

IMMIGRATION HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Saturday marks the end of Immigrant Heritage Month, an annual tradition dedicated to celebrating the contributions immigrants have made to communities all across the country.

Our Nation was founded by immigrants. The very existence of our entire democracy, of this institution, is the result of compromise and consensus by the descendants of immigrants, and today our Nation continues to owe a great debt of gratitude to the contributions of more recent arrivals who are an essential part of daily life, our economy, and our society.

I had hoped we would be able to close out this celebration with the news that, for the first time in a long time, Congress had come together to fix our broken, inefficient, unfair immigration system. Instead, a bipartisan majority decided to double down on the status quo: a porous border, uncertainty for the victims of a broken immigration system, and continued division between Americans over the issue of immigration.

Despite this setback, I am hopeful that, working with any colleague that is willing to do so in this House, I and other Members can find a solution to this broken immigration system and, in doing so, help heal our country's politics.

HONORING PRIDE MONTH

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 49th anniversary of the Stonewall riots in New York City, where, on June 28, 1969, a group of bar patrons led by transgender women of color began to fight for LGBTQ equality.

Over nearly 50 years, the LGBTQ community has celebrated many historic victories. In fact, just yesterday, we celebrated the third anniversary of marriage equality becoming the law of the land nationwide.

However, while we celebrate LGBTQ Pride Month, it is important to remember we still have a long way to go. In most States, LGBTQ individuals can still get kicked out of their housing, be refused service from restaurants and other businesses, or lose their jobs simply for being who they are.

The Equality Act would end this injustice by extending civil rights protections to LGBTQ individuals nationwide. I am a proud sponsor of the Equality Act and urge Speaker RYAN to bring this commonsense bill to the House floor for a vote.

FOURTH OF JULY

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, 242 years ago, our Founders gathered in Philadelphia to launch an experiment in self-rule that has led to the greatest country the Earth has ever seen. Our founding happened in the time of history in which the understanding of the nature of the human person and the source of the human person's rights reached a new level.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—God-given rights that no one can take away.

This is a transcendent principle that applies to all people for all time. It is the fundamental principle on which Abraham Lincoln relied as he fought to end slavery. The notion of God-given, unalienable rights that no government or majority can take away is as true today as it was in 1776 and 1861.

This Fourth of July, let us recommit to the principles of our founding and continue to work to ensure that all Americans realize the vision of our Founders. That, Mr. Speaker, is an idea that can lead to greater unity in our country.

FUTURE PROBLEM SOLVERS

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an inspiring group of middle school students from Heath Middle School and Calloway County Middle School.

The First District of Kentucky was well represented at the Future Problem Solving Program International's 2018 conference at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. Teams from these two schools competed against their peers from across the globe.

Both teams placed in the top 10 internationally, with the team from Heath Middle School placing eighth and the all-girls team from Calloway County placing ninth.

Throughout the conference, the students experienced new cultures, enjoyed trading keepsakes from around the world, and socialized with students from many countries and States.

I am grateful for the efforts of all involved in helping these students achieve their goals and for encouraging them to pursue interactive, holistic learning to prepare themselves for the future.

I join with their family, friends, and teachers to congratulate these exceptional students on their outstanding efforts and look forward to their continued contributions to the First District of Kentucky.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 970, INSISTING DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE COMPLY WITH REQUESTS AND SUBPOENAS

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 971 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 971

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 970) insisting that the Department of Justice fully comply with the requests, including subpoenas, of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the subpoena issued by the Committee on the Judiciary relating to potential violations of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act by personnel of the Department of Justice and related matters. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURBELO of Florida). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 971, under current consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this morning I am pleased to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee. The rule provides for consideration of H. Res. 970, which insists that the Department of Justice comply with the request of the Judiciary and Intelligence Committees. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee had the opportunity to hear from Congressman JIM JORDAN, a fellow Judiciary Committee member, as well as Ranking Member JERRY NADLER. We also heard from Congressman MARK MEADOWS and Congressman SCOTT PERRY and engaged in a vigorous discussion that lasted a while in the Rules Committee yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, oversight of the executive branch is one of the House's most important responsibilities and authorities. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, which has oversight over the Department of Justice and the FBI, it is a responsibility that I take very seriously.

I believe the administration has an obligation to comply with the committees' legitimate oversight requests and subpoenas. Unfortunately, the Department of Justice has not fully complied with numerous of these requests, many of these which stretch back several months. To illustrate this, let me lay out a timeline for you.

On November 3, 2017, Chairman GOODLATTE and Chairman GOWDY, along with additional Members, sent a letter to the Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General, Rod Rosenstein, requesting five specific categories of documents. The deadline listed in the letter was November 17, 2017. That deadline was not met.

On December 12, 2017, Chairman GOODLATTE, Chairman GOWDY, and additional Members sent a letter reiterating the expectation that the Department of Justice provide the requested documents. The deadline listed in that letter was December 19, 2017. Again, the deadline arrived, and again, the deadline was not met.

On February 1, 2018, Chairman GOODLATTE sent a third letter requesting documents relating to potential abuses under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

On March 22, 2018, the Judiciary Committee issued a subpoena to Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein compelling him to produce documents and communications referring to internal DOJ or FBI management requests to review, scrub, report on, or analyze any FISA collection involving the Trump campaign or the Trump administration.

□ 0915

It also compelled the production of communications relating to defensive briefings provided by the Department of Justice or the FBI to the 2016 Presidential campaigns of Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump.

Finally, he compelled production of all documents and communications referring to proposed, recommended, or actual FISA coverage on the Clinton Foundation or persons associated or in communication with the Clinton Foundation. The deadline for this subpoena was April 5, 2018. The Department of Justice is in the process of complying with this subpoena, but complete compliance has not yet occurred.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that, in regard to the subpoena, the Department of Justice is trying to comply and is in the process of doing so but, yet, has not at this point.

I also share the frustration of my colleagues and the American people that this process is taking way too long. We

need the answers, and we need transparency. It is our duty to conduct oversight. The law charges us with shining light where the government has fostered shadows instead of providing answers. The Department of Justice has a responsibility to produce these documents and yet has not made them available.

The resolution provided for by this rule speaks to the core of our democracy, the inherent tension between branches of government that our Founders intended and our responsibility as a coequal branch to act as a check upon the other branches.

Could this debate not happen at a more appropriate time as we look toward the Fourth of July and our country's founding? This is why we were set up the way we were.

The inherent tension has arisen most recently out of the Department of Justice's failure to timely comply with congressional oversight. Some of the documents this body seeks relate to congressional inquiries that have extended almost the length of the 115th Congress. They deal with some of the most pressing issues in our government today.

Has the Department of Justice abused its FISA authority?

Was an investigation of national importance affected by bias?

I believe that these investigations need to play out, but I also believe they can't last forever. I also believe that evidence of bias, a library of extremely troubling texts, and key personnel removals at the FBI illustrate the heightened need for robust congressional oversight.

As James Wilson, an architect of the Constitution and Associate Justice on the first Supreme Court so eloquently stated: "The House of Representatives . . . form the grand inquest of the state. They will diligently inquire into grievances, arising both from men and things." As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I will continue to take that charge seriously.

Yesterday, the Judiciary Committee considered a similar resolution. Today, the whole House has a chance to responsibly exercise its oversight responsibility and reiterate to the Department of Justice the need to fully comply with our legitimate requests.

It is important to note that the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has been similarly stymied by delays to requests for information and that certain documents have been provided to only select members of that committee.

This resolution insists that the Department of Justice comply with the requests, including subpoenas, of these committees—one of which I proudly serve on—so that the American people can get answers and we can exercise our proper constitutional duties. The American people demanded answers, and that is why Congress, Representatives of the American people who answer to the American people, are demanding that the DOJ answer to us.

Let this also serve as a reminder to the Department of Justice that the U.S. Congress was created by our Founders, and its authority and responsibility arise directly from Article I of the United States Constitution.

The Department of Justice, on the other hand, was created by Congress. Its powers arise from those given to it by Congress. And just as those powers are given by Congress, it is Congress' responsibility to ensure that they are not abused; and, if necessary, it is Congress' responsibility to limit these powers.

Woodrow Wilson, who was among the first to use the term "oversight" in reference to the investigation of the executive branch, stated:

Quite as important as legislation is vigilant oversight of the administration.

Today, we show that we are taking oversight of the executive branch seriously, particularly the Department of Justice, and we are working to prevent bias in government. We demand accountability because the American people deserve no less.

Mr. Speaker, 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 Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I hardly know where to begin. With all that is going on in the country and in the world—we have children being ripped apart from their families at the border; we have Republicans working with the White House trying to take away healthcare protections for the American people; and we have a President who seems unhinged—with all that is happening, this is what we are dealing with today on the House floor this morning. Basically, it is a resolution to try to undermine the Mueller investigation, which is investigating potential Russian involvement and collusion in our election.

That is a big deal. We should all want to get to the bottom of this. We should all want the truth. Instead of wanting to get to the truth, my Republican friends throw roadblocks in the way, one after another after another, to try to get people to try to discredit the investigation and to try to derail the investigation. It is unbelievable to me.

The President this morning tweeted that Russia continues to insist they had nothing to do with meddling in our election. I can't believe the President of the United States is tweeting that. What is wrong with him?

Every single intelligence agency in our government says that the Russians meddled in our election, and we have the President of the United States this morning tweeting that Russia says they didn't do it, so we have got to believe Russia.

I don't know how my friends can defend this. At some point, you have to say, "Enough."

I get it. Republicans want to constantly circle the wagons around the President with every outrageous thing he says and does, but this is about a foreign power—an adversary—meddling in our elections.

What is the response? Let's try to disparage the investigation. Let's try to undermine the investigation.

It is unreal that we are going through this exercise today, but I guess we have come to expect this.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say, also, that the process in this House that got us here today to debate this resolution was a disgrace and an affront to the way this Chamber is supposed to conduct business. In all my time here, I haven't seen a committee minority of either party treated as disrespectfully as Democrats were on Tuesday. That is when the Judiciary Committee considered this resolution of inquiry.

Democrats showed up on time and sat patiently waiting for this hearing to begin—and they waited, and they waited, and they waited because the Republican majority gaveled the hearing to order more than an hour after it was supposed to begin. They didn't even have the courtesy to tell the minority about the delay.

Things got only worse from there. When the hearing actually got underway, Democrats were cut off at every turn. The Republican majority moved the previous question, cutting off debate and preventing consideration of Democratic amendments. They blocked parliamentary inquiries and a unanimous consent request. Committee Republicans even took the extraordinary step of overruling their chairman after an amendment was ruled out of order. It was heavy-handed, and it was undemocratic.

My Republican colleagues should be ashamed of the way they conducted themselves. Maybe they are, because the chairman of the committee appeared to hide in the hallway during the vote until he was called by another Member, and when he did vote, he voted "present." So did the Acting Chair.

Mr. Speaker, were they unwilling to stand up to the more conservative elements of their caucus? or did they concede what went on?

I don't see how anybody in this Chamber could endure such an embarrassing process. It is unfortunate that the majority of the Rules Committee essentially enabled it by using emergency procedures to quickly move this resolution.

This is a new low for a majority that has already turned this Congress into the most closed Congress in history. There have already been 89 closed rules this Congress, and it is only June. There has not been a single open rule under Speaker RYAN—not one.

It is fitting that this measure from the Judiciary Committee is being con-

sidered under the majority's 90th closed rule because the Judiciary Committee is now the second most closed committee in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, what does the majority have to show for this bad process? We have another bad product here, this time a partisan measure meant to undermine the Russia investigation.

Now, we know this isn't a serious attempt at oversight because the Republican majority apparently doesn't believe in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities to begin with. Republicans have refused, for example, to examine foreign payments to the Trump organization. They refuse to examine extravagant travel by members of the administration. They refuse to examine HUD Secretary Carson's \$31,000 dining set.

Who buys a \$31,000 dining set? Where do you find a \$31,000 dining set?

They refuse to investigate the use of private email by administration officials, including Jared Kushner and Stephen Miller, and countless other scandals involving EPA Administrator Pruitt.

The list goes on and on and on and on. We actually have a long list here, Mr. Speaker, of what we should be investigating. If my Republican colleagues would like a copy, I am happy to provide it to them. But suffice it to say, there is no oversight with regard to the misdeeds of this administration.

Mr. Speaker, what happened to the Republicans' zeal for oversight? Former Oversight and Government Reform Committee Chairman Issa subpoenaed the Obama administration more than 100 times in just a 4-year span. I didn't always agree with him on his investigations, but at least the Oversight and Government Reform Committee was performing some oversight.

Republicans today are completely missing in action under President Trump. This is an administration that has been embroiled in one scandal after the next. It is an administration dripping with corruption. This makes the Nixon administration look like Common Cause. I have never seen anything like it. Apparently, the Republicans only believe in oversight if it involves President Obama or Secretary Clinton.

Let me remind my Republican colleagues that there wasn't a single scandal in President Obama's 8 years in office that implicated him: no Cabinet official was forced to resign in scandal; no senior White House official had to leave in the face of wrongdoing. Only with the Trump administration can you have one scandal start at breakfast only to have another one by the time you sit down for dinner.

We should be doing our job—getting to the bottom of what is happening and holding people accountable—but instead we are throwing sand in the gears of the Russia investigation. This is crazy.

Now, let me remind everyone of what Special Counsel Mueller's investigation has yielded so far.

Twenty people and three companies have either been indicted or pled guilty. That includes George Papadopoulos, foreign policy adviser on President Trump's campaign, who pled guilty to making false statements to the FBI; Michael Flynn, the President's former National Security Advisor, who also pled guilty to making false statements to the FBI.

Paul Manafort, his former campaign chair, was indicted on charges of conspiracy, money laundering, and making false statements. He was later also charged with tax, financial, and bank fraud charges. He is sitting in jail today. As we have this debate right now, Paul Manafort is in jail.

Rick Gates, the President's campaign aid, was also indicted on similar charges.

That is just a small sample based on what we know today. We will see what else the Special Counsel's investigation finds.

So this goes beyond your basic policy disagreements. This is about whether the minority in this Congress is allowed to do the job they were elected to do—not just this Democratic minority, but any minority, because we have seen and we could see again this year just how quickly power shifts in Congress. This is about whether this Congress is going to fulfill its oversight responsibilities or sweep possible wrongdoing under the rug.

Now, we have a chance today to demand better from this majority, so we should vote against this rule and demand a better process. That is the only way we are going to see a better product.

Just one final thing before I reserve my time. I say to my Republican friends: Look at what you are doing to this institution. You are destroying it. Not only the closed process, the most closed Congress in the history of our country, but the way you move legislation forward. The way Democrats in the Judiciary Committee were treated on this resolution, in all my years here, I have never seen anything like it.

I get it. We have a President who wants to behave like a king and who thinks, when he speaks, everybody should sit up to attention just like they do when Kim Jong-un speaks. But this is supposed to be the people's House, and you are diminishing this institution. This has to stop.

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

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. At this point in time, as the gentleman from Massachusetts and I have discussed many times—and he has his opinions on things and process; I have mine as well—we can agree and disagree. But I think one thing is let's take a step forward today.

This is a process of what we are doing forward. We are warning and requiring

from an Article I to an Article II agency. Let's do that and continue that process.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as I said in the beginning, there are a whole bunch of troubling things happening in our country today. The Supreme Court's Janus decision was just yet another very disturbing development that really attacks working men and women.

□ 0930

Mr. Speaker, a union's ability to collectively bargain benefits both its members and nonmembers alike. Unions are responsible for many of the worker protections Americans enjoy today, and they continue to fight for fair pay and good working conditions, including for 17.3 million public employees.

We have unions to thank for our weekends, for paid vacations, for overtime pay, for the 8-hour workday, for child labor laws, for pensions, for the minimum wage, for sick leave, for Social Security, for parental leave, for holiday pay, and the list goes on and on and on.

However, yesterday, the Supreme Court dealt a devastating blow to hardworking employees, the unions that represent them, and the protections they provide us. In a 5-4 ideological decision, the Court invalidated the laws of 22 States and undermined public sector unions. This decision enables free-riding by those who benefit from union agreements but do not want to help cover the costs of collective bargaining and enforcement.

Unions fight for every single worker. Therefore, every worker should pay their fair share.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative CARTWRIGHT's legislation, H.R. 6238, the Public Service Freedom to Negotiate Act. This bill protects the rights of State and local government employees to join unions and collectively bargain.

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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) to discuss his proposal.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district in northeast Pennsylvania where collective bargaining rights are time-honored and highly valued. The work our unions have done over the past 100-plus years has changed our laws and practices that helped create our strong American middle class. Our middle class is some-

thing that really makes us the envy of the free world, and American unions keep the middle class strong.

Today, public sector unions represent about 17.3 million workers in State and local governments across the country. These public sector workers keep us safe and teach and nurture our children, care for our families. As union members, they are empowered through collective action to fight for fair wages and work conditions, as Mr. MCGOVERN mentioned.

But yesterday, in a 5-4 decision, the Supreme Court ruled against unions in the case of Janus v. AFSCME. They overturned four decades—40 years—of legal precedent to undermine the rights of correctional officers, State and local policemen, firefighters, snowplow drivers, teachers, all the local government employees that work hard for us and make us safe every day.

The Court's decision invalidates the laws of 22 States and the District of Columbia. These are States that decided to allow unions and State employees mutually to agree on ensuring that employees pay a fair share fee to cover the costs of collective bargaining enforcement.

This Court's decision is nothing but bare-knuckled politics. In fact, prominent Republican politicians have already described it and praised it as a devastating blow to Democrats. It is not jurisprudence; it is just politics.

When you overturn 40 years of American legal precedent, when you rip up 40 years of the fabric of American law, it is a big deal.

Associate Justice Kagan described it yesterday as a weaponization of the First Amendment that has been going on. And she is right. This decision comes at a time when hardworking Americans are fighting every day just to pay their bills and support their families. Labor unions are working hard to give workers a collective voice to gain higher wages, better healthcare, and a secure retirement.

Make no mistake, a tax on public-sector unions is the camel's nose under the tent flap. They are coming after private sector unions next.

Strong public unions build the middle class in our country and shape the life of every American by negotiating for labor rights, including the minimum wage, 8-hour workdays, weekends, employer health insurance.

Now is not the time to turn our back on American workers and labor unions. Now is the time to stand with employees who serve the public across the country.

For that reason, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up my bill, H.R. 6238, the Public Service Freedom to Negotiate Act, a bill that will defend the right of every public sector employee to join a union and bargain collectively.

The bill empowers the Federal Labor Relations Authority to ensure that State and local government employees

are treated fairly and that workplace conditions meet a proper standard. Every employee deserves these basic standards, whether they choose to join a union or not.

Again, the Janus decision is an outright attack on all unions, on all working people, and an attack on the cause that we here in Congress, here in the people's House, fight for every day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule so that this important legislation will be considered immediately.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers. If the gentleman is ready to close, I will be as well.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, there are lots of things that we should be doing oversight on and that they we are not.

The Oversight Committee has chosen not to look into all the scandals in this White House. They have chosen instead to look the other way.

I mentioned EPA Administrator Pruitt. He has demonstrated over and over that he has no regard for taxpayer money. He is living a lifestyle of the rich and famous at EPA. He has no respect for his position and no desire to follow our ethics law. His many abuses of his position demand that we fully investigate his actions.

For example—I love this—he spent \$43,000 on installing a soundproof booth in his office. Who does that? GAO stated that he was required to notify Congress before spending more than \$5,000 on office improvements, but he goes ahead and spends \$43,000 on a soundproof booth, I guess to make private phone calls. He racked up nearly \$200,000 flying first class and luxury aircraft on the taxpayers' dime. One of those trips was to Italy. It cost \$30,000. He rented an apartment from an energy lobbyist for \$50 a night here in Washington. He enlisted an aide to help find his wife a job.

You can't make this stuff up. And crickets from the Oversight Committee and my Republican friends in Congress.

Congress needs to investigate the alarming drug price trends in this country. This is an emergency, a life or death issue for our constituents. Because of high drug prices, one in four Americans cannot afford to fill a prescription. These high drug prices are not due to foreign markets, but they are due to our unfair pricing system.

We issue patents to drug companies, allowing them to have exclusive rights on drugs. Make no mistake, patents are important for incentivizing and rewarding innovation. However, drug companies found ways to game the system by prolonging their patents and continuing their tight hold on lifesaving medications.

A study by UCLA found that 74 percent of new patents from 2005 to 2015

went to drugs that already existed. Patents allow these drug companies to charge patients unfair prices without facing competition. That is just unacceptable.

But I guess we shouldn't be surprised that there is no investigation, because my Republican friends are working with this White House to undue patient protections in the Affordable Care Act. They are even trying to take away pre-existing condition protections.

Right now, because of the law, if you have a preexisting condition, an insurance company cannot discriminate against you and demand that you pay more. They have to give you the insurance. They want to take that away. This is unbelievable. We should be investigating this stuff.

I could go on and on and on, but we are not doing that. What we are doing is, we are bringing a resolution that has been put forward by some who are trying to undermine the Mueller investigation and who do not want the American people to focus on the involvement between Trump operatives and the Russians.

When I would go up to Massachusetts on the weekends, it used to be that people would ask me who in the Trump administration met with the Russians. Now the question is: Who in the Trump administration didn't meet with the Russians?

What I love about the people who are testifying before the Mueller committee, they now are getting in trouble because they are realizing that, if you lie, there is a consequence, so they all have amnesia. They met with Russian operatives time and again, and they forget. They mysteriously remember when they are confronted with the evidence.

We all should be shocked by this. A foreign adversary interfered in our election. Every single intelligence agency in our government confirms that. And yet you have the President of the United States today tweeting: Oh, Russia insists they didn't meddle in our election.

Oh, my God, I can't believe this. The President of the United States is tweeting that today. It is shameful. Stop defending this unacceptable behavior, and stop defending a process that is unacceptable as well.

I mentioned the terrible treatment Democrats received in the Judiciary Committee when this thing was reported out. I have never seen anything like that in my life. Democrats waited for an hour and they were just shut out of any opportunity to amend the measure or even speak.

Welcome to the United States Congress. This is supposed to be the people's House. This is supposed to be the shining example of democracy, and you get people who have questions or who have ideas who are shut down in committee.

Then we bring it to the floor after going through the Rules Committee last night, and it comes to the floor

under a closed process. This is the most closed Congress in history. This is the 90th closed rule.

What does that mean? It means that this legislation cannot be amended. There is limited debate. You have to vote for it up or down, my way or the highway. Everybody, Democrats and Republicans, are blocked from offering any of their ideas or any of their potential improvements to this bill. Nothing.

This is the 90th closed rule, completely closed rule, in this Congress, the 90th bill that has come before us where neither Democrats nor Republicans can offer anything.

It is frustrating beyond words to be here today. The system here is rigged. This is going to pass on a party-line vote, I guess. But this is not the way the people's House should be run. This is disgraceful. At some point, my Republican friends who care about this institution have to say enough is enough. They have to demand a more open, more transparent system here. This cannot stand.

So, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, so we can address the terrible impacts of the Supreme Court decision in the Janus case and vote "no" on the rule. We should not be doing this today. We should not be engaged in an attempt to try to defend the indefensible or undermine an important investigation into Russia's meddling in our election.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we can discuss this and continue to discuss it, as we have.

I respect my friend from Massachusetts and his opinion and the issues of transparency. I want to see that same transparency. I want to see us work. And I think we have an opportunity to do that. By saying that we bring this rule and this resolution here today, to disparage this institution, when we are asking for what we are required and can't get, I am not sure how that is.

Now, we can discuss other issues you want to investigate and other areas you want to go to, and you can do that and we can discuss things, but there is nothing undermining the investigation. The Mueller investigation is still going on, the FBI investigation. All of that is still going on. Nothing is undermining it except the DOJ that has had obvious issues of telling the truth and obvious issues of not giving us the documents we have requested. This is Article I, Article II.

We can have discussions about everything else. And I know if I were in a position on the other side, I would want everything investigated, because when you have seen what we have been able to do in the last year and a half with the economy, with jobs, with regulations, with small business, when you start looking at that, I would yell at everything else, too, Mr. Speaker, be-

cause the President has done what he said he was going to do. And our economy is better, our jobs are better, and we are working toward a system in which America is safer.

But I would also want to investigate everything else, too, because if I was going into a cycle, I would want to throw off and look other places and tell the American people things aren't really right when they know that it is.

□ 0945

Also, the American people, when I go back home to Georgia, want to know: If the Congress asks an agency for documents, why do they not get to produce them?

And don't go to the fact, well, it is classified.

We have SCIFs up here. We have got classified areas up here. What is problematic here is we are hiding behind the fact of things that look like—after they are produced, after they are compelled to produce—it looks like they are just trying to keep it from us to hide embarrassment, and that is not a reason to hide documents.

So we have a simple proposal here. Do what you are required to do. Let Congress be the oversight that it is supposed to be, and we can discuss whatever else we want to for oversight. That is the part of two parties working.

But in this one, this is pretty simple. You can vote "no" and say no, Congress shouldn't do that, in an area in which we have responsibility and oversight protection. If you want to do that, go right ahead.

Again, when you want to throw off everything else in the world—I think it is when you look at the President and you look at the administration and you look at what we have done in the last 18½ months, you see a light at the end of a tunnel, you see an economy coming back, you see a good thing for businesses and small businesses.

When people get up and do not care, Mr. Speaker, what happens on this floor. They really don't. All they want to do is get up in the morning, get their families ready, pay their bills, get a good job, have a possibility of a promotion, or go start that business they want to have. We have provided that.

Now, up here, in the internal workings of government, in the mesh of web that is inside this beltway, when you have got a government agency and government employees who do not want to do what they are supposed to do, it is time for Congress to act. That is exactly what we are doing today.

John Stuart Mill stated: "The proper office of a representative assembly is to watch and control the government, to throw the light of publicity on its acts, to compel a full exposition and justification of all of them which any one considers questionable."

Today the Republicans in the House are doing that, Mr. Speaker. We are taking our oversight responsibilities seriously. We are abiding by the checks

and balances of the Constitution to ensure that the government is acting appropriately to ensure that the American people—who, by the way, we represent—have the answers that they deserve, one way or the other.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 971 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6238) to secure the rights of public employees to organize, act, concertedly, and bargain collectively, which safeguard the public interest and promote the free and unobstructed flow of commerce, 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 Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6238.

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. COLLINS of Georgia. 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 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 224, nays 186, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

YEAS—224

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)

Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)

Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis

Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)

Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—186

Adams
Aguilar
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
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
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva

Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack

Lofgren	Panetta	Sewell (AL)	Hensarling	McClintock	Sanford	Rice (NY)	Serrano	Tonko
Lowenthal	Pascrell	Shea-Porter	Herrera Beutler	McHenry	Scalise	Richmond	Sewell (AL)	Torres
Lowey	Payne	Sherman	Hice, Jody B.	McKinley	Schweikert	Rosen	Shea-Porter	Vargas
Lujan Grisham, M.	Pelosi	Sinema	Higgins (LA)	McMorris	Scott, Austin	Roybal-Allard	Sherman	Veasey
Luján, Ben Ray	Perlmutter	Sires	Hill	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner	Ruiz	Sinema	Vela
Lynch	Peters	Smith (WA)	Holding	McSally	Sessions	Ruppersberger	Sires	Velázquez
Maloney,	Peterson	Soto	Hollingsworth	Meadows	Shimkus	Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Visclosky
Carolyn B.	Pingree	Speier	Hudson	Messer	Shuster	Sánchez	Soto	Wasserman
Maloney, Sean	Pocan	Suozi	Huizenga	Mitchell	Simpson	Sarbanes	Speler	Schultz
Matsui	Polis	Swalwell (CA)	Hultgren	Moolenaar	Smith (MO)	Schakowsky	Suozi	Waters, Maxine
McCollum	Price (NC)	Takano	Hunter	Mooney (WV)	Smith (NE)	Schiff	Swalwell (CA)	Watson Coleman
McEachin	Quigley	Thompson (CA)	Hurd	Mullin	Smith (NJ)	Schneider	Takano	Welch
McGovern	Raskin	Titus	Issa	Newhouse	Smith (TX)	Schrader	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
McNerney	Rice (NY)	Tonko	Jenkins (KS)	Noem	Smucker	Scott, David	Titus	Yarmuth
Meeks	Rosen	Torres	Jenkins (WV)	Norman	Stefanik			
Meng	Roybal-Allard	Vargas	Johnson (LA)	Nunes	Stewart			
Moore	Ruiz	Veasey	Johnson, Sam	Olson	Stivers			
Moulton	Ruppersberger		Jordan	Palazzo	Taylor			
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Vela	Joyce (OH)	Palmer	Tenney			
Nadler	Sánchez	Velázquez	Katko	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)			
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Visclosky	Kelly (MS)	Pearce	Thornberry			
Neal	Schakowsky	Wasserman	Kelly (PA)	Perry	Tipton			
Nolan	Schiff	Schultz	King (IA)	Pittenger	Trott			
Norcross	Schneider	Waters, Maxine	King (NY)	Poe (TX)	Turner			
O'Halleran	Schrader	Watson Coleman	Kinzinger	Poliquin	Upton			
O'Rourke	Scott (VA)	Welch	Knight	Posey	Valadao			
Pallone	Scott, David	Wilson (FL)	Kustoff (TN)	Ratcliffe	Wagner			
	Serrano	Yarmuth	LaHood	Reed	Walberg			
			LaMalfa	Reichert	Walden			
			Lamborn	Renacci	Walker			
			Lance	Rice (SC)	Walorski			
			Latta	Roby	Walters, Mimi			
			Lesko	Roe (TN)	Weber (TX)			
			Lewis (MN)	Rogers (AL)	Webster (FL)			
			LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)	Wenstrup			
			Long	Rohrabacher	Westerman			
			Loudermilk	Rokita	Williams			
			Love	Rooney, Francis	Wilson (SC)			
			Lucas	Rooney, Thomas J.	Wittman			
			Luetkemeyer	Ros-Lehtinen	Womack			
			MacArthur	Roskam	Woodall			
			Marchant	Ross	Yoder			
			Marino	Rothfus	Yoho			
			Marshall	Rouzer	Young (AK)			
			Massie	Royce (CA)	Young (IA)			
			Mast	Russell	Zeldin			
			McCarthy	Rutherford				
			McCaul					

NOT VOTING—17

Barletta	Ellison	Rush
Black	Grothman	Schweikert
Blumenauer	Johnson (OH)	Thompson (MS)
Brady (TX)	Jones	Tsongas
Buck	Labrador	Walz
Costello (PA)	Richmond	

□ 1011

Messrs. VELA, PETERSON, Ms. PIN-GREE, and Mrs. DEMINGS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. KINZINGER, NUNES, POE of Texas, and BANKS of Indiana changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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 224, noes 184, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 305]

AYES—224

Abraham	Carter (TX)	Estes (KS)
Aderholt	Chabot	Faso
Allen	Cheney	Ferguson
Amash	Coffman	Fitzpatrick
Amodel	Cole	Fleischmann
Arrington	Collins (GA)	Flores
Babin	Collins (NY)	Fortenberry
Bacon	Comer	Foxx
Banks (IN)	Comstock	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Conaway	Gaetz
Bergman	Cook	Gallagher
Biggs	Cramer	Garrett
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gianforte
Bishop (MI)	Culberson	Gibbs
Bishop (UT)	Curbelo (FL)	Gohmert
Blackburn	Curtis	Goodlatte
Blum	Davidson	Gosar
Bost	Davis, Rodney	Gowdy
Brat	Denham	Granger
Brooks (AL)	DeSantis	Graves (GA)
Brooks (IN)	DesJarlais	Graves (LA)
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Graves (MO)
Bucshon	Donovan	Griffith
Budd	Duffy	Guthrie
Burgess	Duncan (SC)	Handel
Byrne	Duncan (TN)	Harper
Calvert	Dunn	Harris
Carter (GA)	Emmer	Hartzler

NOES—184

Adams	Deutch	Larson (CT)
Aguiar	Dingell	Lawrence
Barragán	Doggett	Lawson (FL)
Bass	Doyle, Michael F.	Lee
Beatty	Engel	Levin
Bera	Eshoo	Lewis (GA)
Beyer	Espallat	Lieu, Ted
Bishop (GA)	Esty (CT)	Lipinski
Blumenauer	Evans	Loeb sack
Blunt Rochester	Foster	Lofgren
Bonamici	Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal
Boyle, Brendan F.	Fudge	Lujan Grisham, M.
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	Luján, Ben Ray
Brown (MD)	Gallo	Lynch
Brownley (CA)	Garamendi	Maloney,
Bustos	Gomez	Carolyn B.
Butterfield	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney, Sean
Capuano	Gottheimer	Matsui
Carbajal	Green, Al	McCollum
Cárdenas	Green, Gene	McEachin
Carson (IN)	Grijalva	McGovern
Castor (FL)	Gutiérrez	McNerney
Castro (TX)	Hanabusa	Meeks
Chu, Judy	Hastings	Meng
Clark (MA)	Heck	Moore
Clarke (NY)	Higgins (NY)	Moulton
Clay	Himes	Murphy (FL)
Cleaver	Hoyer	Nadler
Clyburn	Huffman	Napolitano
Cohen	Jackson Lee	Neal
Connolly	Jayapal	Nolan
Cooper	Jeffries	Norcross
Correa	Johnson (GA)	O'Halleran
Costa	Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke
Courtney	Kaptur	Pallone
Crist	Keating	Panetta
Crowley	Kelly (IL)	Pascrell
Cuellar	Kennedy	Payne
Cummings	Khanna	Perlmutter
Davis (CA)	Kihuen	Peters
Davis, Danny	Kildee	Peterson
DeFazio	Kilmer	Pingree
DeGette	Kind	Pocan
Delaney	Krishnamoorthi	Polis
DeLauro	Kuster (NH)	Price (NC)
DelBene	Lamb	Quigley
Demings	Langevin	Raskin
DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)	

NOT VOTING—19

Barletta	Costello (PA)	Rush
Barton	Ellison	Scott (VA)
Black	Grothman	Thompson (MS)
Brady (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Tsongas
Buck	Jones	Walz
Cartwright	Labrador	
Ciulline	Pelosi	

□ 1019

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to an unavoidable scheduling conflict, I was unable to cast my vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 304 and “yea” on rollcall No. 305.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 304 and “yea” on rollcall No. 305.

PERMISSION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON H.R. 5895, ENERGY AND WATER, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5895) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON H.R. 6258, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-792) on the bill (H.R. 6258) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.