

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1892, HONORING HOMETOWN HEROES ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-551) on the resolution (H. Res. 734) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1892) to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1892, HONORING HOMETOWN HEROES ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 734 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 734

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1892) to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. The rule provides for con-

sideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1892, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018.

Mr. Speaker, this 2-year budget agreement begins to repair our military and frees our armed services from the harmful spending caps and the devastating practice of funding our troops with stopgap spending bills. It raises defense discretionary spending levels in fiscal year 2018 by \$80 billion and nondefense levels by \$63 billion, while raising fiscal year 2019 levels by \$85 billion and \$63 billion respectively.

I have been told that this will move spending levels from 2009 spending levels to 2011 spending levels, consistent with what we had done during those periods of time.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We saw a shutdown just over 2 weeks ago, and here we are again; I believe this is the fifth one since September. And since the Republicans control every branch of the government, we have to wonder what is going on here.

I stood in this same spot after midnight in 2013 and announced that the great government of the United States was closed for business. At that point, they were closed for business for 16 days, which means all the Federal buildings and parks were closed. The vendors who had little mom-and-pop stores, newspaper kiosks, and things at Federal businesses lost all the money, a lot of it, people with lunchrooms. The estimate was \$24 billion was lost to the Federal Government.

As I recall that particular one, that was because Senator CRUZ, a Republican from Texas, didn't like the Affordable Care Act and apparently was not in favor of giving healthcare to the American people.

The first shutdown that occurred when I first came here was during the Clinton administration, when Speaker Gingrich shut down the government of the United States because he was unhappy with the plane seat in Air Force One that had been assigned to him.

And 2 weeks ago, it was blamed on the Democrats, which is very strange, since the Democrats do not have the vote to shut down the House. Only the majority has those votes. And this is the first shutdown in history, as far as we can find, that the group of persons who control the House, the Senate, and the White House have given themselves a shutdown. It is a pretty sad day for us.

So here we are, 3:30 a.m., 3½ hours after a government shutdown once again. We have really got to stop this. I tell you, our fellow Americans are in a state of nervous anxiety. The stock market dropped 1,000 points in a single day, twice this week. We have perplexed the entire United States of America as well as large parts of the world.

And I would think that a reasonable person, looking at all this, would be understood to believe that perhaps Republicans are incapable of running the government because it is purely, purely government by nothing but crisis.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentlewoman for her help to make sure that the Rules Committee effectively and carefully got their work done this evening, and I want to thank the gentlewoman. I do know it is 3:30 in the morning, and the entire committee, the entire Rules Committee, was prepared on both sides, and I thank the gentlewoman and the staffs that were included.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress who are elected by their respective districts come to Washington to represent their districts. But perhaps, I think, more importantly, some bit of those people also take into account, not just the representation of their district, but the pride and authorship they have in particular about America, about being a part of America and us standing together.

Tonight, we are going to have a chance to say back to one of our Members who has come to Washington, D.C., representing her home of Puerto Rico, home territory of Puerto Rico, and to say back to her that this body offered its condolences for the storms that happened last year.

She stood up, representing Puerto Rico. She is a former Speaker of the House of Puerto Rico. She stands with the people of Puerto Rico. She has come and visited Member after Member after Member to sell to them, not only the attributes of how to fix Puerto Rico, but came and did the things legislatively.

With great, great admiration, I will tell you that our next speaker, who is a member of the Republican majority, has really done an outstanding job as a brand new Member of this body; and I am pleased that we can say tonight, included in this package is that disaster package that the House passed last, I think, October.

She has worked hard. She has had faith and confidence, not only in her home territory of Puerto Rico, but in her body here, the United States Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme pride that I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN), the former Speaker of the House of Puerto Rico.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for allowing me to support this rule that will have, finally, this bill to be considered on this floor.

I think it is important to acknowledge that still, 5 months after the storm, after Hurricane Maria and Hurricane Irma hit Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, 30 percent of Puerto

Ricans are still without power. That is something that you will never expect in a U.S. territory or neither a State.

So that is one of the biggest reasons I stood here, at 3:30 in the morning. Why? Because it is time to show our deeds in terms of supporting a bill that will have the money to restore the power grid in Puerto Rico, to help the island to recover from the last hurricanes.

Also, we were facing a medical cliff in April of this year—a medical cliff that will put an end to the insurance to 680,000 patients in the island. That is the reason this bill is so important for Puerto Rico.

Actually, we have been waiting for 2 months. This bill has been stalled in the Senate, and I actually am very happy to see that agreement between Republicans and Democrats in the Senate voted 71–28 to have this bill here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I need to say that today Congress will make a critical vote in terms of that we finally have a budget deal, and this is the time to vote, not for ideologies, but for the people, for American citizens all over the States. For the States and territories that were struck by disaster during the last year, this bill will provide billions of dollars, including improvement to Puerto Rico's electrical power network.

It also takes the steps to secure the island's Medicaid program and ensure that our people do not lose their health coverage. For the past year, I have been fighting to ensure Puerto Rico receives the money necessary to avoid that medical cliff now in April. This funding will give Puerto Rico and Congress the time to craft a long-term solution, not just for Puerto Rico, but for all U.S. territories, and help out the medical problems that we all face.

I want to thank, especially, the Speaker of the House, Speaker RYAN, the members of this leadership who have been supporting me all of the way; the chairmen, Chairman WALDEN, Chairman BURGESS, Chairman SESSIONS, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN; and all members of this House leadership who have been working with me, visiting the island, even Members from the other side of the aisle, supporting Puerto Rico.

You know what? That is the hard work that we need to do for our people.

On the Senate side, I need to thank our special friend and advocate, Senator MARCO RUBIO, who has been supporting this issue since day one.

I also want to thank all Members of both Chambers willing to save Puerto Rico from near collapse and to help their fellow citizens in the island.

I urge my Democratic colleagues, if we want to help Puerto Rico, now is the time to do it. It is not just talking, it is time to act. It is time to vote for this kind of bill. We can't be hostage of another bill, and I do support having an immigration bill happen.

This is a disaster bill that has been included. It has been included in this

budget, and we must take action today. That is the reason; this is the time to show it, not by words, by acts. That is the reason I ask my colleagues to vote for this, not say just we want to help Puerto Rico. This is the time to show you really want to help Puerto Rico; you really want to help the island.

I understand that, as the Senate did a few minutes ago, we can come together and support what we are willing to do. In Puerto Rico, there are still a lot of things that need to be done. There are so many needs to be met. But let's continue to work together, as the Senate did today; and I hope, and I expect, the House can do the same thing.

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

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation must pass before the time runs out on hundreds of thousands of young people who were promised, by a previous administration, that if they registered and paid \$500, they could stay in the only country they know.

Without any warning, the new President invalidated the program and their lives. The things that they were promised were taken away, and those young people, a part of our lives, are living in fear. I really hope that we can do something about that. It is past time.

But I think what happened to them was most un-American.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I stand here this morning for Nicole, Miriam, Antonio, Karen, Leo, Adriana, and hundreds of thousands of other young Americans who dream and pray for only one thing: that this esteemed body of elected Representatives, endowed with a solemn responsibility to enact laws, will see a piece of themselves in them; that they will see beyond the circumstances by which they came to call America home and, instead, see the American values that they hold deep in their heart of hearts.

I would surmise that there isn't one congressional district that isn't home to a DREAMer, and, by God, we are all lucky for it because, to our kids, DREAMers are their friends; to our students, DREAMers are their teachers; and to our seniors and elders, DREAMers are, in fact, their caretakers.

DREAMers are entrepreneurs with the grit and determination to do something with nothing, following in the footsteps of intrepid explorers who forged new paths that led us to amazing discoveries.

To our economy, DREAMers are a well-oiled engine of valedictorians, doctors, software engineers, and technicians hoping to give back to their communities. Their imagination and determination is a driving force in the offices of Fortune 500 companies and the Main Streets of our towns and cities.

And every year, for the next decade, DREAMer ingenuity and tenacity will quite literally pump billions into our economy. Their efforts help America grow faster and stronger. And collectively, for our Nation, they represent our future and are a reflection of our values.

DREAMers are wide-eyed American optimism. They work so hard because they are so grateful and, despite setbacks, they persevere. Despite struggles, they overcome, just as Americans always have. And in the face of unbelievable adversity, DREAMers beam the hopefulness and dynamism that gives meaning to the American promise.

Our Founders knew that our democracy wasn't perfect, but they believed that, as lawmakers and representatives, we would work every day to live up to the ideals they set forth. And today, we have an opportunity to do just that.

All we have to do is enshrine the promise that unlocked the incredible potential of these young Americans by passing the Dream Act now. With one vote, we have a chance to unite our country around young people who embody our belief that hard work actually pays off.

So I ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can immediately bring the Dream Act to the floor and provide certainty for Americans like Nicole, Miriam, Antonio, Karen, Leo, and Adriana who want to continue to contribute to the country that they love, the only country they have ever known. We cannot afford to wait another day.

□ 0340

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), a member of the Republican leadership team.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, at 3:40 in the morning, I am a little surprised that some of our colleagues wish to repress history, but I guess so be it.

Some forget here that we passed all 12 appropriations bills in September, to no avail. They sit in the Senate requiring 60 votes.

I remember a few days ago I stood here and we talked about math with my colleagues, and the Republicans had 51 votes in the Senate. A democracy requires people work together.

The Senate decided not to do that, so we have ended up with a series of continuing resolutions, what I consider to

be an absolute travesty of governance. We have to fund the government in pieces. A month here, 6 weeks there.

The last CR, we almost had a deal. It seemed like there was an arrangement we would have to move forward to fund the government before the shutdown.

But, I will stress, some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle in the other Chamber decided to throw the kitchen sink at it, demand their entire legislative agenda be put into a CR; DACA, which we are hearing tonight, then they came up with pensions. It was one thing after another of demands, using funding our military, funding our government, keeping the lights on as leverage for their political agenda.

We have a basic function here: keep the lights on.

The second thing the Constitution says is to preserve and protect our Nation, which means we have to fund our military. But some have felt this is not necessarily a priority of theirs if they can't get the other things they want when they want them.

We now have a bipartisan agreement that the Senate has sent over. It is far from perfect. I don't know if we will ever see perfect in this Chamber. In my 35 years of business, I rarely saw perfect, but you take progress and move on.

What does it do for us?

It fully funds defense at the level that Secretary Mattis requested so we can defend our Nation against the threats we see and take care of our military men and women.

It funds community health centers. I have 11 of them in my district. It provides 10-year funding for CHIP now—the Children's Health Insurance Program—near and dear to all of us.

It provides a down payment on infrastructure that is badly needed in this country.

It provides additional funding for opioid treatment in this Nation, a crisis that we face.

So, again, I am left to wonder why it is we want to defeat the rule to turn down this effort, this bipartisan agreement, to add another agenda in there. Why would my colleagues want to do that?

At some point in time we take progress. The Speaker has indicated we will deal with DACA. We will also move on to dealing with infrastructure. We will move on to workforce development. We have got serious policy issues to deal with, but the priority we have at this moment in time is to fund the government.

We have a bipartisan agreement in front of us that has cleared the Senate. It is now 3:43 a.m. I suggest we simply pass the rule, pass it, and go home and get on with policy next week.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened that this body is descending

down a fiscally irresponsible path, a path to trillion-dollar deficits, a path to mortgaging the future for my children and yours.

To be clear, what this massive spending bill includes is a 14.6 percent increase in defense spending and a 12.2 percent increase in nondefense spending this year. Next year, a 15.1 percent increase in defense spending and 12.9 percent in nondefense spending.

The headlines in *The New York Times*, Mr. Speaker, says: "As Deficit Soars Toward \$1 trillion, Congress Shrugs and Keeps Spending."

I also want to quote from the *Los Angeles Times*. It says: "The budget deal also means that the United States probably will be returning to trillion-dollar annual deficits . . ."

When Trump took office about a year ago, the Congressional Budget Office projected the Nation's deficit would run between \$500 billion and \$700 billion. Now, with lower tax revenues and new spending, the deficit will blow past \$1 trillion in 2019.

To be fair, I have long argued that \$500 billion to \$700 billion deficits are too large. I have supported spending cuts, and I opposed the massive Republican giveaway to special interests through the tax reform bill.

It would be easy to say here, Mr. Speaker, that the Republicans own this deficit, the Republicans own this debt. But that is too easy, Mr. Speaker.

Do you know who owns this debt?

My family and yours. It is owned by the American people, Mr. Speaker, in the form of future taxation, in the form of future reduction in services, in the form of a future threat to Social Security and Medicare.

This fiscally irresponsible path has got to end. I will be opposing this bill, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who care about the fiscal solvency of this Nation to join me in opposing this irresponsible spending bill.

As has been mentioned, this bill also fails to include comprehensive immigration reform or the Dream Act.

I would note that comprehensive immigration reform, which passed the Senate with a more than two-thirds vote a few years ago, would reduce our budget deficit by over \$200 billion in increased tax revenue and increased economic productivity.

While the Dream Act and similar measures haven't been formally scored, they also would contribute to reducing our budget deficit because hardworking Americans would be able to get jobs, pay taxes, and participate in the American Dream.

If this massive Republican spending bill passes, it will only dig our Nation deeper into a debt that will become harder and harder to ever emerge from.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this massive Republican spending bill and to get to work on fiscally responsible measures, like comprehensive immigration reform and the Dream Act; to reduce our budget def-

icit and, hopefully, eliminate it rather than bloat it further and further.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy, which is referred to as a SAP. It comes from the Executive Office of the President.

Mr. Speaker, if I could read the last paragraph: "If the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 were presented to the President in its current form, his advisors would recommend that he sign it into law."

#### STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1892—BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2018—(SEN. MCCONNELL, R-KY)

The Administration supports Senate passage of the substitute amendment to H.R. 1892, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018. This amendment raises the defense spending caps for fiscal year (FY) 2018 and FY 2019, a key step toward fulfilling the President's promise to rebuild America's military and ensure funding would be provided to support the enacted National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (NDAA).

After years of dangerous spending reductions and an unpredictable budgetary environment perpetuated by numerous continuing resolutions, the Bipartisan Budget Act lays the groundwork for full funding of America's national defense, within the framework of the Administration's National Security and Defense Strategies and the NDAA. Passage of this legislation would ensure America is prepared to deter and, if necessary, defeat the full spectrum of threats from rival powers, rogue states, and terrorist organizations like the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria.

The Bipartisan Budget Act lays the groundwork for higher investments in several Administration priorities, including infrastructure and combating the opioid epidemic, and the Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to reflect the Administration's detailed funding priorities for the remainder of FY 2018 and for FY 2019 for both defense and non-defense needs.

At the same time, it is critical that the Congress work to decrease non-defense spending in other areas to reduce America's growing national debt. The Bipartisan Budget Act provides non-defense discretionary spending levels higher than the Administration deems necessary. Additionally, although the Bipartisan Budget Act does include some spending reductions, the Administration has proposed hundreds of billions of dollars in additional spending reductions that the Congress should also enact without delay in order to improve our fiscal state.

Further, the Administration recognizes the Congress's desire to provide significant funding for victims of the recent hurricanes and wildfires, as provided in the Bipartisan Budget Act and previously in the House-passed supplemental bill (H.R. 4667). The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress to ensure that adequate oversight is exercised over disaster-related funds to ensure that these funds reach the communities devastated by natural disasters and are not misapplied.

The Administration supports other components of the Bipartisan Budget Act, including greater certainty for the Children's Health Insurance Program, an extension of funding for Community Health Centers, and repeal of Obamacare's Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB). The IPAB authority allows an unelected, unaccountable board to undertake major changes to the Medicare program. The repeal of IPAB furthers the President's goal of repealing and replacing Obamacare.

The Administration also supports suspending the debt limit until March 2019 to provide the certainty to markets around the world that the United States will honor its obligations.

Furthermore, the Administration is concerned with future extensions of special interest tax deductions and benefits in the wake of tax cuts and reforms that were enacted in December 2017.

The President's top priority is to keep the Nation safe from those who wish to harm it, both at home and abroad. To do so, the United States military needs the resources provided in the Bipartisan Budget Act, which have previously been supported on a bipartisan basis in the NDAA and in multiple bills passed by the House.

If the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 were presented to the President in its current form, his advisors would recommend that he sign it into law.

Mr. SESSIONS. There should be no question about that, that the President of the United States is asking not only Members of Congress but the American people to understand how important it is to make sure that this government is up and running, to make sure that our military is funded, and that the men and women who protect this great Nation, those volunteers to our military, deserve a right to have us fully fund our military for the rest of the year.

I know and the Chair knows, Mr. Speaker, that this deal is only until March 23. But we should not ever allow our military to be put in harm's way. They are the ones who protect us, and for us putting them in harm's way without the money to protect them I think is bad timing and a bad way for us to extend our support to the military.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today, at 10 minutes to 4 o'clock Eastern time, that we can say we are going to move forward with this bill that fully funds the military for the rest of the year. I will ask our Members at the very end, accordingly, to please support this underlying legislation.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise because I believe we ought to help the DREAMers. My Republican colleagues have said they want to help the DREAMers as well, yet they have done nothing.

I am deeply frustrated, angry, and disappointed that in the greatest deliberative body in the world, we are constantly prevented from deliberating.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to defeat the previous question so we can bring up the Dream Act so we can help nearly a million people in this country, mostly young people who came here when they were very, very young, who know no other country but this country as their own.

We ought to find a way to protect them, to give them peace of mind. That shouldn't be a radical idea. Yet we can't seem to ever bring to the floor a remedy, a solution to help these people.

Speaker RYAN, when he took the gavel in 2015, promised a return to regular order. He said: "We need to let every Member contribute." He also said: "We ought to open up the process and let people participate."

Well, there is a bipartisan group here who believe we ought to protect the DREAMers, who have a solution: the Dream Act. Let us bring it to the floor, have a debate, and vote on it. If my Republican colleagues don't want to vote for it, they can vote "no." But we ought to have a debate on this.

This is a big-enough deal. This is an important enough issue where we ought to have this debate. It really is frustrating that at this late hour we can't even get a commitment from the Speaker of the House to bring this issue to the floor.

This spending bill that we are talking about, this budget deal, would pass overwhelmingly. All Democrats, I am sure, would support it if the Speaker would just make one promise, and that is that we can bring a bill to the floor, a bill that we think is appropriate, to help the DREAMers. That is it.

If my Republican friends don't want to support it, they can vote "no." But to not let an issue like this be debated on the floor, to not think it is important enough to bring before the full House, is unconscionable.

I don't know whether my friends on the other side of the aisle have met DREAMers or not, but they have been here. They have been knocking on your door. These are incredible people. They contribute to this country in so many ways. They have led efforts to help protect people who have been victims of hurricanes all throughout this country. They have saved lives. They serve in our military.

All we want is a vote. That is it. And I just, for the life of me, can't quite understand why this is such a heavy lift.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so we can have this debate. I am tired of all the excuses. I am tired of all the reasons that we are being given why we can't debate this issue. This is important. These are real people. These are members of our community. They are our neighbors. The time has come for us to act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question. Let's have this debate. Let's protect the DREAMers. Let's do the right thing. But enough of the excuses. Enough of the excuses. It is time to vote.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, this past year, 80 members of our armed

services lost their lives in training and noncombat-related fatalities. We are going to attempt tonight, not wait, to pass a bill which will offer funding for our military.

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

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

I thank the members of the Rules Committee, all of them, for the great service they provide to the House of Representatives, this great House of the people.

I wish that the Speaker would treat the House of the people with the dignity that it deserves by giving us an opportunity, just an opportunity, for him to say that he would bring legislation to the floor, the Hurd-Aguilar bill for one, and then the other pieces of legislation regarding DACA so that the House could work its will under the queen-of-the-hill rule.

Last night, Mr. CLYBURN, the assistant leader; Mr. HOYER, the Democratic whip; and I sent a letter to the Speaker. It said: "Dear Mr. Speaker: In the spirit of bipartisanship, we write again to reiterate our sincere desire to ensure that the government remains open and that the priorities of the American people are properly addressed. As you know, Democrats have been clear that we support a budget agreement that ensures our men and women in uniform have the resources they need to protect our country and that America's middle class and working families have the tools they need to succeed. As part of this agreement, we have always expected that the House and the Senate would address the issue of DACA and the DREAMers."

"Most of our Members believe that this budget agreement is a reasonable compromise to address America's military strength and critical domestic priorities, like fighting the opioid crisis, boosting the National Institutes of Health, moving forward to resolve the pension crisis, caring for our veterans, making college more affordable, and investing in childcare for working families."

The agenda that I read was what we fought for and obtained in the budget agreement. We did not object to the large amount of money that was in the bill for defense, although some had asked: What is the purpose? What is the mission?

We said: Let's go forward with that. But to keep faith with the budget agreement, we insisted that the increases in defense would be met by increases on the domestic side.

So we have fought this fight. This is a success for us to get, as I said, the opioid crisis, boosting the NIH, the pension crisis, caring for our veterans, making college more affordable, and investing in childcare for our working families. This was the fight we had

with the Republicans because they have a reluctance to support domestic spending.

So the fact that this came to agreement after months of going back and forth on the caps, I think, is very important to recognize.

But, again, writing to the Speaker: “We are writing to again reiterate our request that you make a public statement regarding the scheduling of a vote on a DACA bill. Our request is that you publicly state that you will schedule a vote to consider the bipartisan Hurd-Aguilar bill and any other DACA bills that you wish to consider under a Queen of the Hill rule,” as I mentioned earlier.

“We strongly believe that Members of the House and their constituents deserve the same dignity that Leader MCCONNELL has extended to Members of the Senate by allowing for a vote on this issue.

“Thank you for your immediate attention to this letter.”

So we haven’t heard back from the Speaker on this, but I do support defeating the previous question.

One of the gentlemen on the other asked: Why would anybody vote against this bill? Why would anybody vote against this rule?

Well, because we have an opportunity right here to take matters into our own hands. Defeat the previous question so that we can take up the Dream Act.

That would be the House working its will, because we do know that the Dream Act has support on both sides of the aisle. We thank our Republican colleagues, those who have spoken out publicly, for their courage in supporting this protection.

If another country said that they were going to deport 800,000 people or place in jeopardy their protections under the law, we would be appalled. We would criticize them. So how can we, the United States of America—give me your poor—you know Emma Lazarus. I don’t have to go into it right now.

□ 0400

But I do. We all carry it in our hearts. So I urge a “no” on the previous question because a “yes” would have allowed us to bring up the Dream Act.

I really want to disabuse anyone in this body of any idea that we are not there to support our men and women in uniform and to give them the resources they need to keep themselves and our Nation safe. But I do recognize also that what our military are protecting is the greatest country that ever existed in the history of the world, the United States of America.

What is the United States of America?

It is a country governed by a constitution that has been a beacon to the world. It is a country populated by the beautiful diversity of America. It is a country that has a beautiful patrimony

given to us by God, our natural beauty. Fighting for those values is what we try to do in this bill.

Why can’t we extend the hand of friendship and protection to our DREAMers?

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my colleague if he has any further speakers?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentleman I will be closing as soon as she does.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let’s acknowledge that a deal like this could have come much sooner if the majority tried bipartisanship from the very beginning. Instead, our Nation has had to go through four short-term funding fights and two government shutdowns to arrive at where we are this morning. All of that was entirely preventable. It was brought on by the majority’s inability to get its work done.

It was little more than a week ago that President Trump stood in this Chamber and gave his State of the Union Address. In it, he proclaimed: “I call upon all of us to set aside our differences, to seek out common ground, and to summon the unity we need to deliver for the people.”

That was Tuesday. But the following Tuesday, the President said that he would love to see a shutdown. He keeps injecting incredible confusion and uncertainty as to what he actually would be willing to sign into law. I am aware that my colleague, Mr. SESSIONS, did assure us that he wants to sign this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an awful long night, and it didn’t need to be. We don’t need to take up every crisis to the very brink. Since you control every lever of power in this government, you have failed the most basic responsibility: to run this government in a sensible and intelligent way. Everybody—all of us—know, whether we want to admit it or not, that this is no way to run a government and certainly not a government as important as the one we were sent here to represent.

I also urge a “no” vote on the previous question so the House can take up the Dream Act because time is so quickly running out on those young people. It would be a blot on our conscience for the rest of our lives if we did nothing to help.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my friend and colleague, the ranking member of the Rules Committee; and the entire Rules Committee, Republicans and Democrats; and our staffs for their work late tonight and well into the morning.

Mr. Speaker, there was a question about the President of the United States and his advice that he has provided to this body. The President of the United States has indicated through a Statement of Administration Policy that there would be an expectation the President would sign this bill.

What does this mean?

This means that, as quickly as we can accomplish this rule, the underlying legislation, and the vote, perhaps as early as 7 o’clock this morning or earlier, the President of the United States may sign that; meaning that the American people could wake up today with confidence that the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives has averted a further problem through the leadership of making sure that we move forward to fund the government.

Make no mistake about it: there will be people who vote “yes” and people who vote “no,” and that is up to them. But, Mr. Speaker, tonight I would ask every Member of this body for that “aye” vote to do the right thing to fund the government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 734 OFFERED BY  
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote

against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and

Suspending the rules and passing S. 96, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 186, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—224

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

NAYS—186

Adams	Gomez	O'Rourke
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Barragán	Gottheimer	Panetta
Bass	Green, Al	Pascrell
Beatty	Green, Gene	Payne
Bera	Grijalva	Pelosi
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Peters
Blumenauer	Hastings	Peterson
Blunt Rochester	Heck	Pingree
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan	Himes	Polis
F.	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Huffman	Quigley
Brown (MD)	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Brownley (CA)	Jayapal	Rice (NY)
Bustos	Jeffries	Richmond
Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.	Rosen
Capuano	Keating	Royal-Allard
Carbajal	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Khanna	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kihuen	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kildee	Sánchez
Chu, Judy	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Ciциlline	Kind	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Clay	Langevin	Schrader
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Cohen	Lawrence	Serrano
Connolly	Lawson (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Lee	Shea-Porter
Correa	Levin	Sherman
Costa	Lieu, Ted	Sinema
Courtney	Lipinski	Sires
Crist	Loeb sack	Slaughter
Crowley	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lowenthal	Soto
Davis, Danny	Lowe y	Speier
DeGette	Lujan Grisham,	Suo zzi
Delaney	M.	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
DelBene	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Demings	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Titus
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Dingell	Matsui	Torres
Doggett	McCollum	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael	McEachin	Vargas
F.	McGovern	Veasey
Ellison	McNerney	Vela
Engel	Meeks	Velázquez
Eshoo	Meng	Visclosky
Españillat	Moore	Walz
Esty (CT)	Moulton	Wasserman
Evans	Murphy (FL)	Schultz
Foster	Nadler	Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Neal	Welch
Gabbard	Nolan	Wilson (FL)
Gallego	Norcross	Yarmuth
Garamendi	O'Halleran	

NOT VOTING—20

Bishop (UT)	DeFazio	LaHood
Black	Fitzpatrick	Lewis (GA)
Blum	Gosar	Palazzo
Bridenstine	Hudson	Renacci
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Turner
Cummings	Jones	Yoho
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	

□ 0431

Mr. GOTTHEIMER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 67.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 67.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 193, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]  
YEAS—224

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

NAYS—193

Adams	Biggs	Brown (MD)
Aguilar	Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)
Amash	Blumenauer	Bustos
Barragan	Blunt Rochester	Butterfield
Bass	Bonamici	Capuano
Beatty	Boyle, Brendan	Carbajal
Bera	F.	Cárdenas
Beyer	Brady (PA)	Carson (IN)

Cartwright	Jayapal	Pelosi
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Perlmutter
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Perry
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Peters
Ciçilline	Jordan	Peterson
Clarke (MA)	Keating	Pingree
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Clay	Kennedy	Polis
Cleaver	Khanna	Posey
Clyburn	Kihuen	Price (NC)
Cohen	Kildee	Quigley
Connolly	Kilmer	Raskin
Cooper	Kind	Rice (NY)
Correa	Krishnamoorthi	Richmond
Costa	Kuster (NH)	Rosen
Courtney	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Crist	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	Lawrence	Rush
Davis, Danny	Lawson (FL)	Ryan (OH)
DeGette	Lee	Sánchez
Delaney	Levin	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
DeBene	Lieu, Ted	Schiff
Demings	Lipinski	Schrader
DeSaulnier	Loeb sack	Scott (VA)
Deutch	Lofgren	Scott, David
Dingell	Lowenthal	Serrano
Doggett	Lowe y	Sewell (AL)
Doyle, Michael	Lujan Grisham,	Shea-Porter
F.	M.	Sherman
Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray	Sires
Engel	Lynch	Slaughter
Eshoo	Maloney,	Smith (WA)
Españallat	Carolyn B.	Soto
Esty (CT)	Maloney, Sean	Speier
Evans	Massie	Suozzi
Foster	Matsui	Swalwell (CA)
Frankel (FL)	McCollum	Takano
Fudge	McEachin	Thompson (CA)
Gabbard	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Gallego	McNerney	Titus
Garamendi	Meadows	Tonko
Gomez	Meeks	Torres
Gonzalez (TX)	Meng	Tsongas
Gottheimer	Moore	Vargas
Green, Al	Moulton	Veasey
Green, Gene	Nadler	Vela
Grijalva	Napolitano	Velázquez
Gutiérrez	Neal	Visclosky
Hanabusa	Nolan	Walz
Hastings	Norcross	Wasserman
Heck	O'Halleran	Schultz
Higgins (NY)	O'Rourke	Waters, Maxine
Himes	Pallone	Watson Coleman
Hoyer	Panetta	Welch
Huffman	Pascrell	Wilson (FL)
Jackson Lee	Payne	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (UT)	Davis (CA)	Palazzo
Black	DeFazio	Turner
Blum	Gosar	Yoho
Bridenstine	Jones	
Cummings	Kaptur	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 0439

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 67 and "yea" on rollcall No. 68.

IMPROVING RURAL CALL QUALITY AND RELIABILITY ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (S. 96) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure the integrity of voice communications and to prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimi-

nation among areas of the United States in the delivery of such communications.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 0440

HONORING HOMETOWN HEROES ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further discussion of H.R. 1892.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 734, I call up the bill (H.R. 1892) to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment to House amendment to Senate amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018".

DIVISION B—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, TAX RELIEF, AND MEDICAID CHANGES RELATING TO CERTAIN DISASTERS AND FURTHER EXTENSION OF CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Subdivision 1—Further Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2018

The following sums in this subdivision are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018 and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS  
PROCESSING, RESEARCH AND MARKETING  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For an additional amount for the "Office of the Secretary", \$2,360,000,000, which shall remain available until December 31, 2019, for necessary expenses related to crops, trees, bushes, and vine losses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, Maria, and other