

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the outstanding achievement of the Salt Lake Community College men's basketball team, this year's National Junior College Men's Basketball champions.

These 12 extraordinary student athletes, with the unwavering support of their four dedicated coaches, dominated the 2016 NJCAA Men's Basketball tournament, beating their opponents by an average of 18.8 points over five games in 6 days.

Conner Toolson was named the tournament's Most Valuable Player. Head coach Todd Phillips was named Coach of the Tournament.

These young men, who hail not only from Utah, but from as far away as Australia, exhibited more than just exceptional athleticism and skill. They were singled out for their good sportsmanship and kindness off court. Tad Dufelmeier was honored with the tournament's Sportsmanship Award.

I congratulate the team on their championship win and for representing their school, their community, and the State in such an exceptional way.

Go Bruins.

□ 1215

HONORING EDUCATOR JOYCE TOAN

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Joyce Toan, who has taught the children of Joseph Sears School as a kindergarten teacher for nearly two decades. First arriving at Sears in 1997, Mrs. Toan has positively shaped the lives of hundreds of students.

Personally, she has had an undeniably positive impact on my family, teaching my three children, Harper, Bobby, and Honor. Each is better off because of her guidance and teaching.

Our family and community will be forever indebted to her for the kindness she has shown all of our children. Mrs. Toan always went out of her way to recognize what makes each of her students unique. She taught her students not what to think, but how to think, a skill that will be useful for the rest of their lives.

Despite her career at Sears coming to an end, the lessons and memories that she has imparted upon Harper, Bobby, Honor, and all of her students will last a lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my personal thanks to Mrs. Toan for all that she has done and wish her well in her retirement. She will be deeply missed.

PROTECTING RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, in contrast to the religious persecutions in Europe between the 16th and 19th centuries, America increasingly became a safe space for people to exercise their faith in accordance with their conscience. Religious freedom was woven into the fabric and constitution of our country from the beginning, and faith has played a big role in forming the character of our Nation.

From efforts to abolish slavery, secure civil rights, and protect human life, to providing health care, food, shelter, and hope to countless millions, religious organizations have been indispensable to the progress we have made. Indeed, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 recognized the extraordinary contributions of religious organizations when it preserved their right to hire individuals who shared their beliefs.

Today we see clouds encroaching upon the sunshine of religious freedom and the freedom of conscience. These attempts to crush conscience must be resisted. It is conscience that convicts us of our own shortcomings, and it is that conviction that allows us to correct course and to seek what is good, beautiful, and true. That is why protecting religious freedom is vital.

Mr. Speaker, let us together join forces against the growing intolerance that threatens it.

STOP GIVING GUANTANAMO PRISONERS EXPENSIVE SPECIAL TREATMENT

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had 43 students and chaperones from Washburn High School in east Tennessee as my guests at the Capitol.

Among other things, I told them I was next going to a hearing about the prison in Guantanamo and that one group had estimated it was now costing us over \$4 million per prisoner to keep that prison open. One of the students said, "How can I get in?"

There are now only 80 prisoners there, and we spent \$445 million to run the facility in 2015. The Washington Times reported in 2013 that we were giving these prisoners classes on computers, horticulture, art, and calligraphy as well as library services, special food, and recreational facilities. We sometimes hear of country club prisons. Apparently, this should be called a resort prison.

I know the Federal Government cannot do anything in a fiscally conservative way, but spending \$4 million per prisoner in Guantanamo is ridiculous. It costs an average of \$34,000 per year per prisoner in most Federal prisons and \$78,000 per year in the supermax prison.

Mr. Speaker, we should stop giving these terrorists such ridiculously expensive special treatment and send all

80 to the worst, most dangerous prison in the U.S.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE TED S. YOHO, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable TED S. YOHO, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 25, 2016.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the Circuit Court in and for Dixie County, Florida, Criminal Division, for testimony in a criminal case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is not consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

TED S. YOHO,  
Member of Congress.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 2012, ENERGY POLICY MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5233, CLARIFYING CONGRESSIONAL INTENT IN PROVIDING FOR DC HOME RULE ACT OF 2016; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY 27, 2016, THROUGH JUNE 6, 2016

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 744 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 744

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 2012) to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-55 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to commit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. If S. 2012, as amended, is passed, then it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or his designee to move that the House insist on its amendment to S. 2012 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5233) to repeal the Local Budget

Autonomy Amendment Act of 2012, to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to clarify the respective roles of the District government and Congress in the local budget process of the District government, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. On any legislative day during the period from May 27, 2016, through June 6, 2016—

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. 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. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 744 provides for the consideration of S. 2012, the Energy Policy Modernization Act of 2016, and H.R. 5233, Clarifying Congressional Intent in Providing for DC Home Rule Act of 2016.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided amongst the majority and minority members of the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Natural Resources for S. 2012. As S. 2012, as amended, is a comprehensive compilation of energy legislation that has already passed the House, the Committee on Rules made no further amendments in order. However, the rule affords the minority the customary motion to recommit, a final opportunity to amend the legislation should the minority choose to exercise that option.

The rule further provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the majority and minority of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on H.R. 5233. No amendments were made in order as the bill is a targeted response to what Members of the

House have perceived as an unlawful action taken by the District of Columbia in contravention of the Federal Home Rule Act. The minority is, however, afforded the customary motion to recommit, a final chance to amend the legislation.

Finally, the rule contains the standard tools to allow the orderly management of the floor of the House of Representatives during an upcoming district work period.

The House amendment to S. 2012, the Energy Policy Modernization Act of 2016, builds on the work of the House. The House has done this work over the past year and a half to update the Nation's energy laws and move the country forward on energy policy. The bills included in this package include work from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Agriculture Committee, Committee on Natural Resources, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

While many House committees have had input on this package, Members can feel comfortable that a wide array of opinions and positions are represented in the legislation. This is how the House works its will most effectively, by combining various pieces of legislation into one package.

In amending S. 2012, the Senate passed energy legislation. Following passage of S. 2012 in the House, both bodies will be able to begin to conference the differences in the two bills, a further step in the regular order of this bill becoming a law.

The legislation will benefit Americans across the country: modernizing our energy infrastructure; expediting and improving forest management; providing for greater opportunities on Federal lands for hunting, fishing, and shooting; and prioritizing science research using Federal taxpayer dollars.

S. 2012, as amended, includes various pieces of legislation considered and passed by the House not only in the current 114th Congress, but it also includes many pieces of bipartisan legislation from the 112th and 113th Congresses.

A major win for the American people in this package is the provisions allowing for expanded access by sportsmen, fishermen, and recreational shooters to Federal lands, lands that should have always been accessible to all Americans for various legal and constitutional activities.

Further, the legislation before us focuses on protecting American interests in a world where uncertainty due to terrorism and unfriendly and unstable regimes in the Middle East threaten American access to reliable sources of energy. We have long believed that America should focus less on relying on foreign energy sources, given the abundance of resources below our very feet across this Nation. Only if Federal policies are aligned with this view, which the House will do with this package, can our country fully focus on becoming energy secure.

The second piece of legislation contained in today's rule addresses the House concerns with recent actions taken by the District of Columbia's Mayor and City Council. H.R. 5233, Clarifying Congressional Intent in Providing for DC Home Rule Act of 2016, repeals the Local Budget Autonomy Amendment Act of 2012, a referendum passed in the District of Columbia, which many believe violates both the U.S. Constitution and the Federal Home Rule Act.

When the Founding Fathers crafted our Constitution, they acknowledged the special status that the Nation's Capital held and created a special relationship between it and the Federal Government not enjoyed by other States and other localities.

While some argue that the District of Columbia should be entirely self-governed, that is not how our Constitution treats the Federal city. Article I, section 8, clause 17 states that the Congress of the United States shall have the power—I am quoting from the Constitution here—“to exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards and other needful Buildings.”

□ 1230

The District of Columbia, falling squarely within the parameters of this clause, is, therefore, subject to Congress' exclusive exercise over its laws.

I have no doubt that a strong debate will surround the consideration of H.R. 5233, as we heard in the Committee on Rules last night, but Congress would be relinquishing its duty under the United States Constitution to oversee the governance of the Nation's Capital.

Today's rule will allow the House to complete the final two pieces of legislation for the month of May, a month where the House of Representatives has passed legislation to provide funding for our military bases, funding for our veterans, funding for energy and water policies; to provide new authorities and funding to combat the growing threat of the Zika virus; to update our Nation's chemical laws; to provide help to those in this country facing opioid addictions; and to provide tools to our Nation's armed services necessary to keep our citizens safe from the growing threat of terrorism. It has been one of the most productive months of the year for the House of Representatives.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the rule which joins two disparate

issues. The first, District of Columbia budget autonomy. The second, pursuing an energy bill that prioritizes an outdated energy policy.

First, D.C. budget autonomy. Mr. Speaker, Congress sits in the District of Columbia, and our presence looms far beyond the footprint of the buildings. Congress has mandated that the government of the District of Columbia pass every budget plan—every spending plan down to the penny of their own money that they raise—through Congress.

But in 2012, the District of Columbia exerted its own authority and passed the Local Budget Autonomy Amendment Act of 2012 and essentially said: We will allocate our own local funds ourselves unless Congress overrides our plan, and we will only ask permission beforehand when we spend money that comes from the Federal Treasury.

The bill before us, H.R. 5233, would repeal the District's local law, keep the District of Columbia from spending its own money on local services, and prohibit the District from granting itself budget autonomy in the future.

For far too long, the residents of the District have paid their fair share of taxes and have not had full representation in Congress. The District sends young people off to war, but doesn't have an equal voice in either going to war or how the country is governed. In fact, it reminds me a lot of a plantation.

Subjecting the District to the lengthy and uncertain congressional appropriations process for its own use of their local tax collection imposes operational and financial hardships for the District, burdens not borne by any other local government in the country. In addition to that, it is more expensive to them.

It defies reason that the House majority would continue this overreach, and I urge each considerate Republican to rethink their position. In fact, there are some key Republicans who do support the District's budget autonomy. The Oversight and Government Reform Committee's last four chairmen—including Republicans Tom Davis and DARRELL ISSA—worked to give D.C. budget autonomy. I urge my Republican colleagues to follow suit.

Second, the rule would allow the House to replace the text of the Senate's bipartisan energy reform legislation with the House's partisan energy bill. Time and again, we have seen the Senate come to a reasonable, bipartisan compromise, but the House chases a partisan agenda and derails the legislative process every time.

The House proposal encourages an outdated energy policy that favors fossil fuels above the clean and renewable energy sources, and it seeks to roll back important environmental protections. The majority's insistence on negating environmental protections and doubling down on their attacks on environmental laws is a troubling waste of time. Nevertheless, Democrats will

fight to protect the environment and precious natural resources.

The bill locks in fossil fuel consumption for years to come by repealing current law aimed at reducing the government's carbon footprint. It also puts up barriers to the integration of clean, renewable energy technologies, all while rolling back the energy efficiency standards. In the past, efficiency standards were an area of bipartisan compromise. Not anymore.

Americans cannot afford the Republican majority's head-in-the-sand approach to climate change and energy consumption. In fact, I understand that the presumed Presidential candidate of the Republican Party had applied to build a wall on one of his foreign golf courses, blaming climate change for the erosion. So if he believes it in a foreign country, I certainly hope he will think about believing it here.

I urge my colleagues to work toward an all-of-the-above strategy that will modernize our Nation's energy infrastructure in a way that addresses climate change, promotes clean energy, drives innovation, and ensures a cleaner, more stable environment for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would remind the House that this energy legislation has worked its way through the House for the last 18 months; and, indeed, the two previous Congresses, multiple committees have had input on this. It has been one of the most thoroughly vetted pieces of legislation. I cannot tell you the number of hearings, the number of markups that I have sat through in the Committee on Energy and Commerce. It has had similar treatment over in the Senate. The concept of getting this bill through the House, going to conference with the Senate, this is a good product and is worthy of the support of this body.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), a hardworking Member who represents 700,000 people who have no say because this body decides everything that they do. As I pointed out before, they pay their taxes and they send their children off to war, but she cannot vote in this House in any way to affect anything.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank my good friend from New York State for the way she has always understood and championed with respect to the District of Columbia, which also happens to be the capital of the United States. But, as she said, it is more than the Capitol and this building. It is where almost 700,000 Americans live.

Mr. Speaker, I must strongly oppose that portion of the bill providing for

consideration of H.R. 5233. Understand the spectacle we have ongoing here. A strong Republican House is actively sponsoring a bill that repeals a local law, a local law that in this case authorizes the District of Columbia government to spend its own local funds without congressional approval.

Who do the Republicans think they are, that the people I represent should ask for their approval to spend, and to process funds that they had nothing to do with raising?

Understand, no Federal funds are involved, not one penny, but those pennies, over \$7 billion—and I want people who come to the floor to tell me if their State raises \$7 billion on its own. Over \$7 billion. These are our pennies. Not a cent of Federal money is even implicated.

Let's go back to Republican principles to understand what is happening on this floor today because it is going to happen twice. My Republican friends propose in this rule—these are the same friends who despise the Federal reach, despise it so much that every year they try to give back what have long been Federal matters to the States, like the Department of Education. Need I go through the laundry list? The one thing they stand for in this Congress and have stood for throughout human time is that they prefer that power over the people be exercised at the State and local level. That is what they stand for. There are not many things that you can say a particular party stands for. Local control is certainly their cardinal principle.

But look what they are doing this afternoon. They are doubling down. That is not just a matter of emphasis. That means double bills. They are doubling down to use the awesome power of the Federal Government against a local district. If you will excuse me, I regard that as very un-Republican.

We are talking about two provisions—not just the rule before us—that use identical language, as if to say, you know, we really mean it, District of Columbia, because we are going to do it twice. We want to be doubly sure that we keep this local district from enforcing its own local budget.

So what is the point of this bill if they are doing it twice?

This bill is a pretense. It is solely designed to lay the predicate for another action that has occurred this very morning in the Committee on Appropriations. How coincidental. I sat through a Committee on Appropriations markup where a rider, using the very same language that is proposed through this rule, and that rider was indeed passed by the House appropriations subcommittee.

Heavens. I wonder if in the history of the House of Representatives we have ever had this Congress or the Congress of the United States to be so threatened by what a local jurisdiction would do that it proposes not one bill, but two, to keep that local jurisdiction

from proceeding. We are not seceding from the United States. We are simply trying to spend our own money.

So here we have a bill twice over because the—appropriations bill contains the same language, understand, despite another of their rules that prohibits legislating on an appropriations bill. The Republican leadership included the text of H.R. 5233 in the appropriations bill for what appears to be a very good reason. They recognize that that is the only chance they have of enacting the text of the rule before you, and that is to do so in an appropriations bill. So they are doing it twice for good measure, but the only way it is going to pass is attaching it to some must-pass bill.

The Senate—and I say this on this floor—does not have the votes to pass H.R. 5233 itself. And even if it did, the President of the United States, who has long supported budget autonomy, put it in his own budgets, has said he would veto it. The Executive Statement of Administration Policy that came out yesterday indicated so.

This may be news to some Members of this body, but I am the only Member of Congress who was elected by the almost 700,000 American citizens who live in the District of Columbia, and my constituents are the only American citizens who are affected by this bill.

You might be able to understand the anger of my constituents if you knew these numbers. The people I represent pay more taxes than 22 States pay.

Or you want another one that would make you understand the anger of my constituents?

They are number one per capita in the Federal taxes paid to support their homeland, highest taxes per capita in the United States. And yet this very day, twice—first with respect to this rule, then with respect to the bill—every single Member of Congress will get a vote on this bill solely concerning the District of Columbia except the Member of Congress who represents the District of Columbia and is elected to represent them.

□ 1245

If you have never felt like a despot before, I hope that side of the aisle understands how it feels and what it looks like.

The Republican leadership has claimed that it is committed to letting the House work its will on legislation. However, yesterday, the Rules Committee, on a party-line vote, prevented me from offering my amendment to this bill to the House floor. What are you afraid of, if my amendment comes to the House floor that says, “Congress, you do it; you grant D.C. budget autonomy”? Are you afraid you can’t do it? Sure you can do it. Or, at least let us do it. Give D.C. some respect.

My amendment was the only chance for D.C. residents to have a say on the bill during floor consideration. So even though you could have, obviously, and would have defeated my amendment to

say, “You do it, you grant us budget autonomy,” what in the world kept you from allowing us the respect of bringing that amendment to counter what you are doing today, particularly knowing that we can’t counter what you are doing today?

My amendment, of course, would have called the question on whether Members support or oppose local control of local jurisdictions over their own budget. Do Members oppose budget autonomy because the District initiated it? Or do they actually want to toss their own local control principles out of the Capitol window through a vote requiring Federal approval of local funds?

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 3 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. My amendment would have made the text of D.C.’s Local Budget Autonomy Act Federal law. It would have simply said, look, if you don’t like what the District did, you do it. We would have lost. But you would at least have given to us the respect that we are entitled to as American citizens—afraid even to do that.

The Local Budget Autonomy Act is already law. The District government has begun to implement it, and I applaud them for doing so. When you are up against a despotic House of Representatives, the only way to proceed in a democracy is to move on your own, or else they will say: See, we waited them out and there is nothing they can do. There is only one of them against all of us.

Only one court opinion has, in fact, upheld the Budget Autonomy Act, though the good Member on the other side implied that this was a lawless act. Well, let me tell you what the court said, without going through all of it:

Forthwith, enforce all provisions of the Local Budget Autonomy Act of 2012.

That is the law. Who is being lawless, who is being unprincipled is any majority that would want to be involved with the local funds of any American jurisdiction.

When Members cast their vote today on the bill, they will be voting on a bill to require Congress to approve a local budget. How un-Republican. And worse, undemocratic.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Founders recognized that, within the District of Columbia, this was a unique entity. But Congress, in its benevolence, granted the District of Columbia limited autonomy in the Home Rule Act of 1973. That autonomy did not extend as far as what the current Mayor and city council envisioned it to.

The Home Rule Act maintained the role of the Federal Government in the District’s budget process; and, indeed, the Federal Government has had to step in as late as the 1990s because the District had so mismanaged its finances.

Then, the District of Columbia Financial Control Board had to be instituted in order to correct the many financial disasters that the District of Columbia government had created for itself. Congress gave the board the power to override the D.C. government where it saw fit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS), from the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, where this bill originated.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his eloquent words.

As we look at this particular bill, there is a lot that has been said about what home rule is and what it is not. There is a lot that has been said about what the law is and what it is not, and yet it is undeniable that the Constitution actually reserved for this esteemed body the power to legislate over all affairs within the District, going back to Article I, section 8 of our Constitution.

And yet in 1973, Mr. Speaker, this body took on a law, debated it in both the House and the Senate, to actually take some of those authorities granted by the Constitution and allow the District to actually put forth laws with regard to local issues.

Now, specifically reserved in that 1973 law was the whole issue of the budget and appropriations. As we started to look at this particular function—my good friend, the Delegate from the District, obviously has talked very seriously about the law.

Well, the law was very clear in 1973 on what we passed. Actually, Charles Diggs—Chairman Diggs—had what they called the Diggs Compromise that specifically was spelled out in a dear colleague letter on the fact that budgetary control would remain with this body and, indeed, with the appropriators. Yet somehow we see a decision by a superior court as having the effect of law?

Well, we know from our civics class that it is this body that is putting forth Federal law. It cannot be a local jurisdiction that comes in and usurps the power of the Federal law with its local mandates.

So, Mr. Speaker, while my good friend and I will disagree perhaps on a number of issues, what we should agree on is the fact that the Constitution reserved this right for Congress. The Constitution and, indeed, those relegated and delegated powers in 1973 were specific in keeping the appropriations and budgetary process within this body. To ignore that would be, honestly, ignoring the debate that happened then, debate that happens now, and sworn testimony in hearings that, indeed, those who crafted this particular law are all in agreement that this was the intent of Congress.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to not only support this, but reaffirm the role that Congress has and make sure that we keep it within this body.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 18½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. My good friend Mr. MEADOWS speaks as if he didn't speak up for the Congress of the United States with its awesome power, then Congress would be stripped of its power by the District of Columbia—please.

If there is any concern here about this bill, the one thing my good friend should not do is to base it on what lawyers say. The latest and most definitive, on what lawyers say is a court of law.

I want to indicate what happened, because the matter was first in the Federal district court, then appealed to the Federal court of appeals. The Federal court of appeals heard oral argument and received briefs. It looked at this—and we don't know why—but they sent it to a local D.C. court.

That court heard at every single argument Mr. MEADOWS has raised and found for the District of Columbia. And that is the definitive word on the law, unless what he is saying is: Je suis the law, or, I am the law. Well, maybe you are, but you are the kind of law that led the Framers to rebel against England. No respect for local law.

You speak of the Diggs Compromise. What you didn't say is that some compromise had to be reached because the Senate, in its home rule bill, gave the district control over its local budget.

So what we say, what our lawyers say, is that compromise did leave some room in the charter—which does not specifically say that budget autonomy is denied to the District; and they could have said it, but they didn't—and the compromise was to leave some room at such point as it became relevant to step up and claim the right to process and enforce their own local budget.

My good friend managing the bill on that side dares reach back to the 1990s. Yes, the District got into trouble. My congratulations to the District of Columbia as the only city which, for 200 years, carried State functions. And yes, in the 1990s, it became too much; and yes, the city had a serious financial crisis.

So if you want to go back two decades, also come forward, because at this time, the District has perhaps the strongest economy in the United States of America. How many of you have surpluses? How many of you have anything to brag about in terms of the economy of your district?

Have you looked at what is happening in the District of Columbia? You can see the building going on. You can see the increase in our population. So yes, we have had hard times, and I

am sure you have, but I am sure that there was a whole lot less reason for your hard times than for ours.

I am asking you to think about your own principles of local control and try to justify taking local control from the District, but particularly to justify taking local control over our own money. That is what the Framers went to war about. Somebody somewhere was trying to tell them about taxes having to do with their own local funds.

I don't know if that spirit still lives on that side of the aisle, but it still lives in the District of Columbia. This is our money. We are going to keep going at it until you have nothing to say about funds raised in a jurisdiction not your own. My constituents cannot hold you accountable because they cannot vote for you.

Well, sir, they have voted for me; and what I say today represents what they believe and what they will never give up, and that is the right to control their own local laws and, and above all, their own local funds raised from their own local taxpayers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

□ 1300

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, indeed, the delegate opposite is my friend. She serves her constituency well. Her impassioned plea on behalf of her constituents is not only recognized this day, but each and every day in this body.

This particular debate is not over what is believed to be right or wrong. It is over the rule of law. Indeed, the argument was made by the gentleman from Georgia yesterday that this is a matter of law, not on the merits of what is right or what is wrong from a standpoint of budget autonomy.

But I would also refer, Mr. Speaker, to the argument that would suggest that everything is great here in Washington, D.C., in terms of the budget. If that indeed is the case that is being argued here today, you can't have it both ways, because the status quo today has been one that truly has the authority rested and vested here in this esteemed body.

So to suggest that things are less than perfect, I am not here to do that. But if indeed everything is turning up roses today, it is the status quo that has indeed preserved that.

So I would suggest that, as we start to look at this, it is a fundamental question: Are we going to uphold the rule of law?

The rule of law here is very clear. In fact, the debates back in 1973 talked about that all we wanted was some of the local control over our local government. And as that debate went on, there was indeed, as my good friend

mentioned, in the Senate the desire to give budget autonomy to the district.

Yet, as we know from our civics class, it takes both the Senate and the House and the President to sign it into law. I would say that we need to continue to support the rule of law.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up two desperately needed pieces of legislation.

The first would shed light on secret money in politics by requiring groups to disclose the source of the contributions they are using to fund their campaign-related activities. The second would provide \$600 million in funding to combat the growing opioid epidemic.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the 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 gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a personal privilege and rise today with a really sad heart and take a moment to mark what is the end of an era for the Rules Committee family.

This is Miles Lackey's last week as the staff director for the committee's minority, and we are sad about it indeed. The Rules Committee is a family, and the loss is personal.

The Rules Committee, in my opinion, has the highest regarded staff of anybody that is on the Hill. In both the House and Senate, Miles has proved to be the gold standard for any staff wishing to make a contribution to the Congress.

He has been a mentor and a colleague to anyone who asked for it. His counsel will be missed not just for the four of us on the Democratic side of the Rules Committee, but I think both staff members and all other Members alike on both sides of the aisle.

Miles is a graduate of the University of North Carolina and of Yale Divinity School, and he brings a grounded, holistic vision of his work as a staff member, and the example has been a guiding force.

He has the patience of Job and takes every dramatic turn of events in stride. From government shutdowns to national emergencies, Miles has always known exactly what to do.

As the staff director of the Rules Committee or as Senator Dodd's chief of staff in the Senate, he made incredible contributions to legislation that has passed out of Congress during his tenure in both Chambers.

From Dodd-Frank to the Affordable Care Act, it is clear that he dedicated his career to benefiting the American people with skill, intellect, and patience.

There is always one more story to tell, one more hug to linger over, but

there sure is no good way to say goodbye to a trusted and cherished adviser, a colleague, and a friend. There is only the deep gratitude that we feel and the legacy of the excellence that Miles leaves.

Thank you, dear friend, for everything.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, when you serve on the Rules Committee, you spend a lot of time dealing in acrimony at least here on the floor.

When you serve on the Rules Committee and your job is to get the business of the House accomplished, when we are not on the House floor, it isn't acrimony. It may be impassioned. It may be, at times, divisive.

But it is all focused on a single goal, and that is making sure that this institution fulfills not just the expectations of our constituents back home, but the expectations of our framers who established it to begin with.

Members of Congress come and go, Mr. Speaker, and, inevitably, what makes a Member of Congress successful is being surrounded by a team of excellence, a team of excellence back home in terms of bosses and constituents and a team of excellence here in Washington to help make sure that all the i's are dotted and all the t's are crossed and that the big things get done.

When Miles Lackey leaves this institution, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be harder to get the big things done. It is going to be harder because the biggest commodity we have in this town is not a Member pin, is not a Member representational allowance, is not how much mail goes out the door.

The most precious commodity in this town is trust, and not everybody has it. Sadly, not everybody wants it. But to do anything that is worth doing in this town, it has to be built on a foundation of trust.

If you don't have people like Miles Lackey on the other side of the aisle—I sit on this side of the aisle. He is physically sitting on that side of the aisle today not just emotionally, not just intellectually, but physically. If you don't have folks that you can trust, you can't begin the conversations about how to make things happen.

There is no committee that brings more measures to the floor than the Rules Committee. That doesn't happen by accident. It happens intentionally. It happens with good folks like Miles Lackey.

There is no committee that has to deal with more contentious issues than the Rules Committee. The committees of jurisdiction have dealt with as many as they can. The hardest ones, the worst ones, end up on the Rules Committee's plate. We don't deal with those issues successfully without the trust built by folks like Miles Lackey.

Mr. Speaker, we can read the resolution that the Rules Committee put out for Miles, but it is only a page long. Truthfully, it doesn't do justice. When you lose folks who have built that trust, it takes years to find folks to rebuild it.

I want you to look at the folks who come to speak on Miles' behalf today, Mr. Speaker. I want you to look at the folks who sit in Miles' chain of command.

He is certainly not leaving the ranking member high and dry. He has trained a tremendous team of folks who are going to step up and try to fill those shoes.

I came to this institution to make a difference, Mr. Speaker. I didn't come just to make a point. Because Miles Lackey has served in this institution not for a day, not for a week, not for a month, but for decade upon decade. We have been able to make a difference.

I don't want to date Miles. He dates back not just before I got here, but before my predecessor got here. He dates back before Republicans took over this institution, Mr. Speaker, and has seen the control change time and time again.

Watch folks when power changes, Mr. Speaker. Watch folks when power changes in this institution. Watch whether they behave the same once they have it as they did yesterday when they didn't.

We are all in the minority at some point, Mr. Speaker. We are all in the minority at some point. The rules exist to protect the minority.

Watch the folks who have the ability to use the rules. See if they treat you the same when they have the power as when they don't.

There is not going to be a man or woman who stands in this Chamber who will tell you that Miles treats you any differently when he is in as when he is out.

He is an advocate for his position, but he is an institutionalist who believes in all of us collectively. I thank him for his service.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Rules resolution.

Expressing the gratitude of the Committee on Rules to Mr. Miles M. Lackey, the Committee's Democratic staff director, for his service to the Committee, the House, and the Nation on the occasion of his retirement from the House of Representatives.

Whereas Mr. Miles M. Lackey has served the Nation in both the legislative and executive branches over the course of nearly three decades;

Whereas he has served the Committee on Rules for most of his career, first as an associate of the Rules Committee staff, then later as senior advisor to the Chair and both majority and minority staff director;

Whereas during his career, he has brought competence and dignity to each office he has held;

Whereas his advice and counsel are sought by both Members and staff alike;

Whereas he has always endeavored to ensure the effective operation of the Committee, even when the majority and minority differed on policy or process;

Whereas his good humor and steady demeanor will be missed: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That—

(1) the Committee on Rules expresses its profound gratitude to Mr. Miles M. Lackey for his exemplary service; and

(2) the clerk of the Committee is hereby directed to prepare this resolution in a manner suitable for presentation to Mr. Lackey.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee for yielding me the time, and I join with her in expressing my admiration and my respect for Miles Lackey.

I have known Miles for many, many years. We both served as staff members up here when I first came to the Hill. I have known him in his capacity when he worked with Tony Beilinson and Ted Weiss and Chris Dodd and John Edwards in the Rules Committee and I guess a thousand other things he did up here. I always admired his intellect and his dedication.

Mr. Speaker, Miles Lackey is a good man. He is a very, very good man. That is an important quality for people who serve up here, whether as Members of Congress or as staff members, that they are good people.

Miles always put the interests of the people of this country first, and always the most vulnerable were at the top of his list. No matter what we talk about in the Rules Committee, he always talks about how it is going to impact people who are struggling in this country.

I just want to say that I have admired Miles' dedication to this country. I have admired his intellect. I have admired his compassion. We are going to miss him greatly.

He has taught me a lot. I know he has taught a lot of people on the Rules Committee and other staffers and Members a lot as well. But he is a unique individual in that everybody loves him.

I joked last night in the Rules Committee that I appreciated the fact that Miles was the inspiration for a resolution in the Rules Committee that Democrats and Republicans could support because very rarely do we have resolutions that we support in a bipartisan way.

So I am grateful to Miles, and I join with everybody here when I say we are going to miss him.

I will just conclude with this. I have had the privilege of serving with some great Members of the House and great Members who have served as staffers up here.

Miles is at the top of that list. He is a great human being and a great public servant. We are all here, in a bipartisan way, to express our admiration, our deep affection, and our respect for him. We wish him well.

And, Miles, we will be calling you often, so be prepared.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question and “no” on the rule that joins two unrelated measures, first, to continue the House majority’s overreach into the District of Columbia’s local budgetary affairs; second, to double down on an outdated energy policy and pursue a partisan path instead of the bipartisan Senate plan.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out in the statement I gave at the beginning of this hour, just reflecting back on the month of May, a month where the House of Representatives passed legislation funding our military bases, funding our veterans, funding energy and water policies, providing new authorities to combat the growing threat of the Zika virus, we updated our Nation’s chemical laws for the first time in 40 years, we provided help to people in this country facing opiate addictions, we provided pay and benefits to our military, we provided the tools to our armed services necessary to keep our citizens safe from the growing threat of terrorism, it has been a significant month in the United States House of Representatives. Oftentimes we don’t reflect back on what has been accomplished. So this is a good opportunity to do that.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, today’s rule provides for consideration of two important bills to update our Nation’s energy policies and address the constitutional deficiencies in recent District of Columbia Council actions.

I want to thank the many Members of the House on both sides who contributed to the underlying pieces of legislation, which will be considered today following the passage of today’s rule.

Finally, I do want to join my colleagues—I am probably the most recent addition to the House Rules Committee, but I certainly have been there long enough to appreciate the wise counsel and guidance of Miles Lackey and certainly wish him well in his future endeavors and pray for his successor.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 744 OFFERED BY  
MS. SLAUGHTER

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 bill (H.R. 430) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, and other entities, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consider-

ation of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, and Ways and Means. 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. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. R. 430.

SEC. 8. Immediately after the disposition of H.R. 430 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. 5189) to address the opioid abuse crisis. 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 among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 9. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5189.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 176, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 239]

YEAS—239

Abraham Griffith Paulsen  
Aderholt Grothman Pearce  
Allen Guinta Perry  
Amash Guthrie Peterson  
Amodei Hardy Pittenger  
Babin Harper Pitts  
Barletta Harris Poe (TX)  
Barr Hartzler Poliquin  
Barton Heck (NV) Pompeo  
Benishek Hensarling Posey  
Bilirakis Hice, Jody B. Price, Tom  
Bishop (MI) Hill Ratcliffe  
Bishop (UT) Holding Reed  
Black Hudson Reichert  
Blackburn Huelskamp Renacci  
Blum Huizenga (MI) Ribble  
Bost Hultgren Rice (SC)  
Boustany Hunter Rigell  
Brady (TX) Hurd (TX) Roby  
Brat Hurt (VA) Roe (TN)  
Bridenstine Issa Rogers (KY)  
Brooks (AL) Jenkins (KS) Rohrabacher  
Brooks (IN) Jenkins (WV) Rokita  
Buchanan Johnson (OH) Rooney (FL)  
Buck Johnson, Sam Ros-Lehtinen  
Bucshon Jolly Roskam  
Burgess Jones Ross  
Byrne Jordan Rothfus  
Calvert Joyce Rouzer  
Carter (GA) Katko Royce  
Carter (TX) Kelly (MS) Russell  
Chabot Kelly (PA) Salmon  
Chaffetz King (IA) Sanford  
Clawson (FL) King (NY) Scalise  
Coffman Kinzinger (IL) Schweikert  
Cole Kline Scott, Austin  
Collins (NY) Knight Sensenbrenner  
Comstock Labrador Sessions  
Conaway LaHood Shimkus  
Cook LaMalfa Shuster  
Costa Lamborn Simpson  
Costello (PA) Lance Smith (MO)  
Cramer Latta Smith (NE)  
Crawford LoBiondo Smith (NJ)  
Crenshaw Long Smith (TX)  
Culberson Loudermilk Stefanik  
Curbelo (FL) Love Stewart  
Davis, Rodney Lucas Stivers  
Denham Luetkemeyer Stutzman  
Dent Lummis Thompson (PA)  
DeSantis MacArthur Thornberry  
DesJarlais Marchant Tiberi  
Diaz-Balart Marino Tipton  
Dold Massie Trotter  
Donovan McCarthy Turner  
Duffy McCaul Upton  
Duncan (SC) McClintock Valadao  
Duncan (TN) McHenry Wagner  
Ellmers (NC) McKinley Walberg  
Emmer (MN) McMorris Walden  
Farenthold Rodgers Walker  
Fitzpatrick McCaul Walorski  
Fleischmann Meadows Walters, Mimi  
Fleming Meehan Weber (TX)  
Flores Messer Webster (FL)  
Forbes Mica Wenstrup  
Fortenberry Miller (MI) Westerman  
Foxx Moolenaar Westmoreland  
Franks (AZ) Mooney (WV) Williams  
Frelinghuysen Mullin Wilson (SC)  
Garrett Mulvaney Wittman  
Gibbs Murphy (PA) Womack  
Gibson Neugebauer Woodall  
Gohmert Newhouse Yoder  
Goodlatte Noem Yoho  
Gosar Nugent Young (AK)  
Gowdy Nunes Young (IA)  
Graves (GA) Olson Young (IN)  
Graves (LA) Palazzo Zeldin  
Graves (MO) Palmer Zinke

NAYS—176

Adams Brown (FL) Clay  
Aguilar Brownley (CA) Cleaver  
Ashford Bustos Clyburn  
Bass Butterfield Cohen  
Beatty Capps Connolly  
Becerra Capuano Conyers  
Bera Carney Cooper  
Beyer Carson (IN) Courtney  
Bishop (GA) Cartwright Crowley  
Blumenauer Castor (FL) Cuellar  
Bonamici Chu, Judy Cummings  
Boyle, Brendan Cicilline Davis (CA)  
F. Clark (MA) Davis, Danny  
Brady (PA) Clarke (NY) DeFazio

DeGette Kildee Pocan  
Delaney Delaney Poliss  
DeLauro Kind Price (NC)  
DelBene Kirkpatrick Quigley  
DeSaulnier Kuster Rangel  
Deutch Langevin Richmond  
Dingell Larsen (WA) Roybal-Allard  
Doggett Larson (CT) Ruiz  
Doyle, Michael Lawrence Ruppertsberger  
F. Lee Rush  
Duckworth Levin Ryan (OH)  
Edwards Lewis Sanchez, Linda  
Ellison Lieu, Ted T.  
Engel Lipinski Sarbanes  
Eshoo Loeb sack Schakowsky  
Esty Lofgren Schiff  
Farr Lowenthal Schrader  
Foster Lowey Scott (VA)  
Frankel (FL) Lujan Grisham Scott, David  
Fudge (NM) Serrano  
Gabbard Lujan, Ben Ray Sewell (AL)  
Gallego (NM) Sherman  
Garamendi Lynch Sinema  
Graham Maloney, Sires  
Grayson Carolyn Slaughter  
Green, Al Maloney, Sean Smith (WA)  
Green, Gene Matsui Swallow (CA)  
Grijalva McCollum Takano  
Gutierrez McDermott Thompson (CA)  
Hahn McGovern Thompson (MS)  
Hastings Titus  
Heck (WA) Meeks Tonko  
Higgins Meng Torres  
Cárdenas Castro (TX) Herrera Beutler Sanchez, Loretta  
Collins (GA) Miller (FL) Speier  
Fattah Norcross Takai  
Fincher O'Rourke Whitfield  
Granger Rice (NY) Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Hanna Rogers (AL)  
Herrera Beutler Sanchez, Loretta  
Miller (FL) Speier  
Norcross Takai  
O'Rourke Whitfield  
Rice (NY) Yarmuth

□ 1336

Mr. POE of Texas 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. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to being unavoidably detained, I missed the following rollcall vote: No. 239 on May 25, 2016. If present, I would have voted:

Rollcall Vote No. 239—On Ordering the Previous Question, “aye”

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 171, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 240]

YEAS—242

Abraham Barletta Bishop (UT)  
Aderholt Barr Black  
Allen Barton Blackburn  
Amash Benishek Blum  
Amodei Bilirakis Bost  
Babin Bishop (MI) Boustany

Brady (TX) Hudson Poliquin  
Brat Huelskamp Pompeo  
Bridenstine Huizenga (MI) Posey  
Brooks (AL) Hultgren Price, Tom  
Brooks (IN) Hunter Ratcliffe  
Buchanan Hurd (TX) Reed  
Buck Hurt (VA) Reichert  
Bucshon Issa Renacci  
Burgess Jenkins (KS) Ribble  
Byrne Jenkins (WV) Rice (SC)  
Calvert Johnson (OH) Rigell  
Carter (GA) Johnson, Sam Roby  
Carter (TX) Jolly Roe (TN)  
Chabot Jones Rogers (AL)  
Chaffetz Jordan Rogers (KY)  
Clawson (FL) Joyce Rohrabacher  
Coffman Katko Rokita  
Cole Kelly (MS) Rooney (FL)  
Collins (GA) Kelly (PA) Ros-Lehtinen  
Collins (NY) King (IA) Roskam  
Comstock King (NY) Ross  
Conaway Kinzinger (IL) Rothfus  
Cook Kline Rouzer  
Costa Knight Royce  
Costello (PA) Labrador Russell  
Crawford LaHood Salmon  
Crenshaw LaMalfa Sanford  
Culberson Lamborn Scalise  
Curbelo (FL) Lance Schweikert  
Davis, Rodney Latta Scott, Austin  
Denham LoBiondo Sensenbrenner  
Dent Long Sessions  
DeSantis Loudermilk Shimkus  
DesJarlais DesJarlais Love  
Diaz-Balart Lucas Simpson  
Dold Dold Luetkemeyer Smith (MO)  
Donovan Donovan Lummis Smith (NE)  
Duffy Duffy MacArthur Smith (NJ)  
Duncan (SC) Duncan (SC) Marchant Smith (TX)  
Duncan (TN) Duncan (TN) Marino  
Ellmers (NC) Ellmers (NC) Massie  
Emmer (MN) Emmer (MN) McCarthy  
Farenthold Farenthold McCaul  
Fitzpatrick Fitzpatrick McClintock  
Fleischmann Fleischmann McHenry  
Fleming Fleming McKinley  
Flores Flores McMorris  
Forbes Forbes Morris  
Fortenberry Fortenberry Rodgers  
Gohmert Gohmert Trotter  
Goodlatte Goodlatte Turner  
Gosar Gosar Meadows  
Gowdy Gowdy Meehan  
Graves (GA) Graves (GA) Messer  
Graves (LA) Graves (LA) Neugebauer  
Graves (MO) Graves (MO) Newhouse  
Griffith Griffith Whitfield  
Grothman Grothman Williams  
Guinta Guinta Nunes  
Guthrie Guthrie Olson  
Hardy Hardy Palazzo  
Harper Harper Palmer  
Harris Harris Paulsen  
Hartzler Hartzler Pearce  
Heck (NV) Heck (NV) Perry  
Hensarling Hensarling Peterson  
Hice, Jody B. Hice, Jody B. Pittenger  
Hill Hill Pitts  
Holding Holding Poe (TX)

NAYS—171

Adams Cartwright DeBene  
Aguilar Aguilar Castor (FL) DeSaulnier  
Ashford Ashford Chu, Judy Deutch  
Bass Cicilline Dingell  
Beatty Clark (MA) Doggett  
Becerra Clarke (NY) Doyle, Michael  
Bera Clay F.  
Beyer Cleaver Duckworth  
Bishop (GA) Clyburn Edwards  
Blumenauer Cohen Ellison  
Bonamici Bonamici Connolly  
Boyle, Brendan Conyers Engel  
F. Cooper Esty  
Brady (PA) Courtney Farr  
Brown (FL) Crowley Foster  
Brownley (CA) Cuellar Frankel (FL)  
Bustos Cummings Fudge  
Davis (CA) Davis (CA) Gabbard  
Capps Davis, Danny Gallego  
Capuano DeFazio Garamendi  
Carney Delaney Graham  
Carson (IN) Carson (IN) DeLauro Grayson



Green, Al	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Grijalva	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Sarbanes
Gutiérrez	Lynch	Schakowsky
Hahn	Maloney, Carolyn	Schiff
Hastings	Maloney, Sean	Schrader
Heck (WA)	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Higgins	McCollum	Scott, David
Himes	McDermott	Serrano
Honda	McGovern	Sewell (AL)
Hoyer	McNerney	Sherman
Huffman	Meeks	Sinema
Israel	Meng	Sires
Jackson Lee	Moore	Slaughter
Jeffries	Moulton	Smith (WA)
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (FL)	Speier
Kaptur	Nadler	Swalwell (CA)
Keating	Napolitano	Takano
Kelly (IL)	Neal	Thompson (CA)
Kennedy	Nolan	Thompson (MS)
Kildee	Pallone	Titus
Kilmer	Pascrell	Tonko
Kind	Payne	Torres
Kirkpatrick	Perlmutter	Tsongas
Kuster	Pingree	Van Hollen
Langevin	Pocan	Vargas
Larsen (WA)	Polis	Veasey
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Vela
Lawrence	Quigley	Velázquez
Lee	Rangel	Visclosky
Levin	Richmond	Walz
Lewis	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Lieu, Ted	Ruiz	Schultz
Lipinski	Ruppberger	Waters, Maxine
Loeb sack	Rush	Watson Coleman
Lofgren	Ryan (OH)	Welch
Lowenthal		Wilson (FL)
Lowey		

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
 The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, May 24, 2016, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI), had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 80, line 12.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
 The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

- Amendment by Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
- Amendment by Mr. MCNERNEY of California.
- Amendment by Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
- Amendment by Mr. BUCK of Colorado.
- Amendment by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.
- Amendment by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.
- The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

McDermott	Richmond	Smith (WA)
Meadows	Roby	Stefanik
Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Stutzman
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Swalwell (CA)
Miller (FL)	Rokita	Takano
Miller (MI)	Rooney (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Murphy (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (PA)
Murphy (PA)	Ross	Vargas
Nadler	Rothfus	Walker
Napolitano	Royce	Walorski
Newhouse	Russell	Wasserman
Nugent	Ryan (OH)	Schultz
Pascrell	Sánchez, Linda T.	Webster (FL)
Perry	Schakowsky	Wenstrup
Peterson	Schweikert	Williams
Poliquin	Sessions	Wilson (SC)
Polis	Sinema	Yoho
Posey	Sires	Young (AK)
Reed	Smith (NJ)	Zinke
Rice (SC)		

NOT VOTING—20

Cárdenas	Green, Gene	Pelosi
Castro (TX)	Hanna	Peters
Cramer	Herrera Beutler	Rice (NY)
DeGette	Hinojosa	Sanchez, Loretta
Fattah	Johnson (GA)	Takai
Fincher	Norcross	Yarmuth
Granger	O'Rourke	

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLAWSON OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 143, noes 275, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 241]  
 AYES—143

Amash	Crawford	Heck (WA)
Amodei	Crenshaw	Himes
Ashford	Curbelo (FL)	Huizenga (MI)
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Hunter
Benishak	DeFazio	Hurt (VA)
Bera	DeGette	Johnson (GA)
Beyer	Delaney	Johnson (OH)
Bilirakis	DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.
Blum	DeBene	Jolly
Bonamici	Denham	Jones
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeSantis	Jordan
Brady (PA)	DeSaulnier	Katko
Brady (TX)	Deutch	Kildee
Brat	Diaz-Balart	Kilmer
Brown (FL)	Doyle, Michael F.	King (IA)
Brownley (CA)	Duncan (SC)	Kirkpatrick
Buchanan	Duncan (TN)	LaHood
Burgess	Esty	Larsen (WA)
Bustos	Farenthold	Larson (CT)
Byrne	Frankel (FL)	Lieu, Ted
Capuano	Gabbard	Lipinski
Carmey	Garamendi	Loeb sack
Carter (GA)	Gibson	Lofgren
Castor (FL)	Graham	Loudermilk
Chabot	Grayson	Love
Clawson (FL)	Griffith	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Cohen	Harris	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Collins (GA)	Hastings	Maloney, Sean
Courtney		

NOES—275

Abraham	Foster	Maloney, Carolyn
Adams	Fox	Marchant
Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	Marino
Aguilar	Frelinghuysen	Massie
Allen	Fudge	Matsui
Babin	Gallego	McCarthy
Barr	Garrett	Gibbs
Barton	Gibbs	McCaul
Bass	Gohmert	McClintock
Beatty	Goodlatte	McCollum
Becerra	Gosar	McGovern
Bishop (GA)	Gowdy	McHenry
Bishop (MI)	Graves (LA)	McKinley
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	McMorris
Black	Green, Al	Rodgers
Blackburn	Green, Gene	McNerney
Blumenauer	Grijalva	McSally
Bost	Grothman	Meeks
Boustany	Guinta	Meng
Bridenstine	Guthrie	Messer
Brooks (AL)	Gutiérrez	Moolenaar
Brooks (IN)	Hahn	Mooney (WV)
Buck	Hardy	Moore
Bucshon	Harper	Moulton
Butterfield	Hartzler	Mullin
Calvert	Heck (NV)	Mulvaney
Capps	Hensarling	Neal
Carson (IN)	Hice, Jody B.	Neugebauer
Carter (TX)	Higgins	Noem
Cartwright	Hill	Nolan
Chaffetz	Hinojosa	Nunes
Chu, Judy	Holding	Olson
Cicilline	Honda	Palazzo
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	Pallone
Clarke (NY)	Hudson	Palmer
Clay	Huelskamp	Paulsen
Cleaver	Huffman	Payne
Clyburn	Hultgren	Pearce
Coffman	Hurd (TX)	Perlmutter
Cole	Israel	Peters
Collins (NY)	Issa	Pingree
Comstock	Jackson Lee	Pittenger
Conaway	Jeffries	Pitts
Connolly	Jenkins (KS)	Pocan
Conyers	Jenkins (WV)	Poe (TX)
Cook	Johnson, Sam	Pompeo
Cooper	Joyce	Price (NC)
Costa	Kaptur	Price, Tom
Costello (PA)	Keating	Quigley
Cramer	Kelly (IL)	Rangel
Crowley	Kelly (MS)	Ratcliffe
Cuellar	Kelly (PA)	Reichert
Culberson	Kennedy	Renacci
Cummings	Kind	Ribble
Davis (CA)	King (NY)	Rigell
Davis, Danny	Kline	Roe (TN)
Dent	Knight	Rohrabacher
DesJarlais	Kuster	Roskam
Dingell	Labrador	Rouzer
Doggett	LaMalfa	Roybal-Allard
Dold	Lamborn	Ruiz
Donovan	Lance	Ruppberger
Duckworth	Langevin	Rush
Duffy	Latta	Salmon
Edwards	Lawrence	Sanford
Ellison	Lee	Sarbanes
Ellmers (NC)	Levin	Scalise
Emmer (MN)	Lewis	Schiff
Engel	LoBiondo	Schrader
Eshoo	Long	Scott (VA)
Farr	Lowenthal	Scott, Austin
Fitzpatrick	Lowey	Scott, David
Fleischmann	Lucas	Sensenbrenner
Fleming	Luetkemeyer	Serrano
Flores	Lummis	Sewell (AL)
Forbes	Lynch	Sherman
Fortenberry	MacArthur	Shimkus

**ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 743 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5055.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1344

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5055) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.