

to be a renowned institution and one of the 100 largest universities in this Nation.

During the very first commencement address, a speaker noted: "No one could ever possibly chart your course through these years." And it is hard to imagine that the pioneer class could have dreamed of the role that they would be playing in helping Grand Valley State University achieve such great heights.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Grand Valley State University's pioneer class of 1967, the original "Lakers for a Lifetime."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2842, ACCELERATING INDIVIDUALS INTO THE WORKFORCE ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 396 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 396

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2842) to provide for the conduct of demonstration projects to test the effectiveness of subsidized employment for TANF recipients. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-22. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the

amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of June 22, 2017, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the bill (H.R. 2353) to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006.

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), 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 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of a very important measure. The resolution provides for consideration of H.R. 2842, Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act.

□ 1230

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2842 is a commonsense proposal to help transition welfare recipients into steady, paying jobs. Moving welfare recipients into work is a central goal of TANF, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program. This bipartisan bill would incentivize employers to hire TANF recipients and help subsidize these new employees' salaries for up to a year to allow them to transition into the workforce.

The policy idea behind H.R. 2842 is simple: under this bill, States can establish partnerships with employers to hire recipients of TANF dollars. Through these partnerships, employers would receive a subsidy of up to 50 percent of the wage for a TANF recipient while the other 50 percent would be paid by the employer.

Beneficiaries would have to meet three requirements: they must be a TANF recipient, they must be unemployed, and they must have an income of 20 percent or less of the Federal poverty level. H.R. 2842 will direct our resources to the neediest individuals and families to help them accelerate these welfare recipients back into the workforce.

Mr. Speaker, President Ronald Reagan once noted: "We should meas-

ure welfare's success by how many people leave welfare, not by how many people are added."

The legislation under consideration in today's rule is a fulfillment of that promise. Under H.R. 2842, State and local governments will be able to better utilize their TANF dollars to help move individuals into paying work and eventually help them transition out of the welfare system altogether.

Helping people get back to work is a great deal for the individuals who will be helped under this program, for the employers, for the economy, and for the American people. This bill is, at its core, about helping unemployed Americans get back to work.

Mr. Speaker, we are a nation filled with hardworking people, and I have seen over and over again how badly many of the unemployed want to return to work. Many, if not most, recipients of TANF are in the program not because they want to be, but because they have been forced to be by circumstance. These unemployed Americans want nothing more than to return to the dignity of the workforce as quickly as they are able to do so. This bill will help remove barriers to employment and will incentivize employers to hire current TANF recipients.

Workers re-entering the workforce is a good thing for society. Not only will workers who receive jobs under this program be taken off of welfare rolls, thus ensuring the continued success of that program, but these new workers will be better able to contribute to better lives for themselves, for their families, and for their communities.

Here in Washington, we too often describe policy solutions as being "commonsense" or "win-win," but in this case it is absolutely true. H.R. 2842 is a commonsense solution and is a win-win for everyone involved: the workers, the employers, the community, and the country.

That is why this legislation will receive a substantial bipartisan vote tomorrow. Whatever their differences, Republicans and Democrats alike want to put unemployed people back to work. This bill will actually succeed in doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of 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.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Oklahoma for yielding to me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

This measure is a bipartisan bill that will help Americans receiving support from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families find good-paying jobs.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there are more than 6 million job openings in our country. That is the highest level recorded since we started tracking this data, yet the share of Americans participating in the workforce is at a four-decade low. Clearly, there are underlying issues

that need to be addressed to get more people plugged into the workforce.

For people looking for jobs, TANF serves as a lifeline. TANF is administered by the Department of Health and Human Services and is designed to help in-need families achieve self-sufficiency. Under the program, States receive block grants to design and operate their own programs to fulfill the goals of the TANF program.

It is important to note that States are at risk of financial penalty if TANF participants receive more than a year of education or if States have more than 30 percent of the State TANF caseload in education and training programs. Due to these limits, States have largely abandoned efforts to promote or support work in their TANF programs. This is important to understand because one of the most effective ways to get more people employed is through employer-driven on-the-job training.

Research has shown that, properly structured, these programs result in better and more stable employment, especially for individuals who are otherwise unlikely to find work.

Although the measure we are debating today does not address this issue, this bill will help tip the scale back toward job-training programs. H.R. 2842 establishes demonstration projects that combine work, training, and support for hard-to-employ TANF recipients.

This bill provides a onetime appropriation of \$100 million to subsidize these programs. After the 12-month period, States are going to be required to report to Congress on the effectiveness of subsidizing wages in moving individuals receiving TANF into full-time jobs.

Since we are talking about jobs, we need to recognize that we as an institution have not provided the necessary resources to get people back to work. If you were to ask any Member of this body to outline his or her top priorities, I guarantee you that job creation would be mentioned every single time. We all agree on the need, but from there, the conversation stops. There are lots of proposals in Congress to create jobs, but we have been unable to pass a large-scale, bipartisan bill for quite some time. This really needs to change.

Given the legislation we are debating today, it is interesting to me that President Donald John Trump's budget proposal cut workforce training programs by 39 percent. Rather than present a jobs bill, he has presented a plan that would actually stop helping people looking for jobs. That, in my judgment, is penny-wise and pound-foolish. In bringing forward this legislation, I think it is being made clear that this body does not share that approach, but we need to do more than a single, targeted bill.

Five months into the Trump administration, Republican leadership still has not put forward a single large-scale piece of legislation to create good-pay-

ing jobs or raise the wages of hard-working Americans, but its leadership has rejected Democratic proposals out of hand.

We should be working every day on creating jobs and raising wages for everyone everywhere in America. But instead of focusing on job creation, Donald John Trump's budget request would destroy approximately 1.4 million jobs.

His budget would eviscerate billions of dollars from critical job-creating investments in infrastructure and innovation, dismantle skills training programs like the one we are discussing here today, ransack education benefits, and leave our country in a weakened state. Instead of bringing jobs back to communities that have fallen on hard times, the budget walks away from them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will leave it at this. The underlying measure we are debating today is a good step forward. But one step is not nearly enough. We need to do more, not less, to strengthen our communities and help working families.

Just as I urge Donald John Trump to move past the campaign rhetoric and get serious, I also urge this body to lead with more bipartisan measures that will provide for necessary resources for those who need them most.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by agreeing with my good friend on many of the points that he made. I was particularly struck by the point he made about the low participation rate in the labor force. That has been a problem that has been with us, quite frankly, for, as he pointed out, several decades, and it is one that has gotten worse.

That is attributable in large part to another point that my friend made, effectively the thing around here we call the skills gap. We have literally millions of jobs available in this country, and employers are ready to hire people but they simply don't have the training.

I couldn't agree more with my good friend that on-the-job training is sometimes the best training. You actually acquire the skill that you need to be successful, and the situation of this legislation will actually, again, offset the cost of that to the employer and, by the way, not add any cost to the taxpayer.

That is something we ought to talk about as well. We are just taking money that we would have been spending anyway, and we are spending it a lot more productively.

Now, my friend is right. This is a new program. This is a new approach. So trying it out for a year, spending \$100 million—a lot of money—but obviously we would spend more this way if we would know this would be successful. But I can't help but think it will be successful.

It is important to note that this bill is actually, again, exceptionally bipar-

tisan. I was struck, as I hope my friend was, yesterday when we were in Rules Committee considering this legislation. We are used to seeing the members of the Ways and Means Committee come up and sort of fight in front of us. Instead, they actually came up arm in arm with a bipartisan proposal that they had agreed to that, again, is an excellent, excellent work.

It is exactly the way that Congress should work, quite frankly: find common ground and advance commonsense solutions that make life better for the American people. In this case, at least, I think we have succeeded in doing that.

It is also important to note that the rule authorizes the consideration of H.R. 2353, the so-called Perkins grant program. The Perkins grant is something we are pretty familiar with in Oklahoma. This is Federal money that moves into career tech systems that helps actually, again, workers acquire the necessary skills to be productive, quite often, again, working with the employer who has already got the jobs available. We then train the worker at a career tech system partly funded with Federal dollars, and that person is assured the job the day they walk out.

I suspect that bill, like this bill, when it finally reaches the floor will also have substantial bipartisan support. I want to pledge to my good friend that we are going to continue to work together on things like this. I don't think anybody disagrees about putting Americans back to work. Workers would rather be at work than, frankly, just receiving government assistance and not able to go work. So this bill does that.

I want to urge support of the rule and, again, the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the underlying legislation, which includes my amendment expanding apprenticeships for American workers.

I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for supporting this important effort in the Ways and Means Committee, and I look forward to its passage.

We can all agree that helping people find long-term employment in a high-demand industry is one of the best ways to ensure that everyone has economic security. But technological advancements like automation and artificial intelligence are dramatically shifting the way our economy works, and these changes are only going to accelerate.

We cannot allow American workers to be left behind. Congress needs to be forward looking, not reactive, in crafting policies that help workers who are displaced from the workforce. I believe that means we need a national

commitment to addressing the skills gap and mitigating disruption in an evolving 21st century economy.

Apprenticeships and on-the-job training are an important part of that equation. Apprenticeships can be an incredible opportunity for businesses and workers alike.

□ 1245

They allow employers to build a pipeline of qualified workers while equipping job seekers with the specific skills they need to find and keep good-paying jobs.

Oftentimes, they provide skills that are portable and meaningful anywhere in the country, giving workers more freedom to transfer between companies and industries.

In my home State of Washington, investments and apprenticeships have been shown to give a higher return on investment than any other job training program, returning \$23 for each dollar that is invested.

It is important to remember these investments not only have an incredible impact on our economy but also on people's lives by helping them become more self-sufficient through specialized training and increased earning potential.

I appreciate my colleague's bipartisan support for this amendment, and I urge its passage in the underlying legislation.

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

Decades of experience tell us that the most effective antipoverty program is a job, and this bill helps low-income Americans earn success through the dignity of work.

States actually, as my good friends on the other side know, spend very little of their TANF funding on moving people into jobs. Today, half of all TANF recipients are neither working nor preparing for work. This bill ensures that money only goes to those who are working, providing individuals with paychecks in lieu of benefit checks, a key tenet in welfare reform.

This pilot only provides funding for one fiscal year, repurposing money that has already been appropriated and, frankly, using it in a better way than it was originally appropriated to achieve.

The bill requires that States report on outcome measures and provide high-quality evaluations so that Congress can make appropriate decisions after we have actually seen the results yielded by the program.

And finally, as we have been pointing out, but I think around here it is always worth pointing out multiple times, where actually CBO estimates the bill has no cost. So we are actually doing something good without increasing expenditures for the taxpayers, and, indeed, we are probably in the process of creating new taxpayers, people who can contribute to the wealth and the activity and the prosperity of the country; and people, honestly, who

want to contribute to the wealth and the activity; and employers who want to provide people with an opportunity to improve themselves and become more productive.

So it is a good bill all the way around, and, again, I will be urging the passage of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

President Donald John Trump campaigned on the promise of job creation; however, his budget paints a very different picture. It cuts job training programs by 39 percent, and its radical spending cuts would lead to massive job losses.

In this body, we talk a lot about jobs, but we are 6 months into this Congress and have failed to pass any major job creation bills. While the bipartisan legislation before us today is, indeed, as my good friend points out, a step in the right direction, we can and we must do more.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that I have an amendment in my hand that will generate thousands of American jobs. If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative DEFAZIO's bipartisan bill, H.R. 2510, the Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act. This bill will create thousands of new American jobs through increased investment in our Nation's wastewater infrastructure. Here is a chance to take today's momentum a step further and consider Mr. DEFAZIO's bill in addition to the bipartisan TANF bill.

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 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), my very good friend, the distinguished ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee who will discuss our proposal.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity. As he noted, the President has talked and tweeted incessantly about creating jobs and infrastructure investment, but, unfortunately, the only substantive proposal to come out of the White House that relates to infrastructure, infrastructure investment, and jobs is in his budget, and it actually reduces Federal investment in infrastructure, which would basically eliminate jobs.

So I mean, the bill before us today, bipartisan bill on apprenticeships is great, but you have got to apprentice for something that is real: a job in the end, construction.

America is falling apart, and, right now, we have nothing but rhetoric coming out of the White House, and now ideology. They are talking about privatizing all of the infrastructure in the United States so that you will pay tolls everywhere you go, and, you know, they call it asset recycling. They have come up with a catchy new name. That has been floated, but they haven't put any substance behind it.

So this amendment would allow the House to debate and pass H.R. 2510, Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017. This bill would provide \$25 billion in direct infrastructure investment over the next 5 years to address America's crumbling wastewater infrastructure and local water quality challenges.

The state of our water infrastructure, according to the American Society of Engineers' report card of 2017, is a D-plus. Meanwhile, municipalities across the country have a backlog of more than \$40 billion—B, billion—in clean water infrastructure projects, and, according to the EPA, communities need close to \$300 billion over the next 20 years to bring their systems into a state of good repair.

It is clear that we cannot continue to neglect the serious needs of our aging water infrastructure. As these systems fail and degrade, they pose a risk to the health and safety of our citizens and obviously the environment.

I know the President promised, during his campaign, to make clean water a priority. I agree with that. He promised to triple funding for State revolving loan fund programs to help States and local governments upgrade critical drinking water and wastewater infrastructure.

Well, here is a chance to deliver on that promise. H.R. 2510 does exactly that. It triples investment in America's crumbling water infrastructure.

I was a county commissioner at a time when the Federal Government was a good partner, and, in those days, they put up 85 percent of the cost of our wastewater system. We put up the other 15. You know, this could—by renewing this legislation and a commitment to the State revolving loan fund programs and adding in a grant component for lower income areas, that could, you know, be a great step in terms of Federal partnership and creating actual jobs for the apprentices that this bill wants to create.

There is widespread support for this legislation. I include in the RECORD letters of endorsement from 30 separate groups.

OHIO ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL,
Columbus, OH.

Hon. GARRET GRAVES,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Washington, DC.

Hon. GRACE NAPOLITANO,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRAVES AND RANKING MEMBER NAPOLITANO: On behalf of the Ohio Environmental Council, I am writing to enthusiastically support the Water Quality

Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017. This bill bolsters the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) by authorizing \$20 billion over five years for loans to improve wastewater infrastructure in local communities. It also provides crucial additional funding to help states control water pollution and address challenges from outdated sewer systems.

The need for this bill has never been greater as the nation faces a \$40 billion backlog of clean water infrastructure projects, with cities and towns needing \$300 billion over 20 years to update their water systems. In Ohio, the American Society of Civil Engineers found our state needs a total \$14.58 billion for wastewater improvements. The Clean Water SRF is an essential resource to help meet this need.

The Water Pollution Control Loan Fund (WPCLF) program, Ohio's Clean Water SRF, continues to provide fundamental capacity to improve water quality for Ohio communities and residents. The program includes several different loan options that help both cities and rural communities prevent water pollution. This includes funding to upgrade and replace Home Sewage Treatment Systems (HSTS), as well as assistance for wastewater collection and treatment, stormwater activities, and efforts to reduce nonpoint source pollution. Interest from the WPCLF program funds the preservation and restoration of aquatic habitat to counter the loss of natural systems that helped maintain the health of Ohio's water resources.

Since its inception the Clean Water SRF has provided \$7.2 billion serving 621 villages, cities, counties and sewer districts helping to curb pollution while providing quality jobs. To ensure this program's continuing success and help Ohio address our water infrastructure needs, I urge your support for the Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017.

Sincerely,

HEATHER TAYLOR-MIESLE,
Executive Director.

CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
SANITATION AGENCIES,
Sacramento, CA.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Ranking Member, Committee on Public Works and Transportation, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. GRACE NAPOLITANO,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBERS DEFAZIO AND NAPOLITANO: The California Association of Sanitation Agencies (CASA) is pleased to support your efforts to address the water infrastructure funding gap and specifically the introduction of the Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017. For 60 years, CASA has been the leading voice for California's public wastewater agencies on regulatory, legislative and legal issues.

CASA agencies are faced with mounting challenges of aging infrastructure, growing demands from increasing population, and emerging challenges from changing climate conditions. Confronted with these realities, there is clear demand for increased infrastructure investment, including the need to invest in water recycling infrastructure and clean energy facilities derived from the wastewater treatment process.

Under your legislation, the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) would be renewed at \$20 billion over five years. This authorization represents a critical down payment toward a robust federal commitment to the nation's water infrastructure needs. According to the report, the financial burden to

simply meet water quality and water-related public health goals of the Clean Water Act (CWA) in California was in excess of \$26 billion in 2012. Due to drought conditions and other strains on our wastewater systems, that figure has only gone up over the last 5 years. Nationwide the demand for all clean and drinking water infrastructure needs has been estimated at more than \$300 billion over the next two decades. CASA also supports the bill's provisions to authorize grant assistance for water recycling as well as the programs to address stormwater flows and combined sewer overflows. In California, the ability to construct water-recycling projects is vital to a safe and reliable water supply and to ensure protection of our ecosystems.

As you and your colleagues work to develop a comprehensive water infrastructure policy for the nation, we look forward to working with you to advance meaningful federal assistance programs.

ADAM D. LINK,
Director of Government Affairs.

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS,
Washington, DC, May 2, 2017.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER DEFAZIO: The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) supports The Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017 to provide needed funds to fix the nation's wastewater treatment systems.

The nation's wastewater treatment systems are the most basic and critical infrastructure systems for protecting public health and the environment, but are badly underfunded. Nearly 240 million Americans—76% of the population—rely on the nation's 14,748 treatment plants for wastewater sanitation. By 2032 it is expected that 56 million more people will connect to centralized treatment plants, rather than private septic systems—a 23% increase in demand. In the U.S., there are over 800,000 miles of public sewers and 500,000 miles of private lateral sewers connecting private property to public sewer lines. Each of these conveyance systems is susceptible to structural failure, blockages, and overflows.

In March, ASCE released its 2017 Infrastructure Report Card, which graded our nation's wastewater systems a "D+." Many wastewater systems are aging and it's expected that over the next two decades, requiring at least \$271 billion to meet current and future demands.

This legislation is an important step towards meeting our country's wastewater investment needs and improving our wastewater systems.

Sincerely,

BRIAN PALLASCH,
Managing Director, Government Relations & Infrastructure Initiatives.

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK,
May 2, 2017.

Re WIN's Strong Support for the Water Quality Improvement and Job Creation Act.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER DEFAZIO: The Water Infrastructure Network (WIN), a coalition of the nation's leading construction, engineering, municipal, conservation, public works, labor and manufacturing organizations, strongly supports the Water Quality Improvement and Job Creation Act. WIN also commends your continued work to reauthorize our nation's critical water infrastructure funding programs. The United

States is facing a water infrastructure funding crisis as documented in recent reports by CBO, EPA and WIN pointing to a shortfall in funding for clean water infrastructure that exceeds \$300 Billion over the next two decades. The Clean Water Act was last reauthorized in 1987 and WIN believes that consideration and passage of legislation providing substantial increased investment in America's Water Infrastructure is long overdue.

WIN is encouraged by the growing bipartisan support in Congress for investing in our nation's clean water infrastructure. The FY '17 Appropriation Package released this week calls for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to be funded at \$1.39 Billion—a \$414 M increase over the original FY '17 funding request. The Trump Administration has also made investments in our nation's water infrastructure a top priority for the Environmental Protection Agency, requesting increases in funding for both the Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act State Revolving Funds in their 2018 Budget.

WIN believes Congress must seize this unique opportunity make long overdue investments in our nation's critical water infrastructure. Investments in water infrastructure make eminent economic and environmental sense for our nation. WIN is committed to working with you and the bipartisan leadership of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to advance water infrastructure funding legislation in the First Session of the 115th Congress.

Sincerely,

The WIN Executive Committee—American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC), American Public Works Association (APWA), American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), Associated General Contractors of America (AGCA), International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE), Laborers International Union of North America (LIUNA), National Association of Clean Water Agencies (NACWA), National Rural Water Association (NRWA), United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters (The United), and the Vinyl Institute (VI).

OREGON WATER RESOURCES CONGRESS,
Salem, Oregon, May 3, 2017.

Re The Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Washington, DC.

REPRESENTATIVE DEFAZIO: On behalf of the Oregon Water Resources Congress (OWRC), I am writing to express our support of Congressman DeFazio's efforts to reauthorize the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and tackle the water quality financing needs in the country under The Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017. The CWSRF is an effective program that addresses critical water infrastructure needs while benefitting the environment, local communities, and the economy.

OWRC was established in 1912 as a trade association to support the protection of water rights and promote the wise stewardship of water resources statewide. OWRC members are local governmental entities, which include irrigation districts, water control districts, drainage districts, water improvement districts, and other agricultural water suppliers that deliver water to roughly 1/3 of all irrigated land in Oregon. These water stewards operate complex water management systems, including water supply reservoirs, canals, pipelines, and hydropower facilities that serve a diverse set of farmers, ranchers, and other water users contributing to the local and global economy.

The CWSRF is a perfect example of the type of program that should be reauthorized because it creates jobs while benefitting the environment, and is an efficient return on taxpayer investment. CWSRF funded projects provide family wage jobs in construction and professional services industry that are a crucial component to economic recovery in Oregon and other states. Moreover, as a loan program, it is a wise investment that allows local communities to leverage their limited resources and address critical infrastructure needs that would otherwise be unmet.

OWRC was very pleased to see the passage of the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act (WIIN) by Congress in December last year. An integral piece of the funding puzzle for our member districts was reinstated by this act, irrigation district eligibility for principal forgiveness. The CWSRF is often an integral part of an overall package of state, federal and local funding that necessitates a stronger level of assurance that loan funds will be available for planned water infrastructure projects. Irrigation districts are often located in rural communities and have a small number of farmers with limited capacity to take on loan debt. Even a small reduction in the principal repayment obligations can make the difference in whether or not a district can move forward with a project.

The CWSRF program is an important tool utilized by OWRC members across Oregon, and we applaud this effort by Congressman DeFazio to reauthorize this key program. OWRC looks forward to working with the Committee and this Congress as the Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017 moves forward.

Sincerely,

APRIL SNELL,
Executive Director,
Oregon Water Resources Congress.

SOUTHERN ENVIRONMENTAL
LAW CENTER,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2017.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Ranking Member, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JIMMY DUNCAN,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Resources and the Environment, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES DEFAZIO, NAPOLITANO AND DUNCAN: Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC) writes in support of the Water Quality Protection and Job Creation Act of 2017. At a time when much of our nation's infrastructure is at a breaking point, bolstering our national infrastructure funds is more critical than ever. Thank you for your leadership on clean water infrastructure investment.

This bill authorizes \$20 billion in Federal grants over five years to capitalize Clean Water State Revolving Funds (Clean Water SRF). Across the country, many communities are struggling with how to pay for needed investments and upgrades to infrastructure that protects clean water and public health. According to the 2012 Clean Watersheds Needs Survey, municipalities need close to \$300 billion in investment over the next 20 years to bring their wastewater and stormwater management infrastructure to a state of good repair.

The Clean Water SRF provides a critical source of funding to states to address water infrastructure needs and reduce pollution from stormwater and wastewater across the

country. This legislation will help communities address the estimated \$40 billion backlog in clean water infrastructure projects. Additionally, this investment in our water infrastructure is good for the economy. The report Water Works: Rebuilding infrastructure, Creating Jobs and Greening the Environment shows that investments in our water infrastructure, including green infrastructure, would conservatively yield 1.9 million American jobs and add \$265 billion to the economy.

This legislation authorizes \$20 billion in Federal grants over five years for the Clean Water SRF to provide low-interest loans and additional loan subsidizations to communities for wastewater infrastructure. We are supportive of efforts to increase the resiliency of treatment works to natural or man-made disasters. In the face of a changing climate, resiliency of our nation's infrastructure is increasingly important.

Also, this legislation authorizes \$2.5 billion over five years for grants to address combined sewer overflows (CSOs) and sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs) and recapture and reuse of municipal stormwater. CSOs and SSOs pose a significant health and safety risk to communities and can damage local economies that are dependent on clean water and tourism. We are supportive of funds to address this ongoing problem that can cost communities significant resources to address.

Economists estimate that between 20,000 and 26,600 construction, engineering, and manufacturing jobs are created for every billion dollars of federal investment in water infrastructure. Investments in the Clean Water SRFs are critical to protect public health, promote job creation, and restore clean water in our rivers, lakes, and streams.

SELC appreciates your leadership on clean water infrastructure investment and your continued work on reducing pollution related to aging and inadequately funded infrastructure.

Sincerely,

NAVIS A. BERMUDEZ,
Deputy Legislative Director,
Southern Environmental Law Center.

Mr. DEFAZIO. And according to the National Utility Contractors Association, every billion dollars invested in our Nation's water infrastructure creates or sustains 27,000 real jobs in the private sector. That means that the \$20 billion in Federal investment in the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, including H.R. 2510, would create or sustain approximately 540,000 jobs.

This is real. It is real. Real jobs for real people and real improvements in the infrastructure of this country. This would be a great step forward, and I urge that my colleagues adopt the amendment.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have been having such a wonderful bipartisan moment here. My good friend from Oregon, and appropriately, wants to change the tenor a little bit.

Let me begin by actually congratulating my good friend from Oregon because he is a serious legislator and does serious things, and I am probably going to find myself on the same side with him on the issue of air traffic controllers where I think his points have been very well made.

On this particular piece of legislation, I must admit, I have not had the

opportunity. I don't sit on my friend's committee to actually read it, but I suspect the committee hasn't picked it up and dealt with it either.

And just from a process standpoint, I think the appropriate thing to do would be for the committee to actually review it. It could be amended in committee, as indeed this bill was, and then we would have the opportunity to consider it on the floor. But to bring it to the floor immediately, to me, is premature, legislatively.

I also want to take issue, on the record, with my friends of the President of the United States in terms of job creation. I suspect President Trump, in his private life, has created more jobs than just about anybody in the Congress of the United States, and I think he has laid forward some incredibly important proposals to continue and build on his personal record, now that he is President of the United States.

One of those proposals, as my friends are surely aware, because I think they largely agree with it, is to enhance the apprenticeship program announcement he made recently. Another one that my friends may not be quite so much in agreement with, he has laid out his principles for tax reform.

The greatest engine for job growth is never going to be the Federal Government. It is going to always be the private sector. And if we could, as the President has suggested, cut corporate tax rates, incentivize the return of profit, something where perhaps we can work together, that are stranded overseas, bring them back here and invest in America, I think we would create a lot more jobs a lot more quickly and in a lot more sustainable fashion than we would do through additional public spending.

Finally, I think we ought to give the President a little bit of credit for emphasizing and bringing home American jobs, something that actually began once he was President-elect. We saw it in Indiana with Carrier air-conditioning. We have seen it in other cases where he has promoted the sale of American arms in the Middle East where we have got substantial things.

So I think this is a President who actually gets up each and every day and thinks profoundly about what can we do to create an overall ecosystem, an environment, if you will, that will incentivize private investment, private employment, American jobs, and bringing American companies back to this country.

I think he is actually off to an exceptionally good start in those areas, and I look forward to working with him on that. I suspect we will see a tax proposal on this floor in the not-too-distant future—our friends on Ways and Means are working on it now—that will mirror many of the principles that the President laid out in his initial draft discussion of what he thinks we ought to do.

And that one change, changing the Tax Code, I think, will do more than

all the programs that we would work on, many of them worthy programs, many of them things, I think, where the Federal Government does have a role.

I will agree with my friend from Florida, I am disturbed about some of the cuts in training programs. I have seen those programs work and work well, and I suspect the President will find out—we used to routinely praise President Obama's budget on the floor. It never got very many votes. I don't think it ever got any Democratic votes—that, you know, Presidents propose, as they should, that is their prerogative, they run the executive branch, but, at the end of the day, it is Congress that makes the final funding decisions.

I happen to know a little bit about those programs because they come through my subcommittee on appropriations, and I want to assure my friends they are not going to disappear. And we may have to make some tough choices, as you always have to do, in appropriated dollars, but on many of the programs that I know my friend cares about and has championed in his distinguished career, they are going to be protected, and we are going to try and work in a bipartisan fashion in those areas and keep those things going.

But, at the end of the day, I think the President's record on job creation will be outstanding, and I think the actions that he has taken in the opening part of his administration are a testament to how seriously he takes the challenge of making sure that every American has a decent job, a job that pays a good wage, a job that will provide for his or her family, and a job that will give them an opportunity to live a life of dignity and prosperity, something we want every American to have a chance at.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I first want to address my good friend about the previous question and the fact that it has not gone through the process. I will just remind him that the chatter in Washington today is about a healthcare measure that hasn't gone through the process, at least to the extent that most of us would all want.

I also have great respect for my good friend from Oklahoma, and I know he will see and get a chance to talk with President Donald John Trump. I am not likely to.

□ 1300

But I would ask him to tell him when he sees him for me that I came here in 1993, and there were 14,000 bridges in need of repair in America, and last year the statistics from the society that does that analysis showed that there are 54,000 bridges in need of repair in this country. The point that I wish to make is that we need a serious substantial infrastructure measure.

Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot about jobs in this Chamber. I was at a forum on Saturday, and someone mentioned: My governor's mantra is "jobs, jobs, jobs." And that person said: Well, he must mean that you have to have three jobs in order to get by.

I am glad that we are here today considering a bill that will help Americans in search of work to find a good-paying position that will help them support themselves and their families. We have a lot of issues facing us, and this bipartisan legislation is just one tiny step forward in the right direction. I hope this measure translates into more bipartisan bills.

Too often, from healthcare reform, tax reform—footnote right there. My friend mentions that we will likely see a tax reform measure sometime soon. I hope that it doesn't revert to trickle down. We have seen trickle down. It did not work, and I hope we don't do that again.

We have an opportunity on other issues, and in many respects the majority has shut out the minority from the process, just like what has happened until today, at least, in the other body with reference to healthcare.

The bills we have debated and even passed are projected to eliminate millions of jobs. Even as we talk about job creation, my friends across the aisle too frequently turn around and champion measures that would do just the opposite. There is so much room for cooperation in this area, yet time and time again we are kept out of the process, and the results speak for themselves. For the sake of our country, this needs to change.

Even though this is a bipartisan bill, it also serves as an example of what I mean. I was disappointed that my Republican colleagues in the Rules Committee blocked yesterday six germane amendments to this bill. It is a symptom of the closed process. When we prevent germane amendments from even being debated by the House, it does us all a disservice, yet my friends across the aisle do it again and again.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with this: President Obama is credited for creating 11.3 million jobs in our country. The economy added jobs for 75 straight months, and very fortunately that carryover for the last 5 months has continued.

While President Donald John Trump makes untenable pledge after pledge, I watched every word of his speech last night in Iowa, and all I heard was platitudes. I didn't hear anything about substance. And it seemed like a road test for some new ideas. He makes these untenable pledges, including a very humble promise to be—and I quote him—"the greatest jobs producer that God ever created."

The record is clear, the Democratic Party is, has been, and will be the party of job creation, and is ready to work with my Republican colleagues to continue significant job creation in this country.

So I will ask my friends across the aisle, let us continue the trend of the past few years and work together to produce bipartisan measures that will benefit the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by addressing a couple of points that my friend made. There will be places we agree; there will be places we disagree. I think too often around here we talk about how nothing gets done when this has actually been an extraordinarily productive period in terms of passing legislation. We are going to have differences on some of that legislation, there is no question. There is a reason why God created a Democratic Party and a Republican Party, and it probably wasn't to always agree all the time, but it was to challenge one another and try to work together when they could or define alternative paths when they felt they must, and let the American people make the decision.

Fortunately, we are blessed to live in a country where they get to make that decision on a regular basis like clockwork. They have been making some decisions recently. I think the President has had a pretty good run in special elections. We are pretty pleased with the decisions they have been making. But at some point they will change their mind—they always do—and they will decide somebody else has a better way.

I think in the interim we ought to stress occasionally so the American people know when we do work together. I actually was home after we managed to pass healthcare through this particular body, and that bill moved through multiple committees, had multiple amendments, lots of negotiation. Obviously it is in the Senate now. I think that process will start over there. But the day before we passed it, actually, we came together in a really quite remarkable way. We passed an omnibus spending bill of over \$1 trillion. That bill had worked through the Appropriations Committee of each House, 12 different bills put together to fund the Federal Government. That particular bill gave us the largest increase in defense spending in about a decade, the largest increase in border security money in about a decade. It gave us a substantial increase in money at the National Institutes of Health and at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, areas that Democrats and Republicans alike have been working together on and feel very strongly about.

That bill also broke the one-to-one relationship—pretty artificial relationship, in my view—that President Obama had laid down that, if you increase defense spending, you have to automatically increase domestic spending whether you need to or not or whether you can afford to or not.

Frankly, that bill actually passed with a majority of my friends on the Democratic side in both the House and the Senate and a majority of Republicans in the House and the Senate voting for the same bill and Donald Trump signing the bill.

Now, when I go home and I explain that to people, they look at me with a blank stare. It is like: What? That really happened? One trillion dollars with all those different elements in there and a majority of Democrats voted for it and a majority of Republicans voted for it and Donald Trump signed it?

I say: Yeah.

They are amazed. They have never heard about it. They have never seen it. I think that is because sometimes we present a false narrative of constant conflict. There is certainly plenty of conflict here. Look, I have some sympathy with the minority. Having been in the minority myself, you always feel shut out. But this is an occasion—this legislation, and, frankly, that spending bill—when my friends certainly weren't shut out. They participated, and they participated vigorously, and they contributed in the process.

I am with my friend. We need to do more of that. As a matter of fact, I think you will see it is happening right now. If you go to the Defense Committee, they are working on their authorization bill. That committee is the most bipartisan committee probably in Congress. Every time they report something out on an authorization—I think they have 63 or 64 members, something like that—the vote is always like 60 to 3. They have clearly put aside their partisan differences to work together.

In this bill, we have done exactly the same thing. So while we are going to have some points where we disagree, we are going to have some opportunities to agree and come together. And I pledge to my friend I will continue to work with him to try and see that we find more of them.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to encourage all of the Members, obviously, to support the rule, but I am sure my good friends on the other side probably won't accept the invitation. That is okay. This is a process vote and they have got other matters they want on the floor, and I certainly understand that they will be opposing our rule and trying to offer an alternative.

But when the matter counts, when the actual legislation reaches the floor, I think H.R. 2842 will draw broad bipartisan support. This House is taking steps to help workers leave welfare rolls and return to the workforce. Under this bill, employers will be incentivized to hire TANF recipients and will help bring the unemployed up into the workforce and the economy.

This bill is a commonsense bipartisan solution that will benefit everyone: the workers, the employers, the community, the economy, and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to applaud my colleagues on the other side of the aisle

for their work on this important piece of legislation. I think if we can get it through this House and we get it through the Senate, I am sure that Mr. Trump will be more than happy to sign it.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 396 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

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. 2510) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. 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. 2510.

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 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 184, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 316]

YEAS—226

Abraham	Blackburn	Carter (TX)
Aderholt	Blum	Chabot
Allen	Bost	Chaffetz
Amash	Brady (TX)	Cheney
Amodel	Brat	Coffman
Arrington	Bridenstine	Cole
Babin	Brooks (AL)	Collins (GA)
Bacon	Brooks (IN)	Collins (NY)
Barletta	Buchanan	Comer
Barr	Buck	Comstock
Barton	Bucshon	Conaway
Bergman	Budd	Cook
Biggs	Burgess	Costello (PA)
Bilirakis	Byrne	Cramer
Bishop (MI)	Calvert	Crawford
Black	Carter (GA)	Culberson

Curbelo (FL)	Jones	Roby	Maloney,	Pingree	Sinema	Buchanan	Hensarling	Posey
Davidson	Jordan	Roe (TN)	Carolyn B.	Pocan	Sires	Buck	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe
Davis, Rodney	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (AL)	Maloney, Sean	Polis	Slaughter	Bucshon	Hice, Jody B.	Reed
Denham	Katko	Rogers (KY)	Matsui	Price (NC)	Smith (WA)	Budd	Higgins (LA)	Reichert
Dent	Kelly (MS)	Rohrabacher	McCollum	Quigley	Soto	Burgess	Hill	Renacci
DeSantis	Kelly (PA)	Rokita	McEachin	Raskin	Speier	Byrne	Holding	Rice (SC)
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Rooney, Francis	McGovern	Rice (NY)	Suozzi	Calvert	Hollingsworth	Roby
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Rooney, Thomas	McNerney	Richmond	Swalwell (CA)	Carter (GA)	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Donovan	Kinzinger	J.	Meng	Rosen	Takano	Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Rogers (AL)
Duffy	Kustoff (TN)	Ros-Lehtinen	Moore	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)	Chabot	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Duncan (SC)	Labrador	Ross	Moulton	Ruiz	Thompson (MS)	Chaffetz	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Duncan (TN)	LaHood	Rothfus	Murphy (FL)	Ruppersberger	Titus	Cheney	Hurd	Rokita
Dunn	LaHood	Rouzer	Nadler	Rush	Tonko	Coffman	Issa	Rooney, Francis
Emmer	LaMalfa	Royce (CA)	Neal	Ryan (OH)	Torres	Cole	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney, Thomas
Estes (KS)	Lamborn	Russell	Nolan	Sánchez	Tsongas	Collins (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	J.
Farenthold	Latta	Rutherford	Norcross	Sarbanes	Vargas	Collins (NY)	Johnson (LA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Faso	Lewis (MN)	Sanford	O'Halleran	Schakowsky	Veasey	Comer	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Ferguson	LoBiondo	Schweikert	O'Rourke	Schiff	Vela	Comstock	Jones	Ross
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Scott, Austin	Pallone	Schneider	Velázquez	Conaway	Jordan	Rothfus
Fleischmann	Love	Sensenbrenner	Panetta	Schrader	Visclosky	Cook	Joyce (OH)	Rouzer
Flores	Lucas	Sessions	Pascrell	Scott (VA)	Walz	Costa	Katko	Royce (CA)
Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer	Shimkus	Payne	Scott, David	Waters, Maxine	Costello (PA)	Kelly (MS)	Russell
Fox	MacArthur	Shuster	Pelosi	Serrano	Watson Coleman	Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford
Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Simpson	Perlmutter	Sewell (AL)	Welch	Crawford	King (IA)	Sanford
Frelinghuysen	Marino	Smith (MO)	Peters	Shea-Porter	Wilson (FL)	Crist	King (NY)	Schneider
Gaetz	Marshall	Smith (NE)	Peterson	Sherman	Yarmuth	Culberson	Kinzinger	Schweikert
Gallagher	Massie	Smith (NJ)				Curbelo (FL)	Knight	Scott, Austin
Garrett	Mast	Smith (TX)				Davidson	Kustoff (TN)	Sensenbrenner
Gianforte	McCarthy	Smucker	Banks (IN)	Lance	Roskam	Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Sessions
Gibbs	McCaul	Stefanik	Bishop (UT)	Larsen (WA)	Scalise	Denham	LaHood	Shimkus
Gohmert	McClintock	Stivers	Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Tiberi	Dent	LaMalfa	Shuster
Goodlatte	McHenry	Taylor	DeLauro	Long	Wasserman	DeSantis	Lamborn	Simpson
Gosar	McKinley	Tenney	Gabbard	Meeks	Schultz	DesJarlais	Latta	Sinema
Gowdy	McMorris	Thompson (PA)	Johnson (LA)	Messer	Wenstrup	Diaz-Balart	Lewis (MN)	Smith (MO)
Granger	Rodgers	Thornberry	Johnson, Sam	Napolitano		Donovan	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Graves (GA)	McSally	Tipton	Keating	Perry		Duffy	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Graves (LA)	Meadows	Trott				Duncan (SC)	Love	Smith (TX)
Graves (MO)	Meehan	Turner				Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Smucker
Griffith	Mitchell	Upton				Dunn	Luetkemeyer	Stefanik
Grothman	Moolenaar	Valadao				Emmer	MacArthur	Marchant
Guthrie	Mooney (WV)	Wagner				Estes (KS)	Marino	Stivers
Harper	Mullin	Walberg				Farenthold	Marshall	Taylor
Harris	Murphy (PA)	Walden				Faso	Massie	Tenney
Hartzler	Newhouse	Walker				Ferguson	Mast	Thompson (PA)
Hensarling	Noem	Walorski				Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Thornberry
Herrera Beutler	Nunes	Walters, Mimi				Fleischmann	McCaul	Tipton
Hice, Jody B.	Olson	Weber (TX)				Flores	McClintock	Trott
Higgins (LA)	Palazzo	Webster (FL)				Fortenberry	McHenry	Turner
Hill	Palmer	Westerman				Fox	McKinley	Upton
Holding	Paulsen	Williams				Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Valadao
Hollingsworth	Pearce	Wilson (SC)				Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Wagner
Hudson	Pittenger	Wittman				Gaetz	McSally	Walberg
Huizenga	Poe (TX)	Womack				Gallagher	Meadows	Walden
Hultgren	Poliquin	Woodall				Garrett	Meehan	Walker
Hunter	Posey	Yoder				Gianforte	Mitchell	Walorski
Hurd	Ratcliffe	Yoho				Gibbs	Moolenaar	Walters, Mimi
Issa	Reed	Young (AK)				Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	Weber (TX)
Jenkins (KS)	Reichert	Young (IA)				Goodlatte	Mullin	Webster (FL)
Jenkins (WV)	Renacci	Zeldin				Gosar	Murphy (PA)	Westerman
Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)					Gottheimer	Newhouse	Williams

NAYS—184

Adams	Costa	Heck
Aguilar	Courtney	Higgins (NY)
Barragán	Crist	Himes
Bass	Crowley	Hoyer
Beatty	Cuellar	Huffman
Bera	Davis (CA)	Jackson Lee
Beyer	Davis, Danny	Jayapal
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Jeffries
Blumenauer	DeGette	Johnson (GA)
Blunt Rochester	Delaney	Johnson, E. B.
Bonamici	DelBene	Kaptur
Boyle, Brendan	Demings	Kelly (IL)
F.	DeSaulnier	Kennedy
Brady (PA)	Deutch	Khanna
Brown (MD)	Dingell	Kihuen
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	Kildee
Bustos	Doyle, Michael	Kilmer
Butterfield	F.	Kind
Capuano	Ellison	Krishnamoorthi
Carbajal	Engel	Kuster (NH)
Cárdenas	Eshoo	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Españillat	Larson (CT)
Cartwright	Esty (CT)	Lawrence
Castor (FL)	Evans	Lawson (FL)
Castro (TX)	Foster	Lee
Chu, Judy	Frankel (FL)	Levin
Cicilline	Fudge	Lewis (GA)
Clark (MA)	Galleo	Lipinski
Clarke (NY)	Garamendi	Loeb
Clay	Gonzalez (TX)	Lofgren
Cleaver	Gottheimer	Lowenthal
Clyburn	Green, Al	Lowe
Cohen	Green, Gene	Lujan Grisham,
Connolly	Grijalva	M.
Conyers	Gutiérrez	Lujan, Ben Ray
Cooper	Hanabusa	Lynch
Correa	Hastings	

NOT VOTING—21

□ 1333

Ms. SINEMA and Mr. CRIST changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING SERVICEMEMBERS KILLED ABOARD USS “FITZGERALD”

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the USS *Fitzgerald* collided with a container ship off the coast of Japan. Seven of our brave servicemembers were killed in the collision.

I ask my colleagues to join me in a moment of silence to honor the brave sailors who gave the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

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 233, noes 179, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 317]

AYES—233

Abraham	Barletta	Blackburn
Allen	Barr	Blum
Amash	Barton	Bost
Amodei	Bergman	Brady (TX)
Arrington	Biggs	Brat
Babin	Bilirakis	Bridenstine
Bacon	Bishop (MI)	Brooks (AL)
Banks (IN)	Black	Brooks (IN)

NOES—179

Adams	Cicilline	Doyle, Michael
Aguilar	Clark (MA)	F.
Barragán	Clarke (NY)	Ellison
Bass	Clay	Engel
Beatty	Cleaver	Eshoo
Bera	Clyburn	Españillat
Beyer	Cohen	Esty (CT)
Bishop (GA)	Connolly	Evans
Blumenauer	Conyers	Foster
Blunt Rochester	Cooper	Frankel (FL)
Bonamici	Correa	Fudge
Boyle, Brendan	Courtney	Galleo
F.	Crowley	Garamendi
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Gonzalez (TX)
Brown (MD)	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
Bustos	DeFazio	Grijalva
Butterfield	DeGette	Gutiérrez
Capuano	Delaney	Hanabusa
Carbajal	DeLauro	Heck
Cárdenas	DelBene	Higgins (NY)
Carson (IN)	Demings	Himes
Cartwright	DeSaulnier	Hoyer
Castor (FL)	Deutch	Huffman
Castro (TX)	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Chu, Judy	Doggett	Jayapal

Jeffries	McEachin	Sarbanes
Johnson (GA)	McGovern	Schakowsky
Johnson, E. B.	McNerney	Schiff
Kaptur	Meng	Schrader
Keating	Moore	Scott (VA)
Kelly (IL)	Moulton	Scott, David
Kennedy	Murphy (FL)	Serrano
Khanna	Nadler	Sewell (AL)
Kihuen	Neal	Shea-Porter
Kildee	Nolan	Sherman
Kilmer	Norcross	Sires
Kind	O'Halleran	Slaughter
Krishnamoorthi	O'Rourke	Smith (WA)
Kuster (NH)	Pallone	Soto
Langevin	Panetta	Speier
Larson (CT)	Pascrell	Suozi
Lawrence	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Lawson (FL)	Pelosi	Takano
Lee	Perlmutter	Thompson (CA)
Levin	Peters	Thompson (MS)
Lewis (GA)	Peterson	Titus
Lipinski	Pingree	Tonko
Loeback	Pocan	Torres
Lofgren	Polis	Tsongas
Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Vargas
Lowe	Quigley	Veasey
Lujan Grisham,	Raskin	Vela
M.	Rice (NY)	Velázquez
Luján, Ben Ray	Richmond	Visclosky
Lynch	Rosen	Walz
Maloney,	Roybal-Allard	Waters, Maxine
Carolyn B.	Ruppersberger	Watson Coleman
Maloney, Sean	Rush	Welch
Matsui	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (FL)
McCollum	Sánchez	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Aderholt	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Bishop (UT)	Lieu, Ted	Scalise
Cummins	Long	Tiberi
Gabbard	Meeks	Wasserman
Hastings	Messer	Schultz
Johnson, Sam	Napolitano	Wenstrup
Lance	Perry	

□ 1342

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.

Stated against:

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained today for rollcall vote No. 317. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was unexpectedly detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 316, and "yea" on rollcall No. 317.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I missed two votes on June 22. If I were present, I would have voted on the following: Rollcall No. 316: On Ordering the Previous Question, "yea." Rollcall No. 317: On Passage of H. Res. 396, "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 316 and No. 317 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2842. I would have also voted "nay" on H. Res. 396—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2842—Accelerating Individuals into the Workforce Act.

REPORT ON H.R. 2998, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-188) on the bill

(H.R. 2998) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules if a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or if the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on the postponed question at a later time.

STRENGTHENING CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2353) to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2353

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
Sec. 3. References.
Sec. 4. Effective date.
Sec. 5. Table of contents of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006.

Sec. 6. Purpose.
Sec. 7. Definitions.
Sec. 8. Transition provisions.
Sec. 9. Prohibitions.
Sec. 10. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE I—CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES

PART A—ALLOTMENT AND ALLOCATION
Sec. 110. Reservations and State allotment.
Sec. 111. Within State allocation.
Sec. 112. Accountability.
Sec. 113. National activities.
Sec. 114. Assistance for the outlying areas.
Sec. 115. Tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions.
Sec. 116. Occupational and employment information.

PART B—STATE PROVISIONS

Sec. 121. State plan.
Sec. 122. Improvement plans.
Sec. 123. State leadership activities.

PART C—LOCAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 131. Local application for career and technical education programs.
Sec. 132. Local uses of funds.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Federal and State administrative provisions.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE WAGNER-PEYSEYER ACT

Sec. 301. State responsibilities.

SEC. 3. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.).

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect beginning on July 1, 2018.

SEC. 5. TABLE OF CONTENTS OF THE CARL D. PERKINS CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION ACT OF 2006.

Section 1(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

"Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

"Sec. 2. Purpose.

"Sec. 3. Definitions.

"Sec. 4. Transition provisions.

"Sec. 5. Privacy.

"Sec. 6. Limitation.

"Sec. 7. Special rule.

"Sec. 8. Prohibitions.

"Sec. 9. Authorization of appropriations.

"TITLE I—CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES

"PART A—ALLOTMENT AND ALLOCATION

"Sec. 111. Reservations and State allotment.

"Sec. 112. Within State allocation.

"Sec. 113. Accountability.

"Sec. 114. National activities.

"Sec. 115. Assistance for the outlying areas.

"Sec. 116. Native American programs.

"Sec. 117. Tribally controlled postsecondary career and technical institutions.

"PART B—STATE PROVISIONS

"Sec. 121. State administration.

"Sec. 122. State plan.

"Sec. 123. Improvement plans.

"Sec. 124. State leadership activities.

"PART C—LOCAL PROVISIONS

"Sec. 131. Distribution of funds to secondary education programs.

"Sec. 132. Distribution of funds for postsecondary education programs.

"Sec. 133. Special rules for career and technical education.

"Sec. 134. Local application for career and technical education programs.

"Sec. 135. Local uses of funds.

"TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"PART A—FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"Sec. 211. Fiscal requirements.

"Sec. 212. Authority to make payments.

"Sec. 213. Construction.

"Sec. 214. Voluntary selection and participation.

"Sec. 215. Limitation for certain students.

"Sec. 216. Federal laws guaranteeing civil rights.

"Sec. 217. Participation of private school personnel and children.

"Sec. 218. Limitation on Federal regulations.

"Sec. 219. Study on programs of study aligned to high-skill, high-wage occupations.

"PART B—STATE ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"Sec. 221. Joint funding.

"Sec. 222. Prohibition on use of funds to induce out-of-State relocation of businesses.

"Sec. 223. State administrative costs.

"Sec. 224. Student assistance and other Federal programs."

SEC. 6. PURPOSE.

Section 2 (20 U.S.C. 2301) is amended—