

that GA is not some special interest group. We are family, friends, and neighbors. There are doctors, teachers, community leaders, and, most importantly, small businessmen that rely on general aviation to create jobs.

They are just like, in fact, my son, Ryan, who is with us today, who absolutely loves aviation and wants to be a pilot when he grows up. And that is because he has been exposed to general aviation.

General aviation is an important part of our community and our economy. It employs 1.2 million people and adds \$219 billion, Mr. Speaker, of economic output.

So I ask my colleagues to side with general aviation on any bill that comes to the floor, like the one that came out of the Transportation Committee, and vote against such measures.

Moving a system where everyone is treated equally to a system where one user benefits over another is a bad idea and one that we should reject as anathema to American exceptionalism.

DEMOCRACY IS IN JEOPARDY

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Judiciary Committee brought before the House a motion of inquiry that was introduced to seek answers to some of the issues concerning the firing of James Comey and Attorney General Jeff Sessions' role therein.

Instead of passing that and dealing with issues that are fundamental to democracy and the respect our citizens may or may not have for its government, the Republicans put a substitute amendment in, raising all kinds of questions about Hillary Clinton.

They did everything but yell: "Lock her up."

It was a disgusting display of the majority taking advantage of the minority, squelching our voice, and taking the subject away from what is a serious issue concerning obstruction of justice and the potential obstruction of justice that could come about if there is an attempt to fire Mr. Mueller.

Instead, they concentrated on old harangues about Hillary Clinton. It was not a good day for democracy.

We need to be aware of the fact that our democracy is in jeopardy, and we need to be alert at every moment and try to find every answer.

□ 1230

CONGRATULATING CRITTENTON HOSPITAL ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. BISHOP of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and congratulate Crittenton Hospital as we commemorate its 50th anniversary in the Rochester, Michigan, community.

Over the past 50 years, Crittenton Hospital has faithfully dedicated itself to serving the Rochester area community and all of its citizens. Since opening its doors in 1967, Crittenton Hospital has expanded to meet the needs of a growing community while keeping pace with advances in healthcare technology and modern approaches to medicine.

The longevity enjoyed by Crittenton Hospital is a testament to its unique and enduring impact on our community. Its dedication to our residents ensures that Crittenton Hospital will continue to serve and care for patients for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Crittenton Hospital's 50th anniversary. I thank Crittenton Hospital for its commitment to the people it serves and to our entire Rochester area community.

HIGH-SKILLED IMMIGRANT WORKERS

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, more than 700,000 high-skilled immigrant workers from India are in the United States today on temporary work visas. These people are working hard every day helping grow our economy and raising their children as Americans right here in our communities.

But under our legal immigration system, they are essentially here as indentured servants, stuck in a cycle of temporary work visas, unable to change jobs or even start their own businesses to create more American jobs. They are stuck because of the arbitrary 7-percent-per-nation cap on employment-based green cards.

Now there is a mother in Greenland whose unborn child will be able to obtain permanent residence in America before someone from India who has already been working here for years. That is absurd, and it is wrong.

My bill, called the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act, would fix this problem. It would transition us to a first come, first served, merit-based legal immigration system. It would help these people in need, and it would help create new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, with more than 230 cosponsors, it is time to pass this bill and get this done.

THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO JUSTICE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, one of my predecessors set the standard for service to this Nation, among many, certainly—the Honorable Mickey Leland and Craig Washington—but the Honorable Barbara Jordan served on the Judiciary Committee. It was her

standard during the Watergate impeachment hearings that set the Nation afire about the relevancy of the people's right to justice.

That is why I hold this Constitution in hand and rise to the floor today to express my concern of the issues surrounding the Attorney General and the potential firing of the special counsel, Mr. Mueller.

This book that has the Constitution in it guarantees three equal branches of government. There is an orderliness to the responsibilities of the Executive and of the United States Congress. We have oversight.

The people want answers regarding Russian collusion and the steering of the election to one person over the other. Yes, they want jobs and opportunities, but we have the opportunity—or the responsibility—to clean our kitchen up.

I am very concerned about any executive, any Commander in Chief, who would suggest, in violation of the Constitution, that they would fire the Attorney General and then have the opportunity to ensure that the special counsel was fired in contravention of the American people's desires.

That is why I have introduced H. Res. 474, to cause this Congress to disapprove of any firing of the special counsel and reckless pardons of those who are under investigation.

THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, this administration was elected to drain the swamp, and one of the muckiest parts is the Export-Import Bank that makes taxpayer-guaranteed loans to foreign companies that buy American products, often to use in competition with American companies that get no such advantage.

Now, when politicians are picking winners and losers in the shadows, it shouldn't surprise us that we find a particularly nasty breeding ground for corruption.

We can debate the merits of the Ex-Im Bank, but one thing is undeniable: it is an agency that needs a taxpayer watchdog on its board and not just another lapdog for crony capitalists seeking to fleece the taxpayer.

Scott Garrett is a watchdog. He has sounded the alarm on the Ex-Im's more questionable loans, and his leadership on its board would restore credibility to its decisions.

The bank's supporters should welcome an independent voice that could restore its reputation, and the President should insist on it.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3219, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 478 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 478

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes. The further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution, and available pro forma amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 473.

(b) Each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered 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, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment except amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 473, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 473, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of July 27, 2017, or July 28, 2017, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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. NEWHOUSE. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, the House Rules Committee met yesterday and reported a rule, House Resolution 478, providing for further consideration of H.R. 3219, the Make America Secure Appropriations Act of 2018. This legislation includes four individual appropriations bills: Defense, Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction-Veterans Affairs. The rule provides for further consideration of H.R. 3219 under a structured rule.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of a critical measure that will prioritize funding for important components of our national security. This legislation directs funding for our troops and their families, our Nation's veterans, the legislative branch and United States Capitol Police, border and nuclear security, energy and water infrastructure investments, and vital appropriations to ensure our military has the equipment and readiness necessary to keep the Nation safe.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is composed of the serious and essential work conducted by the House Appropriations Committee over the past many months. As an appropriator and a member of this committee, I fully appreciate and understand the hard work my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have put in to report these key measures we have before us today.

The most important job we have as Members of Congress is ensuring the safety of our Nation. By supporting this rule, we can move the national security package forward.

H.R. 3219 includes a 2.4 percent pay increase for our troops. That is the largest military pay increase in 8 years. It keeps our military on the cutting edge of defense technology by investing in research and development and in equipment and weapons procurement. Under the legislation, we will restore readiness shortfalls and make much-needed critical investments for our troops to address ongoing threats around the globe.

We must provide support for our troops to combat terrorism and defeat ISIS. With the legislation, we take a major step forward in restoring the devastating cuts our Armed Forces faced under the Obama administration.

The bill also increases funding for construction of critical military infrastructure to keep our troops safe and prepared.

The bill also provides for critical safety and enhanced security functions for the United States Capitol. In light of the recent horrific attack on our colleagues, on staff, and on the Capitol Police, the legislation provides increased funding for the Capitol Police toward increased training, equipment, and technology-related support.

The men and women who guard these hallowed Halls deserve to have access to every resource needed to do their job as safely and as effectively as possible. Under this bill, H.R. 3219, we can ensure that the Capitol Police and House Sergeant at Arms are equipped with these critical enhancements.

Regarding the important Energy and Water provisions included in the bill, the underlying legislation will improve public safety, will create jobs, and will grow our economy by funding the Army Corps of Engineers, prioritizing navigation projects and studies.

H.R. 3219 reduces regulatory red tape, including authorizing the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency as well as the Secretary of the Army to withdraw from the devastating waters of the United States rule.

The bill also funds important Department of Energy programs, including nuclear cleanup efforts, such as the Hanford Site, which is located in my district in central Washington State, as well as nuclear weapons programs to strengthen our national security.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation also provides the highest level of funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs in our Nation's history, ensuring that we keep the commitment to those who have defended our Nation. It supports vital medical care for our veterans, including mental healthcare services, suicide prevention activities, traumatic brain treatment, opioid abuse prevention, and homeless veteran services.

There are some issues here in Congress that are nonpartisan. Every single one of our colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives believes we must provide the best care possible for our Nation's veterans. I am proud of the significant strides this legislation takes to support veterans across the country.

The rule we consider here today provides for the consideration of a bill that is critically important to keeping our Nation safe.

□ 1245

By passing this legislation, we will continue to rebuild our military, ensure we maintain our military superiority, and boost defense efforts in the face of rising global threats.

The bill will aid in supporting our troops and their families, and improve access to care for our veterans. It will increase the safety of the United

States Capitol complex for Members and staff who serve here; for constituents, as well as the tourists from around the globe who visit this campus; and for the valued Capitol Police, who protect us all.

It will also aid in important infrastructure and construction investments to move the United States towards energy independence, improve our economic competitiveness, and fund nonproliferation efforts to prevent, counter, and respond to global nuclear threats.

Most importantly, this legislation will make major strides to projects our men and women in uniform serving across the globe who are protecting our freedoms.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule as well as the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. I certainly thank the gentleman from Washington, my friend, for his kindness. I think he is one of the best Members we have, but I am going to have to disagree with Mr. NEWHOUSE today.

When Speaker RYAN assumed the gavel, he told the American people that he wanted to have “a process that is more open, more inclusive, more deliberative, more participatory.”

When the majority took control of both the Congress and the White House, they again promised to abide by standard congressional procedure.

But we are here, 3 months from the end of the fiscal year. The majority hasn't passed a budget resolution, and legislation moves at a glacial pace. The majority working to rush through a massive minibus before any individual appropriations bills have been considered on the floor is also a mistake.

This may sound pedantic, but we do have rules.

Every one of us wants to improve our security, but this bill, I am afraid, is a little more than smoke and mirrors. The increase in defense spending under this bill will never see the light of day.

That is because we operate under the Budget Control Act, and that mandates that any breach of the defense cap, which this bill does, will trigger an across-the-board sequestration cut of all defense accounts, making what we do here a useless exercise, I am afraid.

The majority has also inserted an amendment to provide \$1.6 billion President Trump requested to begin construction of the wall on the U.S.-Mexico border.

This is surely just the beginning of making taxpayers pay for the entire wall, which experts have estimated could cost as much as \$21 billion, with nary a peso from Mexico. If we are investing \$1.6 billion now, I see no reason why they do not plan to go on to reach the \$21 billion expenditure.

Let me put that in some perspective: \$21 billion could be used to double the Federal investments in public schools. Think of that. Just the money to build that wall, it could provide 6 million people with healthcare under Medicaid, it could buy school lunches for tens of millions of low-income children. But these investments are not a priority for this majority.

President Trump's own budget director famously said that it isn't worth feeding hungry children if the nutrition does not improve their school performance, and that Meals on Wheels “sounds great,” but doesn't work.

I never thought I would hear either of those things come from the mouth of a Federal official. The idea that we should not feed hungry children unless their school work improves, frankly, I am baffled by that, let me say it that way.

The opposition to the wall is bipartisan. Republican Representative HURD from Texas, a former CIA officer, sits on the Homeland Security Committee and represents the largest border district in the State of Texas. He testified before the Rules Committee late Monday night against it, saying, “having a one-size-fits-all solution to border security makes no sense.” Yet this amendment was included without debating the merits on the floor and without giving Members an up-or-down vote.

Let me explain that a little bit. This amendment is in the bill, but there will be no vote on it. It has been what we call self-executed to keep people from being recorded in any way, whether they are for or against the wall.

The last statistic that I saw from the American public is that 68 percent of them oppose it. They will never know whether their Representatives did or not. It is a sort of a bait-and-switch idea.

Mr. Speaker, immigration has enriched our country beyond measure. It is what has allowed our country to shape the world, rather than to fear it. A wall will lock the United States away from the rest of the world.

The President's new communications director, Anthony Scaramucci, wrote online: “Walls don't work. Never have. Never will.”

We don't know whether he is going to change his mind about that or not, but that is what he said.

One of our famous Republican Presidents that everybody knew and loved, Ronald Reagan, 30 years ago last month stood in West Berlin and demanded that another wall be torn down.

I said in the Rules Committee yesterday and I will say it again here this afternoon: if the President and the majority build this wall, it, too, will be torn down, not by someone crossing the border or by an outside force. It will crumble because the public understands in a way that this President and majority do not, that our Nation does not barricade itself away from the rest of the world.

We will not build walls to keep us in. What kind of superpower would we be if we built a wall around the outside of our Nation and crumbled from the inside because the money we put on the wall kept us from updating our infrastructure, which is in such terrible shape, and a shredded social safety net?

None of us want to find that out, but the majority is putting us on such a path.

Just yesterday, President Trump announced a ban on transgender servicemembers serving in the military. It appears today that he made that announcement all on his own and that neither the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the Pentagon had any idea that he was going to do that.

The announcement came 69 years to the day that President Truman desegregated our military. Think about that for a minute. Sixty-nine years ago, on the very day that President Trump said transgender people couldn't serve, was the day President Truman integrated the military services.

This is an insult to the approximately 15,000 transgender soldiers who sacrifice for our country every day. Transgender servicemembers are being attacked from both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Just days ago, Republicans joined Democrats to defeat an amendment that would bar transgender servicemembers from receiving the necessary healthcare that they deserve. I will note that these same treatments would have been available to other servicemembers under this amendment. Apparently to the majority, it is not about the treatment, but the person who receives it.

The amendment is especially cruel when you consider that a Pentagon report has found that gender transition-related treatment costs between \$2.4 and \$8.4 million a year. That is the cost of just four of the President's trips to Mar-a-Lago. Think about that: several millions dollars to go to Mar-a-Lago would have paid for operations for transgender persons.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from USA Today that details this fact.

[From USA Today, July 26, 2017]

ONPOLITICS TODAY: TRUMP'S MAR-A-LAGO TRIPS COST MORE THAN TRANS SOLDIERS' HEALTH CARE

(By Josh Hafner)

President Trump tweeted this morning that the U.S. military wouldn't allow transgender troops “in any capacity,” an apparent rejection of the military's roughly 6,000 trans troops and the Obama-era policy that embraced them.

The U.S. “cannot be burdened with the tremendous medical costs and disruption that transgender in the military would entail,” Trump said.

Except trans troops don't really cost that much, as many soon pointed out.

A report for the Pentagon last year found that transition-related care would cost between about \$2.4 and \$8.4 million per year—less than 0.14% of the military's medical budget.

That's roughly the cost of four of Trump's trips to Mar-A-Lago, GQ noted, even using a conservative estimate of \$2 million per trip. And it's way less than the \$84 million spent on Viagra and similar meds by the Department of Defense in 2014, as others also said.

It was, as Sen. John McCain noted, "yet another example of why major policy announcements should not be made via Twitter."

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I believe all of our soldiers deserve our thanks and support. They are Americans. They don't need to be attacked based on who they are.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, it is also outrageous—and I saved this for the end—that the majority stripped from the bill Congresswoman BARBARA LEE's bipartisan amendment to repeal the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Until this AUMF, which, as I said, came into law in 2001, is rescinded and replaced, the President of the United States can usurp our power and effectively declare war without Congress' concurrence. In fact, that has already happened.

Matters of war are the most serious issues that Congress considers. We should not—and we don't want to—shirk those responsibilities. We want to fulfill our constitutional duties.

Yet Speaker RYAN removed it from the bill without any debate or single vote because he was afraid of it. He replaced it with weaker language requiring a 30-day study. After those 30 days, we are not assured of anything at all, just a study.

That is not the type of open and transparent process that the Speaker promised. More than just bad process, it silences the debate we need to have. All Americans, especially our men and women in uniform, deserve better from us, as they volunteered to save us with their very lives.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), the chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the rule, which makes an amendment that I offered part of the security package by the adoption of this rule.

I want to acknowledge the frustration of my colleagues at adding funds to construct three barriers on the U.S.-Mexico border.

Like many of you, I would have preferred a package which included all 12 appropriations bills. However, this is the process that we are going forward with, and, of course, I am supportive of it.

Despite my reservations about the process, I believe that each of these three projects included in this amendment are absolutely necessary for national security.

The funds that are in what we call the "wall" part of this bill are 28 miles of levee wall in Hidalgo County, Texas.

Many people have asked me what that is. Mostly everybody knows a levee is a big mound of dirt that keeps the water from flooding. Well, it is a big pile of dirt with a 20-foot wall on one side made of concrete to keep it from washing out and a 6-foot fence on top of that. It serves for water retention, as well as defending our borders.

The funds pay for the construction of 32 miles of bollard wall in Starr County, Texas, which is Rio Grande City and that area. Bollard fence is a bunch of steel poles about the size of a small corner post on a cedar post fence. They rise up about 20 feet in the air and have a cement base.

Also, the funds pay for 14 miles of wall in San Diego, replacing an existing 14 miles of wall or fence with a better product because it has been deteriorating since the 1990s, when it went in. That is what is in this bill.

Many people claim it isn't necessary to put up barriers between the border of the United States and Mexico. They say the border is more secure than it has ever been, apprehensions are way down, and that border walls do not prevent people crossing. In fact, I disagree, and they do, too.

It is a fact that apprehensions are down relative to the mid-2000s. In fact, in the late nineties, in San Diego, before their barrier fences were built, 500,000 people stormed across that border. Last year, the number is 25,000. That is a substantial reduction.

More than a million people crossed our Southern border every year in the early-2000s. However, today, we continue to apprehend certain people, and it is down to 200,000 a year on the border. That is a substantial number.

What concerns me more than the number of apprehensions is the fact that if migrants are crossing the border illegally, then so are terrorists, drug smugglers, and human traffickers.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, many Members of this body probably remember illegal immigrants rushing the border in San Diego back in the 1990s. Illegal immigrant entries decreased significantly, as I said. The number of illegal crossings fell, crime rates declined, commerce increased, and neighborhoods became safe all because of fences and barriers on the border.

The Border Patrol cautions that illegal border migration seeks the path of least resistance and that these commendable results do not mean that the flow has steadied. It has simply moved to another unprotected place like the Rio Grande Valley in my home State of Texas. We want to change that dynamic.

This amendment is important because it is committed to dedicated men and women who stand in harm's way on our behalf.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask Members' support for this bill and for this amendment.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO).

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, there is a really disturbing story in Politico today.

Speaker RYAN was apparently afraid that he wouldn't be able to pass the defense spending bill, including \$1.6 billion for Trump's dumb wall because conservatives wanted to block Medicare for transgender servicemembers, so he called the President asking for help.

What did Donald Trump do to get Speaker RYAN out of this jam? Trump decided to ban brave transgender Americans from serving. That is right, Mr. Speaker, Trump is kicking transgender men and women out of our Armed Services to make sure he can get money to build his stupid, irresponsible, unnecessary wall. He is implementing one bigoted policy in order to achieve another one.

This is hatred in the service of injustice. This is transphobia in the service of racism. This is stupidity in the service of foolishness.

Mr. Speaker, we need to stop doing Trump's dirty work. Not only is President Trump's border wall expensive and unnecessary, Members of this body who care deeply about our national defense shouldn't be forced to decide between voting for this ridiculous proposal and voting to fund our military.

More importantly, on such a momentous issue, the American people deserve to know where their elected representatives stand.

Mr. Speaker, let us defeat this rule. Let us stop this wall. Let us enable every American patriot, regardless of their gender identity, to do what I did: to fight for this country with pride, courage, and selflessness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, we do have a couple of speakers coming who are not here yet.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time at this point but look forward to having them participate as soon as they get here.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the gentlewoman from New York for her consistent leadership. Being a frequent visitor to the Rules Committee as a Member, I want to thank the manager for the courtesies extended to all of us.

Let me say that I am a member of the Budget Committee, and I want to associate my stance with the gentlewoman from New York. We do not have a budget, but, in fact, the budget is not a roadmap that we are even attempting to do. The budget was a slash and burn

of Medicare, Medicaid, only to give tax cuts, and it had no vision but to plus-up the Defense Appropriations.

So now we come with a minibus that wants to do more damage. I have no quarrel with my friend from Texas, but it is very clear that this budget is based upon this wall, and this rule is based upon this wall. It is important for the American people to know that, while we are fighting for Medicaid and Meals on Wheels, better policing, and better education for our children, the wall that was supposed to be paid for by Mexico—let me say it again, the wall that was supposed to be paid by Mexico, as evidenced by the Commander in Chief—is now, in this rule, not for \$100 million, not for \$200 million, not for \$50 million, but for \$1,571,239,000. That is what this rule is all about.

Frankly, I believe that this is a shame. Frankly, I oppose it because the Commander in Chief swore that Mexico would pay for the wall. Now we are paying for the wall, and, as indicated, a Member of Congress from Texas who represents the area is adamantly against it. I would only argue to say that there are other needs in this minibus that the American people desire.

I also rise to express strong opposition to the fact that the Lee amendments were not put in. Congresswoman LEE had an amendment for us to debate the AUMF, two amendments, and those amendments were rejected. Let us go back to regular order and pass appropriations for the American people and debate whether we go to war. Going to war is a point for the American people to hear and discuss.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to register my opposition to the exclusion from H. Res. 478 of the amendments offered by colleague, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE of California.

This rule makes in order 54 amendments to Division A of H.R. 3219, the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2018 and an amendment by Congressman CARTER, the chairman of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee, providing \$1.57 billion in funding to begin construction of the infamous "Trump Border Wall" that the presidential candidate Trump promises, assured, and guaranteed American and the would be paid for by Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, it is passing strange indeed that the Lee Amendments, which were offered, debated, and approved in the regular order were excluded from the rule while the Carter Amendment, which was introduced at the 11th hour, was included.

Lee Amendment No. 95 would repeal the 2001 AUMF after 240 days of enactment of this Act.

Lee Amendment No. 96 does not repeal the 2001 AUMF but would prohibit the expenditure of any funds to implement, administer, or enforce the 2001 AUMF beginning 240 days of enactment of this Act.

They knew that the decision to go to war was too important to be left to the whim of a single person, no matter how wise or well-informed he or she might be.

Over the last 16 years, we have seen 3 Presidents use the 2001 Afghanistan AUMF

as a blank check to engage in serious military action.

In 2016, the Congressional Research Service issued a report detailing 37 unclassified uses of this authorization in 14 countries, including for operations at Guantanamo Bay, warrantless wiretapping, and recent military action in Libya, Syria, Somalia, and Yemen.

The overly broad 2001 AUMF represents a critical deterioration of Congressional oversight, which should be repealed, rather than repeated with respect to North Korea.

As our brave service members are deployed around the world in combat zones, Congress is missing in action.

As provided under the War Powers Resolution of 1973, absent a Congressional declaration of war or authorization for the use of military force, the President as Commander-in-Chief has constitutional power to engage the U.S. armed forces in hostilities only in the case of a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its armed forces.

As a co-equal branch of government, it is Congress's right and responsibility to be fully consulted regarding any potential plans to conduct military operations in foreign lands and to assess whether such action is in the national security interest of the United States and its allies, and to withhold or grant authorization for the use of military force based on this assessment.

As we have learned from the painful and bitter experience of the past 16 years, at the initiation of hostilities, the costs in terms of blood and treasure of U.S. military interventions abroad are often underestimated and the benefits overstated.

For example, more than 6,800 American service members gave the last full measure of devotion to their country on battlefields in Afghanistan and Iraq, with hundreds of thousands more returning with physical, emotional, or psychological wounds that may never heal.

The direct economic cost of the war in Afghanistan exceeds \$1.07 trillion, including \$773 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations funds, an increase of \$243 billion to the Department of Defense base budget, and an increase of \$54.2 billion to the Veterans Administration budget to address the human costs of the military involvement in Afghanistan.

I am confident that affording Members the opportunity to debate and vote on the Lee Amendments would strengthen our democracy and help restore Congress's preeminent constitutional role in the decision to take the nation to war.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in strong opposition to the Carter Amendment to H.R. 3219, Department of Defense Appropriations Act for FY2018.

I oppose the amendment because it is ineffective, costly, and wasteful legislation for three reasons: it is costly and ineffective; President Trump broke his promise that Mexico would fund the wall; and a policy shift of this magnitude requires regular order with the Committees of Jurisdiction weighing in on the real cost to the American people should a wall be built.

First, I oppose the Carter Amendment because it is costly and ineffective.

It wastes \$1.6 billion to build an unnecessary wall with our already peaceful neighbors to the south.

Only \$32 million dollars of that \$1.6 billion would actually go towards the wall.

That leaves over \$1.5 billion simply wasted. The wall throws away American taxpayers' money when it could and should be spent on a number of necessary initiatives like education, healthcare, transportation, infrastructure, or even military preparedness.

Second, I oppose H.R. 3219 because Trump swore Mexico would pay for the wall.

The President has broken his promise to the American people and is asking American taxpayers to foot a \$1.6 billion bill for a useless, expensive wall.

No wonder the wall is strongly opposed by Democrats and many Republicans.

There is no assurance that Americans would ever be reimbursed by Mexico.

Trump's cost estimations do not include the cost of building in more treacherous terrain, access roads, maintenance, or acquiring land in Texas, where almost all border landholdings are privately held.

Building this wall would require stripping landholders in my very own home state of Texas of their private land.

Instead of wasting \$1.6 billion on building a wall, that money could be appropriated to maintaining our effective border security and immigration practices, like those currently in place for asylum seekers.

The United States already enforces the most extensive immigration and border security practices in the world. We have

This is a bad business deal for the American people.

Third, I oppose the Carter Amendment because it represents a policy shift that will have dire consequences for our economy that far exceed the \$50 billion estimated cost of this wall.

A policy shift of this magnitude requires regular order with the committees of jurisdiction weighing in on the real cost to the American people should a wall be built.

Mexico happens to be one of the United States' strongest trading partners.

U.S. goods and services trade with Mexico totaled an estimated \$579.7 billion in 2016.

Exports were \$262.0 billion; imports were \$317.6 billion.

The U.S. goods and services trade deficit with Mexico was \$55.6 billion in 2016.

Mexico is currently our 3rd largest goods trading partner with \$525.1 billion in total (two way) goods trade during 2016.

Goods exports totaled \$231.0 billion; goods imports totaled \$294.2 billion.

The U.S. goods trade deficit with Mexico was \$63.2 billion in 2016.

Trade in services with Mexico (exports and imports) totaled an estimated \$54.5 billion in 2016.

Services exports were \$31.1 billion; services imports were \$23.5 billion.

The U.S. services trade surplus with Mexico was \$7.6 billion in 2016.

According to the Department of Commerce, U.S. exports of Goods and Services to Mexico supported an estimated 1.2 million jobs in 2015.

Mexico was the United States' 2nd largest goods export market in 2016.

U.S. exports to Mexico in 2016 were \$231.0 billion, down 2.0 percent (\$4.8 billion) from 2015 but up 72.7 percent from 2006. U.S. exports to Mexico are up 455 percent from 1993 (pre-NAFTA).

U.S. exports to Mexico account for 15.9 percent of overall U.S. exports in 2015.

The top export categories in 2016 were: machinery (\$42 billion), electrical machinery (\$41 billion), vehicles (\$21 billion), mineral fuels (\$20 billion), and plastics (\$16 billion).

U.S. total exports of agricultural products to Mexico totaled \$18 billion in 2016, our 3rd largest agricultural export market.

Leading domestic export categories include: corn (\$2.6 billion), soybeans (\$1.5 billion), pork & pork products (\$1.4 billion), dairy products (\$1.2 billion), and beef & beef products (\$975 million).

U.S. exports of services to Mexico were an estimated \$31.1 billion in 2016, 1.4 percent (441 million) less than 2015, but 30.5 percent greater than 2006 levels. It was up roughly 199 percent from 1993 (pre-NAFTA).

Leading services exports from the U.S. to Mexico, in 2015, were in the travel, transport, and intellectual property (computer software, industrial processes) sectors.

Mexico was the United States' 2nd largest supplier of goods imports in 2016.

U.S. goods imports from Mexico totaled \$294.2 billion in 2016, down 0.8 percent (\$2.3 billion) from 2015, but up 48.4 percent from 2006.

U.S. imports from Mexico are up 637 percent from 1993 (pre-NAFTA). U.S. imports from Mexico account for 13.4 percent of overall U.S. imports in 2015.

The top import categories (2-digit HS) in 2016 were: vehicles (\$75 billion), electrical machinery (\$62 billion), machinery (\$51 billion), optical and medical instruments (\$13 billion), and furniture and bedding (\$11 billion).

U.S. total imports of agricultural products from Mexico totaled \$23 billion in 2016, our 1st largest supplier of agricultural imports.

Leading categories include: fresh vegetables (\$5.6 billion), other fresh fruit (\$4.9 billion), wine and beer (\$3.1 billion), snack foods (\$2.0 billion), and processed fruit & vegetables (\$1.5 billion).

U.S. imports of services from Mexico were an estimated \$23.5 billion in 2016, 7.0 percent (\$1.5 billion) more than 2015, and 57.9 percent greater than 2006 levels. It was up roughly 216 percent from 1993 (pre-NAFTA). Leading services imports from Mexico to the U.S., in 2015, were in the travel, transport, and technical and other services sectors.

The U.S. goods trade deficit with Mexico was \$63.2 billion in 2016, a 4.2 percent increase (\$2.5 billion) over 2015.

The United States has a services trade surplus of an estimated \$7.6 billion with Mexico in 2016, down 20.7 percent from 2015.

U.S. foreign direct investment (FDI) in Mexico (stock) was \$92.8 billion in 2015 (latest data available), a 3.5 percent increase from 2014. U.S. direct investment in Mexico is led by manufacturing, nonbank holding companies, and mining.

Mexico's FDI in the United States (stock) was \$16.6 billion in 2015 (latest data available), up 0.2 percent from 2014. Mexico's direct investment in the U.S. is led by manufacturing, wholesale trade, and depository institutions.

Sales of services in Mexico by majority U.S.-owned affiliates were \$45.9 billion in 2014 (latest data available), while sales of services in the United States by majority Mexico-owned firms were \$8.5 billion.

We share one of the longest peaceful borders in the world with our neighbors to the

north and to the south. We are not at war with our peaceful neighbors; we do not need to build an almost 2,000 mile wall to divide us from our neighbor.

This tragic initiative is inconsistent with the American character of building bridges not walls.

These are just some of the facts that Committees of Jurisdiction would have to weigh before we make any decision.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this Rule so that this bill can return to the Rules Committee to have Division E removed from this appropriations package.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, the American people spoke loud and clear last November. They voted to support a stronger military, an unyielding national defense, and that includes the need for a much-improved border security. As the gentleman from Texas said, we have threats of human traffickers, drug smugglers, terrorists coming across our borders, and this is something that the American people said that they wanted, and we are responding to that with recommendations from the Customs and Border Protection agency.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of disorder in Washington, D.C.:

There is chaos and conflict and confrontation in the White House.

There is conflict within the majority party in the House of Representatives.

There was a representation that we were going to follow regular order. We have not.

There is no budget, which was supposed to be adopted some 3 months ago. A budget should have told all the Members of Congress and the country how much discretionary spending we were going to have.

The majority party has been unable to bring a budget to this floor and to pass it because of the disarray and disorder that we find in this House. This rule represents a litany of broken promises and exposes, frankly, the hypocrisy of this Republican majority.

This rule would add an amendment to the underlying bill that directs \$1.6 billion of American taxpayer dollars toward the construction of President Trump's proposed border wall. This was not in the original bill.

The irony is, in the Rules Committee, an amendment that was in the original bill has been struck not by a vote of the Defense Committee or by the Appropriations Committee, but by the Rules Committee. They just struck out an amendment.

Let me remind my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, of the words of our Speaker, PAUL RYAN. He said this: "We will advance major legislation one issue at a time."

Mr. Speaker, as you probably know, I have been here for some years—36, to be exact. I have never seen, in 36 years,

an omnibus or minibus brought to the floor before September. Why? Because the regular order is to consider the bills one at a time, or, as the Speaker said: "We will advance major legislation one issue at a time."

But what the Republicans have done, Mr. Speaker, is to bring a bill and put so much in it, they dare people to vote against it because of the national security.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this rule ought to be rejected. It is not the regular order, it is not good policy, and it is not good for the institution of the House of Representatives or for the country.

The border wall is controversial, and many people in the Trump administration do not believe the border wall will be effective, and they believe it is a waste of money. And, of course, the President told us all the Mexicans were going to pay for the wall.

Well, this is \$1.6 billion of about \$20 billion that would have to come not to be paid for by the Mexicans, but to be paid for by the U.S. taxpayer for an ineffective effort to make this country more secure.

Everybody on this floor believes we ought to know who comes into this country and that people ought not to come into this country unless they are authorized to do so. We all agree on that.

I ask the majority leader: Bring this border wall to the floor; let us debate it; put it open for amendment. That is the regular order.

The Speaker went on to say: "We will not duck the tough issues. We will take them head on." That is Speaker PAUL RYAN, October 29, 2015.

They had an amendment offered on the authorization bill by Mrs. HARTZLER of Missouri. It was controversial, and the majority party lost. So what did they do? They didn't add it to the bill as Mrs. HARTZLER wanted to do, have an amendment on this floor so we could debate it again on its merits or merits depending upon your perspective, but they went around not by regular order, not by taking issues head-on, but by having the President issue some tweet that the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff says he never was talked to about it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let us stand up for this institution. Let us stand up for regular order. Let us stand up for not ducking the tough issues. Let us reject this rule, and then let us go back to regular order and hopefully do so in a bipartisan way and do what the American public expects us to do:

make tough decisions for them, for our country, for our security, and for our children.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the debate on both sides on this very important issue.

Let me just say that this has been a very open process. Not all may want to acknowledge that, but let me just point out that this rule makes 54 amendments in order: 21 of those amendments are from the Democrats, 16 from Republicans, and fully, 17 are led by bipartisan cosponsors. So that tells me that the openness of this process, the ability for people to bring their perspectives, their opinions in this important debate is real.

As far as the Rules Committee unilaterally striking language and reinserting other language, that is true. We struck section 9021 of the Defense Appropriations Act of 2018 and replaced it, though, with language from an amendment offered by Mr. COLE to the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act of 2018, which was adopted by the full House on July 13 of this year. It was replaced with language that was approved by this body. So again, Mr. Speaker, I think that points to the openness of this process.

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

□ 1315

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this so-called security minibus.

The Republican majority has rushed through the fiscal year 2018 appropriations process, passing 12 bills without benefit of a budget resolution. Now they have failed to secure the votes on the floor for that Republican-only omnibus package, so they have decided to move forward with what is before us today—four appropriations bills stitched together that would bust the Budget Control Act defense cap and, if enacted, result in a \$72 billion sequester against all defense accounts.

The entire fiscal year '18 appropriations process has been a Republican exercise in sham accounting and wishful thinking: ignore current law, jack up defense spending, and impose huge, unnecessary, and detrimental cuts on domestic appropriations.

When future students learn about congressional appropriations, this episode should be exhibit A of what not to do.

The four bills before us today are also full of objectionable and unreasonable policy riders, including the ridiculous inclusion in the rule of \$1.6 billion

to be spent on 74 miles of border wall. Nobody would know it from the President's hysterical rhetoric, but there are already 700 miles of fence along the border—vehicular fencing and pedestrian fencing. I know about it because most of that fence was built when I was chairman of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee.

When Congress appropriated funds to build that fence, we required segment-by-segment analyses and environmental impact studies. This bill doesn't include that. It doesn't include any language regarding congressional oversight. There are no requirements for Homeland Security to submit a cost-benefit analysis or to work with Congress through any modifications.

Mr. Speaker, funding an unnecessary wall, especially without congressional oversight, is not a defensible use of taxpayer dollars. We would simply become complicit in what we all know was campaign demagoguery.

Speaking of which, wasn't the Mexican Government going to pay for this wall? Weren't they going to pick up the tab?

This \$1.6 billion should be spent on much more important priorities, within and beyond homeland security, that would actually improve the lives of our citizens.

It is time for Republicans to stop playing games with taxpayer money and start negotiating with Democrats. We know this is going to have to happen eventually. We need a bipartisan budget and appropriations package that actually has a chance of becoming law and that addresses the need of a great country for serious investment.

Oppose the border wall. Oppose this sham appropriations minibus.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 8½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, for our Nation of immigrants, a wall rejects our very history. A wall is not about America leading the world. A wall is about trying to shut off the rest of the world.

Ignored today, of course, is the history of how poorly laws have worked to stop desperate people. Most all of those who are coming to America—risking their lives, suffocating in the back of a truck, going over a perilous desert—are not here to cause us harm; they are not here to do wrong and mooch off of our social services. They are trying to escape violence or provide a little hope to their family. And they do it by taking the dirtiest, toughest jobs in our society, as immigrants have done since the very founding of our Nation. A wall only makes their path more perilous without offering us more security.

Last year, Trump's most famous and oft repeated claim was that he would build a wall that Mexico would pay for. But, this year, we just have one broken Trump campaign promise after another.

Today, we have confirmation that Trump is just putting taxpayers on the hook to pay for another section of a wall—yes, a wall of broken campaign promises. Instead of a wall, we ought to be building opportunity. As Austin Mayor Steve Adler said, “bridges make money, and walls cost money.”

Building Trump's boondoggle in the desert, at the same time he says we can't afford medical research or educational opportunity or job training, just shows how backward these priorities are. Let's oppose a wall of ignorance, a wall of prejudice, and create a bridge of opportunity. To achieve both true security and economic growth, we need to reject this narrow-minded approach in favor of comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I do know that even though some people would like to ignore the situation we have on our southern border, we do need to respond to those border protection agents who are asking us for help. We do need to respond to the crisis that we see along our southern border to keep our country as safe as possible. And we do need to confirm to people across the country that help is on the way.

Certainly, the border is one aspect of this important piece of legislation, but there are many things in this bill that will help our country and help our military forces keep our Nation safe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGAN).

Ms. BARRAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the security minibus.

I actually happen to sit on the Homeland Security Subcommittee, and I know what it is like to make sure that national security is our number one priority.

I also happen to know that I have heard testimony from experts, and I have heard bipartisan opposition to this wall in my committee. Because when we hear from experts, they tell us a wall is not going to stop a terrorist, and they tell us that the drug cartels are not going to be stopped either, they are just going to build a tunnel under the wall.

So when you talk about homeland security, I know exactly what you are talking about. The reality is that this \$1.6 billion is just a waste of taxpayer dollars. It is a dubious political promise that was made, and now the American people are being asked to foot the bill.

Let me repeat. I sit on Homeland Security. The border on the south is not our number one terrorist target. We know that what is there now is already

an existing wall. We already have fencing there. Some of the areas we are talking about are even just areas in the Rio Grande, where it is not going to make the biggest difference.

If we are going to secure our borders, we could spend money on technology and other areas, or we could secure our borders by putting more money into port security, where there is a greater threat of terrorism.

This is just another way to bully Congress into funding a border wall that the majority of people don't want. I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will not be bullied by this because it is being packaged in with other bills that would otherwise get passed without the partisanship.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow the House to consider Representative LEE's AUMF amendment—authority to use military force. This will provide all Members the chance for an up-or-down vote, which we have, thus far, been denied.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time and for her tremendous leadership as our ranking member on the Rules Committee. It is a true testament to her love for our country and for our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition, first, to this terrible rule, but, of course, also in strong support of this amendment to sunset funding for the 2001 AUMF, after 240 days after enactment of this act.

This important amendment would provide Congress plenty of time to do our job and finally have a debate and vote on matters of war and peace.

Mr. Speaker, last week, Republicans unilaterally decided to kill my bipartisan amendment to sunset the 2001 AUMF, which would allow 8 months to debate and vote on a new one before it would be enacted.

This amendment was adopted on a bipartisan basis in the full Appropriations Committee. It was stripped out of the bill in the dead of the night, with no debate or vote from the Rules Committee.

This undemocratic and underhanded behavior really makes me wonder: What is Speaker RYAN so afraid of?

I came to the Rules Committee this week and asked them to rectify a

wrong and allow a debate and a vote on this important measure, and they refused.

I even offered a second amendment, which we have before us today, which would sunset the funding for the 2001 AUMF, 240 days after enactment—that is 8 months—which would allow ample time to debate and vote on any replacement. This would be repeal, but remain in place, allowing 8 months to debate this.

Even though this amendment was germane to the bill, Republicans refused to even allow a debate on this important measure and a vote.

I understand Speaker RYAN has said that it was a mistake to include my original amendment and that it would endanger our national security.

Initially, on June 29, according to press accounts, my colleague and friend, who supported this amendment, Chairman COLE responded and said: It is time for leadership to wake up, and the administration to wake up, and send over a recommended AUMF, mark it up, and take it to the floor. I don't know any other way to get their attention because we have been talking about it for years.

Now, instead of listening to their own party, what do they do? They stripped our bipartisan amendment.

Some Members have said that the funding would be cut immediately with this amendment, but that is furthest from the truth. That is very disingenuous. That would be irresponsible, and I would in no way offer an amendment like that.

It would allow 8 months for Congress to debate and vote on any new AUMF. Some have said that this is political, and I say it is just the opposite.

Our brave troops deserve us to come together and do this so they know their country has their back.

I voted for the 2001 authorization because I believed it opened the door for any President to wage endless war without a congressional debate or vote. Quite frankly, unfortunately, history has borne that out.

According to a Congressional Research Service report, the 2001 AUMFs have been used more than 37 times in 14 countries to justify military actions.

This report only examines the unclassified incidents. How many other operations have been conducted without the knowledge of Congress or the American people?

These authorizations have also been used to justify perpetual wars that are thousands of miles away.

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

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

Ms. LEE. Let me conclude by saying, now any President can unilaterally wage war under the outdated authorization forever unless it is repealed.

The American people—our constituents—know that Congress is missing in action. They deserve better. Surely, Congress can muster the courage to do

our constitutional duty and debate and vote on a new AUMF within 8 months if that is our decision.

We passed the 2001 AUMF within 3 days, and it never came to the Foreign Affairs Committee, where I served for 11 years.

So let's stand up for the Constitution, our servicemen and -women, and our national security by bringing forward this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so we can finally have this debate, vote "no" on the rule, and vote "no" on the underlying bill.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my good friend from California, I agree that a new authorization on the use of military force is something that is necessary, something that we owe our military, and something that we should do.

The language with the Cole amendment, I think, starts us down that path. In fact, the Foreign Affairs Committee, just this week, is holding hearings on this very important topic.

I look forward to working with Ms. LEE on this, as well as all of us here in this House, to get us to the end result that I think is absolutely necessary, and I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

□ 1330

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), and I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this important issue.

I am an Arizona native. I grew up in southern Arizona, and trips to the southern Arizona border were not infrequent and not unusual. I have gone from San Luis to Naco, to Nogales, to Agua Prieta. I have been along the border many times, most recently just a couple months ago, and during that time, I used it as kind of a fact-finding expedition. I wanted to know what people who live right along the border talk about and think about as we in Congress consider things like a Presidential promise to build a wall, even in this bill, a partial wall, a good start.

I will tell you what I know is that the number one drug and human smuggling corridor in the United States of America is through the Tucson sector. That is right through the heart of the Arizona-Mexico border. It impacts, literally, 75 to 80 miles into the border. Where we have wilderness preserves, our agents can't go in, they don't go in, and yet roadways are cut in this pristine desert by those who enter from the cartels, cutting roads with their vehicles that they know that our agents cannot traverse.

So I am familiar with the area. I am familiar with the issue.

I had the privilege of talking to Border Patrol agents over the last few years, but in particular the last time I was at the border, and I talked to a

number of them. I wondered what the men and women think who actually service the border for us. I asked them whether they supported a wall. It was 100 percent, it was unanimous: they want a wall. They want additional infrastructure. They want a road that parallels that wall so they can have access to that wall and make the apprehensions that they need to.

I talked to ranchers and farmers. It was unanimous then as well. Everyone wanted that wall, all recognizing the need for additional infrastructure of a roadway.

When you go to various portions of the border now, it is a single strand of wire. You can step over it. We had one of the ranchers, an 81-year-old gentleman, demonstrate how he crawls underneath the wire at 81 years of age.

Where there are small areas of fencing outside Nogales, either side from Nogales, that has cut down the number of folks who come that way; but since that fence only goes about 3 or 4 miles onto each side of the city, what happens is there is a flood of people who come around that fence.

A border wall is important. It is imperative. Those of us who feel the direct brunt of the influx of people who come across the border, whether for hostile or benign intentions, we feel very strongly that a border wall would benefit our State.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this initiative, and I can tell you that my constituency also supports this initiative. With that, I urge everyone to support this initiative.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that one of the beauties of Congress is being able to hear from people firsthand their experiences, who speak not just in theoretical senses but because of the life they live and their constituents, and so I appreciate very much the gentleman from Arizona and his testimony.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for the way that he has worked with other colleagues in terms of trying to move this bill and this process forward. It would take Solomon in all of his wisdom to get it completely right, and in that regard, I give you due deference in the way that you all have put this bill together.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to rise in support of what my colleague from California spoke about just a moment ago, which is the fact that neither one of Ms. LEE's amendments were ultimately made in order. I have a problem with that from the standpoint of the construction of this rule, because one of those amendments was tied to, in essence, the base bill that actually passed at the committee level, and then the other one was an adaptation of that same notion.

What she is getting at, I think, is incredibly important. I think it is incredibly important, because the saying is that the road to hell is paved with good intentions, and we have been meaning and meaning and meaning and meaning to do something about the Authorization for Use of Force in the Middle East since 2001 in terms of bringing it up to date, but we haven't, for whatever reason, done so. What she is getting at with her amendment is saying, simply, it is time, it is well past time, and I think there is real legitimacy to that point.

I would say, secondly, what doesn't work in life are blank checks. In essence, if you sign on to this notion that an Authorization for Use of Force back in 2001 will apply now, why doesn't it apply 30 years from now or 50 years from now, if you follow that logic out.

I think our Founding Fathers were so concrete in their constitutional premise that only Congress should declare war because what they knew was that body bags don't return to Washington, D.C. They return to congressional districts and States across this country. And knowing that, they said you have got to go to the people's House to have the Authorization for Use of Force so that you do not put people in harm's way without Congress debating that subject and actually coming up with a decision to the affirmative.

Finally, I would simply say this: This is important in terms of sending a clear signal to soldiers and to the public at large that we are behind them, we are behind the soldiers. We say this is what you ought to do. We are going to give you the tools necessary to do the job; and to the public: This is why we think it ought to be done. Authorization for Use of Force is about those two things.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Mr. NEWHOUSE's efforts here.

Hearing a concern about the \$1.6 billion for the wall, let me just say, living in Texas, spending a lot of time on the border, spending time in Mexico—it is where my wife and I went on our honeymoon—there is only one reason Mexico is not one of the top 10 economies in the world, and it is because the drug cartels make tens of billions of dollars they use for corruption to keep it from being that.

The best thing we could do as a good neighbor to Mexico is to build a wall where it is needed, just like President Trump has talked about, stop that flow of tens of billions of dollars to Mexico used for corruption to keep down the Mexican people—hardworking, God-fearing people—and bring that country up by being a good neighbor; because, in this case, a good fence or wall will make a good neighbor, and Mexico will have its rightful place in the economic hierarchy of the world.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), my good friend.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, having lived in Texas all my life, I, like many other Texans, have been to the Texas border numerous times. I have been to the border from San Diego to Brownsville while I have been in Congress, the entire length of the border. Some things are working on the border, and one of those things that is working is a wall in the big cities.

One of my friends from El Paso likes to talk about how El Paso is the safest city in America. Well, one reason is El Paso has multiple fencing, a canal, and a river between the U.S., Texas, and Mexico.

The sheriff of El Paso told me after that fencing was created, cross-border crime is almost nonexistent. That is one reason—not the only reason—why El Paso is the safest city in America is because they have a wall, a fence, the Rio Grande River—a barrier. Let's use that term.

Sure, not everybody from Mexico is coming to commit crimes, of course not, but a wall works.

It also works where they have fencing in San Diego. It also works where they have fencing in Brownsville, Texas, between Brownsville and Mexico. It stops and reduces the cross-border individuals coming in without permission. So a partial fence will work.

This bill, let's make it clear, is not a complete border wall of the whole border. It is only 74 miles. And we need to do everything. We need to have that 74 miles. We need to have aerostats in the air. We need to have more Border Patrol on the ground. We need to have all types of technology to have a virtual wall, if you will, to protect the United States' security.

People need to come to the United States. We want people to come to the United States, but come the right way.

Lastly, as my friend from Tyler, Texas, said, the drug cartels are the major problem, and the criminal gangs, like the MS-13 gang, are the ones who come into the United States because there is no barrier to stop them.

And that is just the way it is.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we hadn't had this last election and the campaign that went with it, we wouldn't be talking about any wall. One of the candidates threw out that he would like to have a wall and was sure—he gave us the absurd notion that somehow Mexico would pay for it.

Not many of us believed that, but I will tell you, now that we have put in this \$1.6 billion for this wall, I will bet you that we are going to finish it, and we don't know how much it costs—somewhere between \$20 billion and \$40 billion for a wall.

Now, if I have heard correctly what my colleagues have said over there, the walls are working already, the ones they have got. There are walls there. I

heard San Diego had three. So the idea, I guess, if one works, we will build us another one. Oh, my goodness.

This funding bill that we are talking about spending on a wall is needed to repair roads and bridges and bring down the cost of education, but the majority refuses to have debate on the AUMF, something that is critically important, life and death to many people who live in this country who are presently in the armed services. This amendment should have been included here.

And I appreciate what my colleague, Mr. SANFORD, said. He is absolutely right. But if we were to get a new AUMF, it would put Congress back into its duty to declare war. That is something that the Constitution gave us that we no longer have.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the discussion we have had this past hour from all Members that have participated. Although we may have our differences, some difference of opinion, I believe that this rule and the underlying bill are strong measures that are important to ensuring the security and the prosperity of our country. The rule provides for further consideration of H.R. 3219, the Make America Secure Appropriations Act of 2018.

Let me say again, while my friends on the other side may not want to acknowledge it, this rule makes 54 amendments in order; 21 of those 54 are from my Democratic friends, 16 are Republican, and 17 are bipartisan, led by bipartisan cosponsors. In fact, the majority of the amendments that were made in order under yesterday's rule that provide for the initial consideration of this bill were also led by Democrats, so this reflects the balanced approach of the process under this rule.

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, it is our job, it is Congress' job, to appropriate the necessary funds to keep our Nation safe and our defense strong. This rule allows us to complete our efforts to complete the appropriations process for our top priorities, those of national security. I look forward, though, to bringing the other eight appropriation bills to the floor to fulfill the rest of our duty. Certainly, as an appropriator, no one wants to see this effort completed more than our committee and as I do.

I have appreciated the important advocacy my colleagues on both sides have brought forward through this process, from within the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, through the full committee, through the Rules Committee, and now, here on the House floor.

The measures included in this rule will provide vital resources for our national defense and for our military infrastructure. As I said, it will boost the

pay of our troops, support our military families who sacrifice so much for our country; it will strengthen the care we provide for our veterans and enforce our border security to protect all of the American people.

This rule will also allow for further security improvements for the Capitol campus to protect all who visit here. It will also provide robust funding to improve our Nation's waterways, our infrastructure, our important nuclear clean-up, as well as nonproliferation efforts.

It also reinstates our top priority, providing funding for our national defense. We must begin to rebuild our Nation's military, and I am proud of this as a major step forward, restoring military readiness in order to keep our country safe.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying appropriations within this rule are of the utmost importance to the Nation, and we must move forward with this rule in order to get our job done. The men and women in uniform serving our Nation around the globe are depending on us.

I hope our colleagues, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, will support this rule so that we can do that, get our job done.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 478 OFFERED BY
Ms. SLAUGHTER

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment described in section 7 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution if offered by Representative Lee of California or her designee. Such amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 7. The amendment referred to in section 6 is as follows:

"At the end of division A (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, enforce, or administer the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note).

(b) Subsection (a) shall apply beginning on the date that is 240 days after the date of the enactment of this Act."

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 de-

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 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 233, nays 185, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

YEAS—233

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

NAYS—185

Adams	Brownley (CA)	Cleaver
Aguilar	Bustos	Clyburn
Barragán	Butterfield	Cohen
Bass	Capuano	Connolly
Beatty	Carbajal	Conyers
Bera	Cárdenas	Cooper
Beyer	Carson (IN)	Correa
Bishop (GA)	Cartwright	Costa
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Courtney
Blunt Rochester	Castro (TX)	Crist
Bonamici	Chu, Judy	Crowley
Boyle, Brendan	Cicilline	Cuellar
F.	Clark (MA)	Davis (CA)
Brady (PA)	Clarke (NY)	Davis, Danny
Brown (MD)	Clay	DeFazio

DeGette	Kildee	Price (NC)
Delaney	Kilmer	Quigley
DeLauro	Kind	Raskin
DelBene	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
Demings	Kuster (NH)	Richmond
DeSaulnier	Langevin	Rosen
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
Doggett	Lawrence	Ruppersberger
Doyle, Michael	Lawson (FL)	Sánchez
F.	Lee	Schakowsky
Ellison	Levin	Schiff
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Schneider
Eshoo	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
Espallat	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Esty (CT)	Loeb	Scott, David
Evans	Loftgren	Serrano
Foster	Lowenthal	Sewell (AL)
Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham,	Shea-Porter
Fudge	M.	Sherman
Gabbard	Luján, Ben Ray	Sinema
Gallego	Lynch	Sires
Garamendi	Maloney,	Slattery
Gomez	Carolyn B.	Smith (WA)
Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney, Sean	Soto
Gotthelmer	Matsui	Suozzi
Green, Al	McCollum	Swalwell (CA)
Green, Gene	McEachin	Thompson (CA)
Grijalva	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Gutiérrez	McNerney	Titus
Hanabusa	Meeks	Tonko
Hastings	Meng	Torres
Heck	Moore	Tsongas
Higgins (NY)	Moulton	Vargas
Himes	Murphy (FL)	Veasey
Hoyer	Nadler	Vela
Huffman	Neal	Velázquez
Jackson Lee	Norcross	Visclosky
Jayapal	O'Halleran	Walz
Jeffries	O'Rourke	Wasserman
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Schultz
Johnson, E. B.	Panetta	Waters, Maxine
Jones	Payne	Watson Coleman
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Welch
Keating	Peters	Wilson (FL)
Kelly (IL)	Peterson	Yarmuth
Kennedy	Pingree	
Khanna	Pocan	
Kihuen	Polis	

NOT VOTING—15

Collins (GA)	Nolan	Rush
Cummings	Pascrell	Ryan (OH)
Hollingsworth	Pelosi	Sarbanes
Lowey	Rogers (AL)	Scalise
Napolitano	Roskam	Speier

□ 1408

Messrs. CAPUANO and COSTA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 426.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 426.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). 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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 230, noes 196, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

AYES—230

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

NOES—196

Adams	Brownley (CA)	Clyburn
Aguilar	Bustos	Cohen
Amash	Butterfield	Connolly
Barragán	Capuano	Conyers
Bass	Carbajal	Cooper
Beatty	Cárdenas	Correa
Bera	Carson (IN)	Costa
Beyer	Cartwright	Courtney
Bishop (GA)	Castor (FL)	Crist
Blumenauer	Castro (TX)	Crowley
Blunt Rochester	Chu, Judy	Cuellar
Bonamici	Cicilline	Davis (CA)
Boyle, Brendan	Clark (MA)	Davis, Danny
F.	Clarke (NY)	DeFazio
Brady (PA)	Clay	DeGette
Brown (MD)	Cleaver	Delaney

DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind

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

Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
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

Cummings
Hollingsworth
Issa

Napolitano
Roskam
Ryan (OH)

Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1415

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3298. An act to authorize the Capitol Police Board to make payments from the United States Capitol Police Memorial Fund to employees of the United States Capitol Police who have sustained serious line-of-duty injuries, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 473 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on

the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3219.

Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) kindly take the chair.

□ 1416

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3219) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, with Mr. HILL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on the legislative day of Wednesday, July 26, 2017, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 63 printed in House Report 113-259 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) has been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-259 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 62 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 63 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MRS.
BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 140, noes 285, answered “present” 1, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

AYES—140

Allen	Bucshon	Duncan (TN)
Amash	Budd	Dunn
Babin	Burgess	Estes (KS)
Banks (IN)	Carter (GA)	Farenthold
Barton	Chabot	Ferguson
Biggs	Collins (GA)	Flores
Bilirakis	Comer	Foxx
Black	Conaway	Garrett
Blackburn	Cramer	Gibbs
Blum	Crawford	Gohmert
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Goodlatte
Brat	Davidson	Gosar
Bridenstine	DeSantis	Gowdy
Brooks (AL)	DesJarlais	Graves (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Graves (LA)
Buck	Duncan (SC)	Griffith

Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harris
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (MS)
King (IA)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love

Lucas
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Norman
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Ratcliffe
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis

NOES—285

Abraham	Davis (CA)	Johnson (LA)
Adams	Davis, Danny	Johnson, E. B.
Aderholt	DeFazio	Joyce (OH)
Aguilar	DeGette	Kaptur
Amodei	Delaney	Katko
Arrington	DeLauro	Keating
Bacon	DelBene	Kelly (IL)
Barletta	Demings	Kelly (PA)
Barr	Denham	Kennedy
Barragán	Dent	Khanna
Bass	DeSaulnier	Kihuen
Beatty	Deutch	Kildee
Bera	Diaz-Balart	Kilmer
Bergman	Dingell	Kind
Beyer	Doggett	King (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Donovan	Kinzing
Bishop (MI)	Doyle, Michael	Knight
Bishop (UT)	F.	Krishnamoorthi
Blumenauer	Ellison	Kuster (NH)
Blunt Rochester	Emmer	Langevin
Bonamici	Engel	Larsen (WA)
Bost	Eshoo	Larson (CT)
Boyle, Brendan	Espaillat	Lawrence
F.	Esty (CT)	Lawson (FL)
Brady (PA)	Evans	Lee
Brown (MD)	Faso	Levin
Brownley (CA)	Fitzpatrick	Lewis (GA)
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Lieu, Ted
Bustos	Fortenberry	Lipinski
Butterfield	Foster	LoBiondo
Byrne	Frankel (FL)	Loeb sack
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Loftgren
Capuano	Frelinghuysen	Lowenthal
Carbajal	Fudge	Lowe y
Cárdenas	Gabbard	Luetkemeyer
Carson (IN)	Gaetz	Lujan Grisham,
Carter (TX)	Gallagher	M.
Cartwright	Gallego	Luján, Ben Ray
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	Lynch
Castro (TX)	Gianforte	MacArthur
Cheney	Gomez	Maloney,
Chu, Judy	Gonzalez (TX)	Carolyn B.
Cicilline	Gottheimer	Maloney, Sean
Clark (MA)	Granger	Marino
Clarke (NY)	Graves (MO)	Mast
Clay	Green, Al	Matsui
Cleaver	Green, Gene	McCollum
Clyburn	Grijalva	McEachin
Coffman	Gutiérrez	McGovern
Cohen	Hanabusa	McKinley
Cole	Harper	McNerney
Collins (NY)	Hartzler	Meehan
Comstock	Hastings	Meeks
Connolly	Heck	Meng
Conyers	Herrera Beutler	Moolenaar
Cook	Higgins (LA)	Moore
Cooper	Higgins (NY)	Moulton
Correa	Himes	Murphy (FL)
Costa	Hoyer	Murphy (PA)
Costello (PA)	Huffman	Nadler
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Neal
Crist	Jayapal	Newhouse
Crowley	Jeffries	Noem
Cuellar	Jenkins (WV)	Nolan
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Norcross

Rooney, Thomas
J.
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Sanford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Stewart
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wittman
Woodall
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin