

I want to respond quickly to some of my friend's points, Mr. Speaker, and I want to go back to the essential reality that we are facing.

Number 1, last year, when the President asked for \$1 billion more for NIH, we said: That is not enough. We are going to give you two.

Last year the President submitted a request for CDC. We looked at it and said: You know, it is not enough. You evidently don't care enough about public health, Mr. President. We are going to spend more money.

This year he brought us a request to try and take \$1 billion of discretionary funding away from NIH. My friends on the other side were as appalled as we were. We said: No, Mr. President, you are not going to take \$1 billion out of NIH in a dangerous time of disease. We are not only going to keep that money there, we are going to put more money, additional money than you asked for.

We said the same thing about the CDC, and so we will do it.

In terms of what has been done, the minute the Zika virus appeared and the administration asked for emergency money, HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the committee, responded and said: Spend whatever it takes.

And, indeed, the administration has done that.

My friends seem to suggest that there is something that hasn't been done, yet they never tell us what that one thing is.

The reality is the administration has had the money to do everything it has wanted to do. This bill provides more money on top of that. Our Senators are proposing even more, so we go to conference to figure out the appropriate amount and whether or not and to what degree it should be paid for. I would hope it is all paid for. It should be because we have the funds to do that.

So to suggest that there is some sort of failure of funding is simply not true, and my friends know it is not true. To suggest that we are not willing to put the money here would suggest that recent history has no relevance, because we have put more money here than the President asked us to put, and we have committed to put even more going forward.

The only difference here, and what drives my friends into a frenzy, is that we actually want to pay for this. They simply don't. They think, let's just put another \$1.9 billion on the national credit card. This is a great excuse to do that.

Well, we are not prepared to do that, but we are prepared to respond to the legitimate needs of the American people and use the resources that we have.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I agree with my colleagues on the other side. We should address the issue. We disagree with the other body on how to do it, and we will go on from there.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues in conference on these important issues.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 751 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

On page 2, line 4, insert "as modified by the amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution" before the semicolon.

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

SEC.2. The amendment referred to in section 1(a) is as follows: Strike divisions B and C and insert the text of H.R. 5044 as introduced.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

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 House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5055.

Will the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1030

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. RIBBLE (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on May 25, 2016, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through 80, line 15.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS) having assumed the chair, Mr. RIBBLE Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration 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, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry

amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 743, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LANGEVIN. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Langevin moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5055 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In the "Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation" account on page 53, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

In the "Federal Salaries and Expenses" account on page 54, line 14, after the dollar amount relating to the National Nuclear Security Administration, insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which would not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is simple. It adds \$20 million to nuclear nonproliferation accounts so that nuclear materials do not fall into the wrong hands.

The possibility that terrorists or rogue nations will acquire nuclear weapons, fissile material, or radiological material that could be used in a dirty bomb are among the gravest threats facing our Nation and the international community.

Right now, luckily—though there are, of course, exceptions—these most dangerous weapons are in the hands of responsible actors. We cannot allow that dynamic to shift, and we must ensure that these weapons never fall into the hands of bad actors who would seek to do us or the rest of the international community harm.

However, today, there is more fissile material in the world than at any other time in our history, and the bad actors are taking notice. According to several studies conducted at Harvard, at least two terrorist groups—al Qaeda and the Japanese terror cult Aum

Shinrikyo—have made serious efforts to buy, steal, or otherwise obtain nuclear weapons in recent years.

There is clear evidence that ISIL would, if given the opportunity, strive to do us great harm. After all, it only takes a grapefruit-sized amount of highly enriched uranium to make a nuclear weapon, and there are hundreds of metric tons of material out there, some of which is still vulnerable to theft. Now, according to reports, ISIL has been monitoring a senior official of a Belgian facility, by way of example, with substantial stocks of highly enriched uranium.

We absolutely cannot assume the risk that the United States would be ambushed by a rogue nuclear threat, and we must not leave ourselves exposed to a threat that would forever change our American way of life. While we can never protect against every threat, we can, however, mitigate it by working with our international partners, Federal agencies, national laboratories, and the private sector to more quickly secure and eliminate vulnerable nuclear materials.

Small investments, such as the ones offered in this amendment, can yield significant national security benefits. By moving \$20 million into the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation account, we would ultimately make our country—and the world—a safer place to live.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has worked across the aisle on this issue many times before, and we have seen some incredible success stories that have a profound impact on the security of our nuclear materials.

During the fiscal year 2012 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill, the House approved an amendment—by a voice vote, no less—offered by Congressman FORTENBERRY and Congresswoman SÁNCHEZ to do exactly what this motion to recommit seeks to do today.

Their amendment to increase appropriations for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative under the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation account was enthusiastically supported on both sides of this Chamber, securing an important bipartisan victory for the international effort to secure vulnerable fissile material and keeping our Nation safe from the threat of nuclear terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, this House did not cower when faced with this challenge back then, and we must not do so today. Let today be another one of those bipartisan success stories. Let us redouble our efforts to prevent the proliferation and catastrophic abuse of sensitive nuclear materials and technologies across the globe and here at home.

I beseech my fellow Members, adopt this amendment, keep our Nation safe, and deny the nuclear terrorists who would seek to do us harm their own success story.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5055, is a good bill that invests \$37.4 billion in priorities we can all support—national security, critical water resources, infrastructure projects for our districts, and energy independence—through an all-of-the-above approach.

First and foremost, this legislation is a defense bill. \$19.44 billion out of the \$37.4 billion, or 51 percent, is dedicated toward our national security. Carrying out our Nation's nuclear deterrence mission is, in part, the responsibility of the Department of Energy; while DOD provides delivery vehicles and operators, DOE provides nuclear warheads themselves.

Congress provides funding for this critical defense mission through the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill. As we drafted this bill, we carefully considered 2,700 Member requests. This legislation addresses 95 percent of those requests in one form or another. This included four requests from Democratic Members to fund nonproliferation programs at the budget request level of \$1.8 billion, which this bill does.

I agree that nonproliferation is a critical part of our overall nuclear defense strategy. We need to be doing everything we can to keep dangerous nuclear materials away from rogue nations and terrorists. Extra funding for DOE nonproliferation programs, however, is not the only way to do this. We must also provide for a strong defense capability, and this bill accomplishes that.

While I appreciate the passion for the nonproliferation and securing these materials abroad, I would also like to see the same passion for securing these materials at home. While the prospect of a terrorist getting hold of nuclear materials in the Middle East, Africa, or East Asia is terrifying, the prospect of them getting ahold of these materials in Tennessee, Texas, or California is even more so.

In 2012, three peace activists—a drifter, an 82-year-old nun, and a house painter—penetrated the exterior of the Y-12 National Security Complex in Tennessee, supposedly one of the most secure nuclear facilities in the United States. If they had been terrorists armed with explosives, that scenario would be frightening to imagine. That is why this funding in this bill is so critical.

The bill increases funding \$30 million above the request to improve security at aging nuclear weapons facilities to make sure our own nuclear materials are secure on our home soil and address a backlog of \$2 billion in security upgrades needed at nuclear weapons facilities.

In a tight fiscal environment, we need to be making these investments at our own nuclear facilities, not spending American taxpayer dollars to perform work in Russia's nuclear facilities.

In addition to these investments, the bill also continues prohibitions on funding for nonproliferation projects in Russia, which is spending billions of dollars on its own nuclear modernization.

In all, this is a fiscally responsible, economically smart, and critically important national security bill. It deserves to be passed quickly without further changes or delays.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion and to support the underlying bill.

Lastly, let me say, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate every Member of this body, on both sides of the aisle, for the 2 days of debate we have put in for the amendments that we have debated and the respectful debate that we have had on a lot of important issues. It has been a good debate, and I look forward to seeing my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who had some of their amendments adopted now voting for this bill because of the amendments that were adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote against this motion to recommit and vote for passage of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. 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 the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 5055; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 751; and adoption of House Resolution 751, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 178, nays 236, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

YEAS—178

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

Hastings	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda	Rogers (AL)	Shuster	Walden
Heck (WA)	Maloney,	T.	Rogers (KY)	Simpson	Walker
Higgins	Carolyn	Sanchez, Loretta	Rohrabacher	Smith (MO)	Walorski
Himes	Maloney, Sean	Sarbanes	Rokita	Smith (NE)	Walters, Mimi
Hinojosa	Matsui	Schakowsky	Rooney (FL)	Smith (NJ)	Weber (TX)
Honda	McCollum	Schiff	Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Webster (FL)
Hoyer	McDermott	Schrader	Roskam	Stefanik	Wenstrup
Huffman	McGovern	Scott (VA)	Ross	Stewart	Westerman
Israel	McNerney	Scott, David	Rothfus	Stivers	Westmoreland
Jackson Lee	Meeks	Serrano	Rouzer	Stutzman	Williams
Jeffries	Meng	Sewell (AL)	Royce	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Johnson, E. B.	Moore	Sherman	Russell	Thornberry	Wittman
Kaptur	Moulton	Sinema	Salmon	Tiberi	Womack
Keating	Murphy (FL)	Sires	Sanford	Tipton	Woodall
Kelly (IL)	Nadler	Slaughter	Scalise	Trott	Yoder
Kennedy	Napolitano	Smith (WA)	Schweikert	Turner	Yoho
Kildee	Neal	Speier	Scott, Austin	Upton	Young (AK)
Kilmer	Nolan	Swalwell (CA)	Sensenbrenner	Valadao	Young (IA)
Kind	Norcross	Takano	Sessions	Wagner	Young (IN)
Kirkpatrick	Pallone	Thompson (CA)	Shimkus	Walberg	Zeldin
Kuster	Pascrell	Thompson (MS)			
Langevin	Payne	Titus			
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Tonko			
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Torres			
Lawrence	Peters	Tsongas			
Lee	Peterson	Van Hollen			
Levin	Pingree	Vargas			
Lewis	Pocan	Veasey			
Lieu, Ted	Polis	Vela			
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Velázquez			
Loebach	Quigley	Visclosky			
Lofgren	Richmond	Walz			
Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman			
Lowe	Ruiz	Schultz			
Lujan Grisham	Ruppersberger	Waters, Maxine			
(NM)	Rush	Watson Coleman			
Luján, Ben Ray	Ryan (OH)	Welch			
(NM)		Wilson (FL)			

NAYS—236

Abraham	Farenthold	Lance
Aderholt	Fitzpatrick	Latta
Allen	Fleischmann	LoBiondo
Amash	Fleming	Long
Amodei	Flores	Loudermilk
Babin	Forbes	Love
Barletta	Fortenberry	Lucas
Barr	Fox	Luetkemeyer
Barton	Frelinghuysen	Lummis
Benishek	Garrett	MacArthur
Bilirakis	Gibbs	Marchant
Bishop (MI)	Gibson	Marino
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	Massie
Black	Goodlatte	McCarthy
Blackburn	Gosar	McCaul
Blum	Gowdy	McClintock
Bost	Granger	McHenry
Boustany	Graves (GA)	McKinley
Brady (TX)	Graves (LA)	McMorris
Brat	Graves (MO)	Rodgers
Bridenstine	Griffith	McSally
Brooks (AL)	Grothman	Meadows
Brooks (IN)	Guinta	Meehan
Buchanan	Guthrie	Messer
Buck	Hardy	Mica
Bucshon	Harper	Miller (FL)
Burgess	Harris	Miller (MI)
Byrne	Hartzler	Moolenaar
Calvert	Heck (NV)	Mooney (WV)
Carter (GA)	Hensarling	Mullin
Carter (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Mulvaney
Chabot	Hill	Murphy (PA)
Chaffetz	Holding	Neugebauer
Clawson (FL)	Hudson	Newhouse
Coffman	Huelskamp	Noem
Cole	Huizenga (MI)	Nugent
Collins (GA)	Hultgren	Nunes
Collins (NY)	Hunter	Olson
Comstock	Hurd (TX)	Palazzo
Conaway	Hurt (VA)	Palmer
Cook	Issa	Paulsen
Costa	Jenkins (WV)	Pearce
Costello (PA)	Johnson (OH)	Perry
Crawford	Johnson, Sam	Pittenger
Crenshaw	Jolly	Pitts
Culberson	Jones	Poe (TX)
Curbelo (FL)	Jordan	Poliquin
Davis, Rodney	Joyce	Pompeo
Denham	Katko	Posey
Dent	Kelly (MS)	Price, Tom
DeSantis	Kelly (PA)	Ratcliffe
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Reed
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Reichert
Dold	Kinzinger (IL)	Renacci
Donovan	Kline	Ribble
Duncan (SC)	Knight	Rice (SC)
Duncan (TN)	Labrador	Rigell
Elmiers (NC)	LaHood	Roby
Emmer (MN)	LaMalfa	Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)	Shuster	Walden
Rogers (KY)	Simpson	Walker
Rohrabacher	Smith (MO)	Walorski
Rokita	Smith (NE)	Walters, Mimi
Rooney (FL)	Smith (NJ)	Weber (TX)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Webster (FL)
Roskam	Stefanik	Wenstrup
Ross	Stewart	Westerman
Rothfus	Stivers	Westmoreland
Rouzer	Stutzman	Williams
Royce	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Russell	Thornberry	Wittman
Salmon	Tiberi	Womack
Sanford	Tipton	Woodall
Scalise	Trott	Yoder
Schweikert	Turner	Yoho
Scott, Austin	Upton	Young (AK)
Sensenbrenner	Valadao	Young (IA)
Sessions	Wagner	Young (IN)
Shimkus	Walberg	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—19

Cárdenas	Hanna	Rice (NY)
Castro (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Takai
Cramer	Jenkins (KS)	Whitfield
Duffy	Johnson (GA)	Yarmuth
Fattah	Lamborn	Zinke
Fincher	O'Rourke	
Franks (AZ)	Rangel	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1103

Messrs. POE of Texas, SHUSTER, and ROHRABACHER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. MCCOLLUM changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 112, nays 305, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 266]

YEAS—112

Ashford	Granger	Paulsen
Barr	Green, Gene	Peterson
Benishek	Grothman	Poliquin
Bishop (UT)	Hardy	Pompeo
Boustany	Hill	Price, Tom
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Reed
Brooks (IN)	Hurd (TX)	Reichert
Bucshon	Hurt (VA)	Renacci
Byrne	Issa	Rigell
Calvert	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (KY)
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Carter (TX)	Jolly	Rokita
Chaffetz	Joyce	Rooney (FL)
Coffman	Katko	Ros-Lehtinen
Cole	King (NY)	Royce
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Salmon
Comstock	Kline	Scalise
Cook	Knight	Schweikert
Costa	LaHood	Shimkus
Costello (PA)	Lance	Simpson
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Cuellar	Love	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Lummis	Stefanik
Curbelo (FL)	MacArthur	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Massie	Stivers
Denham	McCarthy	Thornberry
Dent	McClintock	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	McHenry	Tipton
Dold	McKinley	Turner
Donovan	McMorris	Upton
Emmer (MN)	Rodgers	Valadao
Emmer (MN)	McSally	Vela
Emmer (MN)	Meehan	Walden
Emmer (MN)	Messer	Walters, Mimi
Emmer (MN)	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)
Emmer (MN)	Nunes	

Womack Young (AK)
Woodall Young (IA)

NAYS—305

Abraham Franks (AZ)
Adams McGovern
Aderholt Fudge
Aguiar Gabbard
Allen Gallego
Amash Garamendi
Amodei Garrett
Babin Gohmert
Barletta Goodlatte
Barton Gosar
Bass Gowdy
Beatty Graham
Becerra Graves (GA)
Bera Graves (LA)
Beyer Graves (MO)
Bilirakis Grayson
Bishop (GA) Green, Al
Bishop (MI) Griffith
Black Grijalva
Blackburn Guinta
Blum Guthrie
Blumenauer Gutiérrez
Bonamici Hahn
Bost Harper
Boyle, Brendan Harris
F. Hartzler
Brady (PA) Heck (NV)
Brat Heck (WA)
Bridenstine Hensarling
Brooks (AL) Hice, Jody B.
Brown (FL) Higgins
Brownley (CA) Himes
Buchanan Hinojosa
Buck Holding
Burgess Honda
Bustos Hoyer
Butterfield Hudson
Capps Huelskamp
Capuano Huffman
Carney Huizenga (MI)
Carson (IN) Hultgren
Cartwright Israel
Castor (FL) Jackson Lee
Chabot Jeffries
Chu, Judy Johnson (GA)
Cicilline Johnson, E. B.
Clark (MA) Johnson, Sam
Clarke (NY) Jones
Clawson (FL) Jordan
Clay Kaptur
Cleaver Keating
Clyburn Kelly (IL)
Cohen Kelly (MS)
Collins (GA) Kelly (PA)
Conaway Kennedy
Connolly Kildee
Conyers Kilmer
Cooper Kind
Courtney King (IA)
Crawford Kirkpatrick
Crowley Kuster
Cummings Labrador
Davis (CA) LaMalfa
Davis, Danny Langevin
DeFazio Larsen (WA)
DeGette Larson (CT)
Delaney Latta
DeLauro Lawrence
DelBene Lee
DeSantis Levin
DeSaulnier Lewis
DesJarlais Lieu, Ted
Deutch Lipinski
Dingell Loeb sack
Doggett Lofgren
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth Lowenthal
Duncan (SC) Lowey
Duncan (TN) Lucas
Edwards Luetkemeyer
Ellison Lujan Grisham
Ellmers (NC) (NM)
Engel Luján, Ben Ray
Eshoo (NM)
Esty Lynch
Farenthold Maloney,
Farr Carolyn
Fleischmann Maloney, Sean
Fleming Marchant
Flores Marino
Forbes Matsui
Fortenberry McCaul
Foster McCollum
Frankel (FL) McDermott

Young (IN)
Zeldin

Trott
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg

Cárdenas
Castro (TX)
Cramer
Duffy
Fattah
Fincher

Walker
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Hanna
Herrera Beutler
Jenkins (KS)
Lamborn
O'Rourke
Rice (NY)

Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Yoder
Yoho

Takai
Whitfield
Yarmuth
Zinke

□ 1112

So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2577, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 751) relating to consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 180, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

YEAS—236

Abraham Chaffetz
Aderholt Clawson (FL)
Allen Coffman
Amash Cole
Amodei Collins (GA)
Babin Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes

Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren

Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummi
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica

Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon

NAYS—180

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

Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin

Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Pallone
Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)