

you have on so many lives. Day in and day out, our teachers are there. We are grateful to them.

□ 1215

TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Teacher Appreciation Week to honor the educators in my district, who work tirelessly on behalf of our students.

The public schools in the Third District of Kansas are some of the best in our Nation, and our workforce of qualified, dedicated teachers are a major factor in making our schools so great. As a product of public schools myself, I know the kind of impact teachers can have on the lives of their students. Good teachers are a key to setting our kids and our communities up for a successful future.

I am working hard to give teachers the tools and resources they need to do to their jobs well. I fought to protect the educator expense deduction in tax reform, affirming that our Tax Code should support and reward our teachers. I also supported the recent omnibus funding bill, which included a \$2 billion investment in continuing education and workforce development grants for teachers.

Mr. Speaker, none of us would have the opportunities we have in life without the teachers who gave us the tools and skills to succeed, and we pay special recognition to each of the teachers who made a difference in our lives, and who continue to make a difference in the lives of kids in our districts this week during Teacher Appreciation Week.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 9, 2018, at 9:09 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1732.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3053, NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2017

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

call up House Resolution 879 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 879

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3053) to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 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 Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-69. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and

reported a rule, House Resolution 879, providing for consideration of an important piece of legislation, H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018. The rule provides for consideration of this measure under a structured rule, making three amendments offered by the minority in order. This legislation passed out of the Energy and Commerce Committee on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis by a vote of 49-4, and has been a comprehensive effort spearheaded by my colleague from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) over several Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, in 39 States and in 121 communities across this country, including in the Tri-Cities community in my home district, in the great State of Washington, the Federal Government continues to fail to meet its obligation to collect and dispose of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste. This spent fuel and waste is generated as a result of commercial nuclear power production, and as a byproduct of our Nation's nuclear defense activities, including used fuel from nuclear-powered submarines and aircraft carriers and from the legacy waste created from uranium and plutonium development as nuclear weapons deterrents.

No one knows the magnitude of impact stemming from the development of these nuclear deterrents more than the Tri-Cities community, where the Hanford Site played a major role within the Manhattan Project during World War II to develop the first atomic bomb. It was because of the extraordinary work of the more than 50,000 workers at Hanford that we were able to end World War II, and later the Cold War.

However, this work came with great repercussions. The Hanford Site contains 56 million gallons of high-level radioactive waste, and is one of the world's largest nuclear cleanup efforts. Fifty-six million gallons, Mr. Speaker, enough to fill this room that we are standing in today more than 20 times.

This amount of radioactive waste has been a legacy issue in my district since the 1940s. My constituents fully understand the impacts holding this waste has on the region. The Federal Government must keep its commitment to collect and dispose of it to a permanent repository.

Thankfully, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018, would make great strides in addressing this very problem. H.R. 3053 would, rightfully, move forward with the licensing of the Yucca Mountain facility in Nevada as the first permanent geological repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste.

First designated by Congress in 1987 as the location for these materials to be disposed of, the site has undergone extensive scientific and technical evaluations. In 2002, the U.S. Department of Energy concluded that Yucca Mountain met all of the requirements to serve as a permanent repository. In

2008, DOE applied to construct the repository, but the Obama administration illegally terminated the effort for what appeared to be political, rather than scientific, reasons. Fortunately, for our Nation, and for the communities like the Tri-Cities, this administration has stated its firm commitment to getting this project back on track and moving forward.

Not only does central Washington continue to store the legacy waste from Hanford, but it is also home to the only nuclear power plant in the Pacific Northwest, the Columbia Generating Station. While H.R. 3053 provides for a path forward for a long-term solution for waste disposal at Yucca Mountain, it also authorizes DOE to contract with a private company to temporarily store spent nuclear fuel for the very first time.

Communities that host nuclear power production sites across the country have, for far too long, been held responsible for the management of spent fuel, even though, under law, it is the legal obligation of the Federal Government to collect and dispose of it. This legislation directs DOE to initiate a program to consolidate and temporarily store commercial spent nuclear fuel during the development, construction, and initial operation of a repository.

H.R. 3053 provides for other innovative and necessary management tools for waste, including encouraging DOE to take ownership of spent nuclear fuels from facilities that have ceased commercial operation, and allowing the Department to enter into contract with private storage facilities.

The legislation also protects taxpayers by reducing legal liabilities. Consumers of nuclear energy across the country have paid over \$42 billion into the nuclear waste fund, with nearly \$40 billion still waiting to be spent to dispose of nuclear waste. This includes more than \$200 million from Washington State ratepayers.

What have they received from the Federal Government for paying of these fees, Mr. Speaker?

Absolutely nothing. Not one ounce of waste has been collected, which is the very purpose of the fund.

This legislation will reform the fund to protect ratepayers by assuring there is a definite answer on the Yucca Mountain repository prior to restarting the fee collection.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of visiting the Yucca Mountain facility. While it may seem to some like just a dusty 5-mile tunnel bored 1,000 feet deep in a remote Nevada desert, I found it to be an impressive site and full of potential. The Federal Government has spent decades, and billions of American taxpayer dollars, studying the best place for a repository. The conclusion was that Yucca Mountain is now the legal repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste under the law.

I cannot express more ardently the importance of moving this effort for-

ward, both for my district and districts around the Nation. This legislation takes a great leap forward for a long-term solution, while also tackling serious impacts and disparities of the current situation facing these communities.

Mr. Speaker, this is a straightforward rule, allowing for considering of H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018. I encourage my colleagues to support the rule, as well as the underlying legislation, to address this vital issue for our entire Nation.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate the rule for consideration of this measure, H.R. 3053.

As my good friend alluded to, this legislation has bipartisan support and takes an important step towards permanently securing nuclear waste in our country.

□ 1230

Thirty-six years ago, Congress passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. In doing so, this institution created a formal process for constructing a permanent geological repository for the growing amount of nuclear waste across our country.

This particular provision established a scientifically based, multistage process for selecting an eventual site of permanent storage for highly radioactive nuclear waste, delineated the Federal Government's responsibilities for the transportation of spent nuclear fuel, and created a dedicated funding source for disposing of nuclear material.

Five years after passing the NWPAA and following significant congressional review of the Department of Energy studies, it was determined that the facility be built at Yucca Mountain. However, after many subsequent years of planning, licensing, and construction, the project has stalled—at a cost of tens of billions of dollars.

The question of how to dispose of spent nuclear fuel and nuclear waste has been an ongoing problem in our country for decades. Even with the statutory requirements put in place by the NWPAA nearly four decades ago, no permanent solution is currently available for safely storing high-level radioactive waste in a consolidated, secure location. Rather, spent nuclear fuel is stored at nuclear reactors across the country. Many of these facilities have been shut down, or soon will be, without any solution to the long-term problem.

For obvious reasons, the issue of nuclear waste storage at plants across the country is of great concern to the surrounding communities, especially as

some nuclear plants are shuttered early. The longer we wait, the greater the problem will become.

H.R. 3053, the underlying legislation, directs the Secretary of the Department of Energy to create a program to consolidate and temporarily store commercial spent nuclear fuel during the development, construction, and initial operation of a national repository. The legislation provides the Energy Department with consolidated storage options to help fulfill the Federal Government's obligations to take possession of spent nuclear fuel in other States that are waiting for a permanent repository.

This bill, although I have some concerns, is a good step forward. This is a complicated issue, and I believe this institution has come together to present at least a viable option for addressing a very serious need.

Mr. Speaker, in taking up this legislation, the Rules Committee has acted for the second time in just a few weeks to bring bipartisan legislation to the House floor. While the bill we are debating today is certainly not perfect, it is, nonetheless, an example of what can be accomplished through compromise and bipartisan cooperation. This type of process should not be the exception to the rule. It should be the standard operating procedure for the House of Representatives.

I mention this because we all know this is, by and large, not the case. Instead of working together, we have witnessed dozens of controversial and partisan bills pushed through the House through a closed process designed to silence the minority and even voices within the Republican majority. That is wrong, and for the sake of this institution, it cannot continue.

Using the closed process, my Republican friends recently pushed through one of the largest tax giveaways in American history. They did so at the expense of middle class families across the country, passing the bill without so much as a single hearing or bipartisan conversation.

According to the latest survey by the National Association for Business Economics, the massive tax cuts have not made any difference in businesses' hiring plans. Rather, almost every week, we hear of corporations using their millions of dollars in handouts to buy back stock and pad the pockets of their investors. It is no wonder most Americans haven't seen their paychecks go up.

In a few years, when the tax breaks expire—that is right, they are only temporary—the few families across the country who benefit will recognize the tax scam for what it really is: an empty bag of goods that added nearly \$2.5 trillion to the national debt.

My friends on the other side are even contemplating paying for part of their tax plan by retroactively eliminating funding for a number of programs, and the children's healthcare program is one of them.

Let me say that again. In order to pay for the tax cuts for millionaires and large corporations, my Republican colleagues are suggesting cutting billions of dollars from healthcare programs for vulnerable children.

How dare they.

The closed process isn't just about what is being rammed through the House; it is about what is being blocked altogether.

Americans across our Nation continue to be victims of gun violence, yet Congress has failed to pass even basic commonsense reforms like banning bump stocks or fixing our background check system.

More than 26,000 children and teens have been killed in gun violence since 1999. This year alone, 500 teens and over 100 children have been killed or injured by guns. People are killed every single day, and this body has done nothing but prevent sensible reforms from even being considered.

Another example is DACA. Eighty-three percent of Americans say they favor continuing the DACA program, as do a majority of the Members of this House, and that includes Republicans and Democrats; yet the majority refuses to bring up the Dream Act for a vote.

Just put it down here for a vote; that is all. The 26 measures for guns that are reasonable, put it down here for a vote. If it doesn't pass, then at least we can say to the American people that we tried to do something about gun violence and we tried to do something about the Dream Act.

Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility to the American people to consider legislation in a transparent and serious manner, and the legislation that we are considering today is exactly that kind of situation, something that doesn't happen nearly enough. I commend my colleagues for their bipartisan work on H.R. 3053, but it is absurd that bipartisan work is such a rarity, and that is worthy of comment.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for joining me in support of this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to my State of Washington and the legacy of the Federal Government's work at Hanford, like I said, they left behind 56 million gallons of radioactive and chemical waste that is currently being stored in 177 underground tanks in temporary storage.

I had the fortune of being able to join a bipartisan congressional tour of Yucca, of the Yucca Mountain site, to see firsthand what we were talking about. Under the law, Yucca is the Nation's permanent nuclear repository.

What I saw deep beneath the mountain in a remote desert that is between, I think, 90 and 100 miles north of Las Vegas—it has been referred to as the most studied site on Earth. But imag-

ine this: being inside a 5-mile-long tunnel with 1,000 feet of rock above your head and 1,000 feet of rock below your feet. That is what we are talking about.

The Federal Government has spent \$15 billion over decades preparing the site as the Nation's sole permanent nuclear repository. Yucca has been deemed safe by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC. A recent safety evaluation found that the site could safely isolate spent nuclear fuel for 1 million years.

Mr. Speaker, the prospect is that Yucca could stand in two different ways: it could be a monument to billions of dollars in government waste instead of being a monument to a solution that we promised every American in this country.

I hope it is the latter, Mr. Speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, few people in this body understand the dynamics of Yucca Mountain as do the Members from the State of Nevada. One of my good friends is on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I have had the pleasure of being on the Rules Committee and hearing her make presentations with reference to this matter. She speaks very clearly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those kind words and for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I represent Las Vegas, which is the heart of southern Nevada. We have over 2 million people, and we welcome 40 million people from around the world every year. Let me give you a different perspective.

I have been fighting Yucca Mountain since the 1980s. I do know these issues. I appreciate some of the points that have been made, but some of them are just incorrect. H.R. 3053 is a flawed piece of legislation, and it just doubles down on bad policy and bad politics.

I testified in front of the Energy and Commerce Committee on this bill when it was first introduced last year and noted many of the flaws in the legislation, flaws that remain in the bill.

I also presented a map that showed that, if this waste is taken to Nevada, it will go through over 300 of our Members' districts: past their schools, past their churches, past their businesses, in their backyards. So I want them to keep that in mind as they focus on Nevada.

Other flaws with the bill: First, the bill would bust the cap for the amount of highly radioactive nuclear waste that would be dumped in Nevada. The bill arbitrarily increases the amount by 37 percent, 37 percent over what was authorized in 1987. But what is more, not one of the environmental impact studies, the five-volume safety evaluation report, or any scientific document that relates to Yucca Mountain has

studied the impact of increasing that original 70,000-metric-ton cap. So this would not only increase it, they haven't even studied what the impact of the increase would be.

The bill also deems approved changes in the EPA's radiation protection standards for Yucca Mountain prior to the NRC's final licensing document. This leads one to conclude that, no matter what challenge they face, they will just figure out a way to get around it regardless of what the science says.

Proponents of this legislation also say that, well, you will get generous host benefits if you take this facility. Well, that is just another falsehood. The provisions in the bill that were changed after it passed the committee in order to bring down the cost of the bill and address the massive scoring issues make our getting those benefits much less likely.

These benefits have to be approved by future Congresses appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars. You don't really think they are going to do that, do you? They shut down the government twice just this year alone over disagreements on spending.

If this legislation were about good policy or addressing the issue or getting the technicalities correct, I would be standing here supporting it, but I just cannot do that the way it is written.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress first passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as you heard, in 1982. It was amended in 1987 just to look at Nevada, not any of the other sites. We call that the "Screw Nevada" bill.

Well, we call it that because you didn't have Nevada wanting it to come there. You didn't have the science to put it there. You just screwed Nevada and stuck it there.

□ 1245

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentlewoman from Nevada an additional 1 minute.

Ms. TITUS. Well, this is just more of the same. It is politics, pure and simple. It is three decades later. We have heard we spent \$15 billion. All you got is a hole in the ground. This is "Screw Nevada 2.0."

I am going to offer an amendment that allows for consent-based decision-making, which was the Blue Ribbon Commission's recommendation, and I hope that we can go in that direction. You allow consent-based for interim storage, why not for permanent storage? That would be the way to solve this problem. That would be the way to move us forward. We wouldn't waste billions more and decades more in terms of time.

So I urge a "no" vote on the rule and a "no" vote on the bill.

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

Let me quote the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee,

the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), who said that:

Overall, this legislation is a balanced step in the right direction that will benefit ratepayers, taxpayers, and those living near nuclear facilities housing nuclear waste.

So I am happy to have his support for this legislation as well.

And just a couple of points from the gentlewoman from Nevada, whom I deeply respect and take her perspective on this with a great deal of gravity.

The transportation issue has been brought up several times. Nuclear waste is transported in this country already, and I have just got to tell you, the vessels, the containers that I have witnessed that this waste is being temporarily stored in and used for transportation, literally, is missile-proof. I mean, it is in containers that are very solidly contained and in such a way that the safety factor is many times over to ensure that, in case of any incident, that there would be no contamination.

As far as the language, it is true that the bill would allow the potential increase of storage capacity at Yucca Mountain. However, there is a strict process of approval that would have to be gone through in order to increase the amount of nuclear waste stored at Yucca Mountain, so it is not a given, passing this legislation. It would be something that would go through a very long, strict process.

I just have to say that we would gladly have entertained any amendments to clarify or perfect language along those lines as far as the storage amounts in Yucca Mountain.

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

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

When debating a bill as significant as this one, it is imperative that the people's House allow as much debate and as open a process as possible. Sadly, the Rules Committee did not even allow all Members from Nevada, whose State this bill will impact the most, to offer their amendments on the House floor.

Once again, this majority picked winners and losers and limited debate to just a select few amendments. This is unfortunate but all too common an event during the 115th Congress.

To block a Member from offering an amendment to a bill that would impact their district, in particular, is to block a Member from representing their constituents. I might add, there were five Members, Democratic and Republican, from the Nevada delegation who were present at the Rules Committee last night.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to allow the people's House to debate and vote on Representative ROSEN of Nevada's amendment, which was blocked by the Rules Committee.

Her amendment, which is a thoughtful proposal, would delay licensing,

planning, or construction of the nuclear repository at the Yucca Mountain site until the Director of OMB studies the economic viability and job-creating benefits of alternative uses of the Yucca Mountain site.

It is bothersome to me that we have had most of the discussion here already without talking about reprocessing; and I asked last night how much research is being done, of the distinguished chairman of the committee, who, I believe, has done an incredibly good job in offering up bipartisanship.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. As I said previously, the members of the Nevada delegation know more about this issue than all the rest of us combined. So to discuss our proposal, yet another clear voice that came to the Rules Committee last night and her amendment was not made in order.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), a member of the Armed Services Committee, and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, if today's vote on the previous question fails, we have the opportunity to vote on my amendment, the Jobs, Not Waste amendment, a proactive and innovative proposal to turn Yucca Mountain into something useful, a project that would create jobs without threatening the health and safety of Nevadans and other Americans across this country.

My amendment would prohibit the Department of Energy from moving forward with its current plan to ship nuclear waste by truck and rail through 329 congressional districts to Yucca Mountain until the Federal Government considers a number of other job-creating alternatives, including defense activities, like a command facility for unmanned aircraft systems, scientific research, the development of a secure electronic data center, or renewable energy generation.

One of the arguments I regularly hear from proponents of Yucca Mountain is that it will create jobs and that we have already invested billions in building a repository at this sight. Well, I am here to say that we can still create jobs without having to take on monumental health and safety risks that come with transporting over 100,000 metric tons of hazardous and lethal nuclear waste.

Congress should have the opportunity to vote on my amendment because it would give Members a chance to find a smart, strategic solution that repurposes this dangerous and costly project. This amendment gives us an opportunity to convert Yucca Mountain into a facility that could still pro-

vide economic opportunity, drive innovation, and create new, good-paying jobs.

Relaunching the failed Yucca Mountain nuclear waste storing experiment will also cost the taxpayers an additional \$80 billion to complete, minimum. Let me repeat that: \$80 billion, minimum.

Instead of spending billions more of hard-earned taxpayer dollars on the project that is destined to fail, that will inevitably put Nevada families and your families in your districts at risk, let us consider these forward-thinking opportunities.

I strongly urge you to do what is smart and fiscally responsible, what is right for the health and safety of all of our constituents, by making my amendment in order. I therefore ask all Members to vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), who has been carrying the banner for the Yucca Mountain project for many Congresses.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Rules Committee for bringing this bill to the floor tomorrow. I appreciate the due diligence they did on scrutinizing those amendments that could be additive to it and also the one from my colleague, Representative TITUS, so we can really put aside this debate on a consensus-based issue because we need to help educate the American people. We need to help educate our colleagues.

In the State of Nevada, 90 percent of all the land is owned by the Federal Government, and a big portion of that is at this location.

When people say "not in my backyard," we think they are talking about the Rayburn Building. Not in my backyard, in this debate, we are talking about Baltimore. But in between here and Baltimore, there is desert; and in the 60-mile radius is a fenced-in enclosure where we used to set off atomic weapons and groundbursts. So there is a place in this land that is called Yucca Flats, and some of us have seen that. Yucca Flats is where we did atomic testing.

We need to make sure people understand this debate. Big area of land, Federal Government, really, the local consensus is us. It is the Federal Government. We are the landowners of this property.

This is a tough decision. No one wants nuclear waste or defense waste. I am glad my colleague, Mr. NEWHOUSE, is managing this bill, because I have been out to his location. In Hanford, we have a lot of defense waste there.

So what are we trying to do? We will flesh this out more, obviously, tomorrow, but this issue is a multigeneration debate which we in this Chamber get a chance to move forward again after a long delay.

This goes back to World War II. This goes back to the atomic age. This goes back to winning the Cold War. This goes back to our weapons programs. When that occurred, they said: Now we have got this technology; let's use it for civil electric generation.

The government wanted to encourage that because we wanted to have nuclear scientists and we wanted to have energy generation, but we also wanted to have the experience and the expertise of nuclear scientists and engineers who could move back and forth from the private sector to the defense sector for our Nation's security, and, hence, we agreed.

In 1982, we had to address the spent nuclear fuel at nuclear power sites and we had to address the defense waste that is predominantly in Congressman NEWHOUSE's district, a lot of it in South Carolina. There is a little bit in New York. We have some left in Colorado. That is just the defense waste, not including the 39 States and 121 locations that have nuclear fuel—a national issue, a national concern, and we are moving forward to a national solution.

In 1982, under the Reagan administration, they said: Well, how are we going to pay for this? So they decided to charge ratepayers who are using electricity that has been generated by nuclear power a fee, a fee-based system to help the industry find a location to store their spent fuel and for us to clean up the defense sites—pretty good proposal.

Years later, they are trying to find the location. They do three analyses. Yucca Mountain was on the top three of these three. Then, as I will mention tomorrow, Senator JOHNSON and a guy named John Dingell said: Yucca Mountain, we need to move forward.

So that was in 1987. Then we started generating the movement to get to a point where, under the law, the State of Nevada could say, "We reject the proposal," which they did. The law then said the Federal Government could veto their objection, which we did.

□ 1300

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, we had an administration that put a pause on that for about 8 years, and now we are ready to move forward again. We have got an administration that wants to fund the licensing process.

I see my good friend from California (Ms. MATSUI) is on the floor, and she has worked on interim; what do we do with the waste before we put it in the final repository?

There are what I call dead plants—probably not the proper word—we have plants that are no longer generating electricity, but they have waste on site.

Can't we consolidate those for the benefit of the Nation and get them away from some of our more pristine areas?

The answer is "yes." That is what we tried to do with the bill. We are going to accept a couple amendments that have been brought forward by some Democrat colleagues on, I think, financing, or evaluation of the money and what do we do to the cities and how do we help them redevelop. And I will encourage my colleagues to support those when we have that debate.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is not an easy process in the Rules Committee. This is a step to get it to the floor. I appreciate the kindness that was shown to me yesterday, and I look forward to joining with you all tomorrow.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), my good friend, who serves on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and is a former member of the Rules Committee, so she understands our process extremely well and has done extraordinary work on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HASTINGS for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act.

We worked in a bipartisan manner in the Energy and Commerce Committee to ensure there is language in this bill that provides a responsible path forward for consolidated interim storage.

When this bill was first presented in committee, the licensing of an interim storage facility was linked to a final decision on Yucca Mountain.

As someone who is critical of Yucca Mountain and its chances of ever being completed, I found that to be unacceptable. It meant that our Nation's nuclear waste could continue to be stranded at decommissioned plants in California and across the country. That is not sustainable.

However, through bipartisan negotiations, we were able to successfully agree on language that creates a separate path to interim storage, decoupling it from a permanent repository.

That is the primary reason why I am supporting the bill today.

This is an issue that directly impacts my constituents and many others across the country. My local utility, the Sacramento Municipal Utility District or, as we call it, SMUD, currently maintains the decommissioned Rancho Seco nuclear power plant. SMUD has reiterated how important it is for the redevelopment of the site, that we have a plan for consolidating spent fuel at a safe, licensed facility.

Moving spent fuel will enable SMUD to expand their adjacent solar development or environmental mitigation area.

Consolidated interim storage is currently the most viable solution to our Nation's spent fuel challenge. And there are private applicants that want to take this fuel. Today's bill strength-

ens the regulatory pathway that allows them to do so.

This bill also funds transportation safety, ensuring that we build on our country's decades-long history of safely moving spent fuel.

While I don't believe every provision of H.R. 3053 is ideal, it is a balanced step in the right direction, and that is why I will vote "yes" for this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by again commending the committees involved in presenting this legislation, and for doing so in a bipartisan manner.

While the underlying bill we are debating today is not perfect, it is, nonetheless, an example of what can be accomplished through bipartisan work.

In bringing up this bill, the Republican leadership has, perhaps, tipped its hand. It has demonstrated that it is capable of working with the minority and allowing for mature debate and compromise worthy of this institution. I hope this trend continues. I suspect that it will not.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say, it is a pleasure to manage a rule with my friend from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), and my hands are wide open, not tipped whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have spent over \$15 billion in research and development of the Yucca Mountain project. It would be utterly foolish, in my estimation, to literally flush this time, energy, and capital down the drain, particularly as the Department of Energy has deemed that the site has met all the requirements to move forward with the licensing process.

The rule we have debated here today provides for consideration of very, very important legislation, H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2018, which would jump-start this vital effort to move the Yucca Mountain plan forward.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to speak in favor of this rule, and I urge all of my colleagues to support House Resolution 879 and the underlying legislation to provide relief and a long-term plan for communities like those in my district and those in Mr. HASTINGS' State of Florida, and the rest of our districts around the Nation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 879 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment specified in section 3 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution if offered by Representative

Rosen of Nevada or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 206. STUDYING THE ECONOMIC BENEFIT OF ALTERNATIVE USES OF YUCCA MOUNTAIN SITE

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy may not take any action relating to the licensing, planning, development, or construction of a nuclear waste repository at 6 the Yucca Mountain site until—

(1) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget submits to Congress, and makes available to the public, a study on the economic viability and job-creating benefits of alternative uses of the Yucca Mountain site as outlined in GAO Report 11-847, published on September 16, 2011, including—

(A) defense activities, such as a command facility for unmanned aircraft systems;

(B) a secure electronic data center;

(C) the development of renewable energy sources; and

(D) scientific research; and

(2) Congress holds a hearing on the alternative uses under subparagraphs (A) through (D) of paragraph (1).

(b) DEFINITION. In this section, the term “Yucca Mountain site” has the meaning given such term in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101).

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 pre-

vious question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TROTT). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 189, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

YEAS—223

Abraham	Chabot	Flores
Aderholt	Cheney	Fortenberry
Allen	Coffman	Fox
Amash	Cole	Frelinghuysen
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Gaetz
Arrington	Collins (NY)	Gallagher
Babin	Comer	Garrett
Bacon	Comstock	Gianforte
Banks (IN)	Conaway	Gibbs
Barletta	Cook	Gohmert
Barr	Costello (PA)	Goodlatte
Barton	Cramer	Gosar
Bergman	Crawford	Gowdy
Biggs	Culberson	Granger
Bilirakis	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (GA)
Bishop (MI)	Curtis	Graves (LA)
Bishop (UT)	Davidson	Graves (MO)
Black	Davis, Rodney	Griffith
Blackburn	Denham	Grothman
Blum	Dent	Guthrie
Bost	DeSantis	Handel
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Harper
Brat	Diaz-Balart	Hartzer
Brooks (AL)	Donovan	Hensarling
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Herrera Beutler
Buchanan	Duncan (SC)	Hice, Jody B.
Buck	Duncan (TN)	Higgins (LA)
Bucshon	Dunn	Hill
Budd	Emmer	Holding
Burgess	Estes (KS)	Hollingsworth
Byrne	Faso	Hudson
Calvert	Ferguson	Huizenga
Carter (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Carter (TX)	Fleischmann	Hunter

Hurd	McSally	Scott, Austin
Issa	Meadows	Sensenbrenner
Jenkins (KS)	Mitchell	Sessions
Johnson (LA)	Moolenaar	Shimkus
Johnson (OH)	Mooney (WV)	Shuster
Johnson, Sam	Mullin	Simpson
Jordan	Newhouse	Smith (MO)
Joyce (OH)	Noem	Smith (NE)
Katko	Norman	Smith (NJ)
Kelly (MS)	Nunes	Smucker
Kelly (PA)	Olson	Stefanik
King (IA)	Palazzo	Stewart
King (NY)	Palmer	Stivers
Kinzinger	Paulsen	Taylor
Knight	Pearce	Tenney
Kustoff (TN)	Perry	Thompson (PA)
LaHood	Poe (TX)	Thornberry
Lamborn	Poliquin	Tipton
Lance	Posey	Trott
Latta	Ratcliffe	Turner
Lesko	Reed	Upton
Lewis (MN)	Reichert	Valadao
LoBiondo	Renacci	Wagner
Long	Rice (SC)	Walberg
Loudermilk	Roby	Walden
Love	Roe (TN)	Walker
Lucas	Rogers (AL)	Walorski
Luetkemeyer	Rohrabacher	Walters, Mimi
MacArthur	Rooney, Francis	Weber (TX)
Marchant	Rooney, Thomas J.	Webster (FL)
Marino	Ros-Lehtinen	Wenstrup
Marshall	Roskam	Westerman
Massie	Ross	Williams
Mast	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)
McCarthy	Rouzer	Wittman
McCaul	Russell	Womack
McClintock	Rutherford	Woodall
McHenry	Sanford	Yoder
McKinley	Scalise	Yoho
McMorris	Schweikert	Young (AK)
Rodgers		Young (IA)

NAYS—189

Adams	Engel	Lynch
Aguilar	Eshoo	Maloney
Barragan	Espallat	Carolyn B.
Bass	Esty (CT)	Maloney, Sean
Beatty	Evans	Matsumi
Bera	Foster	McCollum
Beyer	Frankel (FL)	McEachin
Bishop (GA)	Fudge	McGovern
Blumenauer	Gabbard	McNerney
Blunt Rochester	Gallego	Meeks
Bonamici	Garamendi	Meng
Boyle, Brendan F.	Gomez	Moore
Brady (PA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Moulton
Brown (MD)	Gottheimer	Murphy (FL)
Brownley (CA)	Green, Al	Nadler
Bustos	Green, Gene	Napolitano
Butterfield	Grijalva	Neal
Capuano	Hanabusa	Nolan
Carbajal	Hastings	Norcross
Cardenas	Heck	O'Halleran
Carson (IN)	Higgins (NY)	O'Rourke
Cartwright	Himes	Pallone
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Panetta
Chu, Judy	Jackson Lee	Pascrell
Cicilline	Jayapal	Payne
Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Pelosi
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Peters
Cleaver	Kaptur	Peterson
Clyburn	Keating	Pingree
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Connolly	Kennedy	Polis
Cooper	Khanna	Price (NC)
Correa	Kihuen	Quigley
Costa	Kildee	Raskin
Courtney	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Crist	Kind	Richmond
Crowley	Krishnamoorthi	Rosen
Cuellar	Lamb	Roybal-Allard
Cummings	Langevin	Ruiz
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Rush
DeFazio	Lawrence	Ryan (OH)
DeGette	Lawson (FL)	Sánchez
Delaney	Lee	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Levin	Schakowsky
DeBene	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
Demings	Lieu, Ted	Schneider
DeSaulnier	Lipinski	Schrader
Deutch	Loebach	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Lofgren	Scott, David
Doggett	Lowenthal	Serrano
Doyle, Michael F.	Lowe	Sewell (AL)
Ellison	Lujan Grisham, M.	Shea-Porter
	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sherman
		Sinema

Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Castor (FL)
Gutiérrez
Harris
Hoyer
Jenkins (WV)
Jones

Kuster (NH)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Messer
Pittenger
Rogers (KY)

Rokita
Royce (CA)
Smith (TX)
Zeldin

□ 1333

Mr. NADLER changed his 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. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 184, answered “present” 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

AYES—224

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

Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd

Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem

Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross

Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry

NOES—184

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

Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

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

PRESENT—1

Amodei

NOT VOTING—19

Castor (FL)
Cohen
Davidson

Doggett
Duffy
Gutiérrez

Hoyer
Huizenga
Jenkins (WV)

Jones
Kuster (NH)
Labrador
Messer

Pittenger
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Royce (CA)

Smith (NE)
Woodall

□ 1341

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 174.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 774

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 774.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 774

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 774.

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL
EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO
THE ACTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT
OF SYRIA—MESSAGE
FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-
118)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions of the Government of Syria declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004—as modified in scope and relied upon for additional steps taken in Executive Order 13399 of April 25, 2006, Executive Order 13460 of February 13, 2008, Executive Order 13572 of April 29, 2011, Executive Order 13573 of May 18, 2011, Executive Order 13582 of August 17,