing their jobs, careers, their families, and everything they have worked for their entire lives. Many take solace in a court injunction issued in California and New York.

As a lawyer, I can tell you these Dreamers are hanging by a thread. They are one adverse ruling away from oblivion.

What about the over 1 million Dreamers who are not part of the case? Those young people who would be entering the program, the young sisters and the young brothers of Dreamers who are in the DACA program and those Dreamers who did not apply out of concern and out of a mistrust they had for giving their information to a Federal Government that has turned their back on them? They would have no quarter under these injunctions and no rest. They have no peace.

Why can’t we, once and for all, come together to give these deserving young patriots who embody our deepest values the opportunity to earn their citizenship, hardworking patriots like Josh, Karen, and hundreds of thousands of others who will have contributed an estimated \$460 billion to the U.S. economy over the next decade? These young people are making positive and significant contributions to the economic

growth of our country which benefits all of us.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Florida an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues across the aisle don’t want deportation of Dreamers on their hands, so why not do something now, at this moment, at this time? Why not pass a law that would permanently allow these young people to build a life here, to graduate from college, to start a new business, and to show their immense gratitude to a country that gave them a chance?

Today we have the opportunity to uphold our values and pass the Dream Act so that these Dreamers and the millions of people who swore to represent them aren’t worrying and wondering any longer. We are asking for one vote, just one vote, that will keep whole our principles and ideals and allow these young people to pursue the American Dream.

So for the 26th time in 198 days, I ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can immediately bring the Dream Act to the floor and provide certainty for Dreamers like Karen and Josh who want to continue to work, live, and contribute to the only country they love and the only country they have ever known. I cannot afford to wait another day, nor can they.

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

Mr. Speaker, I don’t want to digress too much, but the gentleman from Massachusetts referred to a process that just was embarrassing and did not work. I recall, last night, testimony from the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY): “This is one of the best processes that I can recall. We have products that we can be proud of. We worked together.”

Mr. Speaker, it is hard doing business in this town. It is hard doing business because we have disagreements. But let us not also misunderstand that it was President Trump who challenged Congress when our previous administration simply went about writing their own rules and regulations that made the circumstances on our border not only more dangerous, but very costly for every single American by encouraging tens of thousands of people to travel through Central America to come to the United States, and for us to take them into the United States with illegality that has been ruled on by Federal courts in this country.

A legal and lawful process is what President Trump is attempting to have this Congress do. He understands that power under Article I and the power under Article II. I believe that President Trump personally invoked hours of his time to make sure that he properly worked with Congress—key people from the House, key people from the Senate—televised day after day to get

closer on the issue that he felt could gain resolution. It is a hard issue. But to suggest in any way that President Trump is a culprit of anything except leading to the best I believe would be an unfair statement against his intended desire to resolve the issue.

Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee, under the strong leadership of the gentleman from Georgia, ROB WOODALL, and the strong leadership of TOM COLE, provided evidence-based information not just to sustain the document that we are here for, but actually to continue the explanation of what we are doing and why, including the balances of budgeting and those necessary items but also the content.

Our vice chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma, TOM COLE, doubles in his duty to Congress, and he serves as the lead appropriator, the chairman of the subcommittee that is responsible for health, NIH, and research and development. Mr. COLE's professional attributes really shined last night as he, with great pride, discussed major, hard issues facing this Nation, facing the United States, and facing the medical community in this country. I was very proud of not only his content with the substance, but also with the delivery of the product.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) to discuss this seemingly impossible work that he made possible.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his gracious comments. I appreciate the time, and I appreciate the fulsome praise.

I do want to talk just a little bit about process because I think, if you are not on the Appropriations Committee, you probably haven't been able to follow a lot of this. And, frankly, this process can be made better; there is no doubt about it. I suspect, processwise, my friend from Massachusetts and I are not very far apart on where we think it ought to end up. But I do want the full body to understand what we went through to get to this point.

First, it is important to remember that all 12 subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee produced legislation last year. There were full hearings and fulsome debate, and each subcommittee reported out their product. Then the full committee dealt with each subcommittee's report and presentation, and in doing so, all amendments were open from both parties.

Eventually, of course, all those 12 were put into a single bill. There were hundreds of amendments from both sides of the aisle that were made in order in that process. That bill was brought to the House floor in mid-September, and it was passed.

So, the House effectively did all of its work. It did the hearings; it did the markups; it reported it to the floor; and it moved it across the floor. We have been waiting for about 180 days

for the Senate to respond. I could point some fingers. I am not going to. They didn't get a single appropriations bill across the floor, and only a few out of the full committee.

We have finally, about 4 weeks ago, had a bipartisan negotiation at the leadership level that reset the numbers: a big increase from the Budget Control Act for defense spending. That is something Republicans very much wanted, and many Democrats did as well. And, frankly, also, an increase from nondefense discretionary spending as well—so new numbers.

At that point, we began what is a pretty normal appropriations process at the committee level. That is the so-called four-corner prospect, when the ranking member of each subcommittee and the chairman of that committee sit down with their Senate counterparts and negotiate the differences between what were effectively Senate committee bills, but bills that the House had moved fully across the floor.

There is a great deal of give-and-take in that. When you go as far as you can to the subcommittee level, you kick them upstairs to the chairman at the next level. They negotiate, and they solve those.

I can give you an example. In Labor-HHS, we had 12 issues unresolved in a \$170 billion bill. That is actually awfully good. They were moved up to full committee. Nine of those issues were resolved there. Eventually, three more were kicked up to the leadership level, and they were all resolved there.

That happens for each and every subcommittee. So there is a great deal of give-and-take.

Frankly, we begin this process knowing it needs to be a bipartisan product in the end. You have to have 60 votes in the United States Senate. There are 51 Republicans. Frankly, over here, obviously, they will take both Republican and Democratic votes. So there is a good deal of give-and-take in this particular process.

At the end of the day, we have got a bipartisan bill that both the chairman and the ranking member brought before us last night. Again, as I mentioned earlier, from a Republican standpoint, you are probably most pleased with the defense number. That is something we have wanted and the administration wanted.

But in the nondefense area, there are many, many things that both sides agree on are very important for the national well-being: a \$3 billion increase at the National Institutes of Health, the largest increase in a generation; substantially more money on opioids, a crisis we know affects all of our districts, \$3 billion this year and \$3 billion next year spread over a number of subcommittee jurisdictions.

There is a substantial increase in early childhood education and childcare, something, again, that people on both sides of the aisle feel strongly about. There is lots of money for mental health to follow up on some

of the initiatives that were laid out in the 21st Century Cures Act, again, a bipartisan product. Now you are seeing bipartisan appropriations to try and match the money with the legislation that was created by the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

There is money for school safety. This is probably the largest single increase we have had. I think last year under, title 4, we did about \$400 million. This bill has \$1.1 billion, a pretty substantial increase in something I think we all care about. So, again, it has been pretty extraordinary.

Also, I want to point out—we are all proud of our respective committees—that Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member LOWEY produced an omnibus last year in April or May. They have done three supplementals for the disaster relief. They now have produced this omnibus which will fund the government for fiscal year 2018, and they are hard at work on the next one. So they have been extraordinarily productive.

My friend is right. I wish more of this work got piecemeal to the floor so we could look at each bill. Hopefully, we can do that going forward since we now have a top-line agreement between the two sides for fiscal year 2019 as to what the bill will be.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Oklahoma an additional 2 minutes.

□ 1000

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, we have the possibility of having a more regular measure. But whether that can be achieved or not, I don't know. In passing this bill, we have at least laid the groundwork for it.

I particularly want to single out Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member LOWEY because they have shown how Congress can work together. They have managed all 12 of these bills—multiple bills in multiple areas—and gotten them to the floor and across the floor in a bipartisan manner.

So, if we can do the same thing in the body as a whole, I think there would be much more appreciation and understanding and, frankly, much more input. That would be a good thing. My friend is right about that. But if we are going to do that, I would also add we have to think through how many amendments there will be.

How much floor time do you want to give us?

If you are going to come down here with 200 or 300 amendments on each side of the aisle, I guarantee you that all you will be doing is appropriations for the whole year. As appropriators, we might like that. As legislators in other areas, you might not. I think there has got to be some leadership give-and-take on what the appropriate structure is going forward.

But none of that should take away, number one, that the rule itself is

bringing to the floor an extraordinarily important product. If we don't get that product passed here on a bipartisan basis and in the Senate by midnight tomorrow night, both parties will have participated in shutting down the government of the United States. I don't think that is something either of us want to do. As a matter of fact, each of us have tried this once or twice, and we now know it is not a very productive way to proceed.

I think we have got an opportunity, by passing of the rule—and I urge passage of the rule—and then the underlying legislation, to do some really good things for the American people to fulfill our obligations.

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

Mr. Speaker, I guess I would just say to my colleague from Oklahoma that I have no problem with the appropriators. I think that is what Ranking Member LOWEY was talking about yesterday when she talked about the process. The appropriators have done their work. They work in a bipartisan way and it is not their fault that we are at this moment. As I said, it is not even the fault of the Rules Committee. It is the fault of the Republican leadership.

This bill that we are doing now could have been done last December, but the Republican leadership couldn't figure out a budget agreement until last month. Without top numbers, no one could move forward in the House or in the Senate.

It turned out that what was more important was a tax cut for billionaires. That was the priority. So they passed the tax cut for billionaires and we get five CRs and two government shutdowns as a result. This process cannot be explained away, cannot be justified, and cannot continue.

I probably should have had the bill in front of me here for dramatic effect, but it is 2,200 pages long. Again, it is not what I know is in the bill that I have a problem with. It is what I don't know is in the bill that concerns me. I know it concerns Democrats and Republicans alike.

I just want to go back to something the chairman of the Rules Committee referenced with regard to DACA and President Trump's, somehow, support for these incredible people.

Let's not forget there was no reason at all—none—for this President to end DACA. There was no deadline, there was no court case, there was no law that required that the program come to an end. It was just plain, old-fashioned cruelty and stupidity. That is what was at play here: red meat for the extreme rightwing base that can never get to "yes" on anything regarding immigration.

The way we are treating these young people is unbelievably cruel. The frustration level throughout the country is at an all-time high. Every poll I have seen, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents all overwhelmingly support us helping the DACA recipients.

There are unbelievably high approval ratings for moving forward and passing a bill like the Dream Act, yet we can't even get it to the House floor for a vote.

We talk about a lousy process. That is what we are also talking about.

We talked earlier about guns. We have record-high levels of gun violence in this country and we have massacres that occur on a regular basis. I am so grateful that millions of young people are going to be out on the streets protesting on Saturday, demanding that their government do something. They are frustrated that this Chamber, supposedly the greatest deliberative body in the world, can't even find the time to bring something to the floor for a debate. All we do is have moments of silence in the aftermath of massacres.

It would give me hope for the future of these young people, because they are not going to take it anymore. They are sick of the indifference. They are sick of the lack of action. They are sick of Members in this Chamber not listening to their voices.

I feel hopeful that, ultimately, we will take action and do the right thing. I will tell you right now, for those who continue to turn their backs on the demands of these young people, I don't think they are coming back here after November.

But, again, the frustration that you are hearing on our side here today—and I know that a lot of my Republican friends feel the same way—is that this place is broken. This process stinks. There has to be a better way to do this. None of us want to shut the government down.

People are going to vote how they want to on the omnibus, but I would say: Don't endorse this lousy, broken process by voting for the rule. People should vote against this rule.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if the gentleman has any other speakers.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I have one additional speaker.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), the Rules Committee designee to the Budget Committee, a gentleman who has served this Nation well and will continue to serve the Budget Committee well.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on the committee. It seems like I just saw

him a couple of hours ago, but only because I just saw him a couple of hours ago.

Mr. Speaker, you know as well as anyone that it is hard to get things done around here. It is never made any easier by the recriminations that circulate so widely. I appreciate the Speaker's admonition about engaging in conflicts of personality. This is hard.

This isn't the bill I would have voted for. In fact, it is not the bill I voted for the first time around. When this House did its job 9 months ago, when it was supposed to do its job, we voted on a completely different bill. But as my friend from Massachusetts knows full well, Mr. Speaker, if Republicans had 60 votes in the Senate, we wouldn't be going through these machinations.

We go through these machinations for one reason and one reason only, and that is, after a Republican-led House gets its work done, the Senate can't. The Senate can't because they work in a much more bipartisan way. As bipartisan as this institution is, that institution is even more so by the Senate rules.

We talk about this as if it is a spending bill, Mr. Speaker. I just want to be clear: this includes brownfields act reauthorization. That is the bill that lets us go into environmentally damaged areas and restore them. We haven't been able to get that done just in the normal course of doing business. So to get it across the Senate floor, it is now added into this bill.

The Child Protection Improvement Act, Mr. Speaker, is the bill that provides the database so that caregivers and parents can go and see who it is that is taking care of their children and make sure folks are properly vetted. We couldn't get that through in the normal process, so we had to add it into this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the CLOUD Act is the bill that allows law enforcement to go and access information stored on clouds in other countries so that you don't have to wait 9 months through bureaucracies so that you can identify those terrorists, those criminals, earlier and more often. We couldn't get that through the regular process, so we have got that in the bill.

E-Verify, Mr. Speaker, is the provision that allows any employer to dial in online to make sure that they are hiring American citizens. It is buried in this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Together, we are getting things done. This bill is an example of that. It is a source of progress, not an impediment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip.

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

I have been here long enough to see my Republican colleagues bring to the floor these bills and plop them down heavily on the table.

I have been here long enough to have citizens assault me in a town meeting and ask: "Have you read the bill?"

I have been here long enough to hear the demagoguery about: "What's in the bill? Do you know what's in the bill? Have you read the bill? How can you do this?"

I have heard demagoguery about the 3-day rule. I call it the 24-hour-and-2-second rule. That is the last second of the first day, 24 hours of the second day, and the first second of the third day. We are not even going to make that. This was filed at 8 o'clock last night.

I ask any Member in this House to join me in the well if you have read this bill. Join me if you have read this bill.

No one is joining me.

These are earmarks. They call them authorizing legislation, but they are earmarks. They are pieces of legislation in this bill that are against the rules, of course, but we will waive those rules. They are things that were gone through in the dark of night, at 8 o'clock last night.

These are the appropriations bills, the only piece of this legislation that were done properly.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. When the Speaker became the Speaker, he said: "We will advance major legislation one issue at a time."

How can any self-respecting Member of this House, how can any self-respecting Republican who made that representation to my Tea Party friends, vote for this rule?

I have no idea.

This is an abomination of the legislative process. You have had 6 months to get it right. Six weeks ago, the Speaker promised that an issue of great importance to us, DACA, would be solved. It hasn't been addressed, much less solved.

But the real problem is that nobody knows what is in this legislation. With all due respect to the chairman of the Rules Committee, he hasn't read this bill.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. MCGOVERN hasn't read the bill. I have not read the bill. It was 8 o'clock last night. The only person that could read this bill is the supercomputers. None of us even claim to be supercomputers.

This rule ought to go down. Very frankly, there are a lot of things in here I know that I like and I know that everybody else likes, but if we defeat the rule, we ought to go back to a process that we can respect, that you argued you were going to follow, that you pledged to the American people you were going to follow, and that Mr. Cantor and Mr. MCCARTHY and Mr.

RYAN wrote a book about and said they were going to change this institution and do it right.

This is wrong. Vote "no."

□ 1015

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me close by echoing the words of our distinguished minority whip and by saying that we need a better process, and I hope my colleagues will vote against the rule.

I just want to say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, one of the reasons why I think there is so much polarization in this Chamber, why it is hard to kind of get things done, is because of the process. I think process matters. When people don't have the opportunity to read the bills, when people are routinely denied the opportunity to bring to the floor their ideas for debate and vote, it results in increased tensions and increased polarization; and, quite frankly, it undermines the integrity of this institution.

This is supposed to be the people's House. We all represent the same number of constituents, yet routinely the voices of the people are denied to be heard on this House floor.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule, vote "no" on the previous question so we can bring the Dream Act to the floor, we can help the Dreamers, we can help those DACA recipients who everybody says publicly that they want to help, yet, when it comes to actually helping them, all we get is obstruction from the Republican leadership here. Let's bring that to the floor. This is our 26th time trying to do it. Let's do something that will make a real difference, that will help these people.

They deserve our help. They deserve our support. They are valued members of our community. They are American in every way except they weren't born here. And Democrats, Republicans, and Independents overwhelmingly believe we ought to help them. We ought to stop playing politics with the Dreamers.

I know the President is holding them hostage and wants a ransom that gets bigger and bigger, and bigger, and bigger. Enough. Let's do what is right for these people. So vote "no" on the rule. Make it clear that this process is something that we cannot endorse or embrace. We want a change in process. Vote against the previous question so we can bring up relief for the Dreamers.

Finally, I just, again, plead with the Republican leadership of this House, we need to have a better process here. If you want to end the polarization, if you want to end the partisanship, you have to open this place up. I don't think that is too much to ask.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank not only the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) but also thanks to the minority whip for coming and engaging in this issue.

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that this last summer, last summer, we engaged in all 12 spending bills on the floor of the House of Representatives. The Appropriations Committee received over 700 thoughts, ideas, so to speak, amendments for them to consider. It was an open process. Mr. Speaker, on the floor, 232 amendments were a part of the process of the 12 bills.

Last night, NITA LOWEY, the ranking member, sat before the Rules Committee at about midnight and said: It is late, but the process worked. The process worked for Democrats. The process worked for appropriators to work on a bipartisan basis, and the process worked in the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, two members of the Appropriations staff, Shannon O'Keefe and Nancy Fox, are sterling members of the professional staff of the House of Representatives who did one heck of a job to make sure our Rules Committee—staff and Members—got the information we needed.

I agree the process should be better. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, when the Committee on Rules filed its report (H. Rept. 115-614) to accompany House Resolution 796 the Committee was unaware that the waiver of all points of order against consideration of the motion to concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1625 included:

A waiver of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of legislation providing new budget authority in excess of a 302(a) allocation of such authority.

A waiver of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of legislation that would cause the level of total new budget authority for the first fiscal year to be exceeded, or would cause revenues to be less than the level of total revenues for the first fiscal year or for the total of that first fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years for which allocations are provided.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 796 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC 7. 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. 8. 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. SESSIONS. 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 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 H.R. 4227; and

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 5131.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 186, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—233

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

Katko	Newhouse	Shimkus
Kelly (MS)	Noem	Shuster
Kelly (PA)	Norman	Simpson
King (IA)	Nunes	Smith (MO)
King (NY)	Olson	Smith (NE)
Kinzinger	Palazzo	Smith (NJ)
Knight	Palmer	Smith (TX)
Kustoff (TN)	Paulsen	Smucker
Labrador	Pearce	Stefanik
LaHood	Perry	Stewart
LaMalfa	Pittenger	Stivers
Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Taylor
Lance	Poliquin	Tenney
Latta	Posey	Thompson (PA)
Lewis (MN)	Ratcliffe	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Reed	Tipton
Long	Reichert	Trott
Loudermilk	Renacci	Turner
Love	Rice (SC)	Upton
Lucas	Roby	Valadao
Luetkemeyer	Roe (TN)	Wagner
MacArthur	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Walden
Marino	Rohrabacher	Walker
Marshall	Rokita	Walorski
Massie	Rooney, Francis	Walters, Mimi
Mast	Rooney, Thomas	Weber (TX)
McCarthy	J.	Webster (FL)
McCaull	Ros-Lehtinen	Wenstrup
McClintock	Roskam	Westerman
McHenry	Ross	Williams
McKinley	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)
McMorris	Rouzer	Wittman
Rodgers	Royce (CA)	Womack
McSally	Russell	Woodall
Meadows	Rutherford	Yoder
Meehan	Sanford	Yoho
Messer	Scalise	Young (AK)
Mitchell	Schweikert	Young (IA)
Moolenaar	Scott, Austin	Zeldin
Mooney (WV)	Sensenbrenner	
Mullin	Sessions	

NAYS—186

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

Shea-Porter Takano
Sherman Thompson (CA)
Sinema Thompson (MS)
Sires Titus
Smith (WA) Tonko
Soto Torres
Speier Tsongas
Suozzi Vargas
Swalwell (CA) Veasey

NOT VOTING—10

Amodei Cummings Walz
Bridenstine Davis, Danny Wilson (FL)
Clarke (NY) Jones
Cramer Pingree

□ 1044

Messrs. McCLINTOCK, GOSAR, and KELLY of Pennsylvania changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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 211, noes 207, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

AYES—211

Abraham Duffy Kinzinger
Aderholt Duncan (SC) Knight
Allen Dunn Kustoff (TN)
Amodei Emmer LaHood
Arrington Estes (KS) LaMalfa
Babin Farenthold Lamborn
Bacon Faso
Banks (IN) Ferguson Latta
Barletta Fitzpatrick Lewis (MN)
Barr Fleischmann LoBiondo
Barton Flores Long
Bergman Fortenberry Loudermilk
Bilirakis Foxx Love
Bishop (MI) Frelinghuysen Lucas
Bishop (UT) Gaetz Luetkemeyer
Black Gallagher MacArthur
Blackburn Gianforte Marchant
Bost Gibbs Marino
Brady (TX) Goodlatte Marshall
Brat Gowdy Mast
Brooks (IN) Granger McCarthy
Buchanan Graves (GA) McCaul
Buck Graves (LA) McClintock
Bucshon Graves (MO) McHenry
Budd Grothman McKinley
Burgess Guthrie McMorris
Byrne Handel Rodgers
Calvert Harper McSally
Carter (GA) Hartzler Meehan
Carter (TX) Hensarling Messer
Chabot Herrera Beutler Mitchell
Cheney Higgins (LA) Moolenaar
Coffman Hill Mullin
Cole Holding Newhouse
Collins (GA) Hollingsworth Noem
Collins (NY) Hudson Nunes
Comer Huizenga Olson
Comstock Hultgren Palazzo
Conaway Hunter Palmer
Cook Hurd Paulsen
Costello (PA) Issa Pittenger
Crawford Jenkins (KS) Poe (TX)
Culberson Jenkins (WV) Poliquin
Curbelo (FL) Johnson (LA) Ratcliffe
Curtis Johnson (OH) Reed
Davis, Rodney Johnson, Sam Reichert
Denham Joyce (OH) Renacci
Dent Katko Rice (SC)
DeSantis Kelly (MS) Roby
DesJarlais Kelly (PA) Roe (TN)
Diaz-Balart King (IA) Rogers (AL)
Donovan King (NY) Rogers (KY)

Rohrabacher Shimkus
Rokita Shuster
Rooney, Francis Simpson
Rooney, Thomas Sinema
J. Smith (MO)
Ros-Lehtinen Smith (NE)
Roskam Smith (NJ)
Ross Smith (TX)
Rothfus Smucker
Rouzer Stefanik
Royce (CA) Stewart
Russell Stivers
Rutherford Taylor
Ryan (WI) Tenney
Scalise Thompson (PA)
Schweikert Thornberry
Scott, Austin Tipton
Sensenbrenner Trott
Sessions Turner

NOES—207

Adams Garrett
Aguilar Gohmert
Amash Gomez
Barragán Gonzalez (TX)
Bass Gosar
Beatty Green, Al
Bera Green, Gene
Beyer Griffith
Biggs Grijalva
Bishop (GA) Gutiérrez
Blum Hanabusa
Blunt Rochester Harris
Bonamici Hastings
Boyle, Brendan Heck
F. Hice, Jody B.
Brady (PA) Higgins (NY)
Brooks (AL) Himes
Brown (MD) Hoyer
Brownley (CA) Huffman
Bustos Jackson Lee
Butterfield Jayapal
Capuano Jeffries
Carbajal Johnson, E. B.
Cárdenas Jordan
Carson (IN) Kaptur
Cartwright Keating
Castor (FL) Kelly (IL)
Castro (TX) Kennedy
Chu, Judy Khanna
Cicilline Kihuen
Clark (MA) Kildee
Clarke (NY) Kilmer
Clay Kind
Cleaver Krishnamoorthi
Clyburn Kuster (NH)
Cohen Labrador
Connolly Langevin
Cooper Larsen (WA)
Correa Larson (CT)
Costa Lawrence
Courtney Lawson (FL)
Crist Lee
Crowley Levin
Cuellar Lewis (GA)
Davidson Lieu, Ted
Davis (CA) Lipinski
DeFazio Loeb sack
DeGette Lofgren
Delaney Lowenthal
DeLauro Lowey
DelBene Lujan Grisham,
Demings M.
DeSaulnier Luján, Ben Ray
Deutch Lynch
Dingell Maloney,
Doggett Carolyn B.
Doyle, Michael Maloney, Sean
F. Massie
Duncan (TN) Matsui
Ellison McCollum
Engel McEachin
Eshoo McGovern
Española McNerney
Esty (CT) Meadows
Evans Meeke
Foster Meng
Frankel (FL) Mooney (WV)
Fudge Moore
Gabbard Moulton
Gallego Nadler
Garamendi Napolitano

NOT VOTING—12

Blumenauer Davis, Danny
Bridenstine Gottheimer
Cramer Johnson (GA)
Cummings Jones

Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

□ 1052

Mr. KING of Iowa changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

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.

VEHICULAR TERRORISM PREVENTION ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4227) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to examine what actions the Department of Homeland Security is undertaking to combat the threat of vehicular terrorism, and for other purposes, as amended, 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 Kansas (Mr. ESTES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 417, nays 2, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—417

Abraham Cartwright Doyle, Michael
Adams Castor (FL) F.
Aderholt Castro (TX) Duffy
Aguilar Chabot Duncan (SC)
Allen Cheney Duncan (TN)
Amodei Chu, Judy Dunn
Arrington Ellison
Babin Clark (MA) Emmer
Bacon Clarke (NY) Engel
Banks (IN) Clay Eshoo
Barletta Española
Barr Cleaver Española
Clyburn Esty (CT)
Coffman Evans
Cohen Farenthold
Cole Faso
Beatty Collins (GA)
Bera Collins (NY) Ferguson
Bergman Comer Fitzpatrick
Beyer Fleischmann
Biggs Comstock Flores
Bilirakis Conaway Fortenberry
Bishop (GA) Connolly Foster
Bishop (MI) Cook Foxx
Bishop (UT) Cooper Frankel (FL)
Correa Correa Frelinghuysen
Black Costa
Blackburn Costello (PA)
Blum Courtney Gabbard
Blumenauer Crawford Gallagher
Blunt Rochester Crist Gallego
Bonamici Crowley Garamendi
Bost Cuellar Garrett
Boyle, Brendan Culberson Gianforte
F. Curbelo (FL) Gibbs
Brady (PA) Curtis Gohmert
Brady (TX) Davidson Gomez
Brat Davis (CA) Gonzalez (TX)
Brooks (AL) Davis, Rodney Goodlatte
Brooks (IN) DeFazio Gosar
Brown (MD) DeGette Gottheimer
Comstock Delaney Gowdy
Conaway DeLauro Granger
Cook DelBene Graves (GA)
Costello (PA) Demings Graves (LA)
Crawford Denham Graves (MO)
Culberson Dent Green, Al
Curbelo (FL) DeSantis Green, Gene
Curtis DeSaulnier Griffith
Davis, Rodney DesJarlais Grijalva
Denham Deutch Grothman
Dent Diaz-Balart Guthrie
DeSantis Carson (IN) Gutiérrez
DesJarlais Schrader Hanabusa
Diaz-Balart Carter (GA) Doggett
Donovan Carter (TX) Donovan Handel