

on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans held a field hearing to hear from retirees and employers. Their jobs ranged from coal miners to truck drivers to candymakers.

As Perry Rapiere from Pennsylvania said at the rally: "We've worked and sweat and toiled into this position, and we've earned that pension; and now to know that somebody that's sitting behind a desk is willing to take that from us, we're going to stand up and fight for that."

Retirement security is an American value. Workers' pensions must be protected. Congress must find a solution to their earned pensions and give security to the retirement years of millions of hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Congress to act before this Congress ends.

RULE OF LAW

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, countries that were part of the old Soviet Union are now growing democracies, but they face ongoing interference from the new Soviet Union, Russia. The country of Georgia is one such country.

Georgia and those nations that were behind the Iron Curtain are now working to improve their democracies. A strong economy allows these countries to grow and stand on their own. That is why Georgia and others seeking real freedom must work harder on the international stage to keep American and Western money flowing.

This money goes away if the rule of law is not followed. It is simple: Follow the rule of law; prosperity follows. Don't follow the rule of law; poverty follows. This simple act will make our world more free.

HONORING THE LIFE OF KURT VON TILLOW

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Kurt von Tillow.

Kurt attended the Route 91 festival in Las Vegas on October 1. Kurt enjoyed owning his own trucking company in northern California. He would often go to concerts and was happy to be going to the Route 91 festival with a number of his relatives.

Kurt and his wife loved to take golfing trips to Scotland and Ireland, and they loved to boat. He was fun, friendly, and liked to enjoy good beer. Kurt is remembered as being very patriotic and a big family man.

I would like to extend my condolences to Kurt von Tillow's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieves with you.

EXPRESSING AGREEMENT WITH STATEMENT OF THE SPEAKER REGARDING RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE IN THE 2016 ELECTIONS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 999 was introduced by our colleague ELIOT ENGEL from New York. Basically, what it says is that the House of Representatives expresses its agreement with the statements of the Speaker of the House of Representatives made on July 16, 2018, regarding the Russian Federation's interference in the 2016 United States elections and related matters.

It basically, again, is an endorsement word for word of what the Speaker of the House said, a very strong statement, basically making it clear that there was no question that Russia interfered in our election and continues to attempt to undermine our democracy here and around the world.

It is not just the finding of the American intelligence community but also of the House Intelligence Committee.

REQUEST THAT COMMITTEES OF REFERRAL BE DISCHARGED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 999

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any committees of referral be discharged from further consideration of H. Res. 999, expressing agreement with the statements of the Speaker of the House of Representatives made on July 16, 2018, regarding Russian Federation interference in the 2016 United States elections and related matters, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORMAN). Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCGOVERN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how do I get this cleared? Maybe I can yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, who can maybe, in a gesture of bipartisanship, agree that it would be a strong statement for the House of Representatives to come together, Democrats and Republicans, and get behind the strong words of our Speaker of the House. Would that be appropriate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not been notified of clearance for the request by the gentleman.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my question was: How do I get it cleared now that I am on the floor? Can I ask the Republicans if they would agree to it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clearance comes from the leaderships and the committees.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 996, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 996 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 996

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. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, 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 Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-81 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 or clause 5(a) of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with the colon on page 251, line 5, through "2012" on page 251, line 8. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and pro forma amendments described in section 2 of this resolution. Each further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 2 of this resolution, 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 further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been

adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 6147 for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my good friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of H.R. 6147, the Department of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2019, which also includes the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act of 2019.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriations package in front of us is the third installment of the House's effort to pass all 12 appropriations bills on the floor for fiscal year 2019. We have previously passed appropriations bills covering Energy and Water, Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, Legislative Branch, and Defense.

Today we turn to the work of the Appropriations Committee Subcommittees on the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies and Financial Services and General Government.

Once the House finishes its work for the week, we will have passed 6 of the 12 appropriations bills across the floor.

Overall, the package covers \$58.65 billion in spending. Of those funds, \$35.25 billion are allocated to the Interior bill and \$23.4 billion to the Financial Services bill, which is equal to the enacted level for fiscal year 2018 for both of these bills. The package represents many months of work by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, as I have so often said when discussing appropriations bills, today's package represents the most fundamental duty of Congress, to fund the government and keep it open each year to continue to provide our constituents with the services they need and deserve. But, importantly, this

package also fulfills an additional duty of Congress to the American people: its fiscally prudent stewardship of the taxpayers' hard-earned money and to ensure that we appropriately prioritize where and how to spend taxpayer dollars in the most efficient manner.

Mr. Speaker, the Interior and Environment Appropriations bill funds critical programs at the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other crucial areas. Among the areas of greatest importance, the bill includes \$3.9 billion for the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Forest Service to fight wildfires. It includes \$500 million for payments in lieu of taxes to help local governments, and it provides \$2.6 billion for the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund.

□ 1230

It funds the National Park Service at \$3.25 billion, an increase of \$53 million over fiscal year 2018. Of great import, not only to my home State of Oklahoma but to Native Americans all across the country, the bill honors our treaties and trust agreements by providing \$5.9 billion for the Indian Health Service and \$3.1 billion for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian Education.

The bill also fulfills an additional commitment to the American people by including provisions to rein in the runaway regulatory agendas of parts of the Federal Government. It reduces the EPA's regulatory programs by \$228 million. It also fully repeals the economically damaging waters of the United States rule and includes various prohibitions preventing the EPA from overregulating agricultural operations and exempting livestock producers from EPA greenhouse gas requirements.

The Financial Services and General Government portion of this bill provides \$23.4 billion across several important accounts. It provides \$7.7 billion for the operation of the Federal court system. The bill also provides funding to help combat the opioid crisis, including \$415 million for the Office of National Drug Control Policy, including \$280 million for high-intensity drug trafficking areas and \$118 million for other Federal drug control programs.

It encourages responsible spending at the Internal Revenue Service by appropriating \$11.6 billion for IRS activities, an increase of \$186 million over fiscal year 2018, and continues stringent oversight and protections of taxpayer dollars that have been included in recent years.

The bill provides \$1.66 billion for the Securities and Exchange Commission and will help grow the economy by providing \$737 million, or full funding, in capital to various Small Business Administration loan programs. Perhaps most importantly, this bill includes provisions that will finally bring the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau under congressional oversight.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, when the CFPB was created in the original

Dodd-Frank Act, the new agency was allowed to operate without congressional oversight because it did not receive appropriations. Consequently, since its inception, unelected bureaucrats at the CFPB have been allowed to operate entirely without congressional supervision. Today's bill will remedy that and will ensure that the CFPB falls under congressional authority, oversight, and supervision once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill. The package before us represents a fulfillment of our most important responsibility as Members of Congress and provides appropriate funding in two divisions: Interior and Environment, and Financial Services and General Government. I applaud my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their months of work in making this bill a reality and cheer their efforts on moving forward to completion of the fiscal year 2019 appropriations process.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the measures included here aren't just bad, they are dangerous. Take the Interior Appropriations bill. It would put the health and safety of Americans at risk by slashing funding to address climate change and enforce environmental safeguards.

The EPA, the agency tasked with fighting carbon emissions, is cut by \$100 million. That is especially ironic since the majority was completely unwilling to rein in the wasteful spending by its former Administrator, Scott Pruitt. This is someone who spent \$43,000 on a soundproof phone booth, but the majority was silent.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is cut by \$65 million. That is after Republicans cut it by a third in the last fiscal year. As many of my colleagues know, I have been a champion of the LWCF, especially the stateside grant program where States provide a 50 percent match to grants that create more recreational and green open spaces in our districts. The people in communities in nearly every congressional district in the country have benefitted from these grants. We should be increasing, not cutting, LWCF.

There is even language in the bill that would repeal a rule designed to protect our wetlands and waterways. State revolving funds were cut by \$300 million, a \$150 million cut to clean drinking water and a \$150 million cut to clean water projects like water treatment and sewage programs.

Mr. Speaker, the American people rely on Congress to make sure that the

water they drink is clean. What is going on with this bill?

As always, Republicans have again attached several poison pill provisions that undermine the health and safety of our communities and the environment. Every year—every year—provisions like these weigh down this bill.

Mr. Speaker, when will my Republican friends realize that harmful provisions like this are why the bill has to become law? I am especially outraged to see what the majority has done with the Financial Services Appropriations bill, especially after what we saw on Friday. That is when some of our worst fears were confirmed.

As part of Special Counsel Robert Mueller's investigation, Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein announced charges against 12 Russian military intelligence officers. They were accused of hacking the Democratic National Committee, hacking Hillary Clinton's Presidential campaign, and hacking the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. The website of a State electoral board was also hacked. Voter information was stolen. Even the vendor of voting equipment was targeted for a cyber attack. And those individuals involved in administering elections were also targeted.

These charges are proof that our Nation, that our very democracy, is under attack. No troops were sent into combat. Not a single gun was fired. Instead, an adversary turned the internet into a battlefield. That is the new face of warfare in the 21st century.

Although the methods were different, this Congress should be responding the way we always have, by putting partisanship aside and putting our country first by doing whatever it takes to ensure we are not left vulnerable again.

But, Mr. Speaker, how is this majority responding? By using the Financial Services Appropriations bill to zero out funding for grants that help protect our election systems from cyber hacking. That is a cut of \$380 million compared to what Congress enacted in fiscal year 2018. The wolf is at the door, and my Republican colleagues are inviting it inside for dinner. This is insane.

The President tweeted, shortly after the election: "Unless you catch 'hackers' in the act, it is very hard to determine who was doing the hacking."

Well, Mr. Speaker, it may be hard, but it is not impossible, because we now have a 29-page indictment from President Trump's own Justice Department providing the roadmap. The indictment goes into extraordinary detail outlining how Russia successfully hacked into our election systems, how candidates and committees were successfully targeted—not by China or somebody sitting on their bed who weighs 400 pounds, as the President suggested, but by Russia, by Vladimir Putin.

It is mind-boggling that even after this indictment, after Russia's meddling was laid bare, the President did

not stand up to Putin. He held a summit with him instead. He even told CBS News, in an interview before his sit down, that he "hadn't thought" about raising the issue with Putin during their talk.

It gets worse, Mr. Speaker. British investigators believe that current and former agents of the same Russian military intelligence service accused of disrupting our 2016 elections are also likely responsible for the nerve agent attack on a former Russian spy and his daughter in Salisbury, England, earlier this year.

Sadly, it is no surprise that the President didn't stand up to Putin. He never does. When President Trump was asked whether he was a friend or a foe, he recently called Putin a competitor instead, like this was all some kind of real estate deal.

A President who calls the free press, journalists in the United States, "the enemy of the American people" time and time again is unwilling to call the leader of Russia a foe or even an adversary. It is disturbing.

What kind of hold does Vladimir Putin have on this President, Mr. Speaker? So much so that the President basically blamed the United States for much of the tensions between the two countries.

The President even deflected when asked whether he trusts the American intelligence community or Putin.

The President may be satisfied by what he called Putin's strong and powerful denial of election interference, but I am not, Mr. Speaker. I am disgusted.

It is clear that an effort to defend our democracy will have to be led by Congress, because it is not coming from the White House. But we are not leading when we make it easier for an adversary like Russia to attack us again. That is retreating.

I remember learning about the separation of powers in school, how the legislative branch is a separate but equal branch of government. The Founders designed it that way so we could provide a check on a President.

Mr. Speaker, when are the Republicans in Congress going to provide a check on President Trump? He is cozying up to Putin instead of holding him accountable for hacking our election.

As Senator SCHUMER suggested, we should be increasing sanctions on the Russians. The Republican majority should be joining us, demanding the President's national security team that accompanied him to Helsinki testify before Congress, detailing what they know.

It is past time that Republicans end their attacks on the Department of Justice, on the FBI, and on the special counsel. Already, 32 people and three companies have been either indicted or pleaded guilty under Special Counsel Mueller's investigation. Now, we will see where else it leads, but there is already evidence of clear wrongdoing.

He should be able to finish his work without any interference. The majority should move a bill from Representative NADLER to the floor immediately, so we can protect the special counsel's investigation from the whims of this President.

President Trump has shown he is willing to fire his FBI Director. Mr. Speaker, are the Republicans really going to stand by and make it possible for him to fire Robert Mueller, too?

This majority must also demand the President insist that the 12 Russians named in Friday's indictment are sent to the United States to stand trial. The President should have already done this when he met with Putin, but, apparently, it was an afterthought. Maybe he was too busy admiring the strongman to stand up for his country's interests.

I wish I were optimistic that Republicans would take these commonsense steps to protect our country, but I am not, not after what we saw in the Rules Committee last night. The majority failed to make in order an amendment by Representative QUIGLEY. It was germane. But they failed to make in order his amendment that would provide \$380 million to help States protect election systems from cyber hacking. This funding should not have been zeroed out in the first place.

Do my Republican friends see what is happening? Is anybody paying attention over there? Russia meddled in our election, and your response is to zero out funding for an election security assistance program. Then, when we pointed it out and tried to put the money back, you blocked the amendment. You won't even allow us to debate the program. That is the smallest step that they could have taken. Instead, we can't even have a debate on the floor.

Apparently, the Republicans are afraid of having a fair fight about protecting our democracy, and it is indefensible. If the President isn't willing to do more to prevent Putin from doing it again, then this Congress has an obligation to act, not gut the accounts that provide for election security.

We can start standing up by voting against this rule and the underlying legislation. It doesn't do nearly enough to protect our Nation against hostile foreign powers hell-bent on attacking our democracy.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and then I will turn and yield time to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to quickly respond to my friend's concern about the Election Assistance Commission funds.

As I am sure he is aware, that was the last installment last year, this fiscal year, of a \$365 billion authorization that was actually done back in 2002. Currently, 39 percent of those funds for this year are still available to the

States. Actually, 19 States have yet to submit any sort of request, and the legislation itself has not been reauthorized. If the authorizing people reauthorize it, I am sure we will revisit this matter.

It also worth noting that anything added will be available only from October 1, and the election is 5 weeks after that. So the idea that we are going to do something in that period of time, I think, is a bit of a red herring.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS), my good friend from the Seventh District.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying legislation that provides funding for programs vital to the environmental and economic health of my home State of Ohio and the entire Great Lakes region. This appropriations bill includes full funding, \$300 million, for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

□ 1245

The GLRI is an important program focusing on critical environmental restoration projects, such as improving water quality, fighting invasive species, and repairing native habitats for wildlife.

The Great Lakes region supports over \$200 billion in economic activity and is the world's largest source of fresh water. Restoring and preserving the Great Lakes is good for our environment and good for the thousands of Ohioans whose livelihoods depend on a clean Lake Erie.

Additionally, the bill repeals the burdensome Obama-era waters of the United States rule, a bureaucratic overreach that expands EPA jurisdiction beyond congressional intent and in contradiction of court rulings.

When the Obama administration announced this rule, I heard from farmers, ranchers, local and State governments, homeowners, and private property rights advocates. All agreed the Obama administration went too far, creating confusion and uncertainty about what would and would not fall under EPA jurisdiction. By repealing the flawed 2015 WOTUS rule, we are committing to work with State environmental agencies as partners in protecting our Nation's natural resources, rather than as adversaries.

Finally, this appropriations bill maintains funding for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, a valuable tool for State and local agencies to finance projects to ensure our municipalities have access to clean and affordable water.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the rule and passage of the legislation to keep the Great Lakes healthy and continue to improve our Nation's water quality.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to my good friend from Oklahoma who I think said that 39 percent of the funds are still left in the Election Assistance

Commission account. Well, we still have 5 months left in this year, and does anybody here really believe that these attacks are going to stop? And shouldn't we have money in the pipeline? Shouldn't we be prepared not just for this election, but for the election after that?

This is about protecting our democracy, and I don't understand why this is controversial. But no matter what you think about Mr. QUIGLEY's amendment, it was germane. It was relevant to this bill. It should have been brought up, and we should debate it. All we are asking for is a fair fight.

We are deeply concerned about what is happening to our country, and we are especially concerned in the aftermath of President Trump's disastrous meeting with Vladimir Putin.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for Congress to stand unified with the unanimous assessment of our intelligence community.

I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If we do, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative ENGEL's resolution, H. Res. 999, which follows word for word yesterday's statement by Speaker RYAN affirming Russia's attacks on our democracy.

This is the second time today that I am going to give my Republican friends a chance to go on the Record and agree with the words of the Republican Speaker of the House, PAUL RYAN.

Defending our democracy shouldn't be controversial. Agreeing with the Republican Speaker that "the United States must be focused on holding Russia accountable" should not be controversial. I would say to my friends, take yes for an answer.

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 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding to me, and I want to strongly identify with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I led the Foreign Affairs Committee Democrats last week urging President Trump to cancel his meeting with Vladimir Putin because I knew this was going to turn out badly, but, frankly, I didn't know how bad it would be. It turns out President Trump embarrassed himself and disgraced our Nation.

Standing on foreign soil, the President of the United States questioned America's intelligence community; he attacked America's law enforcement with bizarre conspiracy theories; he lobbed petty political insults; and he

did it all while standing next to America's chief rival, Vladimir Putin.

When faced head-on with the question, "Who do you believe?" President Trump sided with Putin and affirmed Putin's brazen lies. This is the tyrant who directed attacks on America's democracy in an effort to elect Donald Trump and hurt Hillary Clinton. And, as Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats said, these attacks are still ongoing.

As we all know, Putin is a ruthless leader who seeks to tear down our alliances, undermine Western unity, and destroy democracy. With the eyes of the world on them, it is plain that the President of the United States is now Putin's willing accomplice, Putin's poodle. It is outrageous; it is disgusting; it is dangerous; and it has been met with near universal condemnation.

Here is what Speaker RYAN said just yesterday, and I agree with the Speaker:

There is no question that Russia interfered in our election and continues attempts to undermine democracy here and around the world. The President needs to understand that Russia is not our ally. There is no moral equivalency between the United States and Russia, which remains hostile to our most basic values and ideals, and that Russia must be held accountable.

That is what our Republican Speaker said, and I agree with him.

I have introduced this resolution so that the entire House can go on record agreeing with the Speaker, affirming that we stand with the Speaker. I deeply regret that a member of the Speaker's own party just blocked the House from speaking with one voice and taking up this resolution by unanimous consent.

We must reject the President's capitulation to Putin; we must stand up for American leadership on the global stage; and we must demand that this administration treat Russia like the enemy it is.

How can you treat Putin better than U.S. intelligence? It just boggles my mind.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution I have just introduced, which is H. Res. 999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for purposes of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I am reiterating my earlier announcement that all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only, and I will not yield for any other purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to defeat the previous question.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Federal administrative law judges, commonly known as ALJs, decide over 1 million cases a year, covering everything from appeals of Social Security Disability and Medicare claims to disputes over black lung benefits and securities law violations. These are cases that can touch virtually all of our constituents.

On July 10, President Trump issued an executive order that will undermine the quality and independence of ALJs and the impartiality of the decisions they render. It does so by changing the hiring standards for judges.

The current standards guarantee that ALJs are fully qualified to serve. The executive order will replace those standards with a far more lenient system that would allow ALJs to be hired based on ideology or cronyism rather than experience and competence.

This executive order, titled, "Exempting Administrative Law Judges from the Competitive Service" will open the door for the politicization of a profession that plays a defining role in the lives of millions of American families.

Representatives ELIJAH CUMMINGS, DAVID CICILLINE, JOHN LARSON, and I filed an amendment to defund the executive order and preserve the impartiality, independence, and competence of administrative law judges. Unfortunately, the majority on the Rules Committee has refused to allow Members of Congress to vote on or even debate our amendment.

The longstanding hiring standards for ALJs were designed to guarantee the legitimacy of their decisions. ALJs were required to have 7 years of trial-level experience as an attorney and successfully complete a six-part examination. To insulate judicial decision-making from agency political pressure, the examination was conducted by the Office of Personnel Management, OPM, which maintained a list of the highest scoring applicants from which agencies can then select their candidates.

All of that was jettisoned by the President's executive order, which removes ALJs from the competitive service. Now the only requirements are that an ALJ must be a lawyer in good standing.

This executive order is strongly opposed by a broad spectrum of organizations. The Federal Administrative Law Judge Conference, a nonpartisan, voluntary professional association, warns, "now, any agency that wants to hire an ALJ needs no approval from OPM and can hire any attorney regardless of skill or experience. The new appointment process will not afford members of the public the due process and fair hearings they deserve. Instead, it will give agency insiders and political loy-

alists a job for which they may not be qualified but for which they will feel indebted."

The Association of Administrative Law Judges, which represents over 1,600 ALJs at the Social Security Administration, states that the President's order "will politicize our courts, lead to cronyism, and replace independent and impartial adjudicators with those who do the bidding of political appointees."

The American Association for Justice writes: "It is important for all cases overseen by ALJs to have a neutral ALJ handling the case, not someone who may be beholden to a particular political party, hostile to a particular agency or program, or otherwise politically motivated in their decisionmaking."

The American Bar Association writes: "By giving agency heads sole discretion to hire ALJs who will be making determinations affirming or overturning decisions rendered by that agency, the executive order has the potential to politicize the appointment process and interfere with the decisional independence of ALJs."

The American Bar Association says further that: "Nothing less than the integrity of the administrative judiciary is at issue here. That is why it is critical that Members of Congress have an opportunity to participate in the debate and help formulate a solution. The first step is to halt implementation of the executive order."

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letters from those four organizations.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR JUSTICE,
July 13, 2018.

Hon. MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The American Association for Justice strongly opposes the Trump Administration's recent executive order regarding the hiring and role of federal Administrative Law Judges (ALJs). An impartial judiciary is central to the strength of our justice system, and ALJs should not be involved in the political process. The ALJ executive order threatens the American people's right to a neutral arbiter and right to due process.

It is vital that ALJs be independent and impartial. This executive order eliminates the process of selecting ALJs based on their qualifications, and instead allows these positions to be filled by political appointees without any merit-based procedure. Administrative proceedings should continue to be overseen and adjudicated by ALJs who are qualified, such as attorneys with at least seven years of litigation experience and who are vetted by the Office of Personnel Management, as was the prior process. The appointment of ALJs with no experience, who can gain appointment solely due to their financial contributions or other political incentives so long as they possess a bar license, could result in unfair, biased rulings for millions of Americans.

The executive order will have a devastating effect on a vast array of cases, including cases before the Social Security Administration, Department of Labor, National Labor Relations Board, and Department of Health and Human Services. There are about

2,000 ALJs that decide over a million cases each year. Approximately 1,600 of those ALJs hear Social Security disability cases and render almost 700,000 decisions each year at the hearing level. It is important for all cases overseen by ALJs to have a neutral ALJ handling the case, not someone who may be beholden to a particular political party, hostile to a particular agency or program, or otherwise politically motivated in their decision-making. AAJ is especially concerned about bias against claimants seeking Social Security disability benefits.

We urge you to oppose this executive order and to support Amendment #55, sponsored by Reps. Scott (VA), Cummings, Cicilline and Larson (CT), to Division B of Rules Committee Print 115-81 (H.R. 6147). We greatly appreciate your support in protecting the American people's right to due process.

Sincerely,
LINDA LIPSEN,
CEO, American Association for Justice.

[News Release From the Association of Administrative Law Judges, July 12, 2018]
STATEMENT BY HON. MARILYN ZAHM, PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES (AALJ) ON WHITE HOUSE EXECUTIVE ORDER ON ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES

President Trump's executive order this week regarding the hiring and role of federal administrative law judges should concern anyone who has a Social Security Card. This is an assault on due process for the American people who have a right to a neutral arbiter. Currently, 1,600 of the roughly 2,000 federal ALJs hear Social Security disability cases. The president's order calls for replacing the current merit system used to hire judges with a court-packing plan that will allow agency heads to hand pick judges who hear cases at the Social Security Administration and dozens of other federal agencies. This change will politicize our courts, lead to cronyism and replace independent and impartial adjudicators with those who do the bidding of political appointees. This is a decision that should be reversed. If allowed to go forward it would be the equivalent of placing a thumb on the scale of justice.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, IL, July 16, 2018.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Committee on Rules, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JAMES MCGOVERN,
Committee on Rules, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS AND RANKING MEMBER MCGOVERN: On behalf of the American Bar Association and its over 400,000 members nationwide, I write to urge you to support consideration of Representative Scott's proposed amendment to Division B of Rules Committee Print 115-81 during floor consideration of H.R. 6147. The amendment would prohibit the use of funds by the Office of Personnel Management or any other executive branch agency for the development, promulgation, modification, or implementation of the July 10, 2018, Executive Order Exempting Administrative Law Judges from Competitive Service.

The Executive Order (EO) is an ill-considered and legally vulnerable response to the Supreme Court ruling in *Lucia et al. v. Securities and Exchange Commission*, which held that SEC Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) are considered "inferior officers of the United States" and therefore require appointment consistent with the Appointments Clause of the United States Constitution.

The EO, which eliminates the nationwide, uniform, competitive selection exam process

and weakens existing qualifications standards, gives each agency head the unfettered authority to hire ALJs based on criteria established by the agency. In fact, the EO specifically states that it gives agencies greater discretion to assess critical qualities, including the applicant's "ability to meet the particular needs of the agency," which are, of course, left entirely to the agency to define.

There is no doubt that changes to the current selection and appointment process for ALJs are required by Lucia, but we believe that those changes should be instituted after there has been an opportunity for Congress and the public to engage in an open and deliberative process that considers possible options for curing the constitutional defects in the current process. We hope this includes an examination of ways to assure that safeguards remain in place that respect the unique adjudicative role of ALJs and retain public confidence in the system. If adopted, the Scott amendment, by halting implementation of the EO, would allow congressional and public engagement on this important issue.

A fair and impartial administrative judiciary is indispensable to our system of justice. Vast numbers of Americans are involved in administrative adjudicative proceedings every day, and the decisions rendered by ALJs in these proceedings often affect their lives in profound ways.

By giving agency heads sole discretion to hire ALJs who will be making determinations affirming or overturning decisions rendered by that agency, the EO has the potential to politicize the appointment process and interfere with the decisional independence of ALJs.

Nothing less than the integrity of the administrative judiciary is at issue here. That is why it is critical that Members of Congress have an opportunity to participate in the debate and help formulate a solution. The first step is to halt implementation of the EO.

We therefore urge you to allow the House to vote on the Scott amendment when it deliberates on H.R. 6147.

Sincerely,

HILARIE BASS,
President.

[From the Federal Administrative Law Judges Conference, July 11, 2018]

EXECUTIVE ORDER ON ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES LOWERS STANDARDS AND REDUCES INDEPENDENCE

WASHINGTON, DC.—On July 10, 2018, President Donald J. Trump issued an executive order eliminating the competitive process to select nonpartisan Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) based on qualifications demonstrated through courtroom experience and an examination process. These positions may now be filled by inexperienced political appointees.

Nearly two thousand ALJs decide over a million cases each year. Americans are far more likely during their lifetime to encounter a federal ALJ than any other type of judge.

Since 1947, administrative proceedings, under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), have been objectively overseen by presidents from both political parties without partisan interference. In enacting the APA, Congress ensured that agency judges must be both highly qualified and independent from political influence.

Until yesterday, federal agencies hired ALJ candidates with 7 years of litigation experience. Candidates were ranked based on their scores on a six-part examination conducted by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). Now, any agency that wants to

hire an ALJ needs no approval from OPM and can hire any attorney regardless of skill or experience.

The new appointment process will not afford members of the public the due process and fair hearings they deserve. Instead, it will give agency insiders and political loyalists a job for which they may not be qualified but for which they will feel indebted.

As judges, we are disappointed that a merit selection system that produced nonpartisan judges for seven decades was eliminated by the stroke of a pen. We call for presidential reconsideration or Congressional intervention to restore the ALJ merit selection system.

The Federal Administrative Law Judges Conference (FALJC), established in 1947, is a nonpartisan voluntary professional association for federal ALJs. FALJC is dedicated to improving the administrative judicial process, presenting educational programs, and ensuring due process and judicial independence in administrative proceedings.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, by refusing to allow this amendment to come to the floor, the majority has denied Members the opportunity to have an important debate on this issue. Rather than avoiding the issue, the majority should be standing up for a just and impartial review process. Rather than refusing a vote on this amendment, the majority should be joining us in holding the administration to account.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed by the majority's opposition to consider this issue that affects so many constituents across the country. I, therefore, urge Members to oppose the rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the majority has filled the Financial Services Appropriations bill with anti-Home Rule riders that meddle in local D.C. affairs. Not one or two provisions, which would be bad enough, but five.

One would prohibit D.C. from using its own funding to carry out Initiative 77, which eliminates the tipped minimum wage. That is an initiative, by the way, that passed recently with 56 percent of the vote.

Last night in the Rules Committee, the Republicans even made in order the Palmer amendment. This would prevent the District from implementing its local individual responsibility requirement. If passed, this amendment would increase health insurance premiums and cause residents to lose access to affordable coverage options.

Mr. Speaker, why are the Republicans continuing to interfere in local D.C. government? Where are the small-government conservatives? Where is the Freedom Caucus? They should be outraged by this meddling.

Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON filed amendments to strike these riders and spoke in the Rules Committee last night. She asked a pretty simple question: Don't my Republican friends have their own districts to worry about?

Her amendments complied with the rules of the House, yet they were

blocked from getting a vote on the floor. We can't even debate them here. The majority is afraid of a fair fight.

We are long past the point of breaking the record for being the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America. This is more of the same for the most closed Congress in history, but that doesn't make it right, Mr. Speaker. When will the Republicans finally say, "Enough"?

So enough with the meddling in D.C. affairs, enough with overriding the will of local residents, and enough with the restrictive amendment process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

□ 1300

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the ranking member for his very cogent remarks that go to the principle of the matter before the House today.

I have to say, I come to the well of the House in outrage against the attack on the District of Columbia by the Republican House. In 1973—that is 45 years ago—Congress passed the District of Columbia Home Rule Act, which created the locally elected government.

Understand that after the Civil War, it is Republicans who first gave the District of Columbia the right to have its own home rule, a tradition that this Republican majority has repudiated. According to the Home Rule Act, a central purpose of the act was, and I am quoting, "to relieve Congress of the burden of legislating upon essentially local District matters."

President Nixon, who signed the bill, affirmed that purpose himself when he wrote—and I am going to quote President Nixon: "One of the major goals of this administration is to place responsibility for local functions under local control and to provide local governments with the authority and resources they need to serve their communities effectively. The measure I signed today represents a significant step in achieving this goal in the city of Washington. It will give the people of the District of Columbia the right to elect their own city officials and to govern themselves in local affairs."

"As the Nation approaches the 200th anniversary of its founding, it is particularly appropriate to ensure those persons who live in the Capital City the rights and privileges which have long been enjoyed by most of their countrymen. But the measure I signed today does more than create machinery for the election of local officials. It also broadens and strengthens the structure of city government to enable it to deal more effectively with its responsibility."

Signed, Richard Nixon.

How do we square those words and the bipartisan Home Rule Act with a fiscal year 2019 appropriation bill which is the most significant abuse of congressional power over the District

of Columbia since Republicans took control of the House in 2011?

This bill repeals two D.C. laws and prohibits the city from spending its local funds, consisting only of local taxes raised in the city by local citizens, not a cent of it raised from this House, to either carry out or enact three laws.

I filed amendments to strike all five of these undemocratic riders. Even though my amendments complied with the House rules, the Rules Committee did not make any of them in order, afraid, apparently, of debate on this matter before the people of the United States. Adding insult to injury, the Rules Committee piled on by making in order two additional anti-Home Rule riders. If this bill stands, there will be a record seven anti-Home Rule riders in it.

Some of these riders come back every year, and yet we have been able to get them off every year in conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIQUIN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman from the District of Columbia an additional 1 minute.

Ms. NORTON. This Republican majority endlessly touts their support of local affairs—a lie, as long as that principle stops at the District of Columbia border, and Republicans interfere with the spending and laws of a local jurisdiction not their own.

Pardon me for being angry, but I remind my colleagues that the 700,000 American citizens who live in the District of Columbia pay the highest Federal taxes per capita in the United States and have fought and died in every war since the Revolutionary War; yet they have no voting representation on this House floor, even on their own appropriation, and no representation in the Senate at all.

These riders amount to bullying that takes unfair advantage of the District of Columbia. No wonder we are making headway on our D.C. statehood bill, but it should not take statehood.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman from the District of Columbia an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. NORTON. It should not take statehood for any district to be treated with respect and fairness.

We have been successful in cleaning up the D.C. appropriation in the past, and we will be successful again. The people of the District of Columbia will not let you get away with bullying them after they have paid their Federal taxes the way every Member of this House has.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how many more speakers the gentleman has on his side.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, when Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein announced the charges against 12 Russian military officers on Friday, he said: “We need to work together to hold the perpetrators accountable, and we need to keep moving forward to preserve our values, protect against future interference, and defend America.”

Well, Republicans and Democrats working together need to come together to defend this country. That shouldn't be controversial. It should be common sense, and it should be above partisanship.

But we have a President who probably tunes out anything the Deputy Attorney General says because President Trump is too busy attacking the special counsel investigation on a near-daily basis. He calls it a witch hunt and even worse, and that is despite the fact that the Justice Department has issued more than 100 criminal counts against more than 30 people and three companies. Numerous associates of the President have pled guilty, and his former campaign chairman is sitting in jail today.

Or maybe more accurately, Mr. Speaker, the President attacks Robert Mueller's investigation because of that fact, because the special counsel could be closing in on even more possible wrongdoing. Where there is smoke there is usually fire, and there is at least a lot of smoke so far.

So, given the President's action, we need, as a Congress, to step it up. We need to hold Russia accountable and prevent this kind of hacking from ever happening again because the President, who is unwilling to say even publicly that he trusts the American intelligence community over Vladimir Putin, will not.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can go on record as disagreeing and condemning what the President did in Helsinki, which was such a betrayal of our values. And what we are asking to do is to vote to endorse the Speaker of the House, the Republican Speaker of the House's words.

I mean, quite frankly, we should have a resolution of disapproval on the floor, or maybe even a censure, given what the President did. But we are saying let's come together in a bipartisan way, and let's make a statement that we disagree with what the President did, what his behavior was.

So vote “no” on the previous question, and vote “no” on the rule.

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

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

Let me make a couple of comments in response to my friend.

It was the last President, not this President, who told Russian leaders that he would be more flexible after an election.

It was the last President, not this President, who said Russia was not a geopolitical threat and chastised Mitt Romney when he raised it in the campaign.

And it was the last President, not this President, who drew a red line and then refused to enforce it.

If you actually look at the RECORD, it is this administration and this party that, frankly, has begun to restore America's defenses after years of neglect by the last administration. That is not good news for Russia.

It is this administration that has also encouraged and cajoled some of our allies to increase their defense level up to the levels that they, themselves, had committed to.

It was this President that twice enforced red lines in Syria.

It was this Congress that administered ever-increasing penalties on Russian sanctions.

So I think if you look at the actions, the actions are pretty impressive.

But I want to actually get back to the matter at hand, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to encourage all Members to support the rule. Today's bill represents the next step toward fulfilling our primary obligation as Members of Congress: funding the Government of the United States.

Although not perfect, the bill before us today will lead to the completion of the House's work on two more appropriations bills. We will provide funding for important government activities like fighting forest fires, funding the Indian Health Service, enforcing tax and securities laws, and funding our national parks; and we will ensure that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is no longer allowed to operate without congressional oversight.

While I look forward to completing our work and passing all 12 appropriations bills, this legislation represents an important step along the way to fulfilling that goal. I applaud my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their work.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 996 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution the House shall be considered to have adopted the resolution (H. Res. 999) expressing agreement with the statements of the Speaker of the House of Representatives made on July 16, 2018, regarding Russian Federation interference in the 2016 United States elections and related matters.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to

offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Adopting the resolution, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 183, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

YEAS—230

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

NAYS—183

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

NOT VOTING—15

Black	Hill	Shea-Porter
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Simpson
Crowley	Luetkemeyer	Speier
Ellison	Lujan Grisham,	Walz
Gutiérrez	M.	
Hanabusa	Roby	

□ 1336

Messrs. SOTO and O'HALLERAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

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

Stated for:

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 331.

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 229, noes 184, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 332]

AYES—229

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

NOES—184

Adams	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Aguilar	Blunt Rochester	Capuano
Amash	Bonamici	Carbajal
Barragán	Boyle, Brendan	Carson (IN)
Bass	F.	Cartwright
Beatty	Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)
Bera	Brown (MD)	Castro (TX)
Beyer	Brownley (CA)	Chu, Judy
Bishop (GA)	Bustos	Cioccine

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

NOT VOTING—15

Black	Gutiérrez	Shea-Porter
Cardenas	Hanabusa	Simpson
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	Speier
Crowley	Lujan Grisham,	Walz
Ellison	M.	
Garamendi	Roby	

□ 1344

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 against:

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 332.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, for personal reasons, I was unable to vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 331 and "yea" on rollcall No. 332.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1000

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Cloud.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Cloud.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

PRO BONO WORK TO EMPOWER AND REPRESENT ACT OF 2018

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 717) to promote pro bono legal services as a critical way in which to empower survivors of domestic violence, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 717

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pro bono Work to Empower and Represent Act of 2018" or the "POWER Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Extremely high rates of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking exist at the local, State, tribal, and national levels and such violence or behavior harms the most vulnerable members of our society.

(2) According to a study commissioned by the Department of Justice, nearly 25 percent of women suffer from domestic violence during their lifetime.

(3) Proactive efforts should be made available in all forums to provide pro bono legal services and eliminate the violence that destroys lives and shatters families.