

from the Gig Harbor Rotary Club. Having a group of Rotarians honor a Lions Club member is a big deal.

Beyond that service to community, though, he is also a servant when it comes to our kids. He served on the board of the Communities In Schools group in the Peninsula School District and on the Peninsula Schools Education Foundation board. He writes a Kids' Corner column in the Peninsula Gateway. Anytime there is a kid in our neck of the woods doing something cool, Hugh McMillan is there with a camera to take their picture and make them feel special.

I am just very grateful for all he does on behalf of kids and on behalf of our community and our country, and I am proud to call him a friend.

A DAUGHTER WILL NOT BE WITH HER FATHER THIS FATHER'S DAY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a Texas father wrote me this week:

"I heard your statements . . . about removing the so-called judge in the Stanford swimmer's rape case. I do hope you pursue this all the way to his elimination.

"As the father of a daughter that was raped a number of years ago while she was jogging at night near a college campus in Texas, I would even consider the death penalty for the perpetrator. Why? Because that is what happened to my daughter. The feeling of violation and uncleanness caused her to take her own life in later years. The judge does not know the meaning of rape and the effects it has on a female."

Mr. Speaker, the father is correct. Rape victims live lives of quiet hopelessness and despair. That is why the weak-kneed judges like the one in California need to be removed.

Sunday is Father's Day, and I will be with my 4 kids and 11 grandkids. The father I referenced here will not be with his daughter. We must deliver justice for rape victims, daughters, and families because, Mr. Speaker, justice is what we do in America.

And that is just the way it is.

HONORING LEON LEGGETT AND HERBERT ROGERS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Leon Leggett and Herbert Rogers, two distinguished American veterans who served in the Korean war from 1950 to 1953.

On June 25, the American Legion's Post 9 in the First Congressional District of Georgia will present both men with South Korea's Ambassador of Peace Medal.

South Korea offers the Peace Medal to all U.S. servicemen and -women who served in the Korean war as an expression of gratitude for their service. During the Korean war, nearly 40,000 Americans sacrificed their lives and over 100,000 were wounded. This reward is certainly well deserved by Mr. Leggett and Mr. Rogers.

Making the ceremony even more unique is that Mr. Rogers and Mr. Leggett will be only the third and fourth people from the American Legion Post 9 who have been awarded the Peace Medal. I am proud to recognize these two veterans from the First Congressional District of Georgia, and I thank them for their service to the United States.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 781

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Davidson.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Davidson.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5053, PREVENTING IRS ABUSE AND PROTECTING FREE SPEECH ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5293, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 778 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 778

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5053) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from requiring that the identity of contributors to 501(c) organizations be included in annual returns. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-58 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 and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5293) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 3. Section 10002 of H.R. 5293 shall be considered to be a spending reduction account for purposes of section 3(d) of House Resolution 5.

SEC. 4. (a) During consideration of H.R. 5293, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment proposing both a decrease in an appropriation designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and an increase in an appropriation not so designated, or vice versa.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to an amendment between the Houses.

SEC. 5. During consideration of H.R. 5293, section 3304 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 shall not apply.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 1 hour.

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

□ 1230

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STIVERS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for H.R. 5053, the Preventing IRS Abuse and Protecting Free Speech Act, and H.R. 5293, the fiscal year 2017 Department of Defense Appropriations Act. House Resolution 778 provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 5053 and a general debate rule for H.R. 5293.

The resolution provides 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means for H.R. 5053, and 1 hour equally divided between the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations for H.R. 5293. The resolution also provides for a motion to recommit for H.R. 5053, with or without

instructions. In addition, the rule includes provisions related to budget enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution and the underlying legislation. Under current law, 501(c) nonprofit organizations are required to collect personally identifiable information on what are known as substantial donors and report that information to the IRS. Substantial donors are defined as individuals who donate \$5,000 or more to an organization during the course of the calendar year.

Normally, that information is reported by 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organizations. However, the IRS expanded the substantial reporting requirement to all tax-exempt organizations through the use of Form 990.

The security of personal information of American taxpayers is vital. The IRS doesn't normally make this information public, yet there have been instances involving IRS employees improperly accessing this information and even releasing it to the public. One particular instance saw the National Organization for Marriage have its donor list information publicly disclosed in 2012.

In California, Mr. Speaker, the State attorney general wanted to require that the information reported is made public, which prompted a lawsuit. In April of this year, the U.S. district court ruled that requiring an organization to disclose its donor list is unconstitutional.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle may make the accusation that this bill will allow for a flood of foreign money into our elections. Mr. Speaker, this argument rings hollow for two reasons.

First, we have laws on the books to specifically protect against that very thing. It is called the Bank Secrecy Act. Federal regulations under that law require every bank to file information with the Treasury Department and report any suspicious transactions relevant to a possible violation of law or regulation. H.R. 5053 does not change the Bank Secrecy Act or those regulations in any way.

Second, and more importantly, the IRS doesn't even have authority to share this information with the two organizations that enforce campaign finance laws: the Federal Election Commission and the Department of Justice. So only in limited circumstances in which there is already evidence of a criminal act can these tax privacy laws allow the IRS to share this information. The problem is the IRS doesn't share this information anyway. It is up to the Federal Election Commission and the Justice Department to enforce those laws, and they do so already.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the district court ruling because American citizens have a right under the First Amendment to free speech and free association. The IRS has demonstrated in the past that many of their employees do not adequately protect personally iden-

tifiable information of American taxpayers. Individuals should not be forced to disclose how much of their hard-earned money and to whom they donate to charity.

Even the Director of Exempt Organizations at the Internal Revenue Service has publicly stated that the IRS is considering removing Schedule B themselves. Let me repeat that. This is a democratically appointed Director of Exempt Organizations at the Internal Revenue Service. This individual said that the IRS is considering removing Schedule B themselves. That is exactly what this bill does. That makes this a bipartisan bill.

I hope my colleagues will support this measure. It makes sense.

The second underlying bill is the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2017. The legislation includes \$517 billion for our national security, a slight increase over last year's enacted level.

The legislation includes \$58.6 billion in funding to fight the global war on terror, which includes funding for our forces in the field as well as support to key allies to resist aggression from nation-states and terrorist groups.

The bill includes a small 2.1 percent pay raise for our military, which is more than the 1.6 percent requested by the administration, and it includes \$34 billion for the Defense Health Program to provide care for our troops, their families, and retired members of the armed services.

Important investments in cancer research, traumatic brain injury, psychological health research, and suicide prevention outreach as well as sexual assault prevention programs are also included in this bill.

A well-equipped, well-trained, effective military providing for the common defense of our Nation is our most basic constitutional responsibility. This bill helps preserve our military as the most capable and superior armed force in the world, while providing funds necessary to fight America's enemies abroad.

While there will be amendments offered by colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the days to come, Mr. Speaker, the rule here today is only for general debate of the overall bill. I look forward to continuing the debate on these policies with our House colleagues, and I urge support for the underlying bills.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I get into the substance of the rule and the underlying bills that the rule would allow to be considered, I do want to take a moment to reflect on what happened yesterday here in the House of Representatives.

In the aftermath of this terrible tragedy in Orlando, the Speaker of the House asked for a moment of silence to pray for the victims: those who lost their lives, those who were injured, and their families. We stood here and, for 10 seconds, had a moment of silence.

One of our leaders, Mr. CLYBURN, sought to get the Speaker's attention to ask a question. Basically, the question was: Is that it? What about legislation? What about action to prevent these types of tragedies from happening in the future? He was gavelled down.

There was a lot of outrage here on the House floor, and I think justifiably so. We have been on this floor calling for moments of silence after terrible tragedies like the one in Orlando again and again and again. It is not enough. Surely, this Congress, Democrats and Republicans, can come together and do more than just have a moment of silence.

Mr. CLYBURN was asking about whether or not we could bring to the floor the bill that basically says that, if you are a suspected terrorist and you are on the FBI's no-fly list, then you ought not to be able to go into a gun store and buy a weapon of war, could that come up for a debate and could we have a vote on that.

He was also going to raise the issue about whether or not we can revisit legislation that would call for a ban on assault weapons. The weapon that this killer used was an assault weapon, and it was perfectly legal for him to buy. Is it worth a discussion as to whether or not we ought to place limits on the purchase of such weapons?

He was also going to raise the issue about whether or not we could pass the Hate Crimes Prevention Act, a bill that would prevent criminals who have been convicted of misdemeanor assaults against a victim based on his or her race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or disability from causing further harm with a gun.

This is common sense, and both parties need to come together and take action. For the life of me, I can't understand why there is a hesitancy by the leadership of this House to grapple with some of these issues. It is just not enough to come here after terrible tragedies like the one in Orlando, where 49 people lost their lives and 53 were wounded, and just have a moment of silence. It is becoming an empty gesture. We need to follow it up with action.

The American people, I don't care what their political ideology or political party may be, want us to do something. Instead, all we can do is have a moment of silence. I would just say to my colleagues: It is not enough. It is time for action.

Mr. Speaker, getting to this rule, I rise in strong opposition to the rule, which provides for consideration of H.R. 5053, the so-called Preventing IRS Abuse and Protecting Free Speech Act, under a completely closed process. No amendments can be made in order.

The rule also provides for general debate of H.R. 5293, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for 2017, and we expect the Rules Committee to report a structured rule later today for consideration of amendments to that legislation.

When Speaker RYAN was elected to preside over the House, he made a promise to return to regular order. He promised to fix this broken House by making changes to the process by which the House does business. He promised to “open up the process,” to “let people participate.” He said it would be a “relief” to the American people if we were to get our act together.

Well, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we are light-years away from regular order and have yet to get our act together. We are here on the floor of this House considering another two pieces of legislation under rules that violate the Speaker’s promise of an open process for both the majority and the minority.

□ 1245

This week, the Republican leadership has chosen to shut down the appropriations process even further, with the majority on the Rules Committee indicating that they will issue a structured rule for consideration of amendments to the FY17 Defense Appropriations bill.

Now I am saddened by the recent events that have led to the shutdown of the appropriations process, and by the fact that my conservative Republican colleagues voted down their own appropriations bill because it included an amendment to protect LGBT rights, which was adopted during consideration of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill a few weeks ago.

But I shouldn’t be surprised. Last summer, the appropriations process was upended because some of my conservative colleagues refused to vote for legislation that banned the display of the Confederate flag. So this is just more of the same dysfunction and misplaced priorities from this Republican majority.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have yet to issue a single open rule this Congress, and we are now beginning a process that further restricts what little opportunity we once had to offer amendments under a modified-open appropriations process.

And let me say a few words about the Department of Defense Appropriations Act bill that we are set to consider this week.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I oppose and I have been deeply troubled by these endless wars, by continuing to send tens of billions of dollars each year to fund U.S. military operations and wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Libya, and elsewhere.

In the cases of Afghanistan, and especially Iraq and Syria, I believe that this Congress has failed in its most sol-

emn constitutional duty to debate and approve an authorization for the use of military force. I believe that without Congress approving an AUMF, our troops should not be there, quite frankly.

For me, this is not just a matter of principle, it is a matter of the Constitution of the United States and the role and responsibility of the United States Congress. It is also the duty that we owe every single one of our men and women in uniform, to either formally authorize their mission, or to bring them back home to the comfort and security of their families.

Over the years, we have had a few debates on this serious issue, and often those opposed to bringing forward an AUMF will argue that we can’t put in jeopardy the support of our troops.

Well, Mr. Speaker, for those Members who are concerned about cutting off funds for our troops, they must stand up and be counted and oppose this rule and the underlying Defense Appropriations bill.

H.R. 5293 cuts the funds in the overseas contingency operations account so badly that it is estimated that all funds for all U.S. military engagements in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere will run out on or around the end of next April.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you may recall that the defense authorization bill actually sets a date for this national security disaster: April 30, 2017. And while the authors of the Defense Appropriations bill are too coy to name a date, the amount of money is so limited that it is guaranteed to run out just about this time.

Now the Republican leadership is gambling that the next President and the next Congress will pass a supplemental appropriations bill to fund all these wars through the remainder of fiscal year 2017, just scarcely 2 months after being sworn into office.

Even I, as someone who does not support these wars, can see that this is crazy.

How can anyone stand up and say that they support the troops, and then support a bill that knowingly, deliberately, willfully cuts them off at the knees at the beginning of next year? And why did the Republican majority, with eyes wide open, take such a calculated move?

Well, they did it to pump up the funding of some of their favorite pet projects in the defense base budget. They stole \$15.17 billion of OCO funds—that is nearly 27 percent of the OCO budget—funds that were supposed to fund our troops, their equipment, and their supplies for an entire fiscal year, and boosted the base budget.

To take this hypocrisy another step further, the rule that we are debating right now forbids any amendments from being offered that would take money from the base budget and put it back into OCO, not even to fund our troops for 5 months until the end of the fiscal year.

This is ludicrous. This is a disgrace. And this is just one more dishonorable act perpetrated by this Congress against our men and women in uniform. We won’t formally authorize their missions overseas, and now we are not going to fund them for an entire year.

Now, the last piece of irony to this disgusting set of gimmicks is that this type of prohibition in a rule is rarely, if ever, seen.

Why, you ask, Mr. Speaker?

Well, because that type of guidance is generally outlined in a budget resolution.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the budget resolution that the Republican leadership hasn’t brought to the House floor this year because it can’t get a consensus out of its cantankerous caucus, and can’t corral enough votes to even pass a budget resolution.

Enough is enough, Mr. Speaker. We need to bring forward an AUMF for Iraq and Syria, and if we continue to fail to do so, then we should bring our troops home. If the Members of this House can sit here safe and sound, then so should our troops. And we should stop purposely robbing the funding for our troops and using that money for their pet projects and weapons systems in the base budget.

Lastly, let me just say a few words about the other bill that we are considering this week, to constrain the Internal Revenue Service’s ability to enforce our tax laws and reduce transparency.

H.R. 5053 removes one of the only tools available to ensuring that foreign money is not illegally spent by tax-exempt groups in our elections, and I strongly oppose this most recent effort to unleash a new flood of unlimited, anonymous, unaccountable money into our political system.

My colleague mentioned that this was about people being able to give freely to charitable organizations. The charitable organizations that they are referring to are groups like Crossroads GPS, Americans for Prosperity, American Future Fund, funded by—these are the groups headed by Karl Rove and the Koch brothers.

The Koch brothers sent a nice letter to all of us asking us to support this legislation with one goal in mind, to basically keep the American people in the dark. They don’t want you to know all the money that is being pumped in to influence our elections and who is giving that money. They want to keep the American people in the dark.

I think the one lesson on both the Democratic side and the Republican side during this Presidential campaign that is clear, people want us to open up the process. They think this process has been corrupted by money. And rather than opening up the process, this is shutting the process down, shutting transparency, and I think that goes against what both Democrats and Republicans want.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

Really quickly, on the IRS bill, it is already the interpretation of the Federal district court that these contributions should not be made public; that donor lists should not be made public because people have a right to free association and free speech. These are constitutional rights. So to argue that this information that is not allowed to be made public is somehow going to lead to a flood of foreign money, is nonsense.

Also, again, I will reiterate that the Bank Secrecy Act is in place to make sure that that does not happen. So I just wanted to quickly dispel with that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), who is a distinguished member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on H.R. 5293, the fiscal year 2017 Department of Defense Appropriations Act, and to recognize the hard work that the House Appropriations Committee's Defense Subcommittee has put into this bill.

I would also like to thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and all the members of the subcommittee and the Rules Committee for their work on this bill.

This legislation represents an opportunity for Members on both sides of the aisle to work together to provide our Armed Forces the resources they need to keep our country and Americans safe. We ask the courageous men and women who volunteer in our Armed Forces to confront global terrorism, and we must give them the tools to do so.

This year's Defense Appropriations bill, H.R. 5293, funds the programs that are not only essential to our national security, but critical to the welfare of our military personnel.

The Ohio Replacement Program is set to become the most dominant leg of our nuclear triad and is vital to our nuclear deterrence. This bill progresses that project.

Townsend Bombing Range is being expanded to accommodate the needs of the new fifth generation fighters coming online, and offers a unique training aspect for those planes located on the East Coast. This bill helps to clear up ongoing airspace concerns.

The A-10s, the most lethal close air support aircraft in the Air Force's inventory, will continue to be funded, ensuring our warfighters get the close-in air operations they need.

Cyber is, and will continue to be, a major issue for our military, and I commend the committee's focus on establishing cyber protection teams and partnerships with public universities.

End-strength has been another recurring issue, and this bill provides the necessary funding to reduce the strain on the men and women who serve.

Warfighters have also relied on the Joint Surveillance Target Attack

Radar Systems, or JSTARS, for up-to-date information on enemy movements, and this bill ensures our legacy fleet can continue to fly until the Air Force completes this recapitalization program.

Lastly, this bill also provides support to the Army's combat aviation brigades through additional AH-64 Apache helicopters, and the Air Force's airlift capacity is strengthened under the engine enhancement programs for C-130s.

Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the Defense Appropriations Committee have, again, done a tremendous job on making the difficult decisions to prioritize what is most needed for our Armed Forces. I commend the subcommittee on their work.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by a number of reform organizations that are organized to protect the public from the big money and from foreign donations, from the League of Women Voters, to Public Citizen, to Common Cause, to the Campaign Legal Center, the Center for Responsive Politics, Brennan Center for Justice, and so on. There are many more.

I want to submit for the RECORD the letter they sent to every Member of Congress saying, vote "no" on the Roskam bill, and vote against opening loopholes for foreign money.

These organizations believe that we are opening a loophole for more foreign money into our political system. And if that is what you want, then support the bill. I personally do not, and ask that that be part of the RECORD.

REFORM GROUPS URGE NO VOTE ON ROSKAM BILL, H.R. 5053—VOTE AGAINST OPENING LOOPHOLE FOR FOREIGN MONEY

June 13, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Our organizations strongly urge you to oppose H.R. 5053, Representative Peter Roskam's bill that would eliminate the requirement for 501(c) groups to disclose their donors to the IRS.

Our organizations include the Brennan Center for Justice, Campaign Legal Center, Center for Responsive Politics, Common Cause, CREW, Democracy 21, Every Voice, Issue One, League of Women Voters, Public Citizen, Sunlight Foundation, The Rootstrikers Project at Demand Progress and Represent.Us.

The Roskam bill would open the door wide for secret money from foreign donors to be illegally laundered into federal elections through 501(c)(4) and other 501(c) groups. Foreign money cannot be legally spent in U.S. elections, but it can be given to 501(c) groups and they can spend money in our elections. These groups are not required to disclose their donors publicly, but they are required to make non-public disclosure of their donors to the IRS.

This disclosure to the IRS is the only protection citizens have to prevent 501(c)(4) and other 501(c) groups being used to illegally spend foreign money in our elections. The fact that 501(c) groups are required to disclose their donors to the IRS means the groups know that donor information is available as an accountability check against illegal conduct.

If donor disclosure to the IRS by 501(c) groups is eliminated, however, as the Ros-

kam bill would do, no one will be in a position to determine if a 501(c) group illegally spent foreign money in our elections—other than the group and foreign donor involved. Any check will be gone and there will be no way to hold a group and foreign donor accountable for illegally spending foreign money in U.S. elections.

House members should vote against eliminating the existing check against foreign countries, foreign companies and foreign individuals spending money illegally to influence our elections.

We strongly urge you vote to protect the integrity of U.S. elections by voting against H.R. 5053.

Brennan Center for Justice, Campaign Legal Center, Center for Responsive Politics, Common Cause, CREW, Democracy 21, Every Voice, Issue One, League of Women Voters, Public Citizen, Sunlight Foundation, The Rootstrikers Project at Demand Progress, Represent.Us.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up bipartisan legislation that would bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

It is unconscionable that the majority in this House has repeatedly refused to even debate closing such a glaring loophole, which continues to allow suspected terrorists to legally buy firearms.

The country can simply not wait any longer for this Congress to act. And if my friends want to vote against it, then they can vote against it. But denying the ability of this legislation to come to the floor, I think, is just wrong.

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 gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule today and ask that we defeat the previous question.

The IRS portion of this bill that is included in the rule, the debate regarding that, is nothing more than a political messaging debate, and it is politically charged, and it really has no place on this floor today, given the seriousness of this underlying issue that the gentleman from Massachusetts just spoke about.

The American people don't need more partisan politics. The American people need a Congress that will stand up and take action to help keep Americans safe from a number of things, one of the most important of which is gun violence in their neighborhoods and in their communities.

Thirty people are killed every day by someone using a gun in our country. In

the 3 years since Sandy Hook, there have been over 1,000 mass shootings, and more than 34,000 people have been killed by someone using a gun.

Every time these tragedies take place, the response from my friends on the Republican side of the aisle is the same. Thoughts and prayers are sent and moments of silence are held, but no real action is taken.

In the 3 years since Sandy Hook, we have held 30 moments of silence after a terrible tragedy such as the one that just occurred in Orlando.

□ 1300

But we haven't taken a single vote on legislation that would help keep guns out of dangerous hands.

One of the simplest solutions we have put forward to help keep Americans safe is legislation to prohibit those on the FBI's terrorist watch list from being able to legally purchase firearms.

Today, individuals on the FBI's terrorist watch list can go into a gun store anywhere in the United States of America and buy a firearm of their choosing legally. As a matter of fact, since this watch list has been established, over 2,000 individuals on the terrorist watch list have gone into gun stores across the country and legally purchased firearms. I think that is wrong. It is dangerous, it is unacceptable, and it makes our country less safe.

I have bipartisan legislation that I have offered with my Republican friend and colleague, PETER KING from New York, that would prohibit those on the terrorist watch list from being able to purchase a firearm legally in our country.

The American people are overwhelmingly in support of this, and if House Republicans agree that suspected terrorists shouldn't be able to legally buy guns, then let's take a vote. Vote it up or down, but give the American people the right to have this measure voted on.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON). The gentleman was a colonel in the United States Army, a member of the Armed Services Committee, and a great American.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague, Mr. STIVERS, for yielding time. I also greatly appreciate his work on the committee and his service to our Nation. We appreciate the sacrifices that he has rendered on our behalf and also from his family.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the House Defense Appropriations bill, a very important piece of legislation that provides the resources for our servicemen and -women to defend this cherished way of life and to protect our people. We are reminded of that after this devastating terrorist attack this past weekend.

Mr. Speaker, dating back to the founding, we had a principle by which

we rally our national security, and that is peace through strength; that is, we look to deter potential adversaries, always prepared, in the event that deterrence fails, to fight and prevail to win and to protect our people.

As part of this concept of deterrence, it is critically important at this juncture, in my view, that we provide the resources necessary to revitalize our Armed Forces. We are coming through a very long period of focus on counter-insurgency operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Much needs to be done. I think this bill does quite a bit on that score.

I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work on it. I also want to express my gratitude for them to include the bill that I authored that deals with end strength of our Armed Forces. This is the POSTURE Act. It is supported by 52 of my colleagues. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation. In fact, I authored it with Chairman TURNER, MIKE TURNER from the House Armed Services Committee, and Representative TIM WALZ, the highest ranking enlisted man to ever serve in this Chamber, a Democrat from Minnesota.

This bill effectively stops the drawdown that is planned over the next 2 years. Right now we have end strength numbers that essentially match where we were on September 11, 2001. If the administration's plan is allowed to go into effect, we are looking at handing out approximately 70,000 pink slips between now and 2018, bringing down the size of our Armed Forces.

Now is not the time to be doing that, as we deal with Russia, China, North Korea, Iran, and certainly the Islamic State. We have lots of challenges out there, and if we are going to reassert peace through strength, strengthening the hand of our diplomats, I think it is critically important that we don't continue on that drawdown of our land forces and of our forces in the Department of Defense.

So I appreciate the leadership's including this bill that I have authored with my colleagues in the House Defense Appropriations bill. It was critical that it come with the resources, because you just can't increase end strength. It has to come with the money to do that. This committee did that, and I appreciate that.

I also want to say there are important provisions in here to reassure our allies, the European Reassurance Initiative. It is funded here along with the Global Response Force, and a pay raise for our servicemen and -women. They richly deserve this.

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

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New York an additional 1 minute.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say how important it is that we bring forward all these initiatives: preserving our end strength, reassuring our allies,

and ensuring that the Global Response Force has proper funding. All of these, Mr. Speaker, are going to help strengthen the hand of diplomats.

When you look at our strengths, they are instantiated in our founding documents. On our best day, other countries want to be like us. It is the freedom and it is the prosperity that comes from arraying power the way that we do. Of course, all of this is relying on the principle of deterrence. This bill is very important toward that end.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague and friend, Mr. STIVERS, yielding time. I urge my colleagues to support the House Defense Appropriations bill.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I advise the gentleman from Massachusetts that I have no more speakers, and I am prepared to close.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there are 1,000 reasons to be opposed to this rule. One is that it brings forward two bills that are deeply flawed.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD The New York Times editorial against the Roskam bill, "Dark Money and an I.R.S. Blindfold."

[From the New York Times Editorial, Apr. 28, 2016]

DARK MONEY AND AN I.R.S. BLINDFOLD
(By the Editorial Board)

It is plainly illegal for foreigners to contribute to American political campaigns. But reform groups are warning that the ban would be gravely undermined by a little-noticed bill advanced Thursday by Republicans on the House Ways and Means Committee.

It would alter the current tax code provision that, while permitting the identity of donors to 501(c) "social welfare" groups to be kept firmly secret from the public, requires that the donors be privately identified to Internal Revenue Service officials responsible for enforcing the law. Politically oriented groups claiming dubious exemptions as "social welfare" nonprofits have proliferated in recent elections, allowing donors—including publicity-shy campaign backers—to work from the shadows.

Under the proposal, the I.R.S. would no longer be told the identities of contributors to these nonprofits. Watchdog groups warn in a letter to the House that this would "open the door wide for secret, unaccountable money from foreign governments, foreign corporations and foreign individuals to be illegally laundered into federal elections." The letter, signed by the Brennan Center for Justice, the Campaign Legal Center, Democracy 21 and five other groups, stressed that the disclosure requirement is one of the few ways of guarding against foreigners influencing American elections.

Representative Peter Roskam, the bill's sponsor, dismissed the reform groups' warning, saying the I.R.S. "has a miserable track record when it comes to safeguarding sensitive data" and a history of targeting conservative nonprofits that are critical of administration policies. His office insisted that ending the disclosure requirement would not affect the foreign-donation ban, but the reform groups sensibly ask who else could monitor what has become a runaway system of big-money stealth politicking.

Claiming a “social welfare” tax exemption has become a tool for powerful political operatives like Karl Rove, the Republican campaign guru. His Crossroads GPS group, which has 501(c) status, has spent \$330 million on ads and candidates since it was created in 2010. Other political groups, including the Democrats’ Priorities USA Action, which aided in President Obama’s re-election campaign, have followed suit in claiming “social welfare” status. In the last four years, more than \$500 million in secretive election contributions has been netted by those using the ploy.

Amid fierce Republican criticism, the I.R.S. has grown ever more gun-shy about enforcement, with Tea Party and other right-wing groups accusing tax officials of bias in daring to investigate conservative “social welfare” claims. As I.R.S. wariness grows, so does the attraction of 501(c)s for donors more interested in stealth politicking than charity work. Enabling foreigners to join this dark money debacle would be disastrous.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will read the opening paragraph: “It is plainly illegal for foreigners to contribute to American political campaigns. But reform groups are warning that the ban would be gravely undermined by a little-noticed bill”—which is this bill—“advanced Thursday by Republicans on the House Ways and Means Committee.”

This is basically saying that this opens up a loophole that, quite frankly, can be very, very dangerous. So I urge my colleagues that if this rule gets passed, that they would vote against this bill.

Again, as I mentioned on the Defense Appropriations bill, it is a bill that is based on budget gimmicks, and it is also a bill that continues to fund endless wars without having any authorization from this Congress. We have not voted on an AUMF for the most recent war in Iraq and in Syria. I find it unconscionable that we have no problem just putting these wars on automatic pilot and having our brave men and women in uniform in harm’s way, and we don’t even have the guts to debate it.

We have tried and tried and tried and tried on various bills—on authorization bills and on appropriations bills—to be able to have that debate. There is always an excuse—oh, it is a different committee jurisdiction; oh, we have to give it more than 10 minutes; oh, we have to do this, we have to do that—but this is our constitutional responsibility. We have time to vote on all these other bills that, quite frankly, are going nowhere that are political messaging pieces written at the National Republican Congressional Committee, but we can’t find the time to debate these wars to clarify what our mission is—these wars that our brave men and women in uniform have been put in harm’s way to deal with?

Come on. At some point, we have to find the courage to debate this. If people think these wars are the right way to go or they want to expand Presidential authority, then that is how you do it. If people like me think our military footprint is too big in the Middle

East and that we need to have a more clearly defined mission about what we are doing, then that is the forum in which we restrain these wars.

But to do nothing—to do nothing—is cowardly. It is just wrong. I am hoping in the amendment process that we will have the opportunity to debate some of these issues. But if history is any indication, the answer is probably not.

Finally, I am urging my colleagues to defeat the previous question. Quite frankly, instead of these flawed bills, we should be debating how to prevent more tragedies like the one that took place in Orlando.

If we defeat the previous question, we will bring up a bill that is a bipartisan bill that would simply say that, if you are on an FBI watch list so you are unable to fly, then you should be unable to buy a gun at a gun store. It is that simple.

I don’t quite understand why that is such a big deal. If the FBI believes that you are potentially dangerous so that they will not allow you to fly on an airplane, then how in the world can we allow that person to go into a gun store and buy a gun? And not just any gun; they can buy an assault weapon. It is crazy.

We have tried, on numerous occasions, to bring this issue to the floor, and House Republicans have voted 11 times—11 times—to block the bipartisan No Fly, No Buy legislation that was originally authored by my Republican colleague, Congressman PETER KING.

Since taking control of the House in 2011, my Republican friends have drastically cut the resources available for law enforcement, slashing the COPS program, which includes COPS hiring, COPS technology, interoperability, et cetera, by 64 percent. We need to respond to these terrible tragedies and make sure that our communities have what they need to keep people safe.

According to the Government Accountability Office, as my colleague from California (Mr. THOMPSON) pointed out, more than 2,000 suspects on the FBI’s terrorist watch list have successfully purchased weapons in the United States—more than 2,000. These are people who can’t fly on airplanes because they are suspected of being terrorists, but they can go in and buy a firearm. More than 90 percent of all suspected terrorists who attempted to purchase guns in the last 11 years walked away with the weapon they wanted, with just 190 rejected, despite their ominous history.

This legislation that we want to bring to the floor—just so there is no misunderstanding here—was originally crafted in 2007 and endorsed by President Bush’s Justice Department. It has bipartisan support in the House and is supported by prominent Republicans and counterterrorism and law enforcement experts. Yet we can’t find the time to bring it to the floor. All we can do in the aftermath of terrible massacres like the one in Orlando is come

to the floor and have a moment of silence for 10 seconds, and that is it. That is our obligation.

It is awful that we can’t deal in a responsible way with legislation like the bills that I have mentioned here. I think the American people—and this goes beyond political affiliation—are getting sick of our inaction on this stuff. I should just say, if my friends are afraid of the NRA, according to a 2012 poll, 71 percent of current or former NRA members and 80 percent of other gun owners support preventing people on a terrorist watch list from purchasing guns.

I don’t know what it is going to take, but I will tell you this: the outrage is already beyond description here on the House floor of people who are simply tired of our inaction.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to defeat the previous question so we can actually have a debate and vote on something that might save some lives, and also vote against the rule.

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

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

The gentleman makes an impassioned argument, but today’s rule is about two bills. It is about a bill that will prevent IRS abuse and make sure that our citizens have a right to free speech and free association that they are guaranteed under the First Amendment of the Constitution.

I thought it was really interesting that he read a portion of The New York Times editorial that is very clear to say that reform groups claim that this bill does X. The editorial writer did not make the claim that it happened or that it will happen; he made the claim that reform groups claim it will happen because the editorial writer can’t verify the validity of it, and it is simply not true.

The Bank Secrecy Act will make sure, as it does today, that foreign money is kept out of our elections. The Federal Election Commission, which is responsible for enforcing our election laws, will continue to enforce our election laws.

□ 1315

In fact, no one knows what Schedule B is used for. Today it has no real purpose. The IRS’ Director of Exempt Organizations has publicly stated that they are considering doing away with Schedule B themselves. That is all the first bill does.

The second bill we are talking about is providing for funding for our troops. It is the DOD authorization for funding for 2017. The gentleman talks about some other issues, but if we don’t fund it, we are the ones doing nothing. If we don’t fund our troops, we are the ones doing nothing. We have an obligation to fund our troops to provide for the common defense. We need to make sure we do that. That is what this bill does, and I want to make sure we do that.

I do want to make a quick comment on process because the gentleman is apparently outraged about process. In this session of Congress, the 114th Congress, Mr. Speaker, the majority has allowed 1,269 amendments on the House floor in this Congress. That is as of May—halfway through this year. In the 113th Congress, the majority allowed 1,545 amendments to be considered. When the gentleman from Massachusetts was in the majority in the 111th Congress, his party only allowed 778 amendments during the entire 111th Congress. The gentleman's claims ring a little hollow. Maybe where you stand depends on where you sit.

I will say that these are important bills. The rule will make sure that we can fully fund our national defense and make sure that we look out for the constitutional rights of our citizens. Those are two very important things. I don't argue with the gentleman that there may be other things we want to talk about, but those things are important, and that is what today is about, that is what this 1 hour of debate is about, and that is what the 2 hours the rule provides are about.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 778 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

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 or-

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 5049.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 171, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

YEAS—236

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

NAYS—171

Adams Frankel (FL) Norcross
Aguilar Fudge O'Rourke
Ashford Gallego Pallone
Beatty Garamendi Pascarell
Becerra Graham Payne
Bera Grayson Pelosi
Beyer Green, Al Perlmutter
Bishop (GA) Green, Gene Peters
Blumenauer Gutiérrez Pingree
Bonamici Hahn Pocan
Boyle, Brendan Hastings Polis
F. Heck (WA) Price (NC)
Brady (PA) Higgins Quigley
Brown (FL) Himes Rangel
Brownley (CA) Honda Rice (NY)
Bustos Hoyer Richmond
Butterfield Huffman Ruiz
Capps Israel Roybal-Allard
Capuano Jackson Lee Ruffersberger
Cárdenas Jeffries Rush
Carney Johnson (GA) Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN) Johnson, E. B. Sánchez, Linda
Cartwright Kaptur T.
Castor (FL) Keating Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX) Kelly (IL) Sarbanes
Chu, Judy Kennedy Schakowsky
Cicilline Kildee Schiff
Clark (MA) Kilmer Schrader
Clarke (NY) Kind Scott (VA)
Clay Kuster Scott, David
Cleaver Langevin Serrano
Clyburn Larsen (WA) Lee
Cohen Lee Sewell (AL)
Connolly Levin Sherman
Conyers Lewis Sinema
Cooper Lieu, Ted Sires
Costa Loebach Slaughter
Courtney Lofgren Smith (WA)
Crowley Lowenthal Speier
Cuellar Lowey Swallow (CA)
Cummings Lujan Grisham Takano
Davis (CA) (NM) Thompson (CA)
Davis, Danny Luján, Ben Ray Thompson (MS)
DeFazio (NM) Titus
DeGette Lynch Tonko
Delaney Maloney, Torres
DeLauro Carolyn
DelBene Maloney, Sean Tsongas
DeSaulnier Matsui Van Hollen
Deutsch McCollum Vargas
Doggett McGovern Veasey
Doyle, Michael McNeerney Vela
F. Meeks Velázquez
Duckworth Moore Visclosky
Edwards Moulton Walz
Ellison Murphy (FL) Wasserman
Engel Nadler Schultz
Eshoo Napolitano Watson Coleman
Esty Neal Welch
Foster Nolan Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—27

Bass Goodlatte Lawrence
Bishop (UT) Granger Lipinski
Comstock Grijalva McDermott
Dingell Herrera Beutler Meng
Duffy Hinojosa Rokita
Farr Hunter Sanford
Fattah Kirkpatrick Takai
Forbes Labrador Waters, Maxine
Gabbard Larson (CT) Wilson (FL)

□ 1337

Messrs. RYAN of Ohio, SERRANO, SIREN, and TAKANO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. JOYCE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 299, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 179, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 300]

AYES—239

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

NOES—179

Adams Ashford Beatty
Aguilar Bass Becerra

Bera Garamendi Neal
Beyer Graham Nolan
Bishop (GA) Grayson Norcross
Blumenauer Green, Al O'Rourke
Bonamici Green, Gene Pallone
Boyle, Brendan Grijalva Pascarell
F. Gutiérrez Payne
Brady (PA) Hahn Pelosi
Brown (FL) Hastings Perlmutter
Brownley (CA) Heck (WA) Peters
Bustos Higgins Peterson
Butterfield Himes Pingree
Capps Honda Pocan
Capuano Hoyer Polis
Cárdenas Huffman Price (NC)
Carney Israel Quigley
Carson (IN) Jackson Lee Rangel
Cartwright Jeffries Rice (NY)
Castor (FL) Johnson (GA) Richmond
Castro (TX) Johnson, E. B. Roybal-Allard
Chu, Judy Jones Ruiz
Cicilline Kaptur Ruffersberger
Clark (MA) Keating Rush
Clarke (NY) Kelly (IL) Ryan (OH)
Clay Kennedy Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver Kildee T.
Clyburn Kilmer Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen Kind Sarbanes
Connolly Kirkpatrick Schakowsky
Conyers Kuster Schiff
Cooper Langevin Schrader
Costa Larsen (WA) Scott (VA)
Courtney Larson (CT) Scott, David
Crowley Lee Serrano
Cuellar Levin Sewell (AL)
Cummings Lewis Sherman
Davis (CA) Lieu, Ted Sinema
Davis, Danny Lipinski Sires
DeFazio Loebach Slaughter
DeGette Lofgren Smith (WA)
Delaney Lowenthal Speier
DeLauro Lowey Swallow (CA)
DelBene Lujan Grisham Takano
DeSaulnier (NM) Thompson (CA)
Deutsch Luján, Ben Ray Thompson (MS)
Doggett (NM) Titus
Doyle, Michael Lynch Tonko
F. Maloney, Tsongas
Duckworth Carolyn Van Hollen
Edwards Maloney, Sean Vargas
Ellison Matsui Veasey
Engel McCollum Vela
Eshoo McGovern Velázquez
Esty McNeerney Visclosky
Farr Meeks Walz
Foster Moore Wasserman
Frankel (FL) Moulton Schultz
Fudge Murphy (FL) Watson Coleman
Gabbard Nadler Welch
Gallego Napolitano Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Bishop (UT) Herrera Beutler Takai
Dingell Hinojosa Torres
Duffy Lawrence Waters, Maxine
Fattah McDermott Wilson (FL)
Forbes Meng
Goodlatte Sanford

□ 1344

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted:

No on rollcall No. 299.

No on rollcall No. 300.

NSF MAJOR RESEARCH FACILITY REFORM ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5049) to provide for improved management and oversight of major multi-user research facilities funded by the National Science Foundation, to