

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, this year marks 25 years of KJIL and Great Plains Christian Radio in Meade, Kansas, providing Christian music, weather, sports news, and inspiration to farmers, ranchers, businesses, and into the homes and vehicles of thousands of Kansas families.

The process of going from dream to reality took nearly 10 years; but within 24 hours after completing their transmission tower, KJIL took to the air September 5, 1992, at 99.1 FM. In 2001, they added another station in Abilene, Kansas, at 105.7 FM.

Since then, their story is one of God's constant faithfulness and provision. What started as a small dream for a rural county and my home county of southwest Kansas now includes nearly 40 translators, including the neighboring States of Oklahoma, Texas, and Colorado. Nearly my entire congressional district receives radio signals from Great Plains Christian Radio.

Not only has KJIL served our region so faithfully for 25 years, they have also done so with excellence. The Kansas Association of Broadcasters has awarded them Station of the Year twice. They have also been the recipients of a trio of awards from Focus on the Family Station of the Year—the list goes on and on.

Any opportunity to commend KJIL and their history of humbly serving Kansas requires recognition of the people who made it happen, such as Don Hughes, Jim Fairchild, and my good friend, Michael Luskey, who is currently the CEO and GM. I sincerely hope and pray that KJIL will have service for another 25 years.

#### STOP ARMING TERRORISTS

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, under U.S. law, it is illegal for you or me or any American to provide any type of assistance to al Qaeda, ISIS, or other terrorist groups. If we broke this law, we would be thrown in jail. Yet the U.S. Government has been violating this law for years, directly and indirectly supporting allies and partners of groups like al Qaeda and ISIS with money, weapons, intelligence, and other support in their fight to overthrow the Syrian Government.

A recent New York Times article confirmed that “rebel groups” supported by the U.S. “have entered into battlefield alliances with the affiliate of al Qaeda in Syria, formerly known as Al Nusra.”

The Wall Street Journal reports that rebel groups are “doubling down on their alliance” with al Qaeda. This alliance has rendered the phrase “moderate rebels” meaningless. We must stop this madness. We must stop arming terrorists.

I am introducing the Stop Arming Terrorists Act today to prohibit tax-

payer dollars from being used to support terrorists.

□ 0915

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2028, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 612, GEORGE P. KAZEN FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 949 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 949

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2028) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-70 modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 612) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the “George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse”. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-69 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, when you asked me to clarify the number of the resolution, I am reminded of my mother when she used to ask me if I wanted to take out the trash. She was not asking me if I wanted to take out the trash. She was suggesting, very politely, that it was my responsibility to get out of my chair and get out there and take out that trash. I think about all of the folks that invest themselves in our success here. When you give me a chance to clarify, candidly, I am a little surprised that I need to because I am surrounded by a team of excellence. I should have just spoken it right back to you.

We have two bills today, Mr. Speaker, that are the result of a whole lot of mothers, a whole lot of staffers, and a whole lot of constituents asking the Members of Congress if they would like to take out the trash, telling folks that they have responsibilities that need to be handled and they need to be handled now.

It is two bills that this rule makes in order for consideration today, Mr. Speaker. It is S. 612, which is the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act. That is what they call it on the Senate side. On our side, it is the Water Resources Development Act, the WRDA bill, a bill that authorizes projects one by one, considered by the U.S. House of Representatives, not led by the agencies, but led by the people's House, and directed to the agencies for accomplishment.

The second bill is H.R. 2028. It is the continuing resolution bill for FY 2017 funding, Mr. Speaker. I don't need to tell you—you know the Appropriations Committee well—but this year, for the first time since the people of the Seventh District of Georgia entrusted me with a voting card, we passed an appropriations bill on time. We did it for our veterans. It was signed by the President of the United States before the end of the fiscal year. We took a step at getting back towards regular order a commitment we have all made to one another, and a commitment that this funding bill will bring to fruition.

It is not what any of us would have wanted on day one, it is not the way any of us believed that we could have completed this process had we had more time, but it is the proper way to make sure that certainty, rather than uncertainty, governs this land.

I have got my colleague from the Rules Committee and the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) here with me, Mr. Speaker, so I won't belabor that side of the issue. But what I do want to talk about is something I know well, and that is the WRDA bill.

The WRDA bill, Mr. Speaker, this Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act, came out of the Transportation Committee on which I have the great privilege of serving.

The Transportation Committee, Mr. Speaker, is one of those rare committees that you don't read about on CNN's Web site, you don't see it on FOX News, or MSNBC. On the Transportation Committee, we get together—Republicans and Democrats—and we talk it out. We talk it out because it turns out that if what you are interested in, as citizens of Florida and the Everglades and Port Everglades and the restoration of those marvelous natural resources down there, that is not just a Florida issue, that is an American issue. If you are interested, as my friends from South Carolina are, in dredging the port in Charleston and making that a world class shipping opportunity, that is not just a South Carolina issue, that is an American issue.

If you are like my friends all across this country, Mr. Speaker, from New Hampshire to California, to Texas, to Colorado, you have projects that are vitally important not just to your constituency, but to the economy of the United States of America; and that is what we do on the Transportation Committee. The Transportation Committee is a success if we can help you get to work a little bit faster. We are a success if we can get your kids to that soccer game just a little bit faster. But we are committed to moving freight, goods, and services produced by American hands with American labor to their destinations not just across this land, but across this planet. That is what the WRDA bill, controlling those ports and waterways through which so much commerce moves, controls.

Mr. Speaker, I talked about regular order a little bit earlier. I have to brag, if I can here, at what may be our last day together. When the chairman of the Transportation Committee, BILL SHUSTER from the great State of Pennsylvania, took over the Transportation Committee, he said: These projects are so important. This bipartisan commitment to the American economy is so important. I am not going to let it get delayed.

Now, I confess that we are here on the last day, perhaps, of our time together. It looked for awhile like we might not be able to move this through; but our chairman, through the power of persuasion, fought day in and day out not for 1 year, but for 2 years, to ensure that we could build on the success, which was the WRDA bill in 2014, and bring yet another WRDA bill in 2016.

I will say to my friends: If you did not get everything you wanted, I promise you, as our friend, KEVIN MCCARTHY, from California likes to say, You needed everything you got. Even if you didn't get everything that you needed, we are going to do this again.

That is what is so great about regular order here, Mr. Speaker. When

there is only one train leaving the station, we can't work together on issues. We have got to jam it all in there and we have got to pack everything in because we have only got one chance to serve the people who elected us.

When we get back to regular order, when we know there is another bill coming tomorrow and another bill coming the next day, and another bill coming the next day, it gives us an opportunity to achieve these things one small step at a time. If your constituents are like mine, Mr. Speaker, they didn't send me here to yank the pendulum back and forth from left to right. They sent me here to make a little bit of progress one day at a time.

The WRDA bill exemplifies the very best of us in that way. It represents small steps in almost every jurisdiction in this institution to grow the American economy, to serve our constituents back home, to make sure that the American taxpayer is getting a dollar's worth of value out of a dollar's worth of their tax dollar.

If you can't tell, Mr. Speaker, I am tremendously proud of this work that has gone into this bill. My great hope is that my colleagues will support this rule so that we can move on to support that underlying legislation later on this morning.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to present my opposing view. I thank my colleague for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the new fiscal year began more than 2 months ago. Yet, here we are again, considering another continuing resolution just hours ahead of a midnight Friday deadline to fund the Federal Government. Make no mistake, we are here today up against the threat of another shutdown because of the majority's inability to do its most basic job of funding the government.

It is a shame that we have, once again, resorted to short-term measures instead of passing long-term appropriations bills. In fact, the last time that Congress enacted all 12 regular appropriations bills on time was 1994.

As a result, the Chamber continues lurching from crisis to crisis. This is the same type of leadership that has brought our Nation years of political brinksmanship, including fiscal cliffs, near defaults on our national debt, and a government shutdown as recently as 2013, which experts from Standard & Poor's estimate to have taken \$24 billion out of our economy.

And for what, Mr. Speaker?

So that the majority can play politics with government spending and try to negotiate a more conservative, partisan appropriations package with a Trump administration and a Congress under one-party Republican rule.

It is especially troubling that the majority has taken the unprecedented

step of including a provision in this spending bill to change the congressional rules to hasten the confirmation of President-elect Trump's nominee for Secretary of Defense, retired General James Mattis. That should not be in this bill, Mr. Speaker, but was stuck in here to expedite that movement.

The law that was changed clearly states that a Defense Secretary must be out of uniform for 7 years to qualify for a waiver. Certainly that was not done capriciously. It was done so that we can keep civilian control of the military, which is one of the pillars of our democracy.

Now, I join with my colleagues in respecting General Mattis' lifetime of service and his dedication to our Nation. At the same time, the civilian leadership, as I have said, has been the cornerstone of our democracy. To risk losing it risks losing a very precious and important tenet of democracy that states that the United States military must be under civilian control. That is no small thing, Mr. Speaker, but it will be done here with a single vote.

I am pleased to see, however, that this package includes \$100 million in grant funding to Flint, Michigan, to address the ongoing water crisis that has forced residents to drink and bathe in poisoned water for years. Mr. Speaker, I am painfully aware of the lifelong impacts that children will be forced to live with as a result of toxic metal in their water. The neurodevelopmental damage will be staggering, in addition to impacts including hypertension, renal impairment, and anemia. We know that we have to protect the water we have, Mr. Speaker, because we don't manufacture it.

The resolution before us today would also bring up the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act. I join my colleague from Georgia in saying how important a bill this is. Those of us who about the Great Lakes are happy that the Great Lakes Restoration money is there, which will help to remediate 20 percent of the world's fresh water contained in those five lakes.

It will also increase funding for dredging small harbors, like the Port of Rochester, which ships and receives an average of 95,000 tons of material each year. Commodities that pass through this port generate more than \$6 million in local salaries through my district each year.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, the majority has stripped important language from it, including the Buy American provisions, which we are perplexed by, since they have been in there for years in the past.

□ 0930

When asked the question of why it is not there, we really didn't get a straight answer; but the Buy American provisions would require the Federal Government projects to use steel that was made here in America. It is especially disappointing, since President-

elect Donald Trump has built several of his hotels with Chinese-made steel despite his pledging to “Make America Great Again.” The majority also removed a provision that would have allowed us to utilize funds to improve port and harbor reliability that sit idle in the U.S. Treasury.

One other issue that was concerning to us was that the CR does not extend a provision from all of the past years’ omnibus bills that exempt returning foreign workers from the H-2B visa. I don’t know of any issue most recently that has caused more consternation in my office. I have had almost 100 calls from all over the country saying that they are very dependent on it; and our colleague, Congressman LONG from Missouri, said yesterday that it was critical to the State of Missouri to get this in. Unfortunately, we were unable to do that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a member both of the Rules Committee and a subcommittee chairman on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COLE. I thank my good friend for being so generous in yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of both the rule and the underlying legislation.

I begin by sharing my friend from Georgia’s enthusiasm for the WRDA bill. I think this was an absolutely masterful piece of work by three chairmen. Obviously, primarily, Chairman SHUSTER is the architect; but I was also working with him on several important Indian issues and with Chairman BISHOP from the Committee on Natural Resources and, on the Flint issue in particular, with Chairman UPTON from Energy and Commerce.

I share my friend’s belief that these projects have been worked through in a bipartisan way. Many, many good things, literally, in every part of the country will take place, and our friends on the other side of the aisle were very cooperative in that as well. This is usually a bipartisan effort. It certainly was in this case.

I am very pleased about Flint. There was, frankly, failure at every level of government—Federal, State, and local. I am glad that the Congress is following up on the commitment of the Speaker and of our good friend from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), who has been the leader, obviously, in this and is doing the right thing there.

Again, the water projects, themselves, touch almost every district in the country—certainly, every State in the country.

I want to particularly point out the Indian provisions in here, which often get overlooked. We did some really important things in working with Mr. BISHOP and Mr. SHUSTER in common. We settled a number of really important individual Indian water case issues. I think the Pechanga case, for instance, which I know my friend the

Speaker is familiar with, has been around for many years. We also changed the definitions in law so Indian tribes can now compete for water projects and water funding, particularly in some of the areas. Again, my friend the Speaker has seen some of these shortages in infrastructure as we traveled to reservations around the country together; so putting these people in a position to make sure they have access to funds to deal with water is important.

Finally, for my own State—extremely important—and at no cost to the Federal Government, the Chickasaws, the Choctaws, the city of Oklahoma City, and the State of Oklahoma negotiated a water settlement arrangement inside of Oklahoma for the appropriate distribution of water. That requires Federal approval because there is a trust responsibility. We got the deal done, frankly, relatively late this year. We got tremendous cooperation in Congress and in the Senate. Certainly, JIM INHOFE played a big role over there by getting it in the bill in order to get that memorialized and done in an expeditious fashion. We are very grateful for that.

When it comes to the CR, I certainly support the CR, and I certainly appreciate very much the work that Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY did to adjust, as much as possible, this short-term funding measure to try and deal with what we call around here “anomalies” and try to get the money to where it is supposed to go. There are many good things, again, in this short-term funding bill through April 28, my birthday, so perhaps this will work out in the end. Of course, it is also Saddam Hussein’s birthday, so that doesn’t always work out too well.

At the end of the day, we ought to look at this process. I find myself in agreement with my good friend from New York on many of the things that she had to say. We should be negotiating an omnibus bill. We have the time to do it. We were told, when we passed the short-term CR in late September, that that is what we would do in this timeframe. I can assure you, because they did it last year, that Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY could do it again this year. We are pretty close on all of these issues. It is a mistake, in my view, to push this into next year. Next year, we will have to write the FY18 budget and do the appropriations while we are simultaneously doing this, and the temptation will be very great to just do another CR and pass this on.

While all of this seems like budget double-talk to the average American, the reality is we have passed a lot of good legislation this year, but the funding isn’t matched up with the legislation that we have passed. That is because we are relying on a continuing resolution as opposed to doing the real hard work of appropriations. Last year, when we did that, by the way, it pro-

vided us budget stability this year. It got us out of a lot of the fights—and guess what. All of a sudden, you end up with cures. All of a sudden, you end up with WRDA. All of a sudden, you get a national defense authorization done, because we have done the appropriate things.

The Appropriations Committee, I am quick to add, has done its work. All 12 bills that fund the Federal Government passed out of Appropriations—5 of them across this floor. I believe, with some of the most contentious, like Interior, our problem partly is our friends in the Senate who blocked up the deal, but we could have still finished an omnibus bill this year.

I support this. I don’t think we made a wise decision in the manner in which we are proceeding, but, certainly, we don’t want to shut down the government. I just want to serve notice to my friends who made the decision that I am going to hold their feet to the fire so that, in April, we actually do what we said we were going to do and that we go back to regular order.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to address my concerns regarding WRDA. My home district of Sacramento is the most at-risk major American city for flooding, and with the damaging effects of our changing climate, that risk is not going away. We sit at the confluence of two great rivers, making flood control absolutely essential for the safety of my constituents. That is why I have worked diligently for years to ensure we are making the investments we need to protect our region; but our levees are aging, which is why I have worked so strongly and fought for the inclusion of two projects in this bill: the American River Common Features and the West Sacramento projects. Combined, these projects will result in almost \$3 billion worth of lifesaving investments in my region.

This isn’t just about protecting a few buildings. The area that these projects support protect upwards of 400,000 people. It includes four major highway systems, an international airport, the State capitol, and a major water and electric grid.

This is about protecting the future of my beloved city of Sacramento, which is why I am so disappointed that WRDA has become a vehicle for a poison pill. The drought language that was airdropped into this bill at the last minute pits one region of California against another. It will be detrimental to northern California’s economy and environment, and I am concerned about its impact on our region’s water supply.

I share my colleagues’ concerns about the drought, but we need to work together on a solution that takes the

well-being of every part of our State into account. It is extremely unfortunate that WRDA is being used as a vehicle for legislation that we should consider as a stand-alone bill, especially given the careful bipartisan work that our colleagues have put into this legislative package.

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

I thank my friend from California for her comments.

She is absolutely right. I talked so much about the economics of WRDA, and she talked about the truly life-saving aspects of WRDA. We are talking about flood control in so many of these projects. She mentioned the West Sacramento projects in California. Just going through California alone, Mr. Speaker, the American River Common Features project, the San Diego County storm risk reduction project, the South San Francisco Bay Shoreline project, the Los Angeles River project are all being worked through and approved. These projects are not just going to put people to work. These projects are going to make people safer.

I thank my colleague for recognizing that and for helping to celebrate that with me.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we can defeat the previous question this morning, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that would set aside excess funds from the Abandoned Mine Land fund for the miners' health benefits and pension plans. We must do everything we can to protect the benefits that our hardworking miners have earned throughout the years.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, 70 years ago, United Mine Workers of America President John L. Lewis—a lifetime Republican—crossed party lines to work with President Roosevelt and his administration to make a deal to end a nationwide coal strike. The deal ended up promising health and pension benefits for miners in this country in exchange for their lifetime of hard work. It was a promise that the Federal Government has kept since then. Every year, no matter who the President is, no matter who is in control of the Congress, it is a promise that our Nation has kept every single year for 70 years; but, Mr. Speaker, that is about to change.

Right now, 22,500 coal miners in West Virginia, in Ohio, in my own home

State of Pennsylvania, and across coal country are facing a complete loss of their health and pension benefits during 2017. It breaks the long-time promise between the coal industry, its workers, and the Federal Government.

The continuing resolution before us purports to fix this problem by ensuring that 16,300 miners who would lose their health care on December 31 are taken care of. However, this is only a short-term Band-Aid, 4-month patch for health care, which leaves miners worse off in April than they are today. Most importantly, this CR does absolutely nothing to solve the pension problem—this in return for a lifetime of hard and dangerous work.

There are actual long-term solutions available that this body should be considering. The Miners Protection Act would fix both the health care and pensions for miners permanently. I repeat, it fixes the problems permanently.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no reason for the short-term patch the majority is proposing here today. Miners across Pennsylvania have risked their health and safety to secure better lives for their families. They have dedicated their careers to ensuring that U.S. factories have the energy to continue to work and that our homes, schools, and workplaces can keep their lights on. This country became a great country on the backs of our hardworking coal miners. We should not be turning our backs on them now.

Mr. Speaker, the great American lawyer, Clarence Darrow, came to Scranton in the midst of one of these coal strikes, and he got to know the coal miners. Here is what he said about them:

These are men who toil while other men grow rich, men who go down into the Earth and face greater dangers than men who go out upon the sea or out upon the land in battle, men who have little to hope for, little to think of excepting work. These are men, men like any others, who, in the midst of sorrow, travail, and a severe and cruel crisis, demeaned themselves as nobly, as bravely, as loyally as any body of men who ever lived and suffered and died for the benefit of the generations that are yet to come.

Darrow was right, Mr. Speaker. We need to protect the health care and pensions of our miners and create new jobs throughout our coal regions. The commonsense, bipartisan Miners Protection Act would give miners across Pennsylvania and the rest of coal country the peace of mind of knowing that the retirements they worked all of their lives for are secure.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to fix our partisan spending issues at the expense of the American worker. We have to keep the promises we made to our hardworking men and women. That is why I urge my colleagues to do just that and agree to this motion to defeat the previous question so that we can bring up and include important legislation to protect our coal miners' pensions and health care.

□ 0945

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democrat leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her superior service on the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, across America today, hardworking people and seniors find that their retirement security is under threat and in doubt. Congress has a responsibility to strengthen Americans' retirement security, and we dishonor that responsibility with the half measure for coal miners in the CR today—less than a half measure.

I commend Congressman CARTWRIGHT of Pennsylvania. He knows full well the contribution that the coal miners have made to our economy. He knows the stress that they are under from what is happening now and how this is exacerbated by the continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, 22,500 coal miners in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, and across coal country are facing a complete loss of their health and pension benefits in 2017. However, the continuing resolution offers these men and women only a short term.

Senator MANCHIN has been making the pitch, and many of us have joined him, that these health and pension benefits should be in our legislation at least for 5 years, preferably in perpetuity.

What the CR says is: not in perpetuity, not in 5 years—for 4 months; for 4 months and only health benefits, completely ignoring the pension part of it.

Coal miners are on the Hill today to make their case, to tell their personal stories about how this has affected them. After a lifetime of service and in a culture built around that industry, they trusted that their pension and their health benefits would be there. But their companies went bankrupt.

Think of this, my colleagues. If you, anyone in your family, or any of your constituents were working a lifetime in a company, in an industry, and that company went bankrupt, and the answer to you is: Tough luck. We went bankrupt. Your pension went down the drain.

It is absolutely criminal. It is absolutely criminal.

The CR offers a short-term, 4-month patch for health care and leaves the miners worse off in April than they are now.

I thank Senator MANCHIN for taking the lead in such a forceful way, and I thank MATT CARTWRIGHT for leading us here.

In hope that we could defeat this rule, I urge my Republican colleagues who are from coal country in Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia—and coal country goes beyond. Virginia is one of the biggest coal-producing States, though you might not realize it. The CR does nothing, does nothing to solve the critical pension problem that threatens the future of these miners and their families.

With our previous question, Democrats, led by Congressman CARTWRIGHT, are calling on Republicans to do better. We should be voting on commonsense, bipartisan legislation that would give miners in coal country the peace of mind of knowing that their retirements that they worked for all their lives are secure.

Mr. MCKINLEY of West Virginia, a Republican, has led the way with the Miners Protection Act. It is a bipartisan bill. It has 87 cosponsors, and we would like to defeat this rule so that we can bring up Mr. MCKINLEY's Miners Protection Act.

The bipartisan bill would transfer funds in excess of the amounts needed to meet existing legislation under the Abandoned Mine Land fund to the United Mine Workers 1974 pension plan to prevent its insolvency. The funds are there. They just need to be transferred. Mr. MCKINLEY's bill does that.

Make certain retirees who lose healthcare benefits following the bankruptcy or insolvency of his or her employer eligible for benefits.

As these families head toward the holiday season, we must ensure they can celebrate knowing that the health and pension benefits they earned—they have earned—will always be there for them.

I was disappointed that, in the CR, we did not have an extender for some renewable initiatives, renewable alternatives. But we were told by the Speaker's Office that our guys are fossil fuel guys. They are not interested in the renewables.

Okay. I respect that. If you are fossil fuel guys, why aren't you looking out for the fossil fuel people who have worked under dangerous circumstances for their lives, going into unsafe situations, breathing air that has created problems for their health, and now the companies have declared bankruptcy or insolvency. Tough luck for the workers.

Mr. MCKINLEY knows that is not right. That is why he introduced the bill. Mr. CARTWRIGHT knows that is not right. That is why he is supporting the bill. And that is why Democrats come to the floor today to urge Republicans to express their concern for their constituents in the fossil fuel industry to do justice to them for the service they have provided for the benefits, pension, and health care they are entitled to.

So we will see what the commitment is of the Republicans in Congress to the fossil fuel guys and gals. We will see on their vote here today.

Vote "no" on the bill so we can vote "yes" on the McKinley Miners Protection Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am quoting from *The Washington Post*. It says, "The United Mine Workers of America's retirement and health-care funds currently support about 120,000 former miners and their families nationwide, but the account balances have rapidly declined as

some coal companies shed dues-paying workers and others filed for bankruptcy protection."

Mr. Speaker, this isn't unique to coal country. The promises are unique to coal country, but bankruptcy is not unique to coal country. What is unique about the bankruptcy in coal country is that institutions like this helped to drive it along.

Mr. Speaker, what you haven't heard in this absolutely heartbreaking tale is the government's complicity through shedding of dues-paying workers and driving companies into bankruptcy, that the coal coming out of the ground in America today is being brought out of the ground by companies that are being forced into bankruptcy today. But that this continuing resolution, while a partial fix, is a 100 percent fix for the duration of the continuing resolution.

My friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) is my friend, and what he says when he is talking passionately about the lives and what we can do to make a difference in the lives of retired miners, he says with 100 percent heartfelt sincerity, and I am grateful to him for it.

And my friend from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY), whose legislation is the subject of this motion, believes in these people, believes in work, believes in commitment to promises like no one else in this institution, and I am proud to call him a friend as well.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no question in my mind that we have a shared commitment, shared values, and we will find a shared solution.

I am reminded that the last time I found myself in this situation a friend of mine from Michigan was standing right over there at that podium. He too had a motion: if we defeated the previous question, he would offer to help the people of Flint. And I stood here at this microphone and said to my friend that he had a shared concern, that he had a concern that was on the hearts of all of us in this institution, and that we would come back and address his concern, though the forum was not this one today.

With no sense of irony at all, Mr. Speaker, I tell you that this underlying bill has those dollars for Flint in it today, that the authorization for those projects are in the underlying bill today.

So I say to my friend from Pennsylvania, as I said to my friend from Michigan, this is absolutely a shared concern. I am frustrated about how we got here, and I believe we are going to disagree about where blame lies in how we got here. How we fix it, however, is not dependent on who is to blame for getting here. How we fix it is dependent on our shared commitment to getting it done.

This is not the bill for that long-term fix. We have not had those long-term conversations, Mr. Speaker, but we do have a 100 percent commitment for the duration of the continuing resolution

to make sure those healthcare benefits continue. And I am proud that we, in a bipartisan, bicameral way, found those dollars to do that right thing.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her continued leadership, and let me also acknowledge my support of her stance on the previous question and the eloquence of Mr. CARTWRIGHT on a very, very important issue. I rise to be part of that.

Let me also join my good friend from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) who said that the appropriators did their work. The American people need to know that. That is regular order, that the appropriation bills should have come forward, and the needs of the American people, through their Representatives in the people's House, should have been addressed. That is not the case, Mr. Speaker.

So I rise with deep concern—one, as a neighbor to Louisiana, which I know that funds are being allocated, but I realize the devastation there; but also as a Representative of the State of Texas and the 18th Congressional District, where we face a continuous barrage of rains and flooding, that we need continued relief from flooding and, of course, the additional amendment that I had passed in the Energy and Water Appropriations to finally do a study of Houston's bayous. I am not going to give up on that.

Now, there is money here on a short-term basis for the Army Corps of Engineers' community development block grant, the \$1 billion for Federal Highway Administration, but we don't know whether these moneys will, in fact, be able to solve the problems that we have. So regular order would have been appropriate.

I know that the Senate asked for \$240 million-plus for Flint, a place where I have traveled to more than one time. I know our good friend from Michigan, Congressman KILDEE, has laid himself on the line for those people. There is \$100 million here. They need \$200 million-plus now—now.

This bill goes until April of 2017; and, frankly, I would argue that there are emergency instances where we need the full funding, and that is what is wrong with this CR. It is a compromise to go down even worse in April. That is my fear. It is a compromise to undermine employees of the Federal Government in April. Who knows what will be on the horizon.

So this is not the response that we need for the American people. This is not regular order. This is not full funding. This does not allow for amendments.

And then let me say this, Mr. Speaker. The last time we provided a waiver for a general—I think everybody can read their history books, and they

know who General George C. Marshall was, in 1950. We have not done that now for 66 years. Where is the oversight of Congress? As a member of the Judiciary Committee, to be able to implement a waiver willy-nilly in the CR—no hearings, no legislation, no understanding.

There is a definitive core in the American psyche and the constitutional premise of the civilian-military relationship, that there is a separation.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. To be able to defend the Nation, we have the military. They are excellent. I am sure “Mad Dog” Mattis is excellent. But a waiver? Is this going to be the administration of waivers?

We have already heard from the top Democrat in the Senate, changing the rules governing nominations he opposes. We know that, changing the rules in a CR, we should oppose. This is not regular order or regular legislation. This is a continuing resolution.

For the American people, let me tell you what is happening. They are trying to ease under the door a process of eliminating the basic principle of separating the fact that you are in the military and you must have a separate period of time before you come into civilian leadership.

This is a bad process, a bad bill. Let's not fool the American people. Let's treat them with fairness. This is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to the Rule for Senate Amendment to H.R. 2028, the “Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016.”

I oppose this rule for four reasons:

This rule does not follow the regular order process for House consideration of each appropriations bill; allow the full funding of the federal government for fiscal year 2017; allow for amendments; and support a long standing prohibition of not legislating on an appropriations bill.

The rule before the House addresses consideration of the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation (WIIN) Act, which includes the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2016, and a Continuing Resolution to fund the federal government until April 28, 2017.

The WIIN Act, which contains the WRDA Act, authorizes much needed water projects around the nation that will improve water resources infrastructure.

On April 17–18, 2016 Houston experienced a historic flood event that claimed the lives of eight people; damaged over 1,150 households; disrupted hundreds of businesses; closed community centers, schools, and places of worship due to flood waters.

I appreciate the support I received from the Transportation Infrastructure Committee, which authorized projects that directs the Army Corps of Engineers to conduct studies into the conditions that lead to flooding.

Although the funding has not been appropriated to conduct studies on conditions that

lead to flooding, as it should have been if Congress had followed regular order for the appropriations' process, the efforts to address flooding issues such what was seen in Houston over the last three years is essential to saving lives and property.

The Jackson Lee Amendment to H.R. 5055, the Energy and Water Appropriations Act which will help facilitate the \$3 million needed to fund the Army Corps of Engineers' Houston Regional Watershed Assessment flood risk management feasibility study.

When funding is appropriated for this type of project the Army Corps of Engineers will conduct the first water system studies that looks at all factors that contribute to flooding not only in the City of Houston, but around the nation.

Should the funding become available a special emphasis of the study if conducted in Houston would covers 22 primary watersheds within Harris County's 1,756 square miles, will be placed on extreme flood events that exceed the system capacity resulting in impacts to asset conditions/functions and loss of life.

Because of this Jackson Lee Amendment to authorize flood studies, I know that the WIIN and WRDA bills could have been improved through amendments; unfortunately, this rule does not allow amendments.

I am a strong proponent of regular order and for the House to take seriously its responsibility to fund the federal government in a responsible and prudent manner.

The leadership of the House is using the last days the 114th Congress will be in session to do appropriations work that should take 8 months to complete in a regular appropriations process.

If we do not act, and pass this bill—the federal government would be under threat of shutting down.

The fiscal year of the Federal government for 2016 ended on September 30, and the Fiscal Year for 2017 began on October 1, 2016.

The use of Continuing Resolutions was historically used for the few bills that did not finish the full legislative process prior to October 1.

Now Continuing Resolutions and Omnibus Appropriations bills are an annual part of the House budget and appropriations process—this is wrong and I will work in the next Congress to make sure that we are focused on bringing transparency back to the budgetary and appropriations process by following regular order.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Amendment to H.R. 2028, “Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016,” which extends current Fiscal Year 2017 government funding through April 28, 2017, at its current rate, which includes an across-the-board cut of .19% for all accounts, defense and non-defense.

The federal government operates under budgetary and authorization constraints that cannot be met if administrators of agencies are unable to plan because they do not know what their funding levels will be from year to year.

This short term Continuing Resolution does the most harm to Fiscal Year 2017 because we have already passed one CR and now this body is about to pass another that will end in April.

This creates uncertainty not only for the work of federal agencies, but for programs

that fund local and state programs and projects that include infrastructure, education, food programs and much more.

This haphazard appropriations process also causes problems and uncertainty for companies and businesses that provide goods and services to the federal government.

Further, this rule keeps in place sequestration the most damaging and fiscally irrespirable thing done by the 114th Congress to the American people.

Under the conditions that the two bills under this rule have been managed by the leadership of the House, it would have benefited from amendments to make improvements to the bill.

Because this bill changes a law that has nothing to do with appropriations, it would have been beneficial to allow the House to clearly speak to this single issue through the amendment process, which would support debate and a clear affirmation for the change in law governing the appointment of the Secretary of Defense.

Senate Amendment to H.R. 2028 also does something very serious, which has nothing to do with funding the federal government.

This short term CR has language that changes the number of years a retired member of the armed services must wait before being considered for the position of Secretary of Defense.

The bill's critical imperfection has nothing to do with funding the federal government—it is a change in law that would allow a retired military person to serve after only 3 years of retirement instead of 7.

The service to our nation and the honor and integrity of the person under consideration at present to be the next Secretary of Defense is not in question—it is the reason why there is a waiting period and why that is important.

By placing this change in a continuing resolution—a bill designed not to allow more than an hour of debate and not changes is not the vehicle we should use to make this change.

If President Obama has suggested a change in law to be accomplished in a continuing resolution appropriations bill his request would have been denied.

The politicization of the legislative process has seriously undermined the credibility of the Congress to do the important work of funding the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that we have again been placed in the position of having to fund the government through the device of a continuing resolution rather through the normal appropriations process of considering and voting on the twelve separate spending bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The use of this appropriations measure to further a political objective adds further insult to this body and the appropriations process.

There are oversight committees with the knowledge, expertise and experience to make the determination on whether this change is prudent and if they determine that it is—to make the appropriate changes in law.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in opposition to this Rule and in support of Congress returning to regular order for the consideration of authorization and appropriations bills.

[From CQ Roll Call, Dec. 6, 2016]

NEW CR WOULD EASE CONFIRMATION FOR  
MATTIS

(by John M. Donnelly)

The new stopgap spending bill would clear a path for lawmakers to exempt President-elect Donald Trump's Defense secretary nominee from a law requiring a seven-year waiting period before retired military officers can take that job.

Many Democrats oppose the move and they could make trouble for the continuing resolution as a result, though it is unclear if they will risk a government shutdown to make their point.

The House expects to pass the CR on Thursday and the Senate on Friday, just in time for President Barack Obama to sign the bill into law and keep the federal government operating, as the current CR expires that day.

The new CR, unveiled Tuesday night, contains a provision that would expedite consideration of legislation that would enable the Senate to confirm retired Marine Corps Gen. James Mattis, Trump's now-official pick for Pentagon chief, even though he retired from military service three years ago.

EXPEDITED PROCESS

The provision provides that the Senate may consider under expedited procedures legislation that would give Mattis an exception to a nearly decade-old law requiring a seven-year interlude after military service.

The seven-year mandate was itself a shortened version of the original in-year requirement in the National Security Act of 1947 (PL 80-253), to which Congress granted an exception only once, in 1950, in the case of Army Gen. George C. Marshall.

The legislation to grant the exception can be introduced in the first 30 days of the next Congress's first session. It would have to pass both houses, but the CR seeks to knock down possible dilatory procedures Democrats might use in the Senate.

The Senate Armed Services Committee would have five days to report it. If they did not do so, it would go straight to the floor anyway. Once there, it would still require 60 votes to pass, unless leaders of both parties agreed to waive that requirement.

But the CR provision would knock down a number of other time-consuming procedural hurdles.

The Senate would debate it for 10 hours.

Arizona Republican John McCain, chairman of Senate Armed Services, had said earlier Tuesday that it is critical to confirm a new Defense secretary as soon as possible.

"Apparently, Democrats are saying they want to drag it out," he said, referring to the confirmation process. "You can't drag out the secretary of Defense. . . . It's absolutely disgraceful. It puts the nation's security at risk."

Democrats have said they will resist an attempt to bobtail congressional debate over the Mattis nomination and the larger issue of civilian control of the military, which they believe deserves scrutiny.

Whether they will oppose the expedited process detailed in the CR provision remains to be seen.

OPPOSITION TO RULE CHANGES

Asked before the CR provision was unveiled publicly whether the Mattis provision could doom the whole stopgap, incoming Senate Minority Whip Richard J. Durbin said: "I hope it doesn't come to it . . . There's a strong sentiment opposing any rules changes in the CR."

Jack Reed of Rhode Island, the top Democrat on Senate Armed Services, said in a statement he opposes "changing the rules" governing nominations.

"Trying to jam a historic change like this through on a year-end spending bill, or changing the rules before a serious debate can take place, is not the way to conduct the people's business," Reed said. "Surely, at the very least, it is worth having bipartisan hearings and debate before taking any action that could unintentionally disrupt the long established principle of civilian control of the military."

New York Democrat Charles E. Schumer, the Senate's incoming minority leader, told reporters prior to release of the new spending legislation that the Mattis nomination should not be "short-shrived through a CR."

"There should be a full process, and our caucus feels very strongly about that," Schumer said. "And changing the rules in a CR? That's never been done before."

Along the same lines, in the House, Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., said earlier in the day that using a CR to address a forthcoming nomination would set a "terrible precedent."

"The American people are entitled to regular order and thoughtful scrutiny of nominees and any potential waivers," Pelosi said.

Likewise, the top Democrat on House Intelligence, Californian Adam B. Schiff, said in a statement prior to the CR's release: "Members of Congress would benefit from knowing not only General Mattis' views on civilian control of the military, but who else from the military the President-elect intends to nominate for other key positions in his Cabinet. This ill-considered idea of rushing to judgment and including the waiver in a must-pass spending bill should be rejected."

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend from New York that I do not have any speakers remaining, and I am prepared to close after she does.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to stand here in support of the Water Infrastructure Improvements Act for the Nation, also known as WIIN, because this legislation is a big win for my home State of Florida. There are two projects in there that I would like to talk about: the restoration of our Everglades and actually the expansion of Port Everglades, which is a different project.

□ 1000

Our Everglades is the crown jewel of Florida. We also call it the river of grass. It is the home to an extraordinary natural habitat which attracts thousands and thousands of visitors every year, but, more important, it is where we store and clean the water for 7 million Floridians each year. Within WIIN is CEPP, Central Everglades Planning Project, which will continue the promise of this Congress to restore the natural flow of our river of grass that was interrupted years ago by Federal agencies.

Also in this winning legislation is the expansion of Port Everglades, one of Florida's premier ports. Last year I was able to travel with our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to Panama. We witnessed the opening of the canal, and we have seen the massive ships that are now traveling the

seas, ships that will not be allowed into many of our ports unless we have an expansion. This bill will allow the expansion of Port Everglades to go forward.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to let you know that it has taken us 20 years to get this authorized. So when I say this is a big win, this is a big economic win for south Florida because we expect, with the expansion 7,000 new jobs, 135,000 indirect new jobs, and \$500 million of economic impact for our State.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support what will be a big win for our country.

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

I urge the majority, once again, to get back to regular order and get to work on long-term appropriations to end this long cycle of political brinksmanship. These short-term appropriations stifle economic growth and fail to provide stability to the American people. CBS News has highlighted that it costs the taxpayers an estimated \$24 million a week just to run the House of Representatives. It is disappointing that this session of Congress is ending much the same way it began, with taxpayers failing to get their money's worth.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind words my friend from Florida just had to say about the WRDA bill. Twenty years was her testimony. Twenty years the folks in south Florida have been waiting for a solution. We came to that in a bipartisan way, bicameral way. If we support this rule, we are going to make that the law of the land.

Before I spend a little more time bragging about the content of the bill, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that these things don't happen by accident. On the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure alone, we have got a whole team of folks, again, who have been working for not days, not weeks, not even months, but years on this final project. Our staff director on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Matt Sturges, tireless in this effort; the subcommittee staff director, Geoff Bowman; Collin McCune on the committee, working with every single member to make sure no balls get dropped, that we don't miss a single opportunity to make a difference.

You look at all the work that goes on behind the scenes, Mr. Speaker, and it culminates right here in just this 1 hour of debate. We have talked about what went on in California. We have talked about what goes on in Florida; in Texas, years waiting for the Brazos Island Harbor project, Mr. Speaker, years waiting for the Upper Trinity River project, the Houston Ship Channel. Thanks to WRDA, all of these projects are going to happen. Projects in Alaska, New Hampshire, Maine, Louisiana, North Carolina, Missouri,

Kansas, Washington all inside this bill, all the result of individual members working together to make those a reality.

With the passage of this bill, Mr. Speaker, we are going to get back to a regular order process, exerting our constituents' control over executive branch agencies as it relates to water projects. We are going to get back in the habit of doing the annual work of coming together, looking at what the national infrastructure priorities are of America, and getting about that business, prioritizing those projects, focusing on those projects, getting the red tape out of the way, making sure we are delivering for folks back home.

It has been a long time coming. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to slow it down any longer. I ask all of my colleagues to support this rule so that we can consider the underlying bills, and I ask all of my colleagues to cast an enthusiastic "yes" vote for those underlying bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 949 OFFERED BY  
MS. SLAUGHTER

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

SEC. 3. 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. 2403) to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the Multiemployer Health Benefit Plan and the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. 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. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2403.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). 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 and clause 9 of rule XX,

this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 949, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4919.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 181, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 617]  
YEAS—234

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

NAYS—181

Adams	Bera	Boyle, Brendan
Aguilar	Beyer	F.
Bass	Bishop (GA)	Brady (PA)
Beatty	Blumenauer	Brown (FL)
Becerra	Bonamici	Brownley (CA)

Bustos Hastings  
 Butterfield Heck (WA)  
 Capps Higgins  
 Capuano Himes  
 Cárdenas Hinojosa  
 Carney Honda  
 Carson (IN) Hoyer  
 Cartwright Huffman  
 Clay Israel  
 Castor (FL) Jackson Lee  
 Castro (TX) Jefferson  
 Chu, Judy Johnson (GA)  
 Cicilline Johnson (GA)  
 Clark (MA) Johnson, E. B.  
 Clarke (NY) Kaptur  
 Clay Keating  
 Cleaver Kelly (IL)  
 Cohen Kennedy  
 Connolly Kildee  
 Conyers Kilmer  
 Cooper Kind  
 Courtney Kuster  
 Crowley Langevin  
 Cuellar Larsen (WA)  
 Cummings Larson (CT)  
 Davis (CA) Lawrence  
 Davis, Danny Lee  
 DeFazio Levin  
 DeGette Lewis  
 Delaney Lieu, Ted  
 DeLauro Lipinski  
 DelBene Loebsock  
 DeSaulnier Lofgren  
 Deutch Lowenthal  
 Dingell Lowey  
 Doggett Lujan Grisham  
 Doyle, Michael (NM)  
 F. Luján, Ben Ray  
 Duckworth (NM)  
 Edwards Lynch  
 Ellison Maloney,  
 Engel Carolyn  
 Eshoo Maloney, Sean  
 Esty Matsui  
 Evans McCollum  
 Farr McDermott  
 Foster McGovern  
 Frankel (FL) McKinley  
 Fudge McNerney  
 Gabbard Meeks  
 Gallego Meng  
 Garamendi Moore  
 Graham Moulton  
 Grayson Murphy (FL)  
 Green, Al Nadler  
 Green, Gene Napolitano  
 Grijalva Neal  
 Gutiérrez Nolan  
 Hanabusa Norcross

NOT VOTING—18

Ashford Graves (MO)  
 Clawson (FL) Kirkpatrick  
 Clyburn McCaul  
 Ellmers (NC) Olson  
 Fincher Poe (TX)  
 Forbes Pompeo

□ 1031

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

(By unanimous consent, Ms. LEE was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VICTIMS OF OAKLAND WAREHOUSE FIRE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with a very heavy heart. Last weekend, my home city of Oakland, California, suffered a horrific tragedy. Constituents from Congressman SWALWELL's district and Congressman DESAULNIER's district suffered a tremendous tragedy and were killed. A devastating fire at an artist collective warehouse in the Fruitvale neighborhood in Oakland killed 36 young, talented individuals.

I want to first thank my colleagues, all of you, for your condolences and offers of assistance.

These were young men and women who had their whole futures ahead of them. Their lives were tragically cut

short. We want to extend our deepest condolences and prayers to the victims' families and their loved ones during this anguishing time. We are in mourning for these young people.

But know that Oakland residents are resilient, compassionate, and caring. We will continue to support all of our residents during this very difficult time with any recovery efforts.

I ask the House to observe a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCARTHY). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 180, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 618]

YEAS—235

Abraham  
 Aderholt  
 Allen  
 Amash  
 Amodei  
 Babin  
 Barletta  
 Barr  
 Barton  
 Benishek  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (MI)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Blum  
 Bost  
 Boustany  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brat  
 Bridenstine  
 Brooks (AL)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Buchanan  
 Buck  
 Bucshon  
 Burgess  
 Byrne  
 Calvert  
 Carter (GA)  
 Carter (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Chaffetz  
 Coffman  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Comer  
 Comstock  
 Conaway  
 Cook  
 Costa  
 Costello (PA)  
 Cramer  
 Crawford  
 Crenshaw  
 Culberson  
 Curbelo (FL)  
 Davidson  
 Davis, Rodney  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DeSantis  
 DesJarlais  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dold  
 Donovan  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)  
 Emmer (MN)  
 Farenthold  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Fleming  
 Flores  
 Fortenberry  
 Foxx  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Garret  
 Gibbs  
 Gibson  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (LA)  
 Griffith  
 Grothman  
 Guinta  
 Guthrie  
 Hanna  
 Hardy  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Heck (NV)  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice, Jody B.  
 Hill  
 Holding  
 Hudson  
 Huelskamp  
 Huijzenga (MI)  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurd (TX)  
 Hurt (VA)  
 Issa  
 Jenkins (KS)  
 Jenkins (WV)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jolly  
 Jones  
 Jordan  
 Joyce  
 Katko  
 Kelly (MS)  
 Kelly (PA)  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Klione

Knight  
 Labrador  
 LaHood  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Latta  
 LoBiondo  
 Long  
 Loudermilk  
 Love  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lummis  
 MacArthur  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Massie  
 McCarthy  
 McClintock  
 McHenry  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McSally  
 Meadows  
 Meehan  
 Messer  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin  
 Mulvaney  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Neugebauer  
 Newhouse  
 Noem  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Palazzo  
 Palmer  
 Paulsen  
 Pearce  
 Perry  
 Pittenger  
 Pitts  
 Poliquin  
 Posey  
 Ratcliffe  
 Reed  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Ribble  
 Rice (SC)  
 Rigell  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Rooney (FL)  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothfus  
 Rouzer  
 Royce  
 Russell  
 Salmon  
 Sanford  
 Scalise  
 Schweikert  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shimkus

Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Stefanik  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Stutzman  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Trott  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Wagner  
 Walberg

Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Westerman  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (IA)  
 Young (IN)  
 Zeldin  
 Zinke

NAYS—180

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

Gabbard  
 Gallego  
 Garamendi  
 Graham  
 Grayson  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutiérrez  
 Hanabusa  
 Hastings  
 Heck (WA)  
 Higgins  
 Himes  
 Hinojosa  
 Honda  
 Hoyer  
 Huffman  
 Israel  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jefferson  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilmer  
 Kind  
 Kuster  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lawrence  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis  
 Lieu, Ted  
 Lipinski  
 Loebsock  
 Lofgren  
 Lowenthal  
 Lowey  
 Lujan Grisham (NM)  
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
 Lynch  
 Maloney,  
 Carolyn  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Matsui  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McKinley  
 McNerney  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Moore  
 Moulton  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Nolan  
 Norcross

Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Nolan  
 Norcross  
 O'Rourke  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Pingree  
 Pocan  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Rice (NY)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppersberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda T.  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrader  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Sherman  
 Sinema  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Speier  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Torres  
 Tsongas  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Vislosky  
 Walz  
 Wasserman  
 Schultze  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Ashford  
 Clawson (FL)  
 Clyburn  
 Ellmers (NC)  
 Fincher  
 Forbes

Graves (MO)  
 Kirkpatrick  
 McCaul  
 Olson  
 Poe (TX)  
 Pompeo

Price, Tom  
 Richmond  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Van Hollen  
 Wenstrup  
 Westmoreland

□ 1042

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."  
 So the resolution was agreed to.

