

I know that the families that have been recognized by the Arkansas Century Farm Program understand this concept the best. I congratulate these families on their induction into this prestigious program and wish them another productive century.

RECOGNIZING SKILLS OF CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA AS PAPRS PROGRAM OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the staff from Skills of Central Pennsylvania following the recognition of their psychiatric rehabilitation program being named Program of the Year by the Pennsylvania Association of Psychiatric Rehabilitation Services.

The program at Skills of Central Pennsylvania, which is located in Centre County, provides recovery-oriented treatment through psychological education, skills teaching, and other methods. Those who are eligible for the program either suffer from serious mental illness or moderate-to-severe functional impairment as a result of an illness.

The program was nominated and eventually won this recognition from the Pennsylvania Association of Psychiatric Rehabilitation Services following the efforts of their registered nurses and staff in their integrated care program to handle a physical health crisis that could have resulted in the death of a participant if not for their swift intervention.

Mr. Speaker, as a former healthcare professional, I commend the staff of Skills of Central Pennsylvania for their important work for their community and the surrounding region, helping people emerge from what is often the darkest time of their lives.

HONORING DEPUTY DENNIS RANDALL WALLACE

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service and memory of Deputy Dennis Randall Wallace, who was shot and killed in the line of duty on November 13, 2016, in Hughson, California. On behalf of our community and this Congress, I would like to offer my deepest condolences to Deputy Wallace's family, friends, and fellow law enforcement officers.

Deputy Wallace's end of watch came when he was fatally wounded this past Sunday while investigating a suspicious vehicle.

As a D.A.R.E. officer, he took great pride in his work with our community's youth, helping them stay away from drugs and gangs. Dennis was not only a law enforcement officer, but

also a coach and a mentor and a friend to many of these young individuals.

Dennis has received countless awards and commendations for his outstanding service to our community. The outpouring of support from Stanislaus County and our State reflects the love for our fallen hero.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the life of Deputy Dennis Wallace, who defended and protected our community until his last breath. He made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

My deepest sympathy goes out to the Stanislaus County Sheriff's Department, the Wallace family, and his many loved ones. God bless him always. He will be dearly missed.

HONORING OFFICER BLAKE SNYDER

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Officer Blake Snyder, a 33-year-old police officer who was tragically killed in the line of duty in St. Louis County, Missouri, on October 6 of this year.

Officer Snyder, a longtime resident of Madison County, Illinois, had served as a member of the St. Louis County Police Department for 4 years. His career in law enforcement was inspired by his brother-in-law and late father-in-law, who both served as police officers.

Law enforcement leaders from across the region remember Officer Snyder as a dedicated public servant. St. Louis County Police Chief Jon Belmar said he was a "tremendous police officer," and former St. Louis County Police Chief Ron Battelle said he was highly regarded by his fellow officers and command staff.

Before joining the police force, Officer Snyder served on the board of directors for Riverbend Family Ministries, where he worked to provide a safe environment for children of families in crisis.

Officer Snyder was the 97th law enforcement officer killed this year. He is survived by his wife and 2-year-old son.

May God bless Officer Snyder, his family, and all the first responders who put their lives on the line to keep us safe. Please join me in keeping the Snyder family—and all the families of our first responders—in your thoughts and prayers.

RECOGNIZING DAVIS LOVE III

(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 to honor Mr. Davis Love III for his induction into the World Golf Hall of Fame.

Mr. Love's impressive golf career spans over four different decades. He

has won 21 times on the PGA Tour, including one major championship at the PGA Championship in 1997, two victories at the Players Championship in 1992 and 2003, and five victories at the Heritage in Hilton Head, South Carolina. Further, his outstanding performances gained him a selection to six U.S. Ryder Cup teams—twice as captain.

Although Mr. Love is known nationally for his professional wins, he is also known in the First Congressional District of Georgia for his strong sense of community. Referred to as "Uncle Davis" by locals, Mr. Love stays active in the St. Simons community. When Hurricane Matthew hit, he spent time clearing away tree limbs and providing food to emergency workers.

Certainly, he is respected both nationally and locally. I am proud to rise today to recognize his great achievements and Mr. Love's induction into the World Golf Hall of Fame.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 16, 2016.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 16, 2016 at 9:46 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4511.

Appointment:
State and Local Law Enforcement Congressional Badge of Bravery Board.

Federal Law Enforcement Congressional Badge of Bravery Board.

John F. Kennedy Centennial Commission.

World War I Centennial Commission.

United States Semiquincentennial Commission.

United States Commission on Civil Rights.

United States-China Economic Security

Review Commission.

Creating Options for Veterans' Expedited Recovery (COVER Commission).

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5711, PROHIBITING THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY FROM AUTHORIZING CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS RELATING TO COMMERCIAL PASSENGER AIRCRAFT TO IRAN; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5982, MIDNIGHT RULES RELIEF ACT OF 2016; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 18, 2016, THROUGH NOVEMBER 28, 2016

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on

Rules, I call up House Resolution 921 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 921

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5711) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from authorizing certain transactions by a U.S. financial institution in connection with the export or re-export of a commercial passenger aircraft to the Islamic Republic of Iran. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-66 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 Financial Services; (2) the further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) 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. 5982) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for "midnight rules", and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments 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.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from November 18, 2016, through November 28, 2016—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 4. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

□ 1230

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Resolution 921, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Rules Committee.

The rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 5711, to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from authorizing certain transactions by a U.S. financial institution in connection with the export or re-export of a commercial passenger aircraft to the Islamic Republic of Iran. The rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 5982, the Midnight Rules Relief Act.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. It also provides a motion to recommit. Additionally, the bill provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, with a motion to recommit.

On Monday, the Rules Committee heard testimony from the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, BOB GOODLATTE; from Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law Subcommittee Ranking Member HANK JOHNSON; and from the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, JEB HENSARLING, and Congressman DENNY HECK.

H.R. 5982, the Midnight Rules Relief Act, was marked up and reported by the Judiciary Committee, and it enjoyed discussion at the committee

level. The rule also combines H.R. 5715, the No Ex-Im Assistance for Terrorism Act, with H.R. 5711. Both of these bills were approved by the House Financial Services Committee in July. The rule makes in order five amendments to H.R. 5982 from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and it makes in order the only amendment submitted on H.R. 5711.

I am a cosponsor of the Midnight Rules Relief Act, which was authored by my friend DARRELL ISSA of California. This bill addresses a problem that we have seen far too often in the administrations of both parties.

As the President's term draws to a close, we have come to expect a raft of new regulations to be forced upon the American people. We usually see an even greater jump in the number of regulations during the lameduck period, which is between election day and Inauguration Day. These hurried rules—midnight rules—are too often used to force the political agenda of an outgoing administration on hard-working Americans as a last-ditch attempt to implement partisan priorities. As we enter a lameduck period after last week's election, this is a particularly meaningful time to consider this legislation. I think we can agree, regardless of party, the outgoing administrations should not be rushing to impose burdensome regulations on the American people.

Already, we have seen the Obama administration issue numerous midnight rules, including multiple billion-dollar rules. In fact, this administration has issued or plans to issue at least 180 such rules. Just yesterday, we were presented with a clear example of this problem when the Department of the Interior announced the finalization of a new rule on methane venting and flaring. This rule was announced by the Bureau of Land Management in an attempt to lower output despite the costs it will impose on energy production and on numerous State regulations already in place. This is just one example of an administration's rushing to finalize rules to cement a partisan policy agenda.

We have seen this administration increase the regulatory burden on families and businesses by more than \$100 billion. The last thing we should do is let them further that burden in the waning days of a lameduck Presidency. However, despite the clear evidence that the current administration is taking advantage of the ability to implement midnight rules, this is not a problem that is unique to only one political party. Lameduck regulations have been abused by both parties, but addressing this issue will help rein in that practice and ensure that Congress can exercise proper oversight authority.

The Midnight Rules Relief Act would take steps to solve the problem by amending the Congressional Review Act to provide congressional authority to allow CRA resolutions that disapprove multiple midnight resolutions

en bloc. Currently, the CRA can only be used for individual regulations. The amended Congressional Review Act would maintain flexibility while incentivizing outgoing administrations to avoid issuing broad and controversial midnight regulations.

The rule before us today also provides for the consideration of a different but equally important bill. H.R. 5711 takes critical steps to protect taxpayers and national security. Under the Iran nuclear deal, which I vocally opposed, President Obama agreed to license the exports of commercial planes. Recently, the Treasury Department authorized the sale of almost 100 planes for Iran. I can't believe this is even something we have to talk about here today, but it is a deeply serious issue. The administration has allowed the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism to receive U.S. financing and planes.

H.R. 5711 takes the commonsense step of prohibiting the Secretary of the Treasury from authorizing U.S. financing in connection with the export of commercial passenger aircraft to Iran. It also makes permanent the financing prohibition for the Export-Import Bank assistance to the Government of Iran.

I will say it again: this is just simply common sense. We should not and cannot be in the business of licensing the financing and sale of aircraft to a country that wishes to do us harm. The underlying bills that this rule provides consideration for are necessary to protect the American people and to restore smart policies that will protect us both here and abroad.

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

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

I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding the customary time.

The legislation before us today continues the majority's attempts to undermine the actions taken by President Obama. H.R. 5711 would force us to violate our international obligations under the Iran nuclear agreement, which was painstakingly negotiated by Secretary of State John Kerry, Deputy Secretary of State Wendy Sherman, and Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz with the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, plus Germany.

I think this is a great mistake by the United States to think that we will undermine it and that we have the ability to do that. It is very unlikely, in any event, that should this be undermined and this treaty be overturned that we could put that back together with the same group of people who negotiated it in the first place. In the process, it would put aircraft manufacturers here at home at a competitive disadvantage with their foreign competitors—something I am very much surprised that the majority would even contemplate.

This legislation would also continue their attacks on the Export-Import

Bank, an economic driver that has helped to create jobs and to grow our economy by expanding American businesses' access to foreign markets. These attacks stand in stark contrast to the Export-Import Bank's long history of bipartisan support, including from Presidents all the way back to John Kennedy and Bill Clinton and to Republican Presidents like Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush.

Mr. Speaker, instead of advancing this misguided legislation, this Chamber should be supporting our local businesses and the good-paying jobs that they create.

The majority should also give the Iran nuclear agreement the time to succeed instead of rushing forward with this bill that would already put the U.S. in direct violation of it. As I said earlier, if this agreement fails, we would not likely be able to reapply the sanctions or get the support of the Security Council. If we want to achieve our goal of ensuring that Iran is unable to build a nuclear weapon, this agreement remains the best available option for peacefully and verifiably cutting off its pathways.

The second bill we are considering today, H.R. 5982, is a sad continuation of the majority's attempts to delegitimize any actions taken by President Obama. This time, the majority is trying to amend the Congressional Review Act and allow Congress to invalidate regulations en bloc that are proposed in the final 60 legislative days of the President's term. That means that potentially lifesaving measures could be repealed in the blink of an eye without there being any proper evaluation or examination of their impacts.

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers expect reasonable and thoughtful governance. They also expect us to uphold the Constitution, which clearly states that Presidents have 4-year terms. That means that President Obama is President of the United States for a full 4-year term, not a 3¾-year term. It is a disgrace that President Obama couldn't even get a hearing on his Supreme Court nominee, Judge Merrick Garland. This unprecedented dereliction of the majority's responsibilities is symbolic of its failure to respect this President.

So many issues deserve our attention in the closing days of Congress, and it is disappointing to me and to so many others that the majority has chosen to prioritize measures—that won't even be considered in the Senate—just to take parting political shots at President Obama. We were elected to get things done, Mr. Speaker, and these bills are really just solutions in search of problems that don't exist.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do understand that, yes, our Presidents are elected for a full 4 years. I have no problem with that. What I do

have a problem with, though, is trying to push bills that cannot make it through these bodies in the proper way and with the proper oversight that Congress is supposed to have. We are set up in Article I of the Constitution as the body that makes the laws and sets the policy, along with Executive who carries out that policy. What we are simply saying is: don't go around what you can't get done in Congress and try to do it before you walk out the door. I understand that this is both sides, Mr. Speaker. This is not just this administration; it has been used by both. It just needs to stop. Congress has a role; the Executive has a role; the judiciary has a role. That is why the Founders put it together. This is simply saying: let's do it the right way.

Also, just as a quick note on this issue of the planes to Iran, as a member of the military currently and also as one who served in Iraq, this is very concerning to me on many levels. Also, the problem that we see with Iran is not about not doing business—it is about the protection of American interests and American assets. In fact, this is a bipartisan issue. One of the Financial Services Committee members from across the aisle, Mr. SHERMAN, actually opposed this, but he actually said this—and it really makes a lot of sense. He said:

Until Iran Air gets out of the business of supporting terrorism and supporting Assad's regime in Syria, the United States should not license the sale of aircraft to Iran Air. It is virtually certain that Iran Air will use these aircraft for nefarious purposes.

We are just saying: put our country in a safe position. We are not talking about denying business, but we are talking about what many of us feel was a very bad decision with the Iran nuclear deal and about, simply here, just putting us back in an Article I position.

I appreciate the gentlewoman from New York. I think we just need to do our business and just put our interests first, not only here, but also abroad.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this, and I appreciate the statement that she just made a moment ago in opposing the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I want to focus on just one area, which is H.R. 5711, designed to prohibit the transaction with Iran.

I couldn't agree more with my friend on the other side of the aisle, who is managing this issue for the Republicans, in that we ought to put America's interests first. That is why the overwhelming majority of independent experts agreed with the Comprehensive Joint Plan of Action, which was designed to make it harder and less likely that Iran would develop nuclear weapons.

Now, who is going to forget Benjamin Netanyahu before us and others who

were hysterical that Iran was just months away from a nuclear breakout and the threat that that posed? I, for one, agree that I don't want Iran to have nuclear weapons. I think that would be horrific. It is wrong to put nuclear weapons in their hands with the other cascading effects that could occur if they were to obtain nuclear weapons. That is why the United States—Secretary Kerry—and five other countries worked with us to use the power of our sanctions and international cooperation to make that nuclear breakout less likely.

And what has happened since that agreement was signed and entered into?

As a practical matter, Iran has complied with what it said it would do, and that nuclear threshold for Iran's having the potential of generating nuclear weapons has grown longer. They have reduced the number of centrifuges—less nuclear fissile material. This is what we wanted, and they have done it.

□ 1245

To this point, they have complied. We have complied, for example, by giving them back their own money that was frozen as a result of the events of the Iranian Revolution.

This avenue of trying to undermine the agreement—and make no mistake, Republican leadership and a Trump administration is likely to try to overturn it altogether—will continue a pattern of mismanagement by the United States of our relationship with one of the oldest civilizations in the Middle East. This goes back over 3,000 years.

Iranians are not Arabs. They are Persians. They have their own interests, their own identity. It is twice as large as Iraq and Afghanistan, more populous, more sophisticated. Pretending that we are going to attack them, as some of the people that Mr. Trump is considering for key positions have favored, would be a nightmare.

Remember, the United States overthrew the popularly elected leader of Iran, working with the British in 1953, and installed the Shah on the throne.

The United States sided with Saddam Hussein, who we thought was so evil that we upset the order in the Middle East and undertook that disastrous war. We sided with him as he used weapons of mass destruction against the Iranians.

Now, who would blame the Iranians, given our history, for not being friendly toward the United States? The fact is—and it can be verified by friends of yours who may have visited Iran—that it is actually the country whose people have the most positive feelings toward the United States. After 9-11, there were candlelight vigils in Tehran in sympathy with Americans who were attacked.

Now, many people have a cartoon image of the Iranian situation. It is complex. There are some very bad people in power in Iran, and we need to stand up to them. Many of those people

want this deal to fail, just like some hardliners in the United States want it to fail. I don't think we should serve their interests.

Preventing the United States to follow through on this agreement, for example, with enabling them to purchase Boeing planes, not giving us over \$17 billion in business, not putting over 100,000 Americans to work and building relationships, I think, is foolish.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, in fact, if the agreement falls apart and the sanctions collapse, they will get their planes. They will just buy Airbus planes, not Boeing. Most importantly, we will be undermining an opportunity to use diplomacy to make the world safer.

I have been appalled how difficult it is for us to focus on the big picture. Absolutely push back at some of the bad guys. Stand up to problems that they create. We just reinstituted the sanctions against misbehavior by Iran, and I voted for that yesterday. But don't undermine an agreement that is working—Iran has already got much of what they wanted out of this deal. If we undermine it, they can walk away. They have got some money, and they can have world opinion on their side and go ahead and develop nuclear weapons. That is crazy.

We ought to abide by our agreements. We ought to stand up to them where they are wrong. We ought to promote interaction where we can. We ought to work with the very vibrant Iranian American community, which I hope Donald Trump doesn't deport. They are law-abiding, very effective citizens in the United States. We ought to be working with them to work for the cause of international peace, strengthening the American economy while we make all of us make nuclear weapons less likely and strengthen international cooperation.

It was a signal achievement to have China, Russia, Germany, Great Britain, and France work with us on this agreement. We should not undercut it. We should honor it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up a bill that would prohibit lobbyists from serving on President-elect Trump's transition team.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, these bills will be going nowhere in the

Senate, and we should be happy about that. We shouldn't be frittering away the closing days of this session of Congress with legislation designed to delegitimize the work of our President.

There are major issues that face our country that the American people are crying out for us to address, from our crumbling infrastructure to the skyrocketing cost of education. We were elected to solve these problems, Mr. Speaker. These bills, again, utterly fail to do anything about any of that. Our constituents deserve more; the taxpayers deserve more.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate a good debate. This rule actually deals with two. One is the midnight rule, which again has been abused by both sides.

Also, as it was just spoken of on the floor, there is this issue of the funds for the planes for Iran. Let me just say, I would love to go back and discuss the Iran deal that was put into place. I have been on this floor many times opposing that deal. We can talk about it. I don't think it was ever put into place to stop.

Actually, there is this issue that they have complied. I just find it laughable that they have complied. They have tested rockets. They have sent people overseas. They have not complied with this.

There is one thing that I agree with that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) said just a moment ago. I agree with him when he said: Yes, Iran has got everything they want. They have got the money. They keep going. Their centrifuges are spinning.

I will just say this about this issue right here: If we could actually look at this, I will support Iran when Iran is willing to be a part of the world culture and starts recognizing Israel's right to exist. I will support Iran when they are signing their agreement and not shouting "death to America."

Let's play on a level playing field. I have got no problem with that. We are not debating that. Unfortunately, that is the deal the next administration can deal with. At least, I will have some sympathy for them when they quit breaking the very agreement we are saying that they are honoring. I just can't see that.

So these funds, I don't want them used. There are assets that we have. They are military assets. They are my brothers and sisters in arms right now who are all over the world that could be impacted by this.

So as we go forward, this is a commonsense rule for two reasons. We are not going to use the bank accounts of Americans to buy planes for Iran that can be used against us in a war.

We are not going to have midnight rules by both parties. It doesn't matter which party here. This is Article I, this is basic Constitution. Let the Congress do its work, not a President carrying out an agenda.

These are important bills that make smart, commonsense policy changes to protect Americans. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation provided for by the rule and the rule itself.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the Rule for H.R. 5711, the "Block U.S. Financing for Iranian Aircraft Purchases," and H.R. 5982, the "Midnight Rules Relief Act of 2016."

I thank Chairman SESSIONS and Chairwoman SLAUGHTER for their work in bringing this Rule before the House for consideration.

I would like to thank the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order for H.R. 5982, the "Midnight Rule Relief Act," which exempts any rule promulgated to prevent, respond to, or mitigate matters of critical national security.

H.R. 5711, is in direct violation of a provision of the Iran Nuclear Agreement known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or JCPOA would be undermined by passage of this bill.

The Administration has issued a veto threat on the bill, stating in part, "This bill, if enacted, would contravene U.S. commitments in the JCPOA and interfere with its successful implementation."

H.R. 5711 would prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from authorizing transactions by the U.S. financial institutions in connection with the export and re-export of passenger aircraft made prior to enactment of the bill.

The United States has a long tradition of remaining faithful to our commitments and our international partners, and a reversal of this principle undercuts our credibility, diminishes our ability to lead globally, and threatens the very alliances we rely upon in implementing the JCPOA.

We can anticipate that should this bill become law our closest allies would view this bill as a violation of our JCPOA commitments and Iran would take the issue to the Joint Commission."

In June, it was disclosed that Boeing had a Memorandum of Agreement with Iran Air for the sale of 80 commercial passenger planes.

In September, the Treasury Department then issued a license for the sale of all 80 of these Boeing planes to Iran Air.

The license also authorized U.S. financial institutions to engage in all transactions necessary to provide financing or other financial services to effectuate the sale of the Boeing planes.

This bill prohibits the involvement of U.S. financial institutions in the sale of commercial passenger aircraft to Iran Air, and would put U.S. aircraft manufacturers at a competitive disadvantage with their foreign competitors, whose access to financing would not be subject to the same constraints.

This will translate into jobs lost in the United States.

Promises to bring jobs in October, but working to put people out of work in November is not what the public wants or expects of Congress.

Complaints about Iran have access to \$50 billion of unfrozen oil escrow funds as a result of the JCPOA and charging that this \$50 billion could be redirected to Iran's destabilizing activities in the region is now preventing some of those funds from coming to a U.S. company that would create jobs here at home.

This GOP bill would PREVENT Iran from spending well over \$50 billion on commercial passenger aircraft from Boeing and other manufacturers as well as on air infrastructure improvements.

This Congress has much to do with in the 13 days of official business remaining.

The 114th Congress has to complete work on:

- 11 of the 12 House Appropriations bills;
- Criminal Justice Reform;
- Funding for the Flint Water Crisis;
- Restoring the Voting Rights Act;
- Protecting children with disabilities access to public education;
- Immigration Reform;
- Funding for the Louisiana Flooding;
- Funding for the damage caused by Hurricane Matthew; and
- Cybersecurity of the Nation's Critical Infrastructure.

It is beyond shocking and unacceptable that tens of thousands of citizens living in Flint Michigan have been exposed to toxic levels of lead in their drinking water.

Not only will the dangers and hazards of this disaster be felt by the residents of Flint Michigan for years to come, but the American public remains at risk to national security vulnerabilities exposed through our most basic infrastructure that supports the delivery of clean water to homes and businesses nationwide.

The trust and ability to protect our citizens' basic right to clean water has been shaken, while the leadership of this Congress does nothing.

We all have a duty to ensure justice and protection of our citizens.

Criminal Justice Reform is a pressing issue that Congress must address.

As Judge Learned Hand observed, "If we are to keep our democracy, there must be one commandment: thou shalt not ration justice."

Reforming the criminal justice system so that it is fairer and delivers equal justice to all persons is one of the great moral imperatives of our time.

For reform to be truly meaningful, we must look at every stage at which our citizens interact with the system—from policing in our communities and the first encounter with law enforcement, to the charging and manner of attaining a conviction, from the sentence imposed to reentry and collateral consequences.

House Democrats, led by House Judiciary Committee Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS of Michigan and me, as Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, have accepted and embraced the challenge of reforming the criminal justice system and developed many innovative legislative remedies to correct many of the most glaring inequities and racial disparities in the most critical areas of the system.

This is an important topic and one that Congress must turn its attention to with urgency and unity of effort to:

- address the harms caused;
- get an accounting of what happened;
- understand how the water was poisoned;
- make the lives of people damaged by this tragedy whole;
- find justice for those lives that may have been lost; and
- determine and provide for the long-term health needs of those impacted.

Today, the water in Flint, Michigan is not safe to drink and we have no concrete answer on when it may be safe to drink in the future.

Flint, Michigan like so many communities across the nation really felt the brunt of the financial crisis created by the abuse of new home lending practices and deceptive investment schemes that hid the weaknesses in the economy until the great recession spread across the nation beginning in late 2008.

The financial damage done to communities like Flint in the form of steep declines in property values, which caused significant declines in property tax income.

This was not just Flint's problem, but a national reality—for financially strapped cities, towns, school boards, and municipal governments who rely on Congress to fund all 12 Congressional appropriations bills to provide them with much needed revenue to meet the needs of their citizens.

In the 51 years since its passage on August 6, 1965, the Voting Rights Act has safeguarded the right of Americans to vote and stood as an obstacle to many of the more egregious attempts by certain states and local jurisdictions to game the system by passing discriminatory changes to their election laws or administrative policies.

In signing the Voting Rights Act on August 6, 1965, President Lyndon Johnson said:

'The vote is the most powerful instrument ever devised by man for breaking down injustice and destroying the terrible walls which imprison men because they are different from other men.'

But on June 25, 2013, the Supreme Court decided *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 193 (2013), which invalidated Section 4(b) of the VRA, and paralyzed the application of the VRA's Section 5 preclearance requirements, which protect minority voting rights where voter discrimination has historically been the worst. Since 1982, Section 5 has stopped more than 1,000 discriminatory voting changes in their tracks, including 107 discriminatory changes in Texas.

Although much progress has been made with regard to Civil Rights there is still much work to be done in order to prevent systemic voter suppression and discrimination within our communities and we must remain ever vigilant and oppose schemes that will abridge or dilute the precious right to vote.

H.R. 885, 'Voting Rights Amendments Act of 2015,' of which I am an original co-sponsor, repairs the damage done to the Voting Rights Act by the Supreme Court decision and is capable of winning majorities in the House and Senate and the signature of the President.

For millions of Americans, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is sacred treasure, earned by the sweat and toil and tears and blood of ordinary Americans who showed the world it was possible to accomplish extraordinary things.

The Voting Rights Act is needed as much today to prevent another epidemic of voting disenfranchisement as Dr. Salk's vaccine is still needed to prevent another polio epidemic and I am calling again for Speaker Boehner to bring H.R. 885, 'Voting Rights Amendments Act of 2015' to the floor for a vote this year.

As of October 3, 2016 the Texas Education Agency has 30 days to respond to an order by the U.S. Department of Education to fix its terribly broken system that serves special needs children.

Because the arbitrary cap limiting the number of special needs students enrolled in a

school district set and enforced by TEA clearly violated both the letter and spirit of the IDEA Act, on September 12, 2016, I wrote Education Secretary John King to demand that the U.S. Department of Education “review, investigate, and take immediate and appropriate action to remedy the injury currently being suffered at least 250,000 special needs school children resulting from the systematic and intentional actions of the Texas state government to deprive these students of the rights guaranteed them by the 1990 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA Act).”

Hubert Humphrey once said that the “moral test of government is how it treats:

those who are in the dawn of life, the children;

those who are in the twilight of life, the aged;

and those in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy and the handicapped.”

By this measure, the Texas state government has been failing the moral test for more than a decade when it comes to fair treatment of special needs students.

This should not have happened in Texas and we must act to be sure that it is not happening in other states.

Across the nation, approximately 13% of school children receive the special education benefits guaranteed by the IDEA Act.

In Texas, however, the comparable figure is 8.5%, by far the lowest of any state in the nation.

If the level of service provided by the State of Texas even barely met the national average, an additional 250,000 special need students would be receiving the educational opportunity they desperately need and deserve.

As I document in my letter to Education Secretary King, “the real-world consequence of this deplorable decision is that vital supports to children with autism, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, dyslexia, epilepsy, mental illnesses, speech impediments, traumatic brain injuries, even blindness and deafness, are being denied to approximately 250,000 Texas children.”

When a school district, for example, ignores a mother’s request for a special education evaluation, the emotional and psychological damage inflicted on her child who may be forced to repeat the second and third grade is incalculable and may be irreparable.

My thoughts and prayers continue to be with the with the people of Louisiana who were adversely affected by the historic 1,000 year flooding event that has devastated the Baton Rouge area of Louisiana.

This disaster is the latest reminder of the vulnerabilities posed by extreme weather events faced by people living along the Gulf Coast.

The National Weather Service reported 21.86 inches of rain falling within 48 hours caused levees to overtop and rivers to breach their banks.

Global climate change cares not if you believe in it; the force of nature will do its will at the expense, pain and suffering of our nation’s citizens.

This Congress is about to end its business without taking care of the people of Louisiana devastated by the floods earlier this year.

On Oct. 7 in Florida, a peak surge of 9.88 feet above normal was measured at a tide gauge at Fernandina Beach, Florida.

Storm surge flooding affected the St. Augustine area, including major flooding on Anastasia Island where water was reported to be 2.5 feet above ground level.

To the south in nearby Flagler Beach, Florida, parts of A1A were washed out by the storm surge.

The Northwestern-Jacksonville conducted a storm survey and found a new inlet was carved between Marineland and Matanzas Inlet, between Palm Coast and St. Augustine Beach, Florida.

The St. Johns River in northeast Florida reached its highest level on record at Shands Bridge, along with 3 to 4.3 feet of storm surge inundation reported at the Racy Point, Red Bay Point and 1–295 bridge tide gauges.

Early in the morning on Oct. 8, the St. Johns River was flowing backwards.

Matthew’s storm surge coupled with high tide lead to a record tide level at Ft. Pulaski, Georgia, early Oct. 8, and storm surge inundation roughly waist-deep was reported in parts of Charleston, South Carolina.

We also should not forget Hurricane Matthew—what it did to Haiti and parts of the Southern United States requires Congressional attention to relieve people who are suffering.

Even before Hurricane Matthew struck, more than a quarter of Haiti’s 11 million people lived in extreme poverty, surviving on less than \$1.25 a day.

Haiti’s people once again, in their great sorrow, need our prayers, our generosity, and our compassion.

Much of what the people of Haiti have worked and fought tirelessly for over the last few years has been wiped out in this the third major natural disaster since 2010’s ruthless earthquake.

Because of Hurricane Matthew hundreds of thousands of Haitians have little or no access to potable water or basic health services, and Haiti is facing an impending food crisis according to local and international organizations, and the government of Haiti.

This Congress should replace the funding used by the Centers for Disease Control to address the Zika Virus threat, which depleted funds that were for Ebola response.

We have not seen the full impact of Zika Virus, nor will we for several months as women give birth to children who may be impacted by the disease.

I urge my colleagues to spend the last few legislative days available to us to make the American people our first priority.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 921 OFFERED BY
Ms. SLAUGHTER

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

SEC 5. 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. 6324) to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to prohibit the use of funds provided to the President-elect and the Vice President-elect under such Act for any services or facilities provided by registered lobbyists. 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 Oversight and Government Reform. 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 amend-

ment 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. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6324.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1710

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARDY) at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 921;

Adopting House Resolution 921, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5711, PROHIBITING THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY FROM AUTHORIZING CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS RELATING TO COMMERCIAL PASSENGER AIRCRAFT TO IRAN; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5982, MIDNIGHT RULES RELIEF ACT OF 2016; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 18, 2016, THROUGH NOVEMBER 28, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on order-

ing the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 921) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5711) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from authorizing certain transactions by a U.S. financial institution in connection with the export or re-export of a commercial passenger aircraft to the Islamic Republic of Iran; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5982) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for "midnight rules", and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from November 18, 2016, through November 28, 2016, 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 181, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

YEAS—231

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

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

NAYS—181

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

NOT VOTING—22

Aderholt	Hinojosa	Pompeo
Blumenauer	Kirkpatrick	Price, Tom
Brown (FL)	Kline	Rooney (FL)
Costa	LaMalfa	Sanchez, Loretta
DeSantis	Lewis	Wagner
Fitzpatrick	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Fleming	Nugent	
Forbes	Poe (TX)	

□ 1735

Mr. LEVIN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Messrs. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, NOLAN, and Ms. MOORE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."