

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been 48 days since Ortega began his brutal crackdown on the Nicaraguan people. With over 110 Nicaraguans killed, including one U.S. citizen, the U.S. must take swift action to hold accountable those responsible for the bloodshed. Though I appreciate the administration's remarks condemning the violent attacks, actions must follow.

I sent a bipartisan, bicameral letter urging the administration to sanction two key regime operatives: Francisco Lopez, head of Albanisa, for money laundering and corruption; and Francisco Diaz, who leads the national police, for orchestrating the repression and killing of Nicaraguans.

I also urge our Senate colleagues to pass my NICA Act, to condition our vote at international financial institutions until Nicaragua takes significant steps to restore democratic order.

The U.S. has an opportunity to lead the way, Mr. Speaker. Let's do that.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3249, PROJECT SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS GRANT PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2018; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5895, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 918 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 918

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3249) to authorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program, 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 the Judiciary or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. 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 the Judiciary. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the

chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-72 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5895) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-71 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: page 66, line 14, through page 66, line 20. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules and pro forma amendments described in section 4 of this resolution. Each further amendment printed in part B of the report shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment

except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment pursuant to this resolution, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 4. During consideration of H.R. 5895 for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

SEC. 5. (a) During consideration of H.R. 5895, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment proposing both a decrease in an appropriation designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and an increase in an appropriation not so designated, or vice versa. (b) This paragraph shall not apply to an amendment between the Houses.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am excited to be down here with my friend from Massachusetts today, Mr. Speaker. You heard the Reading Clerk work her way through this rule. It is a big one today, and it is a big one because we have got a lot to talk about today. I am going to try not to go over. I appreciate the Speaker starting proceedings a little early today so that we have time to get through all of the material that we have to work through.

In this rule today, House Resolution 918, we are providing for three separate appropriations bills to be considered as a single package in addition to two other bills that are very important.

First of all, the rule today, Mr. Speaker, provides for concurrence in the Senate amendment to the House-passed bill, H.R. 3249. It is the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program Authorization Act.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK) has been working so aggressively on this bill. You will remember the House passed this bill by a voice vote back in March of this year. It went over to the Senate. The Senate amended it. They, too,

passed it by unanimous consent. House Resolution 918 today provides for the consideration to approve those Senate amendments, send this bill directly to the President's desk, and let it begin to make a difference in these communities right away.

The bill supports Federal, State, and local law enforcement efforts, Mr. Speaker, to combat gang-related violence throughout our communities and to get involved in other prevention techniques.

We have all seen street gang activities increasing in our communities. If you are from a community that has not yet seen that impact, consider yourself fortunate. According to the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. Speaker, we have these crimes on the increase. We have all been hearing about transnational gangs, such as MS-13, as they are becoming increasingly organized and increasingly more violent.

Giving our Nation's law enforcement authorities the ability to keep Americans safe and to have the tools they need to fight these gangs is a priority of all of us in this institution, and approval of this rule today will allow us to bring that bill to the floor and send it to the President's desk for his signature.

House Resolution 918 also provides for a structured rule, Mr. Speaker, for consideration of the first of our fiscal year 2019 appropriations bills. As I mentioned, there are three bills in this package. H.R. 5895 combines the Energy and Water Development bill with the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill and with the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs bill. It puts them all under one umbrella, maintaining our commitment to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 spending caps.

The House Appropriations Committee, Mr. Speaker, has already passed 6 of the 12 annual appropriations bills. I will say that again. Six of the 12 annual appropriations bills have already moved through the House Appropriations Committee.

I look forward to the remainder of those bills being on this floor very soon. In fact, the Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies is marking up their bill today, and the Defense Subcommittee is marking up their bill tomorrow.

So before the end of the week, I would expect we will have 7 of 12 appropriations bills ready for the floor, and we will be well on our way to having an eighth ready for the floor soon. This is only the first week of June, Mr. Speaker, and this is already the progress that the House Appropriations Committee has achieved. I am very proud of their success, and I want to talk a little bit about the bills they have before us today.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill was approved unanimously by the Appropriations Committee. Republicans and Democrats came together to sup-

port that bill. You will recall that we decided early on, Mr. Speaker, that thrift would begin here in this House.

With this Legislative Branch Appropriations bill, not only are we funding the shared priorities across the Capitol, we are also at a funding level still below the level at which this House was funded the year I was first elected to Congress, Mr. Speaker. Thrift does begin at home. We have avoided being penny-wise and pound-foolish. We funded important priorities and were again able to pass this out of committee on a unanimous, bipartisan vote.

The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs bill also came out of committee on a unanimous, bipartisan vote, 47-0 in both cases, Mr. Speaker. And, clearly, this type of collaboration, this type of bipartisan activity is something we would like to see more often in this Chamber, but we have it in these two bills today.

The third appropriations bill that is bundled together here, Mr. Speaker, is the Energy and Water bill, a bill that is tremendously important to my part of the world there on the Georgia coast, involving Georgia's water infrastructure. It passed the Appropriations Committee on a slightly less powerful vote. It was 29-20, still a bipartisan vote, but not as big a majority—in fact, not unanimous, as the others were. But it is critically important to so many of our States, Mr. Speaker, and I am confident we will be able to move it across the floor.

I will just give a couple of examples. I know everybody has their own story to tell about the importance in their State.

In my State, it provides \$49 million as a Federal partnership to the more than \$300 million that the State of Georgia has already put into deepening the Port of Savannah. The Savannah Harbor Expansion Project is one of the largest economic development projects in the Southeastern United States. It has a Corps of Engineers report authorizing this construction. Georgia put all of its money in up front, and now the Feds are coming through with \$49 million of their own.

Mr. Speaker, the bill includes millions of dollars for operations and maintenance of the Corps of Engineers. If you live in the Southeastern United States, as I do, odds are, the Corps controls your water supply. More than 80 percent of the people who live in the multimillion-person metropolitan Atlanta area, Mr. Speaker, depend on Corps of Engineers facilities for their drinking water. Eighty percent depend on Corps of Engineers for their drinking water. It is tremendously important to families across the district.

I am heartened that the Appropriations Committee, even though they could not be unanimous, persisted in moving this bill through committee in a bipartisan way, and I am optimistic of what it is going to do for water and energy infrastructure for years to come.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, to a committee that is almost as near and dear to my heart as the Rules Committee is, this bills brings to the floor a bill from the Transportation Committee, H.R. 8, the Water Resources Development Act of 2018.

Folks often think of the Veterans Affairs' Committee as being one of the most bipartisan committees on Capitol Hill, and, candidly, I think it makes us all proud to know that is true; but the House Transportation Committee sits a very close second.

Infrastructure projects, whether it be safe drinking water, whether it be roads and bridges, whether it be airport facilities, these are issues that we all confront, and these are issues that bring us together in an also unanimous fashion, Mr. Speaker. The House Transportation Committee reported the Water Resources Development Act of 2018, and we have that before us today.

If you haven't gotten to see a good committee chairman and ranking member working in partnership, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend Chairman BILL SHUSTER of Pennsylvania and Ranking Member PETE DEFAZIO of Oregon to you any time. To suggest that these two men agree on everything would be folly, but to suggest that they find a way to work through everything would not be too much said. They never take no for an answer. They always work hard together. In the case of the Water Resources Development Act, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't just exist at the committee chairman level; it exists at the subcommittee level.

On the Republican side of the aisle, we have Chairman GARRET GRAVES from Louisiana; and on the Democratic side of the aisle, we have Ranking Member GRACE NAPOLITANO from California—again, two Members who work incredibly closely together. They produce a superior work product that you are going to be able to see in the line items in this legislation.

We are talking about America's ports. We are talking about inland waterways. We are talking about locks and dams. We are talking about flood protection. We are talking about water infrastructure and ecosystem protection. Line item after line item, we were able to come together in a bipartisan way.

I would argue this is going to be one of the most important bills that the Congress passes in 2018, Mr. Speaker. And, again, it took a lot of hard, bipartisan work to get here.

Our Nation's ports, Mr. Speaker, process about \$4 billion in product a day, imports and exports. About 11 percent of everything we buy in the State of Georgia has come through one of our ports. Nearly 440,000 jobs, Mr. Speaker, in my State alone are dependent on ports and waterways, and there is \$25 billion worth of State income from that.

And that is just a State like Georgia, Mr. Speaker. If you go to Florida, North Carolina, Louisiana, California,

or Washington State, you are going to hear those same stories told time and time again.

Now, I would like to believe, because we passed this bill out of the Transportation Committee where transportation experts sit, that we produced a perfect work product out of the Transportation Committee. But wearing my Rules Committee hat, I recognize that other Members of this Chamber may have some good ideas of their own that they would like to make in order for the debate on the Water Resources Development Act.

To that end, the rule today, Mr. Speaker, passed by this body will make 52 additional amendments in order to be considered for this bill. That is 19 Republican amendments, 20 Democratic amendments, and 13 bipartisan amendments.

I will say that again, Mr. Speaker. Fifty-two amendments were made in order by this rule for the Water Resources Development Act: 19 Republican amendments, 20 Democratic amendments, and 13 bipartisan amendments.

All amendments are intended to make this bill better. This body will decide, if this rule is approved, whether, in fact, they do.

We had four subcommittee meetings on WRDA this year, this cycle, Mr. Speaker—two roundtable discussions in Florida and Oregon, and two hearings here in Washington, D.C.—all seeking to involve stakeholders.

You may not recall, Mr. Speaker, but there was a while that this Congress was unable to pass WRDA bills. We went through 7 years of this Congress failing to pass any WRDA bills at all. I was not in Congress at the time that began, but I am in Congress at the time that that comes to an end.

Beginning with BILL SHUSTER's leadership there on the Transportation Committee, we have gotten back in the habit of moving a water resources bill every single Congress. This will be the third in that cycle, and it matters: It matters for certainty to stakeholders back home; it matters for certainty to constituents back home; and it matters that we don't have to do it all in one giant omnibus bill every single time. We are able to break it down into smaller chunks because we are taking care of it as challenges arise, again, in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to sit on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee where the kind of collaboration and mutual respect that you have heard me talk about exists every single day.

I want to thank, again, Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for making that environment one that can exist.

I think we brought a very fair rule to the floor today to try to bring not just the Water Resources Development Act to the floor, the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program Authorization to the floor, but also the first three appro-

priations bills in our annual cycle to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all my colleagues can support the rule, I hope they will support the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

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 Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is a study in contradictions from my Republican colleagues. They have brought up H.R. 8, the Water Resources Development Act. This is an incredibly important bill to improve our Nation's ports, locks, dams, and more all across the country. It is a bipartisan bill, and it was the product of a process that shows how Congress is supposed to work.

Hearings were held, and thoughtful testimony was given, including from the head of the Army Corps of Engineers. There was a markup. Input and ideas were heard from Members on both sides. Remarkably, a majority of amendments offered were adopted en bloc by a voice vote without much controversy.

That is important to note, Mr. Speaker, because Republicans these days aren't known for their lack of controversy. Just this week the President of the United States is talking about pardoning himself of possible Federal crimes. His lawyer is floating wild theories about how the President could shoot his former FBI Director without facing prosecution while in office.

So this bipartisan bill and the mostly collaborative process that got us here came as welcome relief—until this bill got to the Rules Committee. That is when Republican leaders ran into a back room somewhere and took out a bipartisan amendment from the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Congressman DEFAZIO. The amendment would reform the harbor maintenance trust fund to make sure money gets where it needs to go: to actually maintaining our harbors.

They did this without any debate and despite the fact that both the chairman and ranking member of the committee supported it. The gentleman from Georgia says he is on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and he voted against his chairman and ranking member. So much for bipartisanship. The majority threw sand in the gears of what was a good process. They just can't help themselves, and this is par for the course here.

Just look at the other water development bill, the Energy and Water Appropriations Act. This could have been another bipartisan measure. It funds most programs at an adequate level.

But the majority reverted back to their usual ways: ignoring Democratic ideas and filling this up with one bipartisan proposal after another. It is like a Christmas tree loaded up with bad ideas.

More than \$400 million was cut from 2018 enacted levels for some of our biggest priorities, things like energy efficiency and renewable energy programs. Even nuclear nonproliferation programs were cut; and for what, Mr. Speaker? So the majority can reward their allies by skewing resources toward the fossil fuel industry.

There are controversial riders that are completely unnecessary and would do more harm than good. They have no business being in an appropriations bill.

One of the riders would hinder the Army Corps' ability to protect clean water. Another would kill the Waters of the United States rule. There is one rider that would threaten the Endangered Species Act. There is even language tucked inside this bill that would allow firearms to be carried on all Army Corps lands; and this from a majority that refuses to even consider ways to combat gun violence on the House floor. We can't even get a vote on anything related to gun violence on this floor. This is outrageous.

The majority is also using this appropriations process to fund President Trump's stupid, ridiculous, offensive border wall. Mr. Speaker, didn't the President tell us that Mexico was going to foot the bill for this ridiculous wall? It is being funded by shortchanging priorities for the middle class. That includes programs to educate our children, help students afford college, and provide job training to our workers, all for this stupid wall—more red meat for the most narrow parts of the Republican base.

I remember my Republican colleague talking for years about the importance of passing a budget resolution. Maybe that was just something they cared about under the Obama administration or something they do only when they are trying to take healthcare away from people or reward the wealthy with more tax cuts, because here they are under a Republican President with a Republican Congress pushing ahead with an appropriations package without passing a budget. That April 15 deadline came and went a long time ago.

Mr. Speaker, what happened to doing one bill at a time? We used to consider appropriations bills separately, but the majority's rule lumps several together to try to speed up the process and I guess limit debate; and for what? Funding the government is one of our most important responsibilities. Two of these bills would probably pass with broad, bipartisan support, but, apparently, bipartisanship is not a priority for some of the Republican Conference. So they had to cram them together with a partisan bill that is filled with harmful ideological riders.

I would like to think that the majority would want strong, bipartisan votes on appropriations bills. We used to have them in the past. We don't have any bipartisanship now as a direct result of the choices made by this Republican leadership.

Mr. Speaker, why is the majority using a process that makes it harder to pass bipartisan bills? It may please their base, but it is an awful way to legislate. This majority has had 8 years to decide how to run this place. Mr. Speaker, clearly, they haven't figured it out. There is no budget and not even an attempt to get one. Where are all the Republican budget hawks? Where is their countdown clock with "days since the last budget"? This majority can't even keep the lights on. We have seen two government shutdowns this year alone, and it is only June. My colleague from Georgia again said: Look at all we have done, and it is June.

The other thing they did is they broke their own record of now being the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America. They have brought more bills to the floor under a restrictive, closed process than any other Congress in history. Yes, they have accomplished a lot, it is only June, and it is going to get worse.

There is virtually no oversight of the executive branch from this majority. None. Just one example, and this is a beauty: we have an EPA administrator who allegedly got a sweetheart deal on an apartment and spent \$43 on a phone booth. You can't make this stuff up. He asked a Federal employee who reported to him to hunt for a used mattress from President Trump's hotel.

None of this seems to bother my Republican colleagues. How is that possible?

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the adults in Congress to stand up, bring sanity back to our government, bring professionalism back to our government, and bring some integrity back to this institution. Make your constituents proud. Make your government great again. You can start here today by voting "no" on this rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I didn't come to the floor today to tell anybody that the process was perfect, and I didn't come to the floor today to tell anybody that the pieces of legislation before us are perfect. I am certain that they are not perfect, Mr. Speaker, because I didn't write every line of every one of them. That is my indication that they didn't turn out exactly right.

What I did do, however, because I serve on the committees of jurisdiction, is I worked with my Democratic colleagues to get to a bill that we can all be proud of.

Understand what we are talking about here today, Mr. Speaker. We can go back and have a series of recriminations and talk about all the injustices

that have happened to each and every one of us over the years or we can celebrate the fact that in a really difficult budget environment we found a way to get the appropriations bills out—two out of three of these bills today unanimously—to the floor. The third one that didn't come out unanimously still came out with a bipartisan vote, Mr. Speaker. We should be celebrating that, not pretending that we are not making an honest effort with one another to get things done.

The Water Resources Development Act, Mr. Speaker, the largest water infrastructure bill that this Congress will produce, and we produced it on a committee that has members from the far left to the far right and produced it unanimously, Mr. Speaker, because we did not take no for an answer and continued to work shoulder to shoulder until we found a place that each and every member could live with.

No, these bills are not perfect today, which is why, in the case of WRDA, for example—again, the best work product the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee could produce—we allowed more than 50 additional amendments—more Democratic amendments than Republican amendments, bipartisan amendments as well—to try to improve that language.

How does this WRDA bill come to the floor? It comes after a long period of time where this Congress was controlled by both parties where no WRDA bill was produced at all. I will say it again, Mr. Speaker: it comes after a time when this Congress, controlled by both parties, produced no Water Resources bill at all. No bill for ports, no bill for inland waterways, no bill for water infrastructure, and no bill for locks and dams. No bill, Mr. Speaker, at all.

Fast forward to today, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about the third consecutive Congress where we have come together and gotten it done—not gotten it done for one party or another, not gotten it done for one Member or another—but gotten it done on behalf of all of our constituents who sent us all here, not to find excuses, not to find things to complain about, but to find a way to make it happen.

Support this rule today, Mr. Speaker. I urge all my colleagues to support this rule today, Mr. Speaker, because if they do, we will bring that bipartisan work product to the floor. We will bring that unanimously approved gang violence prevention bill to the floor. And we will bring those three appropriations bills all passing in a bipartisan way out of committee to this floor. It is a day we can be proud of, Mr. Speaker, and I am proud to be here with you to talk about it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman came here to celebrate. I came here to remind everybody, again, that

this is the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America. I think that is an important fact for people to consider and digest, because process is important. Process equals substance. I am sorry, but that is not something to celebrate.

We have no problem with the WRDA bill. We will support that, no problem. The gang violence bill, I think most of us will support that. Where we have a problem is what the majority did with the appropriations bills. The majority took two appropriations bills where there could be virtual unanimity—certainly bipartisan support—and says: If you want those bills, you have got to swallow a poison pill. You have to also vote as part of that package an Energy and Water bill that is filled with antienvironmental riders.

I get it. I know where the allegiance of the majority party is when it comes to the environment. It is in the pockets of the oil companies, the fossil fuel industry, and now the coal companies. I get it.

But for those who are offended by the antienvironmental record of the Republicans who run this House and certainly by the antienvironmental record of this administration, we don't want any part of that. That is not a bipartisan process. That is not a good process.

By the way, these antienvironmental riders have no business being on an appropriations bill. It is stuff that just was added because the majority could. So we can't celebrate that process.

Yes, we will vote for the WRDA bill, applaud Chairman SHUSTER and applaud Ranking Member DEFAZIO and all the members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. We have no problem with that.

But this rule is designed for a purpose, and that is to limit debate and that is to try to put pressure on people to vote for a package that includes some really horrendous riders on it that do great harm to our environment. That is not the way this place is supposed to work.

Unfortunately, the majority controls the process. This is a process the majority chooses to embrace. It is not fair, and, again, it is now the most closed process in the history of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, the infrastructure in our Nation is in dire need of repair and maintenance. Reports are that Chairman SHUSTER is hoping to release an infrastructure bill later this summer. This is good news, but given the Republican majority's recent history, the American taxpayers first need to know where our priorities with that bill lie.

The American people have good reason to be worried about whom such an important bill would actually benefit. Just a few months ago the GOP passed a tax bill that skewed nearly all of the benefits to the wealthy and rich corporations leaving working class people behind. We can't allow this same approach to trickle into an infrastructure

bill that could skew all the benefits to billionaires and Wall Street banks looking to profit from the privatization of our infrastructure.

We need to send a clear signal that our priority in repairing and upgrading our infrastructure is to not privatize these essential resources to enrich a lucky few; but instead will prioritize creating millions of living-wage jobs without selling off our roads and bridges to private investors. Mr. Speaker, here is the Republicans' chance to prove that they stand with hardworking Americans in fixing our Nation's infrastructure and not with billionaires, Wall Street banks, and foreign investors.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative LIEU's resolution, H. Con. Res. 63, which outlines priorities for efforts to enact a bold jobs and infrastructure package that benefits all Americans, not just billionaires.

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.

□ 1300

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Since the beginning of this Congress, we have had more infrastructure weeks than I can count, but we have yet to take up a comprehensive infrastructure bill. America desperately needs that.

The American Society of Civil Engineers has estimated that for the next 10 years, we need \$4.6 trillion of infrastructure funding just to keep pace. Over \$2 trillion of that is not funded.

So, for example, 53 percent of our public schools need funding to make repairs. More than 18 million Americans drink from water systems that fail to meet Federal lead tests. Forty percent of rural America and those on tribal lands lack broadband access.

The President has designated week after week as Infrastructure Week, but this House majority has yet to consider a serious infrastructure proposal. When it comes to infrastructure, the President and this GOP majority has been all talk, no action. America deserves better. We have to fix our roads and highways, water infrastructure, schools, transit systems, and VA facilities. We have to have key principles for this infrastructure.

First, we have to create millions of new jobs through investments in 21st century projects. We also need to emphasize public investment over corporate giveaways and the selling of

public goods. We need to embrace 21st century clean energy jobs, including expanding solar and wind power, promoting energy efficiency, and modernizing the energy grid.

We also need to ensure that investments are not paid for at the expense of Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid. We need to not weaken or repeal existing environmental laws.

H. Con. Res. 63, which embodies all of these principles, is supported by more than one-third of the House, with 157 cosponsors. We need to bring this proposal up rather than considering partisan appropriations bill that cut funding for renewable energy and energy efficiency and repeal protections that keep our waterways clean without offering a meaningful opportunity for debate.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I support the underlying water resources development legislation.

In communities across the country, our infrastructure is falling apart, as colleagues on both sides of the aisle have pointed out. This is evident in the state of our Nation's dams. In communities like Waterbury, Vermont, dams are rapidly aging and the risk of breach continues to grow.

In 2016, Congress took a very positive step to address this issue with the passage of the WIIN Act. Section 1177 of the WIIN Act authorized funding for the Army Corps to rehabilitate some of the Nation's oldest Corps-constructed dams that are classified as high hazard potential. As you know, the failure of a dam that is so classified is anticipated to cause the loss of life.

While section 1177 was a positive start, its limited authorization and per project cap have hindered its effectiveness. To that end, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their willingness to work with me to address this matter.

Section 105 of the legislation before us addresses these shortcomings by increasing the provisions in authorization and giving dams greater authority to accrue Federal funds over multiple years.

The benefits of these changes to communities like Waterbury, Vermont are very clear. In 2011, Mr. Speaker, Waterbury suffered a devastating flood during Hurricane Irene. Despite the damage that the village suffered—totally flooded—the flooding in Waterbury would have been far more catastrophic if it weren't for the Corps-built Waterbury Dam, a 1930s-era construction in need of significant repair. Section 105 will give the Corps the tools it needs to get work done rehabbing high-hazard dams like Waterbury across the country.

Both parties agree we need to improve our infrastructure. This bill will take important steps to do that and ad-

dress some of our most outdated, hazardous dams in this country. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

I appreciate the words of my friend from Vermont. He is absolutely right. Fiscal conservatives, as a rule, are out there trying to save money. Occasionally, we find ourselves in those spaces where we end up being penny wise and pound foolish.

The flood mitigation projects that my friend from Vermont referenced saved countless dollars, but, more importantly, countless lives. As some of these aging infrastructure projects look to be on the brink of failure, the time to act is now, not later.

I am glad to see that we were able to come together to invest needed resources today in a water resources development bill so that we are not spending dollars tomorrow in a disaster relief bill. This is the right time to do it, and I appreciate my friend from Vermont making that point.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Georgia how many more speakers he has on his side?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend that I am prepared to close when he is.

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

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that this is the most closed Congress in the history of the United States, I believe in giving credit where credit is due. This WRDA bill is a bill that is the product of a bipartisan process. I applaud the chairman, Mr. SHUSTER, and the Ranking Democrat, Mr. DEFAZIO, on working together, and all the members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure coming together to try to come to an accommodation that resulted in this bill.

I regret very much that, despite their good work, in some backroom in the Rules Committee somewhere, the majority decided to rip out a bipartisan provision that the chairman and ranking member had agreed on. Then, making that even worse, the chairman and the ranking member had an amendment to try to at least have a debate on the floor and let the Members decide that issue, but the Rules Committee decided not to make that in order as well. Anyway, I don't want to be too picky. Overall, the WRDA bill is good. It will get a bipartisan vote.

Of the three appropriations bills—this new approach where we bunch everything together so we don't have a lot of time to talk about them—two of the appropriations bills are fine. There would be, I think, a pretty big bipartisan vote. The Legislative Branch Appropriations bill would pass with a strong bipartisan vote. I think that is a good thing. The Military Construction-VA bill would pass with a strong bipartisan vote. That is a good thing. But

my friends are allergic to bipartisan-ship.

So, what they have to say is: You know what? Yeah, that is bipartisan, that is bipartisan, but we are going to bunch it in with a bill that is extremely partisan, that is filled with these horrific anti-environmental riders in it. If you want the good stuff, you have got to take this awful stuff as well.

We are not going to do that. You are not going to have a bipartisan vote. I think if we were running this House, we would prefer to see a bipartisan vote than simply a partisan vote on everything.

If this is the beginning of an appropriations process that you are going to employ throughout the remaining time, I worry about how this will all end up. My guess is, it will be what it usually is: this massive, gigantic mess at the end where deals are struck behind closed doors and things are put together, and we get a vote on one big, massive bill, take it or leave it. And then we will find out what is in it weeks and months later.

I think that we are at a point where we have to really decide how this House should be run. I would just respectfully say to my Republican friends that this is not the way we should do the appropriations process. In general, this is not the way we should run the House. We ought to be debating appropriations bills one at a time. We ought to be encouraging bipartisanism, not trying to make it impossible. We have to be more accommodating.

It shouldn't be a proud day for the majority to be able to break their own record of being the most closed Congress in the history of the United States. That is not the way this place is supposed to run. I think it has become too convenient for my Republican friends to run it in a way where they just put bills on the floor and say: Take it or leave it, my way or the highway.

I guarantee you, if you are more accommodating, if you are more open, you will have more bipartisan votes. You will have less rancor in this Chamber. Maybe people will actually like Congress better if they see us working together.

So I regret very much that I think my words are falling on deaf ears, but it really is disappointing and I think it is a disservice to the institution.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so we can bring up Mr. LIU's bill. If that doesn't pass, I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule. This is not the kind of process we want to see move forward on appropriations. I think this is the only opportunity for Democrats and Republicans to be able to express that, by voting "no" on the rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first things first. I mentioned earlier I don't think any of these bills are perfect bills; I just think they are the best we were able to work out together.

I do want to mention that in the Rules Committee report in the summary of Mr. NOLAN's amendment, we did describe that amendment incorrectly. We have now corrected that for the record, that has been submitted, but I just want to highlight that for the purposes of transparency.

I think my friend from Massachusetts is exactly right, Mr. Speaker. It is time for us to decide how we want to run this institution. I don't question his numbers. He is very good. When he says this is the most closed Congress in American history, I am sure he has some set of numbers that backs up that attestation.

But what I know is, when I was running for Congress and Democrats were leading this institution at the time, for the entire cycle that I was running, Democrats allowed less than 1,000 amendments totally for the entire session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress, we have considered more than 1,000 amendments before the month of May got out. We haven't even gotten into the appropriations cycle yet. That doesn't include the 30 amendments made in order on the appropriations bill today. It doesn't include the 50-plus amendments made in order on WRDA today.

We have already done more to allow Members to be heard in this Congress than was happening when the other side led this institution. I don't think that should be the measure of success, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that should be the measure of success. My friend from Massachusetts was right when he said we are going to get bigger votes and better votes when we bring better bills and a better process to the House floor.

Let me tell you what I have brought today, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you what I brought today. I brought a bill that passed this House unanimously before it went to the Senate to be passed unanimously after a few amendments—and I brought it back here so that we can again pass it unanimously—a bill to protect communities, to empower law enforcement to fight gang violence on the front lines. I want to send that bill to the President, Mr. Speaker. And if we pass this rule today, we will be able to send that unanimously agreed-upon legislation to the President. That is in this rule.

Also in this rule is the Water Resources Development Act, which passed the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee unanimously. Unanimously. Republicans, Democrats, conservatives, liberals, everyone working together to bring a bill out of committee. We brought it out of committee unanimously.

The Rules Committee still made another 50 amendments in order in case folks want to improve upon it—50-

plus—but we made those amendments in order to a bill that had already been agreed upon unanimously.

What else does this rule do?

It brings a third piece of legislation to the floor as a part of our appropriations package, the legislative branch appropriations bill, which passed out of committee how, Mr. Speaker? Unanimously, Republicans and Democrats working together to bring that bill out of committee.

We include the Military Construction-Veterans Affairs bill in this package, Mr. Speaker. It came out of committee how? Don't tell me.

Unanimously, as Republicans and Democrats came together to move that legislation forward.

□ 1315

And then we have a fifth part of this package, the Energy and Water appropriations bill, which I confess—I want to be clear; I want to be transparent—did not pass unanimously. It just received a simple bipartisan vote to come out of committee.

So I challenge my colleagues who want a better process, who want to see better bills come to the floor. We are already making more amendments in order than my friends on the other side ever dreamed of doing. We are already bringing bills to the floor that have passed in a collaborative, in fact, unanimous way.

If Members support this rule, they will be supporting five things, four of them that passed unanimously, and one that passed with a bipartisan vote. Is that going to get everybody what they want here today? I doubt it. It is a tall order, but is it worth supporting? Is it worth saying it is a step in the right direction? Is it worth celebrating because you know it could have gone a different way, but we committed ourselves to the excellence that we have here? It is.

I will finish where I began, Mr. Speaker. I am proud to be down here carrying this rule today. I am the luckiest guy in the world to be able to come down here and talk about it, because folks don't get to hear it, they don't get to read about it, they don't get that around the water cooler back home, Mr. Speaker, that we are working together; that we are working together not only on the easy problems, but on the hard problems; that we are doing things here together that we have not done before, but we are doing them now because we have serious men and women on both sides of the aisle who want to make it happen.

Support this rule. Support this rule. Let's show the American people the work product that has gone into this legislation: the rule and those five underlying provisions. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee report (H. Rept. 115-711) to accompany House Resolution 918 included an incorrect amendment description of amendment No. 14 offered by Representative NOLAN of Minnesota.

The correct amendment description should read:

Expresses the sense of Congress that the construction of a new lock at the Soo Locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, is vital to our national economy, national security, and national need for new critical infrastructure.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee report (H. Rept. 115–711) to accompany House Resolution 918 should have included in its waiver of all points of order against amendments to H.R. 8 a disclosure of following violation:

Clause 9 of rule XXI, which requires a list of all earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits contained in an amendment to a bill or joint resolution to be offered at the outset of its consideration for amendment by a member of a committee of initial referral as designated in a report of the Committee on Rules to accompany a resolution, or a certification that the amendment does not contain any of those items. While a statement has not yet been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for amendment No. 1 offered by Rep. SHUSTER, it is important to note that Rep. SHUSTER filed the required earmark statement on June 6, 2018, prior to floor consideration of the bill and amendment.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 918 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 6. 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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 63) supporting efforts to enact a bold jobs and infrastructure package that benefits all Americans, not just billionaires. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble thereto to adoption 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 concurrent resolution, 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 concurrent resolution.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Con. Res 63.

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 (Mr. POE of Texas). 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; and

Agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 176, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]
YEAS—224

Abraham	Graves (GA)	Palmer
Aderholt	Graves (LA)	Paulsen
Allen	Graves (MO)	Pearce
Amash	Griffith	Perry
Amodel	Grothman	Pittenger
Arrington	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Babin	Handel	Poliquin
Bacon	Harper	Posey
Banks (IN)	Harris	Ratcliffe
Barletta	Hartzler	Reed
Barr	Hensarling	Reichert
Barton	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Bergman	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Biggs	Higgins (LA)	Roe (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Hill	Rogers (AL)
Black	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Blackburn	Hollingsworth	Rokita
Blum	Hudson	Rooney, Francis
Bost	Huizenga	Rooney, Thomas
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	J.
Brat	Hurd	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Roskam
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Buck	Jenkins (WV)	Rothfus
Bucshon	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Budd	Johnson (OH)	Royce (CA)
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Russell
Byrne	Jones	Rutherford
Calvert	Jordan	Sanford
Carter (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Katko	Schweikert
Chabot	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Cheney	Kelly (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Coffman	King (IA)	Sessions
Cole	King (NY)	Shimkus
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger	Shuster
Collins (NY)	Knight	Simpson
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (MO)
Comstock	Labrador	Smith (NE)
Conaway	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Cook	LaMalfa	Smith (TX)
Costello (PA)	Lamborn	Smucker
Cramer	Lance	Stefanik
Crawford	Latta	Stewart
Culberson	Lesko	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	Lewis (MN)	Taylor
Curtis	LoBiondo	Tenney
Davidson	Long	Thompson (PA)
Denham	Loudermilk	Thornberry
DeSantis	Love	Tipton
DesJarlais	Lucas	Trott
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Turner
Donovan	MacArthur	Upton
Duffy	Marchant	Valadao
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Wagner
Duncan (TN)	Marshall	Walberg
Dunn	Masie	Walden
Emmer	Mast	Walker
Estes (KS)	McCarthy	Walorski
Faso	McCaul	Walters, Mimi
Ferguson	McClintock	Weber (TX)
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	McKinley	Wenstrup
Flores	McMorris	Westerman
Foxx	Rodgers	Williams
Frelinghuysen	McSally	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Meadows	Wittman
Gallagher	Messer	Womack
Garrett	Mitchell	Woodall
Gianforte	Moolenaar	Yoder
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Yoho
Gohmert	Mullin	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Newhouse	Young (IA)
Gosar	Norman	Zeldin
Gowdy	Nunes	
Granger	Olson	

NAYS—176

Adams	Fudge	Nadler
Aguilar	Gabbard	Napolitano
Barragán	Gallego	Neal
Bass	Garamendi	Nolan
Bera	Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross
Beyer	Gottheimer	O'Halleran
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Pallone
Blunt Rochester	Grijalva	Panetta
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Pascrell
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Payne
Brady (PA)	Heck	Peters
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)	Peterson
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Pingree
Bustos	Hoyer	Pocan
Butterfield	Huffman	Price (NC)
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Carbajal	Jayapal	Raskin
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rosen
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Chu, Judy	Keating	Ruiz
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Rush
Clarke (NY)	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kihuen	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kilmer	Schiff
Cannolly	Kind	Schneider
Cooper	Krishnamoorthi	Schrader
Correa	Kuster (NH)	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lamb	Scott, David
Courtney	Langevin	Serrano
Crist	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Cuellar	Lawrence	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Lawson (FL)	Sinema
Davis (CA)	Levin	Sinema
Davis, Danny	Lewis (GA)	Sires
DeFazio	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Lipinski	Soto
Delaney	Lobesack	Speier
DeLauro	Loeb	Suozi
DelBene	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
Demings	Lowenthal	Takano
DeSaulnier	Lowe	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Lujan, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Maloney	Titus
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Doyle, Michael F.	Matsui	Torres
Engel	McCollum	Tsongas
Eshoo	McEachin	Vargas
Espallat	McGovern	Veasey
Esty (CT)	Meeks	Vela
Evans	Meng	Velázquez
Foster	Moore	Vislosky
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Wasserman
	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
		Welch
		Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—27

Beatty	Gutiérrez	Polis
Bilirakis	Hunter	Roby
Bishop (MI)	Lee	Rohrabacher
Brooks (AL)	Lujan Grisham,	Sánchez
Cárdenas	M.	Sherman
Cohen	McNerney	Sherman
Davis, Rodney	Noem	Sherman
Ellison	Palazzo	Walz
Fortenberry	Pelosi	Waters, Maxine
Gomez	Perlmutter	Wilson (FL)

□ 1344

Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Messrs. RUSH, and COSTA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. DESANTIS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

Stated for:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 234.

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 223, noes 175, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

AYES—223

Abraham	Granger	Nunes
Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Olson
Allen	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Paulsen
Arrington	Griffith	Pearce
Babin	Grothman	Perry
Bacon	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Banks (IN)	Handel	Poliquin
Barletta	Harper	Posey
Barr	Harris	Ratcliffe
Barton	Hartzler	Reed
Bergman	Hensarling	Reichert
Biggs	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Black	Higgins (LA)	Roe (TN)
Blackburn	Hill	Rogers (AL)
Blum	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Bost	Hollingsworth	Rokita
Brat	Hudson	Rooney, Francis
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga	Rooney, Thomas J.
Buchanan	Hultgren	Roskam
Buck	Hurd	Ross
Bucshon	Issa	Rothfus
Budd	Jenkins (KS)	Rouzer
Burgess	Jenkins (WV)	Royce (CA)
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Russell
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Sanford
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Scalise
Chabot	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Cheney	Katko	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Kelly (MS)	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Sessions
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Shuster
Comer	Kinzinger	Simpson
Comstock	Knight	Smith (MO)
Conaway	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NE)
Cook	Labrador	Smith (NJ)
Costa	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Smucker
Cramer	Lamb	Stefanik
Crawford	Lamborn	Stewart
Culberson	Lance	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	Latta	Taylor
Curtis	Lesko	Tenney
Davidson	Lewis (MN)	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Thornberry
Denham	Long	Tipton
DeSantis	Loudermilk	Trott
DesJarlais	Love	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Upton
Donovan	Luetkemeyer	Valadao
Duffy	MacArthur	Wagner
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Walberg
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Walden
Dunn	Marshall	Walker
Emmer	Mast	Walorski
Estes (KS)	McCarthy	Walters, Mimi
Faso	McCaul	Weber (TX)
Ferguson	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	McKinley	Westerman
Flores	McMorris	Williams
Foxx	Rodgers	Wittman
Frelinghuysen	McSally	Womack
Gaetz	Meadows	Woodall
Gallagher	Messer	Yoder
Garrett	Mitchell	Yoho
Gianforte	Moolenaar	Young (AK)
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)	Young (IA)
Gohmert	Mullin	Zeldin
Gohmert	Murphy (FL)	
Goodlatte	Newhouse	
Gosar	Norman	
Gowdy		

NOES—175

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

Cartwright	Hoyer	Panetta
Castor (FL)	Huffman	Pascrell
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Payne
Chu, Judy	Jayapal	Peters
Cicilline	Jeffries	Peterson
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Pingree
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Clay	Jones	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Kaptur	Quigley
Clyburn	Keating	Raskin
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Cannolly	Kennedy	Richmond
Cooper	Khanna	Rosen
Correa	Kihuen	Roybal-Allard
Courtney	Kildee	Ruiz
Crist	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Kind	Rush
Cuellar	Krishnamoorthi	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Schakowsky
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Schneider
DeGette	Lawrence	Schrader
Delaney	Lawson (FL)	Scott (VA)
DeLauro	Levin	Scott, David
DelBene	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Demings	Lieu, Ted	Sewell (AL)
DeSaulnier	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
Deutch	Loeb	Shea-Porter
Dingell	Loeb	Sinema
Doggett	Lofgren	Sires
Doyle, Michael F.	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
Engel	Lujan, Ben Ray	Soto
Eshoo	Lynch	Speier
Espallat	Maloney	Suozi
Esty (CT)	Espallat	Swalwell (CA)
Evans	Maloney, Sean	Takano
Foster	Massie	Thompson (CA)
Frankel (FL)	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
	McEachin	Titus
	McGovern	Tonko
	Meeks	Torres
	Meng	Tsongas
	Moore	Vargas
	Moulton	Veasey
	Nadler	Vela
	Green, Al	Velázquez
	Green, Gene	Vislosky
	Hanabusa	Wasserman
	Hastings	Schultz
	Heck	Watson Coleman
	O'Halleran	Welch
	O'Rourke	Yarmuth
	Pallone	

NOT VOTING—29

Beatty	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bilirakis	Hunter	Pittenger
Bishop (MI)	Lee	Polis
Brady (TX)	Lujan Grisham,	Roby
Brooks (AL)	M.	Rohrabacher
Cárdenas	McCcollum	Sánchez
Cohen	McNerney	Sherman
Davis, Rodney	Noem	Sherman
Ellison	Palazzo	Walz
Fortenberry	Pelosi	Waters, Maxine
Gomez		Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1350

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 177, answered “present” 1, not voting 30, as follows: