

costs will exceed revenues every year for the foreseeable future. The only way these benefits can be paid going forward is if the Trust Fund borrows from taxpayers. Congress designed the Black Lung Benefits Act to be financed by a tax on coal production—not the taxpayers.

Another consequence of failing to act is that the accumulated debt will pile up each year. The Trust Fund will have to borrow to also pay debt service and interest costs each year. When the debt reaches the breaking point, the only solution is a taxpayer bailout. It is irresponsible to allow the coal industry to privatize gains and socialize the costs.

Although black lung disease had been on the decline after the passage of the 1969 Coal Act, in recent years it has returned with a vengeance. Recent studies show that rates of black lung disease have reached 25 percent in Appalachia. The rates of progressive massive fibrosis, the most severe form of black lung disease, are now at epidemic levels, and are now being diagnosed in younger miners. Treating these miners will require costly medical care.

Mr. Speaker, allowing the excise tax rate to expire does a great disservice to coal miners, their families, and taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. Speaker, again, I stand on this Floor and oppose the myopic, Republican mission that asks hard-working Americans to pay for wasteful tax cuts for wealthy corporations.

With baby boomers retiring and needing security, the first Republican tax cuts seriously damaged the health of the Medicare Trust Fund. This bill is more of the same—exploding the deficit and threatening Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare.

After decades of wage stagnation—when over 41 million laborers earn less than \$12 an hour, when almost none of their employers offer health insurance, when more than one-quarter of Americans struggle to cover housing costs—the Republican bill preferences health care industries over lower health care costs for consumers.

Rather than fixing their Failed Tax Law's harmful provisions toward hard-working Americans, this bill makes fixes for industry moguls.

This bill fails to roll back the double taxation on residents in Illinois via the cap on the State and Local Income Tax Deduction.

This bill fails to restore the personal exemptions taken from millions of families with children. This bill fails to help home owners whose houses lost value by capping the mortgage interest deduction.

Rather than helping all Americans affected by disasters, the Republicans are picking and choosing which disaster victims that they feel deserve relief.

Rather than uniting Americans, this bill seeks to divide our places of worship by allowing churches and religious organizations to make political statements.

People in Chicago expect government to help real people. I oppose this dangerous bill that threatens the economic security of our country and citizenry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1180, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 3277. An act to reduce regulatory burdens and streamline processes related to commercial space activities, and for other purposes.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 695, CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-1090) on the resolution (H. Res. 1183) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 695) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes, 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. 695, CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1183 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1183

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 695) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes, 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 with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-88. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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.

□ 1645

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of the Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriations package in front of us represents the fourth appropriations package to fully fund the government for fiscal year 2019. While the Congress has completed its work with respect to almost 75 percent of total discretionary spending, including, notably, the Department of Defense, Health and Human Services, Education, and Labor, roughly 25 percent of this discretionary spending remains outstanding. Today's bill will provide a short-term continuing resolution to February 8, 2019, to ensure that the entirety of the Federal Government remains open and operating while the Congress continues its work.

I have said on numerous occasions both on this floor and elsewhere that continuing resolutions are not the best way to fund the government, but allowing the government to shut down, even in part, is much costlier and much worse. It is our obligation to our constituents to keep all of the government open and operating to provide needed services to them.

Mr. Speaker, from an appropriations perspective, this year has been remarkably successful. Earlier this year, we sent 5 of the 12 appropriations bills to the President for his signature before the beginning of the fiscal year. That is the best record in 22 years.

With hard work from both sides of the aisle in both Houses of Congress, our earlier efforts represented a return to regular order and to the normal legislative process. For us to drop the ball now, at the end of the year and at the end of this Congress, would negate much of the good work that has already been done this year.

As I have said so often on this floor, the primary obligation of the Congress is to fund the American Government and to keep it open and operating. The American people deserve no less. With this package under consideration today, Congress will do just that with respect to 7 of the 12 main spending bills: Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies; Commerce, Justice, Science, and the Related Agencies; Financial Services and General Government; Homeland Security; Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies; State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs; and, finally, Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies.

As my colleagues can see from this list, the group of bills covers a broad array of vital government programs the American people rely upon. It includes key departments like the Department of Homeland Security, the Food and Drug Administration, the Border Patrol, and the State Department.

It covers services like funding roads, operating security checkpoints at airports, passport services, food inspection services, importation and exportation of goods and services, banking services, and thousands of other important government functions.

Perhaps just as importantly, it covers approximately 800,000 employees, about half of whom would need to be furloughed and about half of whom would likely be deemed essential and be required to work without a guarantee of pay.

While continuing resolutions are in no way, shape, or form the best way to do business, the measure before us today will at least ensure that the government remains open and operating and will continue to provide the needed services for our Nation and our constituents. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the coming weeks to complete our work on funding the government for fiscal year 2019.

Importantly, this bill also includes funding for disaster relief and to secure the border. The American people have made their voices heard, and they have told us time and time again that they want additional border security. To that end, this bill appropriates \$5 billion for the purpose of securing the border.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill also appropriates \$7.8 billion for disaster relief. As we have seen time and again in places like New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina, the East Coast after Hurricane Sandy, and my own hometown of Moore, Oklahoma, after devastating

tornadoes, disasters require a helping hand. By appropriating these funds we offer our fellow Americans who have been afflicted by disasters the help that they need and require.

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

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

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Let me begin, Mr. Speaker, by again thanking my colleague from Oklahoma for the work that he and other appropriators did to try to keep the government running. We are here right now not because of the appropriators. We are here right now because Donald Trump has made a mess of things.

Mr. Speaker, it is surreal that we are here today, days before the end of a Congress, hours before one-quarter of the Federal Government runs out of money, scrambling to keep the lights on at the brink of the third Republican government shutdown this year, because we are not dealing with divided government. Republicans today control not only this Chamber, but also the Senate and the White House. They have been fighting among themselves for weeks over whether and how to keep the Government of the United States open for business. It would be comical if it weren't so serious.

This proposal that we are being given right now is not a solution. It is a political temper tantrum all to please one man: the person sitting at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. It doesn't solve the disagreements in this Chamber or the Senate, and it doesn't prevent the shutdown America is facing.

This President and this majority ran on fear during the last election: fear of immigrants, fear of those seeking asylum, and fear of anyone who doesn't look exactly like them.

What happened, Mr. Speaker? They were resoundingly rejected. The American people chose a different course. They don't want a government that reacts only to the wants of the President's ever-shrinking base, the small segment of society that actually supports his offensive border wall.

Let me remind my colleagues, according to polling, Americans, by a 2-to-1 margin, want the President to compromise on the wall to avoid a shutdown. This proposal is exactly what the President may want, but it is precisely what the American people rejected.

The Senate passed a bipartisan continuing resolution to keep the lights on. This House was prepared to pass it until the President's latest outburst. Governing by tweet isn't governing at all. If the President's most senior advisers are Fox & Friends and Rush Limbaugh, maybe we shouldn't be sur-

prised when we find ourselves here today.

But this morning, this House came together to pass same-day authority so the majority could move quickly on a bipartisan, short-term continuing resolution. Democrats joined our Republican colleagues in this effort to provide the tools needed to keep the lights on. This is how you are using them?

This isn't a serious plan. To even vote for disaster relief, this bill requires you to support the President's offensive wall. Democrats and the American people have already rejected this false choice.

This wall is a medieval solution to a 21st century problem. What is next, Mr. Speaker, money for a moat around Mar-a-Lago?

This will not become law, what we are doing right now. This is a waste of time. If it even passes here—which is a big if—it is dead on arrival in the Senate. I say to my friend: The clock is ticking. Let's get to work on a clean bill that can make it to the President. This isn't that. This is just offensive.

Again, let me remind those in this Chamber the Senate, in a bipartisan way, came together by a voice vote and supported a continuing resolution, a clean CR, to keep the government running for 7 weeks. That is it. It is all we are proposing here today. This Chamber can't even do that. This is a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a couple of comments before I yield to my friend from Alabama and fellow Rules Committee member for 3 minutes.

Let me just quickly point out that we are really talking about border security here. This clearly isn't simply a wall. Frankly, there is not enough money involved here. This is a matter of providing additional security.

It is important to note the Border Patrol union itself fully supports what the President is trying to do. This is the type of thing they have asked us to provide them so that they can provide us with the security that we tasked them to give to the American people.

The disaster relief is something I think probably both sides should be able to agree on. We know there is a genuine disaster. We have had fires, and we have got hurricane relief. I have a very detailed summary here of all the various items that would be taken care of. I would be more than happy to provide that to my friend. That is something that we should do before we go home. That is something, frankly, Americans have a right to count on.

I remember—and I was with my friends in this endeavor—during the Sandy debate and how desperately we needed aid at that point in time and how severe the reaction was when Congress went home without getting that done and came back in January. I

think the reaction was appropriate. So this disaster relief is extraordinarily important, and I hope that we focus on that in our debate as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), who is a fellow member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add my support to this rule.

When did protecting the American people—knowing who is entering our country and having a secure border—become some kind of radical or partisan idea?

I am stunned to see the length to which some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will go simply to oppose enhanced border security, including a border wall. In fact, it seems they are willing to shut down the Federal Government instead of supporting President Trump's urgent request for \$5 billion to fund the border wall.

What is especially strange is that some of my colleagues on the other side have already supported a wall in the past. Some have even voted in support of a border wall. What has changed?

I think the answer is very simple. I think some of my colleagues are so committed to appeasing the so-called resistance that they find themselves opposing a very basic and common-sense idea like border security just because they want to earn points from the most extreme part of their political base.

This is really not a complicated issue. This is about the safety and security of the American people. This is about keeping terrorists out of our country. This is about keeping illegal drugs out of our country. This is about keeping criminals out of our country. This shouldn't be hard.

Why am I so passionate about this? Because this is a critical issue. When I talk to the people I represent back in Alabama, they are passionate about it. This is one of the top issues I hear about at events and townhalls throughout Alabama. In fact, the phones in my office have been ringing all day with people urging us to stand strong, secure our borders, and build the wall.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a fight worth fighting. I think pushing to ensure the safety of the American people is worthy, and it is absolutely a critical fight. So I urge my colleagues to stop playing to the resistance. Come back toward a commonsense idea like securing our border. Pass this amendment. Pass this funding bill, and ensure the safety of the American people.

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

Mr. Speaker, if I could just respond to my colleague, if I thought for one second building a stupid wall would somehow secure our borders, I would be for it. But every expert I have talked to, including people on the border, say they need more personnel and say we

ought to invest more in electronic equipment to surveil our borders. I don't know of a wall that has ever been built that people haven't climbed over or dug under. This is ridiculous.

By the way, when the President campaigned, he said that he wanted to build a wall and that Mexico was going to pay for it. Now he wants to build a wall that by all accounts is going to be useless in terms of protecting our borders, and he wants the American taxpayers to pay for it.

Well, you have \$5 billion. How about rebuilding our roads and our bridges that are crumbling in this country?

If you have got \$5 billion that you don't care what you do with, how about investing it in affordable housing?

Or how about dealing with the issue of climate change?

Or how about making sure that some of the 40 million-plus Americans in this country who don't have enough to eat have food?

Wasting money on something so ridiculous is offensive.

So we want border security. We are happy to work with you on enhanced border security, but this isn't it. This is a campaign slogan. This is a waste of taxpayer money. It is ridiculous. It is embarrassing. For the President to want to shut down the government over this is disgraceful.

By the way, on the disaster package, just so my colleagues understand this, the disaster package in this bill does not include \$600 million in nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico. So unless this Congress takes immediate action, 1.4 million of our fellow citizens of Puerto Rico stand to suffer deep cuts in food assistance, causing many of them to go hungry. That is shameful. Where is the help for them?

□ 1700

Of course, we should pass a clean CR to ensure that our government remains open. But my friend talked about disaster assistance, and I just wanted to point out that one thing that is missing in their disaster package is the nutrition money for our fellow citizens of Puerto Rico. I am sure there are others.

We are rushing this thing through. There is no transparency here. We thought we had a deal to keep the government open for 7 weeks. Then, all of a sudden, I guess the President tuned into "Fox and Friends" and changed his mind. You don't know where this President is going to be day-to-day or hour-to-hour or minute-to-minute. But he is the guy who said that he would be proud to own a shutdown.

Well, I think it would be a disaster for this country to have another shutdown. I think it would be expensive. I think we should to do everything we can to avoid it, and that is why we ought to send a clean CR back to the Senate.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a couple of comments with regard to the statement my good friend made.

We are actually talking, really, in a sense, not about not \$5 billion. We are talking about \$3.3 billion. The Senate bill that passed actually added \$1.7 billion, which is a tacit admission that physical barriers do make a difference.

We all agree that the amount of money we are talking about here would not build an entire wall. Quite the opposite, it would just provide some physical barriers at points along the border that are weak and need additional security.

My friend says that nobody is interested in this. Frankly, the border security unions are. The Border Patrol has endorsed the President's proposal. The men and women we have tasked to defend our borders tell us this is something that they need. They have gone so far as to say they would support a government shutdown.

I hope we don't have that. I am not for a government shutdown. I never have been for a government shutdown. But this is not an extraordinary amount of money in a bill, frankly, that totals well over \$250 billion, when you add up all the spending. And being able to put additional security there is important.

To my friend's point about Puerto Rico, I think that is a good point. I think that is a fair point to make. We should probably go back and take a look at that. I do know that Americans desperately need assistance in a variety of areas, Puerto Rico included. Agriculture help is necessary, as well as help for rebuilding military installations and schools that have been destroyed. Why can't we get that done?

This is a very substantial package. There is actually more money in this bill for disaster relief for American citizens than there is for additional border security. So I think this is an eminently sensible proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I urge its adoption and the adoption of the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I don't really want to prolong this debate much longer here. Every day with this administration is another self-made crisis, another demonstration of bad faith.

No one can trust what comes out of the White House, what the President says. His word is worthless. And here we are, as evidence of that fact.

Mr. Speaker, the government is set to run out of money tomorrow. We are running out of time to act. But, apparently, this is exactly what President Trump wants.

Last week, he said he would be "proud to shut down the government." Today, he confirmed he wouldn't even sign a clean CR to keep our government open for just a few more weeks.

It is irresponsible and abhorrent to attach funding for his offensive border wall to a bill to keep the lights on.

That is why, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the Senate amendment to H.R. 695, which is the clean CR that has already passed the Senate by a voice vote. Every Democrat and every Republican stood together and passed the CR. It wasn't controversial over there. Somehow, it is controversial here.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), my good friend.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, we all took an oath. I know we remember that oath—for me, it was pretty meaningful; it was my first oath of office—to keep our citizens safe, to protect them, protect them at our borders, protect them in the case of disasters.

In fact, in the past, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have supported a border wall, border protection. But now, since the name “President Trump” is on it, it is evil; it is bad. How politically convenient.

I remind you of the oath we took to protect the citizens in this Nation whom, apparently, we are so ready to toss aside when it is politically expedient.

You talk about a deal that was made. The Senate may have made whatever deal they wished to make. I am unaware that we work for the United States Senate, Mr. Speaker.

I represent the people of the 10th Congressional District, and I will tell you what they say. They want our borders secure. They want us to take care of people in disasters. There are heartaches for the folks in Florida, George, and California who were devastated by disasters. They ask why we can't fund disaster relief for those people.

Please, let's not talk about a deal that was made in the other House, because we are not responsible to them. We are responsible to the people who elected us.

One last point: We are at this point of struggling over keeping the government open—and let's be honest about it, it is part of the government. The other side of the aisle talks about shutting down the government. It is about 20 percent, 25 percent of the government.

We are at this point because the Senate won't make a deal that doesn't protect the fairly tenuous position that the future Speaker has on the other side of the aisle, and she doesn't want to make a deal.

I spent 35 years in private business. Compromise is the way it works. A

compromise was offered and summarily rejected within minutes in the Senate by Mr. SCHUMER and then by Ms. PELOSI.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule, pass the resolution, and send it back to the Senate and tell them to do their job.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just respond to the gentleman that we are all for compromise. This 7-week CR is a compromise. The clean CR is a compromise. In a bipartisan way, unanimously in the United States Senate, they accepted it. The President said he was for it. Then he changed his mind after watching “Fox and Friends” or listening to some right-wing radio host.

The gentleman talks about protecting the border. We want to protect the border. We want to invest money in things that will actually protect the border, not in a press release, not in a sound bite, not in something that is a total waste of money, like a wall.

But what about the fact that the President is going to shut the government down over a stupid wall and that means that the men and women who work for the Department of Homeland Security, the people who protect our borders, will not get paid, and we are not going to support them?

One of my Republican colleagues, when he was faced with that question, said: “It's actually part of what you do when you sign up for any public service position.”

Really? That is how we treat and respect the men and women who are charged with protecting our borders? We turn our backs on them during the holiday season? Merry Christmas. We are not going to pay you.

What they need, if you go to the border and talk to them, are more personnel. They want us to invest in more electronic equipment to help them surveil the border. They will tell you that this idea of a wall is dumb. It doesn't work. It is not going to protect this country. It is a waste of money.

We had a deal to move this CR forward, and the President changed his mind. He reneged on his word. He didn't keep his promise. And here we are.

So, as Republicans fight with Republicans here in the House, thankfully, the Senate, in a bipartisan way, came up with a solution. There was a compromise. Democrats are willing to support that compromise. But, somehow, it is not enough.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I know what it is like to be waiting on disaster aid and not getting it. Among other things, this potential or so-called disaster aid is missing dollars needed by the people of Puerto Rico. I walked the streets and saw how desperate the need was. It doesn't even include the

\$600 million in assistance for Puerto Rico to deal with food nutrition.

I remember, in the time of Hurricane Harvey, we begged for an extension for the food nutrition program called Disaster Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and in 3 days, we served 30,000 people. You have to feel the pain to understand.

Really, Mr. Speaker, this is a sham and a shame, because Republicans are in the United States Senate—let the American people understand that—and they fostered this compromise. They came together. They have sent it to the President. They spoke to the President. The President agreed that we would do it in this manner and that we would look at this issue on the other side of 2019.

What happened here? A callous disregard of Border Patrol agents; callous disregard of Customs and Border Protection; callous disregard of the National Guard and the military who are down at the border, who are out there every day; and a callous disregard of Jakelin, the 7-year-old who died because we don't have adequate health facilities, medical care, medevac, and the kind of decent living conditions—yes, decent—that are warranted.

We are shutting down Commerce and Justice. We don't have enough judges at the border. We don't have enough judges to deal with the asylum cases.

So if these folks want border security, it is not just a wall. It is technology. It is the agents. It is understanding that human beings are coming across the border. It is medical care. It is, as well, the security that we need.

So I am here to say, Mr. Speaker, as I close, what a sham and a shame. Let's get the Senate bill and put it on the floor.

Yesterday, I introduced H.R. 7332 that says no American tax dollars will be paid for the wall. Mexico will pay for it. Border security will be based upon technology, personnel, and barriers.

Let's pass that bill and pass the CR from the Senate.

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

Mr. Speaker, sometimes, in the heat of debate, it is easy to miss what the real essence of the dispute is.

When I vote for the rule—and I don't expect my friend to vote for the rule; that is always a partisan exercise—but when I vote for the underlying legislation, I will actually be voting to fund the government. If my friends vote “no,” they will be voting not to fund the government. So if they are worried about funding the government, all they have to do is vote for this bill, because it funds the government.

The second thing I will be voting for is disaster relief. My friends have said that there are other areas that are worthy of relief. That is probably true. I don't have any quarrel with that. But I wouldn't vote against this disaster relief because it wasn't enough. I would

vote for this and then try to get additional in the time that we have remaining.

Finally, I will be voting for enhanced border security. We all know we have a problem. We all know that our border is not as secure as we would like. There is a debate over wall versus no wall. This really isn't a wall.

The wall would be \$25 billion. Our friends have offered \$1.7 billion. The President has been the one who has compromised, who has come back with \$5 billion. So we are talking about \$3.3 billion for various physical barriers at spots that we all agree would almost certainly work, done with the cooperation of our own people at Homeland Security.

Finally, we are talking about not paying border agents. Border agents have told us this is what they need. That is what their union has said. That is what their elected representatives said.

We want to do what the President has proposed. The President isn't shutting down the government. The President is willing to sign legislation that funds all the government. He has asked for disaster relief, something that should not be controversial in this Chamber, in my view, but sometimes is.

Finally, he has asked for an awfully modest amount of money to provide additional security along the border that the Border Patrol itself has asked for. That is really what is at issue.

□ 1715

So when you vote against this legislation, you will be the ones voting to shut down the government, not the President, not my colleagues in this Chamber, not the Senate and whatever they decide to do in their infinite wisdom, but a "no" vote on the underlying legislation is a vote to shut down the government.

A "yes" vote for the rule, which my friends would differ with, and that is fair enough, but a "yes" vote for the underlying legislation is the vote to keep the government open, take care of the disasters that we are faced with, and provide modest additional support for our border agents and Border Patrol.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I just need to correct the RECORD on a few things here.

It was the President who said he would be proud to shut the government down. My colleague may recall not too long ago the President had a meeting with Speaker-designate PELOSI and Leader SCHUMER over in the Senate. He bragged about it on camera.

The President invited the cameras in, and he said: I would be proud to own a shutdown. That is what he said.

So we know where the President stands on this. He doesn't care about shutting the government down. We should.

The gentleman said that votes on rules are always partisan. Well, for the most part they are, but not this morning—not this morning.

My Republican friends brought a martial law rule to the floor, which we don't really like because it basically condenses the process and we don't have a lot of time to look at things. But nonetheless, we said we would vote for it.

Almost every Democrat voted with Republicans to move this so-called martial law rule forward so that we could bring up the Senate-passed continuing resolution today and keep the government running and be able to pay the men and women who protect our borders. So we came in good faith, and we did that.

We want border security. We just think wasting billions of dollars on a stupid wall that doesn't do anything to protect our country is the wrong way to go.

So if you want to vote to keep the government open, then you should vote with us to defeat the previous question because, if we defeat the previous question, then I will bring up the Senate-passed continuing resolution, and we can all vote for it. We can all keep the government running. We can all go home and have a merry Christmas and a happy new year. That is how simple it is.

My Republican friends are bringing a rule to the floor that says that, if you vote for this rule, there is no separate vote on the border wall. It is all together.

They know what is going to happen. If it passes the House, it will go over to the Senate, and they are not going to accept this. They have already had a bipartisan compromise. They had a deal with the President until he changed his mind.

So if you want to keep the government open, then vote with the Democrats on defeating the previous question, and we will bring up a clean CR and we will do the right thing. We will do what we thought we were going to be doing this morning until the Republicans got into a fight with one another, and here we are.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman how many more speakers he has.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close whenever my friend is.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am looking at a headline here today. It says: "U.S. stocks clobbered, with Dow losing nearly 500 points, amid White House drama over government shutdown."

Mr. Speaker, creating chaos in the stock market is how a drama queen might act, but it is not how any President should behave. This is totally manufactured by the White House crisis. This is ridiculous that we are at this point, after all the agreements that have been reached in the Senate and, we thought, here in the House.

The President turned the TV set on and started watching FOX News and got carried away and now is reneging on his agreement. That is unfortunate.

But I would again say to my colleagues: Let us defeat the previous question, and we will bring up a clean CR. We will keep this government open, and we will do the right thing by the American people. And most importantly, we will make sure that the men and women who are protecting our border get paid during this Christmas holiday. It is the right thing to do.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend. As always, it is a spirited debate, and I want to be the first to say he is exactly right on a point he made. He did, earlier today, actually help me on this side of the aisle. I was evidently much more persuasive this morning than I have been this afternoon. But my friend is exactly right. On many occasions we have worked together, and I want to thank him for that.

I also want to review just quickly what I see, at least, Mr. Speaker, as the main issues here.

Number one, we all say we agree we want to keep the government funded, and I believe we all do. We don't believe in government shutdowns. We all believe the government ought to be funded. The underlying legislation does exactly that.

I think all of us, on both sides of the aisle, care about Americans who have been hurt in disasters, and we have shown that time and time again. We have struggled on occasion, but we generally get aid to where it is needed; and if we overlook somebody, we try and come back and do that again.

This bill makes a good-faith effort to provide billions of dollars in assistance to Americans who need it through no fault of their own, who have been ravaged by fire, who have been damaged by hurricanes, who face a variety of disasters, not just in the United States, but in the territories as well. If, again, we have overlooked something, we should go back and try and take care of that as well.

Finally, it provides a very modest amount of money. Remember, this package, together, is over \$250 billion. The difference between the two sides—unless my friends object to disaster relief, which I doubt they do—to be fair, is really \$3.3 billion. That is what the President thinks he needs, an additional expenditure along the border, or \$5 billion if you want to characterize it that way. But the difference between the two sides is only \$3.3 billion.

That doesn't build a wall. We have been told the President is uncompromising. He is not uncompromising. He has been, for 2 years, talking about an

elaborate border security of \$25 billion. This is 5, not 25. This would not build a wall, but this would provide additional security.

We all know there are points along the way where physical barriers matter and make a difference. I think that is what the President is asking for.

My friends worry, and rightly so, about people not getting paid during a government shutdown, which I hope we avoid, quite frankly. But the men and women on the border have asked the President to do this. They support what he is trying to do.

When we send troops into combat, I listen to what they have to say and what they need. So does this Congress, and it tries to provide it.

We put people in a difficult situation along the border, and they tell us these are the sorts of tools they need. The President is trying to respond in this case, and I think we should support him in that effort.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to encourage all Members to support the rule. Today's bill represents the next step toward fulfilling our primary obligation as Members of Congress to fund the government.

While continuing resolutions are never the best way to fund the government, today's measure will allow us to keep the entire government open and operating and providing needed services for our country and our constituents until February 8 of 2019. This measure will give Congress the time it needs to complete the rest of our work and fully fund the government through the end of fiscal year 2019.

I want to applaud my colleagues for their work.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1183 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

“That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 695) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes, 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.

SEC. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 695.”

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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;

The motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 88 with an amendment; and

The motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 2606, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 178, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 468]

YEAS—223

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

Tipton Walorski Wittman
 Turner Walters, Mimi Womack
 Upton Weber (TX) Woodall
 Valadao Webster (FL) Yoder
 Wagner Wenstrup Yoho
 Walberg Westerman Young (AK)
 Walden Williams Young (IA)
 Walker Wilson (SC) Zeldin

NAYS—178

Adams Gabbard Napolitano
 Aguilar Gallego Neal
 Barragán Garamendi Nolan
 Bass Gomez Norcross
 Beatty Gonzalez (TX) O'Halleran
 Bera Gottheimer O'Rourke
 Beyer Green, Al Pallone
 Bishop (GA) Green, Gene Panetta
 Blumenauer Grijalva Pascrell
 Blunt Rochester Gutiérrez
 Bonamici Heck Pelosi
 Boyle, Brendan Higgins (NY) Perlmutter
 F. Himes Peters
 Brady (PA) Hoyer Peterson
 Brown (MD) Huffman Pingree
 Brownley (CA) Jackson Lee Pocan
 Bustos Jayapal Price (NC)
 Butterfield Jeffries Quigley
 Carbajal Johnson (GA) Raskin
 Cárdenas Johnson, E. B. Rice (NY)
 Carson (IN) Jones (MI) Richmond
 Cartwright Kaptur Roybal-Allard
 Castor (FL) Kelly (IL) Ruiz
 Castro (TX) Kennedy Ruppertsberger
 Chu, Judy Khanna Ryan (OH)
 Cicilline Kihuen Sánchez
 Clark (MA) Kildee Sarbanes
 Clarke (NY) Kilmer Scanlon
 Clay Krishnamoorthi Schakowsky
 Cleaver Kuster (NH) Schiff
 Clyburn Lamb Schneider
 Cohen Langevin Schrader
 Connolly Larsen (WA) Scott (VA)
 Cooper Larson (CT) Serrano
 Correa Lawrence Sewell (AL)
 Courtney Lawson (FL) Sherman
 Crist Lee Sires
 Cuellar Levin Smith (WA)
 Cummings Lewis (GA) Soto
 Davis (CA) Lieu, Ted Speier
 DeFazio Lipinski Suozzi
 DeGette Loeb sack Takano
 Delaney Lofgren Thompson (CA)
 DeLauro Lowey Titus
 DelBene Luján, Ben Ray Tonko
 Demings Lynch Torres
 DeSaulnier Maloney, Carolyn B. Tsongas
 Deutch Doyle, Michael F. Veasey
 Dingell Maloney, Sean Vela
 Doggett Matsui Velázquez
 Doyle, Michael F. McCollum Visclosky
 Ellison McEachin Wasserman
 Engel McGovern Schultz
 Eshoo McNeerney Meeks
 Espaillat Meng Waters, Maxine
 Esty (CT) Moore Watson Coleman
 Evans Morelle Welch
 Foster Moulton Wild
 Frankel (FL) Murphy (FL) Wilson (FL)
 Fudge Nadler Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—31

Black Jones (NC) Rosen
 Capuano Keating Roskam
 Comstock Kind Rush
 Costa Love Scott, David
 Crowley Lowenthal Shea-Porter
 Davis, Danny Lujan Grisham, Sinema
 Duncan (SC) M. Swalwell (CA)
 Hanabusa Messer Thompson (MS)
 Hastings Noem Trott
 Hultgren Polis Walz
 Jenkins (KS) Ratcliffe

□ 1750

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Messrs. CLYBURN, GOTTHEIMER, and POCAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 221, noes 179, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 469]

AYES—221

Abraham Goodlatte Palmer
 Aderholt Gosar Paulsen
 Allen Gowdy Pearce
 Amash Granger Perry
 Amodei Graves (GA) Pittenger
 Arrington Graves (LA) Poe (TX)
 Babin Graves (MO) Poliquin
 Bacon Griffith Posey
 Balderson Grothman Reed
 Banks (IN) Guthrie Reichert
 Handel Barletta Renacci
 Harper Rice (SC)
 Barr Harris Roby
 Barton Bergman Hartzler
 Biggs Hersarling
 Bilirakis Hern
 Bishop (MI) Herrera Beutler
 Bishop (UT) Hice, Jody B.
 Blackburn Higgins (LA)
 Blum Hill
 Bost Holding
 Brady (TX) Hollingsworth
 Brat Hudson
 Brooks (AL) Huizenga
 Brooks (IN) Hunter
 Buchanan Hurd
 Buck Issa
 Bucshon Johnson (LA)
 Budd Johnson (OH)
 Burgess Johnson, Sam
 Byrne Jordan
 Calvert Joyce (OH)
 Carter (GA) Katko
 Carter (TX) Kelly (MS)
 Chabot Kelly (PA)
 Cheney King (IA)
 Cloud King (NY)
 Coffman Kinzinger
 Cole Knight
 Collins (GA) Kustoff (TN)
 Collins (NY) Labrador
 Comer LaHood
 Conaway LaMalfa
 Cook Lamborn
 Costello (PA) Lance
 Cramer Latta
 Crawford Lesko
 Culberson Lewis (MN)
 Curbelo (FL) LoBiondo
 Curtis Long
 Davidson Loudermilk
 Davis, Rodney Lucas
 Denham Luetkemeyer
 DesJarlais Marchant
 Diaz-Balart Marino
 Donovan Marshall
 Duffy Massie
 Duncan (TN) Mast
 Dunn McCarthy
 Emmer McClintock
 Estes (KS) McHenry
 Faso McKinley
 Ferguson McMorriss
 Fitzpatrick Rodgers
 Fleischmann McSally
 Flores Meadows
 Fortenberry Mitchell
 Foxx Moolenaar
 Frelinghuysen Mooney (WV)
 Gaetz Mullin
 Gallagher Newhouse
 Garrett Norman
 Gianforte Nunes
 Gibbs Olson
 Gohmert Palazzo

NOES—179

Adams Bass
 Aguilar Beatty
 Barragán Bera

Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Cooper
 Correa
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crist
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 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
 Heck
 Higgins (NY)
 Himes
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (MI)
 Kaptur
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kihuen
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Lamb
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowey
 Luján, Ben Ray
 Lynch
 Maloney, Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Halleran
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Scott (VA)
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Sires
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Speier
 Suozzi
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wild
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—32

Black
 Capuano
 Comstock
 Crowley
 Davis, Danny
 Duncan (SC)
 Hanabusa
 Hastings
 Hultgren
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jones (NC)
 Keating
 Kind
 Love
 Lowenthal
 Lujan Grisham, M.
 MacArthur
 McCaul
 Messer
 Noem
 Polis
 Ratcliffe
 Rosen
 Roskam
 Schrader
 Scott, David
 Shea-Porter
 Sinema
 Swalwell (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Trott
 Walz

□ 1800

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.

SHILOH NATIONAL MILITARY PARK BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AND PARKER'S CROSSROADS BATTLEFIELD DESIGNATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 88) to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes, with an amendment