

Tourism Week, which runs from May 7 to May 13.

I grew up in Tarpon Springs, Florida, where our historic sponge docks, authentic Greek communities, and beautiful waterways draw visitors from around the State, country, and the world.

As a young kid, I worked in my grandfather's bakery in Tarpon Springs, Florida. Many of our customers were tourists coming to sample Greek pastries on their visit to Tarpon Springs.

Today, tourism remains important to businesses in our community. And in 2015, both business and leisure travelers spent \$2 billion in Florida's 12th Congressional District.

Travel and tourism is one of the largest industries in the United States. Last year alone, it generated more than \$2.3 trillion in economic output, and it is responsible for 15.3 million jobs nationwide.

In honor of National Travel and Tourism Week, I thank the people who work each day to welcome travelers and keep this important industry strong.

REPEAL AND REPLACE THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I hope that tomorrow the House has the opportunity to deliver on the promise that the President made and Republicans made to finally repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act which is crumbling around us.

Mr. Speaker, we do everything we said we would do. Maintain coverage for preexisting conditions and guarantee it, check. In fact, with the MacArthur amendment and the Palmer amendment, we establish high-risk pools that will actually bring down the premium costs for people with preexisting conditions, as it will for all Americans.

Guarantee coverage and renewability, check. Coverage for people up to age 26 on their parents' plan, check. No discrimination based on gender, check.

And most importantly, in the Medicaid program, we not only preserve but strengthen coverage for our elderly, sick, disabled, and pregnant women on that plan.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time we repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2017.

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 May 3, 2017, at 9:19 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 141.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 274.

That the Senate passed with amendments H.R. 366.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 244, HONORING INVESTMENTS IN RECRUITING AND EMPLOYING AMERICAN MILITARY VETERANS ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 305 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 305

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 244) to encourage effective, voluntary investments to recruit, employ, and retain men and women who have served in the United States military with annual Federal awards to employers recognizing such efforts, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendments numbered 2 and 3, and that the House concur in the Senate amendment numbered 1 with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-16 modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendments 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 final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 2. The chair of the Committee on Appropriations may insert in the Congressional Record not later than May 3, 2017, such material as he may deem explanatory of the Senate amendments and the motion specified in the first section of this resolution.

SEC. 3. The chair of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence may insert in the Congressional Record not later than May 3, 2017, such material as he may deem explanatory of intelligence authorization measures for the fiscal year 2017.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my friend, 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. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of two very important measures. First, the resolution provides for consideration of Senate amendments to H.R. 244, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2017.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. In addition, the resolution provides for consideration of the FY 2017 Intelligence Authorization Act as an amendment to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriations package in front of us is the first successful bicameral, bipartisan negotiation of the Trump administration. It has broad bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress. All Members can feel good about the work of the Appropriations Committee, especially our chairman, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN of New Jersey, and our Ranking Member, Mrs. LOWEY of New York. In the House, the work must continue today but, hopefully, will be concluded today.

The package in front of us not only keeps the government open and operating through the end of the fiscal year, but it also represents a successful completion of key member priorities on both sides of the aisle.

This bill provides for a \$25.7 billion increase in defense spending, notably including an additional \$7.3 billion for Department of Defense readiness and training, as well as the largest pay raise our troops have received in 6 years. These funds will help us enhance our military readiness and marks an end to the erosion of our national military strength.

Importantly, we accomplished this without a dollar-for-dollar increase in nondefense discretionary spending, a practice which was imposed upon us by the previous administration. That practice threatened to drive our national deficit even higher. I am pleased that we broke that connection, for we should never operate under such a formula in the future.

This measure also provides for an increase of \$1.5 billion in funding for border security. \$772 million is available for key administration priorities like border security technology enhancements and infrastructure improvements. It also increases funding for Customs and Border Patrol to improve operational effectiveness. And, I note, the President has wide authority and latitude to deploy these dollars where

they should do the most good. This is the largest increase in border security funding in almost a decade.

Domestically, this bill funds hundreds, if not thousands, of Member priorities. We reached a bipartisan agreement on opioid funding, redirecting over \$500 million to combat this epidemic affecting every district in the Nation. We funded health care for miners, a key priority for many of our Members.

We secured the second consecutive \$2 billion increase for the National Institutes of Health, the Nation's lead biomedical research organization and a key driver of the hope of treating new diseases, saving countless lives, and, incidentally, driving down healthcare costs.

We also secured an increase for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, which will help enhance our readiness to combat pandemics and respond to public health crises.

We increased funding for GEAR UP and TRIO, two essential programs that help first-generation college students actually go to college, and increased funding for Head Start by \$90 million. Every Member of this House has a victory someplace in this bill, and this was done, Mr. Speaker, by cutting spending in other less essential areas and making tough choices.

In the Labor-H provisions of this bill, for instance, we actually spend \$2.8 billion less than President Obama requested, and \$1 billion less than we actually spent last year.

Finally, and most importantly, this bill is the product of a successful bipartisan, bicameral negotiation. This shows all of us that we have the ability for the President, the Republicans in the House and the Senate, and the Democrats in the House and the Senate to sit down and work together on important issues. I am heartened by this success, and I believe it suggests our ability to work together in the future on other crucially important pieces of legislation like tax reform and infrastructure improvements.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate the rule for consideration of the Consolidated Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2017. As you know, this \$1 trillion omnibus will provide discretionary funding for most of the Federal Government for the remaining 5 months of fiscal year 2017.

Before moving to the specifics of the legislation, we need to get a few things straight. It bears repeating that the appropriations measures contained in this bill should have been passed months ago. While I am glad that we have arrived at this compromise, and

the words of my good friend from Oklahoma, I certainly support with regard to the extraordinary work of the chairman and the ranking member, and their respective staffs, as well as all the appropriators, generally, and their staffs, they have done a good job with reference to the measure, as far as compromise is concerned.

But the fact remains that the bill is 7 months late. The House Committee on Appropriations is already hard at work for fiscal year 2018, and yet this body is still trying to fund programs for the current fiscal year. The root cause of this disarray does not lie with the Appropriations Committee but with the majority's leadership, or lack thereof, in this Congress and in the White House.

□ 1245

I also need to level another critique at my friends across the aisle who have time and again brought us to the brink of a government shutdown. We needed months of negotiations and three continuing resolutions to keep the government funded. Much of the time, poison pill riders gummed up the works. Among other things, the majority continuously tries to strip funding from women's healthcare organizations, slash environmental protections, and end protections for Federal employees through the appropriations process.

Well, here we are, Mr. Speaker, 7 months later, with a bill that does none of these things. Yet we do it again and again, lurching from manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis. I said yesterday or the day before in the Rules Committee that we will be back here with a stopgap measure and repeat this same crisis routine that we have done for many of the years that I have had the privilege of serving in this body. Mr. Speaker, maybe next time we will skip the grandstanding and start off with a commonsense measure from the get-go.

This brings me to the bill itself. The measure includes \$1.07 trillion in base discretionary budget authority, including \$551 billion in base defense spending, \$518.5 billion in base nondefense spending, \$62.1 billion in overseas contingency operations defense spending, and \$16.5 billion in overseas contingency operations nondefense spending. More than 160 partisan toxic riders were floated but kept out of the legislation.

Despite Donald Trump's insistence on draconian cuts, the omnibus includes \$1.2 billion in additional nondefense budget authority. It provides funding to alleviate Puerto Rico's emergency budget shortfall and their underfunded Medicaid program. It increases funding for the National Institutes of Health by \$2 billion. It provides \$1.1 billion in disaster assistance for regions affected by storms and flooding in 2015 and 2016, and it includes \$900 million in humanitarian assistance to alleviate international famine.

Toward that end, with reference to famine in the world, we are witnessing a rising number of countries that are experiencing famine. Without identifying them all, it is estimated that some 20 million people in the world are at risk of dying from starvation. In this country, too many people are in a position of being hungry during the course of a day. In the land of plenty, we can do better.

In this vein, I was pleased to see the inclusion of language that will positively impact the district that I serve and every other district that faces the threat of natural disasters. Toward that end, my good friend from Oklahoma is absolutely correct. In the compromise measure, there are some things that will impact all of our districts, and that is, in my judgment, as it should be.

Additionally, I am one of few Members around here who continuously argues that Members should have earmark responsibilities so that they can be held accountable for things that are vital in their districts rather than allowing the bureaucracy to dominate that sphere.

The language clarifies a provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act, codifying the Department of Labor's views on lifting the work restrictions on insurance claims adjusters responding to disasters. When a natural disaster strikes, like a hurricane or a wildfire, insurance adjusters are there to help those affected piece their lives back together and get back on their feet. By ensuring that adjusters can quickly and readily respond to disasters, this codification helps them complete their important work.

I did say in the Rules Committee, and I have said for 20 years here, that this Congress needs a disaster relief committee that is constituted of all of the chairs of the committees of jurisdiction. It is not complicated. It is something that is done in other countries so that when these disasters occur—be they fire, flood, hurricane, tornado, or any disaster—we can respond more quickly than we do now, rather than allowing for the residual remains of the kinds of disasters that we experience in this country.

Just this past weekend, at least 16 lives were lost and many people were injured in tornadic activity in the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Arkansas and floods in Missouri, and we need to respond to those.

Additionally, something else that I want to say that I consider to be important are the responsibilities of FEMA. While I believe they do an extraordinary job with what they are allowed to work with, I don't know what it takes to get across to people that FEMA can only react when there are a certain number of people that have lost their homes. Please know this: when 1 person loses their home to a natural disaster, it is just as important as if 1,000 or 100,000 lost their home; and we,

this Congress, need to be able to respond to that the same way we do to 1,000.

Furthermore, I was glad to see that the bill includes year-round Pell grants to provide 1 million students in this country with an additional average award of \$1,650, and it permanently extends health insurance benefits for retired mineworkers.

I might add that that has been and will continue to be a bipartisan effort to provide for the health of those mineworkers. Hopefully, in spite of all the talk coming out of the White House, we may, one day, find a way to help those that have lost their jobs because of the industrial changes transition to good jobs.

But what is included in this bill is just as important as what is not. In his first major budget negotiation, Donald John Trump made many demands that were defeated. He requested \$30 billion in additional defense spending and \$3 billion to fund construction of a U.S.-Mexico border wall and is around crowing that there is money in this bill to do something about the wall, and there is not.

The President wanted policy riders to restrict sanctuary cities from receiving Federal grants. He wanted to defund Planned Parenthood and undermine health care. As I have already said, there were 160 riders that were floated here in this measure but are not included.

Rather than governing responsibly, Donald John Trump and the House Freedom Caucus have spent a good deal of time and energy pushing partisan interests, from repealing health care to gutting the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and successful programs like community development block grants. All of these programs are fully funded in this measure.

As the President gets cozy with authoritarian strongmen around the world and revisits the history of the Civil War—and for your information, Donald Trump, it was slavery that caused the war—Congress has stepped up and asserted itself, and I am glad.

I have said repeatedly that the legislative branch has given too much authority not to this President but to the one before him, the one before him, and the one before that one. We have continuously ceded our authority. So it is understood by virtue of this action and, I hope, future action that the legislature is an equal branch of our government, and we need to act like it.

Funding the government is one of the most important responsibilities Congress has. There are, undeniably, differences in policy priorities between Members in this body, Democrats and Republicans, and differences between Democrats and differences between Republicans in this body, but holding the Federal budget hostage is not the way to work through these problems. This measure is a responsible compromise

that serves the interests of the American public, and that is what we came here to do.

My good friend from Oklahoma, last night in the Rules Committee, said that the people that win in this measure are the American people, and I agree with him. That is why I was even dismayed and, quite frankly, disturbed at the irresponsible comment that Donald John Trump tweeted yesterday morning that what this country needs is “a good shutdown” in September.

I made it a point, when we were in the Rules Committee, to ask the fine young gentleman that works with me to learn the context because I just can’t believe that this man comes out and says that this institution needs to have “a good shutdown.”

Donald John Trump, there is no such thing as a good shutdown.

The President champions a government shutdown not only to his but to his party’s peril. The hardworking and working poor Americans are at peril with that kind of undertaking. He does so to the peril of our men and women fighting overseas, to the peril of working families and their health care, to education, and to safe, clean, and secure communities.

Donald John Trump may think he can run the country on Twitter while daydreaming of taxpayer-funded jaunts to his private golf club, but he needs to wise up. We don’t need a good shutdown. We need a good leader. If he continues and isn’t prepared to get serious, then he needs to get out of the way.

As my colleague Congressman MCGOVERN said yesterday, rather than a shutdown, the President ought to shut his mouth. I will put it another way from the vernacular: zip his lip, put that Twitter off somewhere on the side and let birds tweet while he talks sensibly to the American people.

Maybe the President thinks that if the government shuts down people suddenly don’t need to pay taxes and that national parks become free. Maybe he thinks that if the government shuts down—if we have a good government shutdown—every regulation suddenly stops and corporations are free to run wild without complying to clean water or clean air standards.

I don’t know what he is thinking. I don’t think anybody else around here knows what he is thinking. I am not even certain he knows what he is thinking. And to be honest, I would be afraid to see what is going on in his head.

But here is what I do know. According to the financial ratings agency Standard & Poor’s, the 2013 government shutdown cost the United States—the American people—\$24 billion. According to a report from the Council of Economic Advisers, it side-tracked the creation of as many as 120,000 jobs.

I hope you are listening, Donald John Trump, because these aren’t alternative facts.

The furloughs amounted to more than 5.5 million days’ worth of Federal employment lost spread across dozens of agencies. Businesses that relied on tourism lost out on more than a half-billion dollars. The Small Business Administration couldn’t process some 700 applications for \$140 million in small businesses loans.

□ 1300

According to the U.S. Travel Association, the 16-day shutdown cost \$152 million per day in lost travel spending. According to CNBC, 2 weeks into the latest shutdown, the Internal Revenue Service reported a backlog of 1.2 million verification requests that could not be processed.

Mr. Speaker, we don’t need a good government shutdown. We don’t need a shutdown at all. We just got through a 7-month negotiation to keep the government open.

Naturally, the media picked up on the fact that Donald John Trump got virtually none of his priorities. When the report started to air, he threw a political temper tantrum and took to Twitter to undermine the compromise.

I will be honest at this point: it is nothing new, so it shouldn’t surprise anyone; nor should the backlash that ensued or his sudden change of heart. In just a few hours, Donald John Trump went from condemning the deal and whining about the rules of the Senate to hailing it as a great compromise. I must have missed that chapter in his “The Art of the Deal.”

So let’s leave it at this: we need to do more, not less, to strengthen our communities and help working families. I urge President Donald John Trump to move past the campaign rhetoric and get serious.

I hope you are listening, sir, because you can put that in a tweet.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

Also, Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

To respond to a few of my friend’s points, Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by agreeing with my friend, actually.

As he knows, I agree with his point that this should have been done many months ago, and could have been done, in my view, many months ago. We should have done this in December. I don’t think we did the country or ourselves or the President any favors by delaying that. So my friend is right about that decision, and I hope we all learn a lesson from it.

I also agree with my friend that, because we delayed, the 2018 appropriations process will be extremely difficult and truncated. It will make work harder. We may find ourselves back here in a number of months asking for

some brief extension as we continue to work through our problems. I hope not, but my friend's observation on that point I agree with.

I want to disagree with my friend pretty strongly about his observation about the 160 riders that we decided in the negotiation not to press, and I want to explain why we decided not to press them.

Frankly, we don't need to press them anymore. Almost 160 of those were designed to limit or reverse rulings of the last administration—either rules or executive decisions. Well, Mr. Trump is now the President of the United States and he is going to have the ability to do almost all of those things on his own. He doesn't need legislative instruction from us. He will certainly get support as he works through that list with the executive branch, which he runs.

I also want to add, just to clarify, it is important to note that there is nothing in this bill that funds Planned Parenthood in any way, shape, or form. As a matter of fact, there is a family planning title and grants are awarded out of that title by the Department of Health and Human Services.

Sometimes in the past, Planned Parenthood has received money in those grants. Now there is new management at the Department of Health and Human Services, so we will see how this goes. This Congress has never appropriated money directly to Planned Parenthood and, frankly, I suspect never will.

Finally, in defense of the President, I want to point out that we are adding billions of dollars to defense of this country, which is desperately needed because, frankly, his predecessor had allowed it to erode. That is because of the President's leadership.

We are making the most substantial investments in border security in a decade. That is because of the President's leadership.

Finally, we have broken this terrible one-for-one formula that the last administration imposed on us. In other words, to defend the United States of America, we had to spend more money domestically, whether we needed to or not, whether we could afford it or not. If it weren't for President Trump, that formula would still be in existence and we would be frittering away money in places where we don't need it and denying support to our troops and our forces in the field when they desperately need it. I am very grateful to the President for making that possible. Again, with his leadership, it could not have occurred.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), my good friend, a fellow Rules Committee member, and also a distinguished member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. I appreciate his leadership to get us here both on the Rules Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, despite what you may hear in the media, this funding bill is a positive step forward for the American people and a big win for the Trump administration. I want to highlight a few reasons why.

First, delivering on President Trump's promise, this bill makes long overdue and much-needed investments in our military. The bill boosts military spending by \$21 billion, which will help boost military readiness and fund the largest pay raise for our troops in 6 years.

Importantly, the bill finally rejects demands of Democrats to only increase defense spending if all other spending is also increased. This bill ends that harmful precedent.

The bill devotes important new funding for border security. In fact, it contains the biggest increase in border security funding in almost a decade. This will allow us to make improvements to the wall at the border, put more Customs and Border Protection agents on the ground, and end the disastrous practice of "catch and release."

The bill includes important pro-life protections to ensure taxpayer money is not used to fund abortions. Just as important, the bill does not contain a penny of funding for Planned Parenthood. I am going to say it again: there is not a penny in here for Planned Parenthood.

The bill includes important Second Amendment protections, increases funding to help fight crime, supports funding for Israel, provides money for missile defense, and sets aside additional resources to defeat ISIS.

Even more, the bill cuts funding to the EPA, freezes funding for the IRS, and reduces the Federal Government's role in education.

Finally, the bill makes progress and priorities important to my folks in southwest Alabama. For example, the bill fully funds three littoral combat ships, which are built, in part, by Austal USA in Mobile. These ships are critical to the United States Navy and are necessary if we are to reach the 355-ship fleet that President Trump wants. This funding bill will ensure we continue to build these first class vessels in Mobile.

The bill also includes a provision important to our red snapper fishermen. With the help of Senator RICHARD SHELBY, we were able to secure a permanent expansion of State waters out to nine nautical miles.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not perfect—no compromise ever is—but I commend President Trump in negotiating a good bill to begin the process of implementing the priorities the American people sent him and us to Washington to accomplish.

President Trump has called on Congress to pass this funding bill while we work to make even more progress in the upcoming fiscal year 2018 funding negotiations. I intend to do just that, and I call on my colleagues to do the same.

I am glad to support President Trump, this rule, and the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to advise how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 19½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, news flash here for those that might have been trying to make plans for leaving here tomorrow morning: it appears that House Republicans are intent on trying to bring TrumpCare back to life.

The Republican healthcare bill was bad the first time, bad the second time, and its latest iteration is even worse. In addition to kicking 24 million people off their health coverage, gutting Medicaid in order to give a trillion-dollar tax cut—mostly to the richest Americans—and dismantling the requirement to provide the essential health benefits, the latest proposal completely guts protections for people with pre-existing conditions and imposes an unlimited age tax on older Americans.

Now we see in the press that the Republican leadership is trying to cut yet another backroom deal on expensive, high-risk pools to try and muster enough votes to pass this monstrosity.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has not gone through regular order from the start. There have been no hearings. There is no CBO score. We are reading in the press that even more changes are on the horizon.

I wish I could start reading in the press or looking at television and just have people that have the responsibility and leadership to inform those of us that are in the minority just what the plan really constitutes and when it will be put forward. Every single Member in this institution should be as outraged as I am, regardless of party. This is a bill that will affect every American.

Therefore, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule that would change the rules of the House to prevent any healthcare-related legislation from being considered if it does not have a CBO cost estimate; or if it would deny health coverage or require higher premiums due to preexisting conditions; impose lifetime limits on health coverage; prevent individuals under age 26 from being covered under their parents' plans; reduce the number of people receiving health care under the Affordable Care Act; increase costs to seniors by reopening the doughnut hole and raising prescription drug costs; require people to pay for preventive services, including cancer screening; reduce Medicare solvency or change the Medicare guarantee; or reduce Federal taxes on the 1 percent of the population with the highest incomes or increase taxes on the 80 percent of hardworking Americans earning moderate to low income.

Every American deserves affordable, high-quality health care. This amendment would ensure that the Republican bill can't sacrifice that goal in favor of giving tax cuts to the wealthy.

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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, to discuss the proposal.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Judge HASTINGS for yielding.

The previous question I offer with Congresswoman SLAUGHTER would prevent any legislation from being considered if the legislation would deny coverage or require higher premiums for preexisting conditions, increase costs for seniors for prescription drugs, or reduce Medicare solvency.

I have listened to the previous three speakers on the Republican side talk about national defense. That is understandable, but might we, for the purpose of this discussion, also acknowledge the following: real national defense also means providing health security for members of American families. That is part of the balance that we should be recognizing.

The priorities on the other side are the following: they are going to turn the issue of preexisting condition back to a voluntary nature at the State level.

As one who comes from local government, we should recognize the following: every time there is an economic downturn, you can be certain that Governors are going to use the money that was intended for health care to balance the budgets, and they are going to call it good management.

They are undermining the health security of the American people with their proposal on TrumpCare.

□ 1315

They have been threatening to eliminate coverage for millions of Americans for years, and now they are telling us they are on the eve of accomplishing just that.

But what does it mean for the American family? They want to go back to the days when you could be denied routine health insurance because you might have been born with diabetes, you might have had a liver transplant in midlife, you might have had a diagnosis of cancer in midlife, and you can no longer be insured despite the fact that you have spent a lifetime paying those premiums? And we are going to make this an option of the States to decide? This is going backwards on the issue of health security.

But that is not enough, as we know. They also are going to ask you to pay

more for hospital care, more for prescription drugs, more for mental health and substance abuse treatment, more for pediatric care, and certainly more for cancer care. And they are going to call this an improvement in health care delivery?

Well, their recent improvements have made it clear. Let's not forget the previous bill had an underlying \$1 trillion tax giveaway that would drain \$75 billion from the Medicare trust fund and cut \$840 billion from Medicaid, all for the purpose of providing a \$1 trillion tax cut to the people at the very top.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. NEAL. Fewer covered, higher costs, and fewer protections for the American family. The previous question that LOUISE SLAUGHTER and I are going to offer is the following:

We would prevent any of this legislation that is proposed that would be considered harmful to the consumers, as the Republican bill is. Americans need assurance about health care and, by the way, some predictability.

During my time of service here, I have seen how difficult it is to do health insurance. I think there is only one person in Washington, by the way, who said: Who knew health insurance could be this complicated?

Well, for those of us who have served here for any extended period of time, I can assure you, we all knew that health care was complicated in terms of delivery and economic consequence. But that is not enough for our friends today. They want to change the basic tenet of the guarantee of ending preexisting conditions.

I had a Republican friend I talked to yesterday. He said: I wish I was still back in the House because I would vote against that bill. He said: My daughter had a liver transplant, and now they are saying, with preexisting conditions, it is going to be up to the Governor of a State to decide whether or not she can continue to get care? We need the guarantee of Medicare coupled with the expansion of Medicaid, which has now offered insurance to 24 million Americans that didn't have insurance prior to the Affordable Care Act.

I would say this as well. And remember, half of that number, that is private insurance. We kept the private sector alive for the purpose of offering discipline to price. It has accomplished that. Healthcare spending in America has plateaued.

But, again, on this occasion, we won't let the facts get in the way of a rigid ideology that says we need to change the Affordable Care Act because Barack Obama offered it. That is what the test is now for the American people: Who sponsored legislation?

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NEAL. We have debated health care since Harry Truman was President. We have debated health care since Lyndon Johnson offered Medicare and Medicaid. Bob Dole and Mitt Romney and Richard Nixon all understood you needed the mandate to provide health care to all members of the American family. They are going to shun that today and tomorrow by turning their backs on preexisting conditions. Remember, real national defense also means providing health care for members of the American family.

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

Before I go to my next speaker, I want to take a moment to respond to my friends.

Mr. Speaker, I actually came here to debate the appropriations bill, which is a great bipartisan compromise, but I am always happy to engage in the healthcare debate as well, if that is what my friends choose to do. I am happy to do it because I remember the conditions under which ObamaCare was passed.

I remember the promises that we would save \$2,500 a family—not true.

I remember, if you liked your plan, you could keep it—not true.

I remember, if you liked your doctor, you could keep that individual—not true.

This was sold, frankly, on a tissue of fabrications and some predictions that were outlandishly false.

Those people who say this is a good system, come to my State. We are down to a single provider—one. That provider, by the way, I always say thank God for them, because they are losing money. We are down to one. Our rates are going up 69 percent.

So anybody who thinks this is a successful system should go look at it. If it were successful, my friends would probably still be in the majority instead of the minority. It has not been successful. The American people have, in election after election, rendered a verdict that this particular system is not meeting their needs, and it badly needs to be overhauled and changed, if not rooted out completely.

Frankly, again, as, I think, through the President's actions and what my colleagues in the leadership of my party are doing, I am very glad they are working overtime right now to try and make sure that we have something better for the American people than my friends delivered on the other side of the aisle when they had the opportunity to do so. It is not working.

I hope very much we have to cancel travel plans so the next day or two we can actually vote on this. I would be ecstatic to do that. So, again, I would be happy to debate that. When the time comes, we will. But I look forward to engaging in that debate because I am absolutely convinced we can do a lot better for the American people than we

did when ObamaCare was passed, and we can implement something a lot better for the American people than we did when it was rolled out. And we certainly can avoid some of the catastrophic consequences.

As for my friend's concerns about preexisting conditions, frankly, they are not going to be reversed, but I happen to live in a State where I trust my Governor and my legislature to make smart decisions. Frankly, I trust them a lot more than I do anybody in Washington, D.C., to understand what is going on in my State. I suspect most people in here actually trust their Governors and their legislature to be more in touch with the needs of their people than anybody in Washington, D.C., happens to be, so I am happy to see a devolution of decisionmaking from Washington to other parts of the country. As I read the Constitution, we call that federalism. It has worked very well for the American people for almost 240 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Fourth District of Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR), my good friend in his second term, but a new member of the Committee on Appropriations. I am very glad to have him on my Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman COLE, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, and the entire Committee on Appropriations, as well as the President and congressional leaders in both the House and the Senate for their work on this bipartisan appropriations bill.

This legislation is not perfect, but it addresses many priorities for the people of Michigan and the United States. It funds the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, which protects the Great Lakes. It instructs the Army Corps of Engineers to turn over its report on stopping Asian carp from invading the Great Lakes.

It funds important scientific research at Michigan State University, and it continues support for vaccines against emerging threats. It also commits funding for cures research at the National Institutes of Health, including the fight against Alzheimer's, so we can work on stopping this nefarious disease that steals golden years from our seniors.

For the rural communities in my district, this legislation increases funding for rural development grants and the Farm Service Agency.

This legislation promotes border security and integrity, providing more money for Customs and Border Patrol and increasing the number of Border Patrol agents hired.

This legislation will ensure that our men and women in uniform have the resources they need to keep us safe from threats, including North Korea, Russia, Iran, and ISIS.

This legislation makes important cuts, including eliminating wasteful

funding for U.N. programs that overreach and run counter to the ideals of our country.

Finally, this legislation extends prohibitions on funding for abortion that have been in place for years.

This legislation addresses many important priorities for the people of Michigan and our entire Nation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), my friend.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the omnibus spending agreement that is before us today, which will finally fund the government for the remainder of fiscal year 2017. The bill before us is not a perfect bill, but it represents a good bipartisan compromise.

Mr. Speaker, we need to engage in good faith discussions about our values and priorities, not participate in posturing to social media. It is my hope that my congressional colleagues on both sides of the aisle will continue the constructive tone that this agreement represents.

This fiscal year 2017 agreement delivers on many priorities important to Rhode Island. It restores the year-round Pell Grant Program or summer Pell eligibility, allowing summer students to receive Pell grant funds to help them finish their degrees on time.

Rather than slash funding as the President had requested, this compromise also adds \$2 billion in funding to the National Institutes of Health, which conducts vital research in our efforts to treat and cure catastrophic diseases and drives innovative economic development.

On the defense side, this agreement funds vital national security programs, including the continued procurement of Virginia class submarines and ongoing development of the new Columbia class, work that I am proud to say happens at Quonset Point in my district.

I want to thank all those involved in these negotiations on both sides of the aisle for their commitment to achieving a good faith compromise that will keep the government open and working for the American people. I hope we can continue on a similar bipartisan agreement as we plan for the next fiscal year.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), my very good friend and my fellow member of the Committee on Appropriations and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to rise in strong support of this rule and the underlying legislation, which is the product of a lot of effort on the part of a lot of people on a very bipartisan basis.

I would first like to thank and congratulate our distinguished chair and ranking members for their work on the

2017 Consolidated Appropriations Act and for their leadership in bringing this legislation forward today to address a number of timely issues facing our Nation.

I certainly want to thank the gentleman, Mr. COLE, to my immediate left for his strong work on the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies bill, which I will mention at some point here as well, but his leadership has been extraordinary on this issue.

I would like to draw special attention to some of this legislation's provisions that will further support our veterans and enhance our military's readiness.

Division L of the underlying bill provides supplemental funding to augment the appropriations that were provided to MILCON and the VA accounts, military construction and the VA accounts, last September.

Specifically, this bill will allow us to further address the opioid epidemic that has escalated within so many communities across the country and affected individuals and families from a broad range of backgrounds and professions.

The 2017 bill will provide \$50 million in additional current-year funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs to improve opioid and substance abuse prevention and treatment for veterans. Those funds will allow the VA to achieve full implementation of their responsibilities under title IX of the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016.

I just raised this issue less than an hour ago with VA Secretary David Shulkin in this morning's hearing. He stressed the importance of these funds to stay ahead of this challenge and provide comprehensive treatments to our veterans. It is my hope that the lessons learned from this public health crisis will be remembered so that we can prevent similar episodes from occurring in the future.

In addition, the FY17 Consolidated Appropriations Act will support readiness and infrastructure improvements and facilitate future force structure growth by providing all our military services with the full amount requested for military construction efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with so many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle that we need to make investments in our military readiness. I would like to stress that the investments in the infrastructure and military construction programs that support our troops at home and abroad are critical aspects of our overall readiness posture. This bill will move us in the right direction by addressing needs for both our Active-Duty and our National Guard and Reserve forces.

□ 1330

I would also like to talk about some other aspects of this legislation, too, in the underlying bill. Many pressing needs are addressed here.

Specifically, we are talking about a very significant pay increase, a 2.1 percent pay increase for our troops. It is the largest pay increase in 6 years.

This legislation makes a substantial downpayment on our efforts, and the Trump administration's efforts, to enhance and increase military spending to address the various threats that we are seeing throughout the world.

I just returned from South Korea and Okinawa, Japan, and we have many challenges in Northeast Asia, that I won't go into here today. But we all know that we have some real obligations, particularly for our United States Navy.

I also wanted to mention, too, my good friend, Chairman COLE. He led the effort, along with Senator ROY BLUNT, to increase funding for medical research, critical lifesaving medical research to the National Institutes of Health by \$2 billion in this legislation, taking the funding level from \$32 billion to \$34 billion. And that is on top of what we heard in fiscal year 2016, which took us up \$2 billion, as well, from \$30 billion to \$32 billion.

So the commitment of this side of the aisle to medical research, I think, is strong, and we are backing it up with our dollars. We had to set some priorities, and Chairman COLE did that in the labor health bill. He set those priorities, and we said: This is one of them. I am proud that we as Republicans are stepping up on medical research. I am also pleased, too, that many of our Democratic friends are supporting this in this effort as well.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out that this legislation, in addition to this robust increase for medical research, the chairman also provided substantial support for early childhood, a priority to him and to many of us.

And there are other areas, too. Pell grants made some great changes, too—year-round Pell grants for so many students who are struggling with college affordability.

I also want to point out, too, on border security, a downpayment has been made here as well. This legislation provides \$1.5 billion additionally for border security. This will help us move closer to establishing greater operational control of our border, which is something I think we all agree needs to be done.

These are just a few of the provisions of this legislation beyond what I am responsible for—military construction and VA—that are worthy.

I would urge support of this bill. I would also like to point out that we did pass the Military Construction and VA Appropriations bill back in September on time. It is the first appropriations bill passed on time since 2009. I want to take a little credit for that.

But these other 11 bills that have been discussed here today need our sup-

port. We need to keep this government running. We have done it in a very thoughtful, bipartisan, measured way, and we have been very responsible. This bill needs to get to the President's desk immediately.

Again, I urge support for this legislation, and I support the rule as well.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

The President has said that Americans would win so much, they would be tired of winning. I think for once he and I may be in agreement.

Today's measure advances medical research, protects coal miners, fights back against the opioid epidemic and international disasters, and protects funding for science, education, and health care. It should not have taken us 7 months to get here. But I hope this measure will give the Appropriations Committee a springboard for fiscal year 2018.

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

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

I want to thank my good friend. It is always a pleasure, honestly, to engage in debate with him because it is going to be spirited, but it is going to be civil. So I thank my friend for that.

And, frankly, when my friend points out that he and President Trump are actually on the same side for once, I think the second coming may not be very far. So we are all in a pretty good mood here.

But I do want to echo a couple of points that my friend made, and made, as always, with great skill. There is a lot in this bill that brings us together. This was a product of genuine compromise. We have Republicans in the House and Democrats in the House, Republicans in the Senate and Democrats in the Senate, and, obviously, the administration. It is really a five-corner negotiation.

I think we ought to step back a little bit and reflect that, in the course of that, while all those parties began with very different positions, and some verbal fisticuffs, as well, they actually moved closer together over the course of discussion. And that has effectively meant that we are going to have the first bipartisan, bicameral negotiation in this administration that has been successful.

I would hope it becomes a model for some of the things that lie in front of us, things like infrastructure, and like tax reform. I recognize we won't always agree. But, to me, this agreement shows that we can work towards agreements, if we will sit in good faith and compromise with one another.

I think the President, frankly, did a lot of good things from his point of view here. I think the additional money for our men and women in uniform, the raise in pay for those we have asked so much from, and who have never let us down, is something he can be proud of.

I think the additional money on the border, where we know we have a security problem, we may debate the best way to address that. That is fair enough. But that is an achievement that he deserves credit for.

And I think, frankly, breaking this artificial linkage of domestic spending and security spending was something that is really important. Sometimes we will actually need more domestically than, perhaps, we need in defense. But we are going to have to look at those things logically, not create artificial formulas. I actually fear sometimes my side might do that in reverse by demanding cuts in exchange for military spending when those cuts are, in themselves, not wise.

Finally, I look at things where we find a lot of common purpose here. My friend, Mr. DENT, mentioned a number of those. Things like more money for the National Institutes of Health and the Center for Disease Control. Believe me, pandemics and bioterrorists don't care if you are Republican or Democrat, or Liberal or Conservative. We have to maintain this effort. It is extraordinarily important.

I think, again, and my friends pointed out, we worked together to provide additional funds for early childhood, to provide additional money through programs like GEAR UP and TRIO, to help those who have never had an opportunity to go to college and succeed. And, frankly, things like the year-round Pell grant, that, again, as speakers from both sides of the aisle pointed out, are going to help students actually succeed and help them wrestle with the financial burden. So there is a lot in here to be proud of.

Now, our vote on the rule is always a partisan exercise, so I recognize that. But I am very proud that, after that vote, we will have substantial numbers of Members from both sides of the aisle voting together on something they worked on together and achieved. It will be sent over to the Senate, and I think we will see the same result there, and eventually to the desk of the President of the United States, and I think he can sign it with a great deal of pride and a recognition that: hey, occasionally, bipartisanship and negotiation actually work.

With that, again, I want to thank my very good friend for the debate. And I want to point out in closing that this is so much better than a continuing resolution. This is real governance at work. This is us working together, exercising oversight, and appropriately funding, and compromises on occasion, important functions for the American people.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 305 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

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

SEC. 4. Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

RESTRICTIONS ON CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS RELATING TO HEALTHCARE

13. (a) It shall not be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report which includes any provision described in paragraph (b)."

(b) A provision referred to in paragraph (a) is a provision which, if enacted into law, would result in any of the following:

(1) The denial of health insurance coverage to individuals on the basis that such individuals have a pre-existing condition or a requirement for individuals with a pre-existing condition to pay more for premiums on the basis of such individuals having such a pre-existing condition.

(2) The elimination of the prohibition on life time limits on the dollar value of health insurance coverage benefits.

(3) The termination of the ability of individuals under 26 years of age to be included on their parent's employer or individual health coverage.

(4) The reduction in the number of people receiving health plan coverage pursuant to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PL 111-148) and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010 (PL 111-152).

(5) An increased cost to seniors for prescription drug coverage pursuant to any changes to provisions closing the Medicare prescription drug 'donut hole'.

(6) The requirement that individuals pay for preventive services, such as for mammography, health screening, and contraceptive services.

(7) The reduction of Medicare solvency or any changes to the Medicare guarantee.

(8) The reduction of Federal taxes on the 1 percent of the population with the highest income or increase the tax burden (expressed as a percent of aggregate Federal taxes) on the 80 percent of the population with the lowest income.

(c) It shall not be in order to consider a measure or matter proposing to repeal or amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PL 111-148) and the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010 (PL 111-152), or part thereof, in the House or in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union unless an easily searchable electronic estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office is made available on a publicly available website of the House.

(d) It shall not be in order to consider a measure or matter proposing to repeal or amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PL 111-148) and the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010 (PL 111-152), or part thereof, in the House or in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, that is called up pursuant to a rule or order that makes a manager's amendment in order or considers such an amendment to be adopted, unless an easily searchable updated electronic estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office reflecting such amendment is made available on a publicly available website of the House.

(e) It shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (a), paragraph (b), paragraph (c), or paragraph (d). As disposition of any point of order under paragraphs (c) through (e), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the order, conference report, or rule as applicable. The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adopting the resolution, if ordered; and

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1665, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 192, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 246]

YEAS—231

Abraham	Gaetz	Meehan
Aderholt	Gallagher	Messer
Allen	Garrett	Mitchell
Amash	Gibbs	Moolenaar
Amodei	Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)
Arrington	Gosar	Mullin
Babin	Gowdy	Murphy (PA)
Bacon	Granger	Noem
Banks (IN)	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Barletta	Graves (LA)	Olson
Barr	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Barton	Griffith	Palmer
Bergman	Grothman	Paulsen
Biggs	Guthrie	Pearce
Bilirakis	Harper	Perry
Bishop (MI)	Harris	Pittenger
Bishop (UT)	Hartzer	Poe (TX)
Blackburn	Hensarling	Posey
Blum	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe
Bost	Hice, Jody B.	Reed
Brady (TX)	Higgins (LA)	Reichert
Brat	Hill	Renacci
Bridenstine	Holding	Rice (SC)
Brooks (AL)	Hollingsworth	Roby
Brooks (IN)	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Buchanan	Huizenga	Rogers (AL)
Buck	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Budd	Hurd	Rokita
Burgess	Issa	Rooney, Francis
Byrne	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney, Thomas J.
Calvert	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Roskam
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Cheney	Jordan	Rouzer
Coffman	Joyce (OH)	Royce (CA)
Cole	Katko	Russell
Collins (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Rutherford
Collins (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Sanford
Comer	King (IA)	Scalise
Comstock	King (NY)	Schweikert
Conaway	Kinzinger	Scott, Austin
Cook	Knight	Sensenbrenner
Costello (PA)	Kustoff (TN)	Sessions
Cramer	Labrador	Shimkus
Crawford	LaHood	Shuster
Culberson	LaMalfa	Simpson
Curbelo (FL)	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Davidson	Lance	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Lewis (MN)	Smith (TX)
Dent	LoBiondo	Smucker
DeSantis	Long	Stefanik
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Stewart
Diaz-Balart	Love	Stivers
Donovan	Lucas	Taylor
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Tenney
Duncan (SC)	MacArthur	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Thornberry
Dunn	Marino	Tiberi
Emmer	Marshall	Tipton
Estes (KS)	Massie	Trott
Farenthold	Mast	Turner
Faso	McCarthy	Upton
Ferguson	McCauley	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Wagner
Fleischmann	McHenry	Walberg
Flores	McKinley	Walden
Fortenberry	McMorris	Walker
Fox	Rodgers	Walorski
Franks (AZ)	McSally	Walters, Mimi
Frelinghuysen	Meadows	

Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westernman
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder

Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—192

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Black
Chaffetz
Demings

Gohmert
Larson (CT)
Newhouse

Poliquin

□ 1401

Messrs. RICHMOND, McNERNEY, and DOGGETT changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ADERHOLT changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 3rd 2017, I was not present for rollcall vote 246. If I had been present for this vote, I would have voted: “Nay” on rollcall vote 246.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HENSARLING was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE REMEMBERING VICTIMS OF DESTRUCTIVE STORM

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, a very destructive storm system moved across my home State of Texas, the Midwest, and the Southeast, killing 15 of our fellow citizens and destroying whole communities in its wake.

In Van Zandt County in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, which I have the privilege to represent, four constituents lost their lives in a series of four violent tornadoes that shattered homes, shattered lives, and devastated neighbors in the Fifth District and the Fourth District of Texas.

These storms also tragically killed seven people in Washington, Carroll, and Madison Counties in Arkansas; two people in Rankin and Holmes Counties in Mississippi; one person in Nashville, Tennessee; and one person from Billings, Missouri. Many more, Mr. Speaker, have been hospitalized.

Joining me here today are some of the Members whose communities were affected: Congressman WOMACK and Congressman CRAWFORD of Arkansas, Congressman HARPER of Mississippi, Congressman THOMPSON of Mississippi, Congressman COOPER of Tennessee, Congressman LONG of Missouri, and my fellow Texan, Congressman JOHN RATCLIFFE—again, Mr. Speaker, all who represent communities that were tragically affected.

Mr. Speaker, our citizens who were lost have left a void in their families and left a void in their communities. Our hearts are heavy. Our prayers are sincere for the loved ones they leave behind and for those who recover from their wounds.

For many of us, in our faith, there is a time to mourn. Mr. Speaker, now is the time to mourn. But as we have, in our faith, a time to mourn, we also have faith, Mr. Speaker, that one day our citizens will heal and they will heal and rebuild their communities as well.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would ask the House to help us in honoring those who lost their lives in these deadly storms and the families and loved ones they leave behind by joining us in observing a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 186, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 247]

AYES—240

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodel
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte

Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nunes

O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westernman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—186

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.

Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Clay
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy

Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cohen
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Correa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley

Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen

Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis

Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suoizzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Chaffetz
Duncan (SC)

Newhouse
Poliquin

□ 1414

Mr. CRIST and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISASTER DECLARATION IMPROVEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 1665) to ensure that Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency considers severe local impact in making a recommendation to the President for a major disaster declaration, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 425, noes 0, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]

AYES—425

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Sewell (AL)
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley

Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaull
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern

Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaull
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern

McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascarell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)

Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto

Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suoizzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walder
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—5

Bishop (GA)
Chaffetz

Johnson (OH)
Newhouse

Poliquin

□ 1422

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBMISSION OF MATERIAL EXPLANATORY OF THE AMENDMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE AMENDMENTS OF THE SENATE TO H.R. 244

Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 305, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations submitted explanatory material relating to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate to H.R. 244. The contents of this submission will be published in Books II and III of this RECORD.

HONORING INVESTMENTS IN RECRUITING AND EMPLOYING AMERICAN MILITARY VETERANS ACT OF 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 305, I