

to a dear friend, Justice William Cousins, who passed away a couple days ago at the age of 90.

Bill was a former member of the Chicago City Council, called an independent alderman; a circuit court judge; and an appellate court justice who always sought fairness. He was a gentleman, a scholar, and a Harvard graduate. I commend him for his public service.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, every year, over 14,000 people are trafficked into the United States. Human trafficking is modern-day slavery and is going on in our communities all across the country. That is why, last week, in my district, I hosted a roundtable with local law enforcement, healthcare officials, victim advocates, and elected officials as part of a Human Trafficking Awareness Month seminar to discuss how we can combat this problem.

What we found is a lack of awareness and communication on this issue. The area that I represent contains major highways that are beltways for traffickers, which only makes it easier for this crime to continue.

What we determined is that we need further training for law enforcement and healthcare providers so that this kind of abuse can be more easily identified and reported. We should also re-examine sentencing, as criminals currently face harsher sentences for drug trafficking than for human trafficking.

The bills we voted on yesterday are positive steps in this fight against human trafficking and, hopefully, just the first of many to come. We must do all we can to raise awareness and end this humanitarian problem.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF AYDEN O'MALLEY

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor Ayden O'Malley. Ayden is the daughter of Denny and Rosalind O'Malley of Nokomis, Illinois.

Along with many of her friends and hundreds of other young people from Illinois, Ayden traveled here to D.C. earlier this month to attend the March for Life. During their trip, Ayden was hospitalized after she experienced a serious medical episode.

After countless prayers and 5 days of fighting, Ayden gained her angel wings. As her mom said: "So often answered prayers may not be the answers we want."

Ayden was an eighth grader at St. Louis Catholic School, where she was on the honor roll, played volleyball and

softball, and volunteered in her community as often as she could. Everyone who knew Ayden said she had a bright, vibrant spirit that brought joy to everyone around her.

While they were here in D.C., I met with Ayden's group, but, unfortunately, I never had the honor of meeting her. I admire Ayden's convictions and willingness to be a voice for those who cannot speak for themselves.

I ask this House to join me in praying for strength and healing for Ayden's family, friends, and the Nokomis community during this difficult time.

#### REMEMBERING THE "CHALLENGER" ANNIVERSARY 32 YEARS LATER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, Sunday marked 32 years since the space shuttle *Challenger* disaster.

On January 28, 1986, NASA launched the 10th flight of the space shuttle *Challenger*, and it broke apart 73 seconds into its flight, killing all seven crew members on board. It was devastating for those watching at Kennedy Space Center in Florida, for those viewing at home, and for our Nation as a whole.

I rise today to remember the *Challenger's* dedicated crew:

Michael Smith, Dick Scobee, Ronald McNair, Ellison Onizuka, Christa McAuliffe, Gregory Jarvis, and Judith Resnick.

As President Reagan said in a televised address 32 years ago: "We will never forget them, nor the last time we saw them, this morning, as they prepared for their journey and waved good-bye and 'slipped the surly bonds of Earth' to 'touch the face of God.'"

Madam Speaker, these crew members had a passion for exploration. They inspired children around the world who dreamed of going to space. Through encouraging STEM study—science, technology, engineering, and math—we can continue to preserve their legacy and inspire another generation of explorers.

#### ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 719

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

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Curtis.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 695, CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2017

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 714 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 714

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 695) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House: (1) concur in the Senate amendment to the title; and (2) concur in the Senate amendment to the text with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-56. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI). The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam 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

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 714, which provides for consideration of a single motion to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 695, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2018.

Madam Speaker, we meet here today, 122 days into the current fiscal year. FY 2018 is one-third over, and yet the United States Congress has been unable to appropriate funds for the defense of our Nation.

I ask my colleagues, Madam Speaker, to pause and let that sink in. The fiscal

year is over 30 percent done, and we have been unable to appropriate the funds our military needs to defend the Nation.

Madam Speaker, this is nothing new. The United States Congress has forced the U.S. military to operate like this under continuing resolutions for 9 of the last 10 years. The rule and the underlying bill that we are debating and voting on today, Madam Speaker, is a crucial step towards reversing this dangerous trend.

This Defense Appropriations bill is a clean bill. It clears away all the politics. It clears away all the posturing. It clears away all the jargon and the process arguments.

Madam Speaker, this is an up-or-down vote on the one issue that matters more than any other: providing for the common defense of our Republic.

The question before this House today is whether we will do our constitutional duty and provide the funds for those who are putting their lives on the line for all of us. There is no other question, Madam Speaker. And for those who vote “no,” there will be no place to hide when history comes to ask why they failed to do their duty.

Our military has been strangled for the last decade, Madam Speaker. Obama-era budget cuts are certainly to blame. The Obama administration’s defense budgets were based on a set of dangerous policies and false assumptions:

They assumed we could withdraw from the Middle East and the terrorists would stop fighting.

They assumed we could talk North Korea out of their nuclear program with a policy of “strategic patience.”

They assumed Russian and Chinese efforts to upend the global world order the United States built and sustained with our allies over 70 years were no threat to our national security.

Perhaps worst of all, Madam Speaker, they assumed that paying billions of dollars to the regime in Tehran in exchange for unverifiable promises from the mullahs about their nuclear program would serve America’s interests. Never before, Madam Speaker, has an American President been so wrong about so much at the expense of so many.

But we in Congress must also accept some of the blame. While the previous administration was pursuing policies that aided our adversaries and harmed our national interests, the United States Congress adopted the Budget Control Act, a law that has proven devastating to the security of our Nation.

Beginning with the Budget Control Act in 2011, the United States Congress imposed arbitrary spending caps on domestic and defense discretionary spending. We handcuffed the military, Madam Speaker. No longer could they ask: What are the threats, and what do we need to defend ourselves? Instead, our men and women in uniform were faced with arbitrary caps and, in 2013, sequestration.

When the supercommittee that was established by the Budget Control Act failed to come to any agreement on cuts in mandatory spending—mandatory spending being the real driver, Madam Speaker, of our national debt—sequestration kicked in. This was like taking a meat cleaver to every account in the defense budget at a time of war when our adversaries are gaining in strength, readiness, and capability every day.

By every measure, Madam Speaker, the Budget Control Act has failed. Since its passage in 2011, the national debt has grown by nearly \$4 trillion.

□ 1230

Five years ago, the CBO estimated that the U.S. debt would reach 80 percent of GDP by 2029. Today, Madam Speaker, the CBO projects that will happen by 2022. The Budget Control Act has failed to do what it intended to do.

Madam Speaker, we have got to acknowledge something else. The Budget Control Act created the concept on which our current budget negotiations are stalled. The idea, espoused especially by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that we must have “parity”—for every dollar we increase defense spending, they demand a dollar increase in domestic spending—is lunacy, Madam Speaker.

We are the people’s elected Representatives with the responsibility for stewardship over taxpayer dollars. We are responsible for appropriating funds for the Nation. Those funds should be appropriated based upon our determination of the needs and priorities, not based upon some arbitrary concept of parity.

The dysfunction in this budget process is now so great, Madam Speaker, that, because of the BCA, we are in the process of actually spending more on programs we don’t need. It is time to fully repeal the BCA.

Madam Speaker, my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN, will no doubt shortly point out that Republicans control the House and the Senate and the White House. He is right, of course. But Mr. MCGOVERN also knows that it takes 60 votes to pass anything in the Senate, which gives the Democrats and their leader, CHUCK SCHUMER, power far beyond what they would otherwise enjoy to block action.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, we have passed all 12 appropriations bills through this body, including this Defense Appropriations bill, only to have these bills languish in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the defense of this Nation must no longer be held hostage to the rules of the United States Senate. If 60 United States Senators cannot be found to do what is right and fund our military, then, Mr. Speaker, that body has a constitutional obligation to change its rules and stop allowing a small minority to hold our military hostage for political reasons.

The threat is real and the situation is dire, Mr. Speaker. Today, we have

the smallest Army since before World War II, the smallest Navy since before World War I, and the smallest and oldest Air Force we have ever had.

Only 5 of 58 brigade combat teams in the Army are “ready to fight tonight.” Funding for future readiness against competitors like Russia and China has been cut by over 70 percent in the last 10 years. As North Korea’s missile program advances, the U.S. inventory of missile defense interceptors is dangerously low. Less than half of the Navy’s aircraft can fly, due to maintenance and spare parts issues. Only 50 percent of the Air Force’s combat forces are sufficiently ready for a highly contested fight against a peer adversary.

Mr. Speaker, we are running out of bombs. Our supply of precision munitions has been depleted by budget cuts and increased operations. Fatal accidents are increasing. This is all happening, Mr. Speaker, as the global threat environment is more complex, more imminent, and more grave than at any time since World War II. Every day we fail to do our duty in this body, the risk to our troops increases, and it becomes easier for our adversaries to close the capabilities gap.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, on this issue we can set politics aside and do what is right for our Republic, for our freedom, and for every man and woman standing watch on the front lines for all of us. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this rule and the underlying bill, 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 the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) for the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again, literally. Today we are considering, for the third time, the FY 2018 Defense Appropriations Act. The House took up and passed this bill in July. The House took up and passed this bill in September. And now, we will take it up and pass it once again under a completely closed process for the third time.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that many people think that the third time is the charm, but in this case, I think the third time is a farce.

There are a couple of minor changes to this version of the bill. For example, once again, it has \$1.18 billion to fund President Trump’s request to send 3,500 more U.S. troops to Afghanistan, funding which has been attached to prior spending bills.

It also has a general provision that turns off sequestration for defense spending. So it busts the budget caps but exempts itself from any consequences. That is a neat little trick, Mr. Speaker.

But, really, why are we wasting our time on this bill for a third time?

Here is a little bit of a reality check, Mr. Speaker. Neither this defense bill nor any other appropriations bill can move until the House and Senate Republican leadership get their act together, negotiate a budget agreement that works for all our Federal programs, and finally set the top-line numbers for all the appropriations bills. Then, and only then, will our appropriators be able to begin negotiations on the final FY 2018 omnibus spending bill to fund all our Federal programs, defense and nondefense alike, through the rest of the fiscal year.

It would have been nice if this had been done in September, Mr. Speaker, or maybe by October or the end of November or the end of December. One might have hoped to have finally completed the job by the end of this month. That would be 4 whole months into fiscal year 2018. But we all know that is not going to happen.

Now, I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but I sure hope we can get these FY 2018 appropriations bills all done before we have to start working on the fiscal year 2019 appropriations bills.

There is a very simple reason why there is no budget agreement. The Republicans are squabbling among themselves over either raising the budget caps or making even deeper cuts in domestic spending. It is like the Republican rightwing is fighting with the Republican extreme rightwing.

I will again remind my colleagues, as my colleague from Wyoming did, Republicans control everything. They control the House. They control the Senate. They control the Presidency. I wish they didn't, but they are in charge. It is their job to keep the lights running. But there is an incompetence that is on display here that I have never, ever seen in all my years of government.

What should be happening is that the Republican leadership should be reaching out to the House and Senate Democratic leadership and negotiating a real bipartisan budget agreement, one that has votes in both Chambers.

What a radical idea, to actually sit down and negotiate a bipartisan agreement that will get bipartisan votes. The notion that they can present legislation on the House floor in this kind of my-way-or-the-highway approach and expect Democrats to vote for it is ludicrous. We are not going to get everything we want. We know that. We are in the minority. But our values need to be represented in these overall budget negotiations as well.

So they should do their job. Sit down and work out a deal. That is what they are supposed to do when they are in charge. Instead, here we are entering our fifth month of fiscal year 2018 and no budget agreement, which translates into no final appropriations bills because the appropriations committees don't know what their top-line spending ceiling is for any of the remaining bills, including defense.

It doesn't matter how many times they send this same bill over to the Senate. It can't come back to us as a final House-Senate conference report without a budget agreement.

They should do their job. We can't get a budget agreement until the Republicans stop fighting amongst themselves and decide to work for the good of the American people and the American military. They should do their job.

I know today that we will hear a lot about how important it is to fund our military. Of course, that is important. You won't hear anybody in this House argue against that. But it is also important to fund things like the Department of Homeland Security. They help protect us here in the United States from potential terrorist attacks.

It is also important to fund the Justice Department. There are many anti-terrorism programs in the Justice Department that are important to protecting the citizens of this country. To suggest that somehow they don't matter, I think, is just wrong.

Isn't it important that we support our Veterans Affairs Department to support our veterans who have sacrificed so much for this country? To say that somehow they are not a priority, I don't think that is right.

It is important to fund the State Department. It is important to fund Transportation, Health and Human Services, Agriculture, Education, Housing and Urban Development, the Energy Department, the Interior Department, and all our Federal bureaus, agencies, and programs.

America's national security is more than just our military. It is our local law enforcement. It is our courts. It is our hospitals, our schools, our roads, and our bridges. It is investing in our communities, cities, and our towns. It is taking care of our veterans, our seniors, and our children. It is helping our local farmers, businesses, and companies survive and thrive.

If we fail in these duties, Mr. Speaker, then what is there left to defend?

Time and time again, Secretary of Defense Mattis has declared that the greatest damage to our military comes from continuing to fund defense by a series of short-term continuing resolutions, one after another after another. Yet that is exactly what Republicans in Congress are doing.

So, please, Mr. Speaker, let's have no more crocodile tears about defense spending and how important our military is. If the military were really a priority for the Republican leadership and not just a good sound bite, then they would have reached a budget agreement and finished the FY 2018 appropriation bills—all of them—last year.

Mr. Speaker, right now, Federal agencies, including the Pentagon, are operating under a fourth continuing resolution. Even if, by some miracle, a budget agreement is reached today or by next Monday, Congress will still need to pass a fifth CR by next Thurs-

day, February 8, because there is no way the appropriators will be able to start and finish their negotiations on a final omnibus in just a few days.

So, Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, under a completely closed process, is theater. It is not about our military. It is not about the defense of this country. It is about a sound bite. It is about trying to provide some smoke so the people don't realize that the Republicans who run this government don't know how to do their job. It is nothing more than face-saving for the most extreme Members of the Republican Conference. It does nothing that hasn't been done twice before. It means nothing. It is a waste of time.

Since the House is really only working 1 day this week—namely, today—then we could have brought up legislation that hasn't already moved twice through the House but for which action is desperately overdue.

We could have brought up the reauthorization of our community health centers, which help more than 24 million Americans access essential healthcare. Or how about the reauthorization of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program, which helps young families all across this country?

The Republican leadership deliberately chose to let the authorization for each of these critical programs expire in September. They haven't even lifted a finger since to reauthorize them. We could have easily taken care of their reauthorization today in a couple of hours and sent those bills over to the Senate rather than spending the same amount of time passing the same defense bill for a third time.

Mr. Speaker, defense spending and all other Federal programs are in a mess today because the Republicans are incapable of running the government. It is that simple. Each day it becomes even more clear that the Republican leadership not only can't govern, they are not even interested in governing. Everything we are doing on this day is going nowhere, and my Republican friends know that.

This, again, is about theater. It is not about troops. It is not about our security. It is about giving them some cover to justify the incompetence that is on display here.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my colleagues on the Republican side that we don't need lectures from them about America's national security. When it comes to forcing their terrible policies on the American people, they say "yes, yes, yes" to President Trump; but when it comes to holding President Trump accountable and protecting American democracy, all they say is "nyet."

Clearly, House Republicans' desire to protect President Trump has clouded their judgment and caused them to lose sight of what is at stake: the security and integrity of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump's own CIA Director, our former colleague,

CIA Director Mike Pompeo, recently admitted that Russia is currently working to undermine the upcoming election and has been doing so for decades.

□ 1245

And, just yesterday, President Trump refused to impose defense and intelligence sanctions on entities purchasing Russian military equipment. In July, Congress passed an overwhelmingly bipartisan bill requiring President Trump to impose defense and intelligence sanctions on entities purchasing Russian military equipment. His decision, yesterday, to refuse to do so tells us all we need to know about where his loyalties lie.

And still, Mr. Speaker, all the other side continues to do, day after day, is assault the rule of law. They have led an all-out assault on our Department of Justice and on our FBI to smear Special Counsel Robert Mueller's investigation, attempting to tarnish the credibility of our Federal law enforcement along the way, and sowing doubt and confusion about the very ability of anyone in law enforcement to conduct an impartial investigation.

And let's not forget that we are not talking about some hypothetical investigation. Here are the facts:

The President's former National Security Advisor has pled guilty to lying to the FBI about his contacts with the Russian Ambassador.

The President's former foreign policy adviser pled guilty after he lied about his contacts with the Russian Government.

And the President's former campaign manager has been indicted by a grand jury for, among other things, conspiracy against the United States of America.

Now the Republicans are trying to whip up a controversy out of thin air with a misleading cherry-picked memo written by their own staff, which contains significant inaccuracies and omissions that misrepresent the underlying intelligence.

Associate Attorney General Stephen Boyd stated:

"We believe it would be extraordinarily reckless for the committee to disclose such information publicly without giving the Department and the FBI the opportunity to review the memorandum and to advise the committee of the risk of harm to national security and to ongoing investigations that could come from public release."

"Indeed, we do not understand why the committee would possibly seek to disclose classified and law enforcement sensitive information without first consulting with the relevant members of the intelligence community."

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are doing this in a ridiculous attempt to discredit an entire investigation, which has already found a serious effort to attack our democracy.

This is a deeply, deeply irresponsible attempt to undermine Special Counsel

Mueller's investigation, regardless of the profound damage that it does to our democratic institutions and national security agencies. It is offensive to the Nation, and it is just plain wrong.

I would remind my Republican colleagues that we are here to uphold the rule of law, not the rule of Trump. I understand that, in this Chamber, there are powerful political incentives to circle the wagons amongst my Republican friends around this White House, but the truth is the truth, and there is nobody, nobody in this country, including the President of the United States, who should be above the law.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleagues that when we are talking about defending the national security of our country, what has gone on in this Chamber these last few days, in my opinion, is a threat to our national security.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate, as always, the candor of my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN. But, I have to say, I am having a hard time understanding why it is, when he is so clearly knowledgeable about the damage that CRs do to the military, we are, today, presenting an opportunity for this entire House to stop that process for this entire House to provide the kind of reliable, secure, sufficient funding that our troops need; yet, I would imagine, many colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to vote "no" on that.

I think it is important, though, to recognize some facts, Mr. Speaker:

The first of those is, for all the talk about a budget agreement, it was the leadership on the other side of the aisle that refused to go to a meeting at the White House a couple of months ago and pulled out completely of the talks last year.

It was also, with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, the leadership on the other side of the aisle, the Democrat leadership, that shut the government down 2 weeks ago. So it is awfully hard, I am sure, to be able to convince constituents back home that they really want to get this job done and get things moving when they continue to stop the process, to gum up the works, and even to shut down the government.

Mr. Speaker, I know that every Member of this body cares deeply about the U.S. troops. And I know that every Member of this body wants what is right for this Nation. But there is a big difference between having the luxury of talking about support for the troops and actually voting for the funds they need to do their job. Talk does not buy equipment; talk does not get our planes back in the air; talk does not provide pay raises for our troops; talk does not provide the kind of protection our servicemen and -women need, the equipment that they need, to do their

job; talk does not roll back Russia, or China, or Iran, or North Korea.

For that, the Pentagon needs money. The only way that our military will get money is if we appropriate: if we break the cycle of continuing resolutions and pass this appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), my dear friend and colleague from the Rules Committee.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I appreciate all of the work that she does on behalf of our Nation's military men and women.

Mr. Speaker, here we are again. Once again, this House will vote to fully fund our Nation's military and critical national security programs.

I have said this many times before, but I will continue saying it because the point is so very important: the global threat environment facing the United States today is greater than at any time since the conclusion of World War II.

North Korea is continuing to build its nuclear weapon program, which poses a direct threat to the United States and our servicemembers stationed abroad.

Terrorist groups, like ISIS and al-Qaida, may be weakened in Iraq and Syria, but their influence continues to spread to other areas throughout the Middle East and Africa.

The situation in Afghanistan is deeply concerning. Look no further than the recent wave of attacks by the Taliban in Kabul.

China is continuing to build up its military and exert aggression in the South China Sea.

Russia and Putin remain emboldened as they take provocative actions in Ukraine, throughout Eastern Europe, and even in the Pacific.

Other countries continue to catch up to our Nation's capabilities in the space domain.

Iran is showing more and more involvement in the Middle East and continues to support terrorist groups that threaten our allies, like Israel.

Not to even mention the evolving and serious threats posed to the United States by state actors and rogue actors when it comes to cybersecurity.

Despite so many real and wide-ranging threats, our military has not received the funding that is necessary to keep up.

As the gentlewoman said, we have the smallest Army since before World War II, the smallest Navy since before World War I, and the smallest and oldest Air Force we have ever had.

The military does not work like a spigot. You can't just turn it on when a crisis happens and expect everything to work and all of our servicemembers to be ready. Training takes time, and building equipment takes even more time. We have to prepare now for the crisis of tomorrow.

The commandant of the Marine Corps, General Robert Neller, put it best when he said:

“Marines don’t get ready when the crisis occurs.”

“The instability of the current fiscal environment, compounded by current shortfalls in our operation and maintenance accounts, impact our ability to maintain a ‘ready bench.’”

Secretary of the Air Force Heather Wilson also recently stated that: “We are stretching the force to the limit, and we need to start turning the corner on readiness.”

I could go on for hours talking about the real challenges facing our military. But, instead of looking back, I want this Congress to look ahead and solve these problems, instead of just continually talking about them.

This Defense funding bill includes \$659.2 billion in full-year funding for the Department of Defense. That includes increases in military operations and maintenance accounts. That includes a 2.4 percent pay raise for our troops, which would be the largest in 8 years. That includes increased funding for missile defense systems and programs, which is so important, given the threat posed by North Korea.

That includes funding for 11 new Navy ships, including three littoral combat ships, which are built, in part, by Austal USA in my district. That includes critical funding for training and readiness operations.

That also includes much-needed money for research and development to ensure our military continues to have the most innovative and state-of-the-art equipment at their disposal.

All told, this bill would be a landmark step toward rebuilding our military, standing up to our adversaries, and supporting the men and women who work every single day to keep the American people safe.

Now, I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle saying that this bill has no chance in the Senate. While I don’t understand why our colleagues and the Senate would not want to fund our military, I have a strong rebuttal to that argument.

If the Senate wants to add non-defense programs to this bill or make changes, then they should take this bill up, make whatever changes or additions that they desire, and send the bill back over to the House. It simply makes no sense to just declare this bill dead and not take a vote on it.

I intend to talk to my two home State Senators about passing this bill, and I expect they will be supportive of this effort because they understand the need to fund our Nation’s military.

But I reject the notion that we shouldn’t be passing this bill and sending it over to the Senate. I am tired of the Senate not acting on our government funding bills, and I think we should keep sending funding bills over there until they take one up and actually pass it. This ridiculous crisis of funding our government from one crisis to the next must end.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and,

once again, send a military funding bill over to the Senate. Here, in the House, we must continue to fulfill one of our most basic responsibilities outlined in the Constitution: to provide for the common defense.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. With this funding bill, we can move back toward a position of peace through strength, and we can keep American families safe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just respond to my colleague from Wyoming who said that talk will not fund our military, or that talk will not upgrade our military equipment, and I agree. Nobody is asking the other side to talk. We are asking them to do their job. We are asking them to go and sit down with Republicans and Democrats and work out a deal on the budget caps.

In order to do any of this stuff, we have to know how much we can spend. Before you go shopping, you have to know how much you are going to spend.

I know my Republican friends don’t want to take responsibility for what is clearly incompetence, but, the bottom line is, in the Senate, the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense hasn’t even marked up the Defense Appropriations bill yet. And the last time I checked, the Republicans controlled the Senate—I wish they didn’t, but the Republicans control the Senate. And as my colleague from Wyoming knows, bills don’t move in the House or the Senate without the Republican leadership moving it.

So I think it is clear that this Republican-controlled government can’t do its job, and November can’t come soon enough, for me, because I think there needs to be a major change here. We need people in charge who understand that the American people come first, not some rightwing ideology, who understand the meaning that the American people comes first means doing your job.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge that my colleagues vote to defeat the previous question, and I will give a little explanation why.

Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, President Trump tweeted that he wants to show that “Democrats do not want to solve DACA, only use it.” Well, I would beg to differ. This is the 19th time that we have attempted to bring the bipartisan bill, H.R. 3440, the Dream Act, for a vote on the House floor, and, if we defeat the previous question, we will bring that bill up.

We have made our position clear: we want immigration policies that make America safer, without betraying our core values as a nation.

President Trump made his position clear as well. He has tweeted and said, time and time again: “My standard is very simple: America First and Make America Great Again.”

Exactly what does he mean by America First?

According to the conservative Cato Institute, repealing DACA would cost the government over \$60 billion and would reduce economic growth by \$280 billion over the next decade. That doesn’t sound like an America First policy to me.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act: this bipartisan, bicameral legislation that would help hundreds of thousands of young people, who are American in every way, except on paper.

I regret very much that the leadership in this House has refused, time and time again, to allow us to debate and deliberate on this issue. We have a bill called the Dream Act. If it was brought to the floor, it would pass overwhelmingly. Every Democrat would support it, and I bet a big chunk of Republicans would support it as well, and we could end this once and for all.

□ 1300

The Republican leadership is so pathetically terrified of a narrow, xenophobic, bigoted element of their base that they cannot bring themselves to allow us to even consider such a bill, and I regret that very much.

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 Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question so that we can immediately bring the Dream Act to the floor.

I stand before you today with a reopened government, ready to transform discussion into action. This is the 19th time that we have requested a vote on the Dream Act.

Congress did not create this emergency. This is a mere negotiation tactic brought about by the actions of a single man.

The time for tactics is over. Now is the time to put your vote to work and break the deadlock issue.

We are a nation of immigrants, refugees, and asylum seekers. A great man once said: “The bosom of America is open to receive not only the opulent and the respected stranger, but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions, whom we shall welcome to a participation with all our rights and privileges. . . .”

That man was George Washington, Mr. Speaker, our country's first President.

Now let us take a moment to reflect on this and how President Washington saw our country. George Washington would welcome an opulent and respected stranger, you know, like folks from Norway. However, we should also welcome the oppressed and the persecuted of all nations and all religions in the world.

Compare George Washington's words to President Trump's, who said: "I do business with the Mexican people, but you have people coming through the border that are from all over. And they are bad. They are really bad. You have people coming in, and I am not just saying Mexicans. I am talking about people who are from all over that are killers and rapists, and they are coming into this country."

Please, Mr. Speaker, do not let this era be known as the day that America surrendered. Do not let our country go down the path of religious persecution. Do not let our country fall to the dictates of convenience.

The United States of America sets the tone for the rest of the world. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if we do not help the less fortunate than us, who can we count on?

It is not easy to say no, Mr. Speaker. It is easy to surrender. It is a rare occasion where an easy choice is the right choice.

It is up to us, the leaders of our country, to take the hard path, the path taken by our ancestors.

About 800,000 young people living in our country, also known as DREAMers, are facing an uncertain future.

Many criticize how DACA was created, some even criticize the granting of a status quo on immigrants. I say this is un-American. I say to these critics that it is time to become problem solvers for our country.

We only have a few days left under the current continuing resolution to pass a bill that provides DACA recipients a pathway to citizenship. We made a promise to the American people and to 800,000 DREAMers who are American in every way except on paper.

To all the DREAMers, I want you to know that I stand with you.

Today I call on every Member of Congress to remember that we are a nation founded by immigrants. I call on you to give these DREAMers a chance. Let's get it done.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have seen now on display in this debate exactly the problem and, frankly, it is despicable, Mr. Speaker.

We are in a situation where our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are holding hostage funding for our troops over the issue of illegal immigration. There is no other way to describe it. There is no other way to—I can't put it into words. The people who are watching, I am sure, have seen it on the floor right now.

If my colleagues feel so strongly about support for the troops, there is a very easy answer. And that answer is to vote for this bill, to vote to support this appropriation, not to try to divert attention, not to try to talk about other issues, not to try to talk about the extent to which we haven't reached a deal.

We have got a bill and we are putting it on the floor. It funds the troops. It ends the damage that has been done by the continuing resolutions. They ought to vote for it, we ought to pass it, and then our colleagues in the Senate should do the same.

They cannot, at the same time, say that they support our troops, that they support resources for the troops, and then go through all of these contortions trying to explain why it is they are going to vote "no" on this issue.

I would also just say, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the United States Senate right now is either incapable or unable of doing its constitutional duty does not absolve us in this House of the obligation to do ours, and that is to provide funding and resources for the U.S. military.

It is absolutely a broken system. We are in a situation where I would ask my colleagues to think, as they are arguing on this floor, debating on this floor today, about the parents of men and women who are deployed, to think about what this debate must sound like to them, to think about trying to explain to them why it is when we have a bill that provides the funding the military needs, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to vote "no" because of some budget process, some budget procedure, because of negotiations over DACA, because of any other reason under the sun they can imagine.

Vote "yes" on this bill, vote "yes" for this rule, and then we can go on and deal with these other issues. But, Mr. Speaker, none of those other issues will matter. If we fail to do what is right for the military, none of those other issues will matter.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the people who write the Republican talking points because they keep on trying to change the subject to try to confuse the American people.

My colleague knows that this battle is not over the DREAMers, although we all think it is immoral that these young people have been treated so terribly and so cruelly, and we believe that there needs to be a resolution to that.

The bottom line is that we need to negotiate budget caps so we know how much we can spend on not only defense, but nondefense appropriations so we can keep our government running. This should have been done months ago.

So if we really care about our troops, then where is the bipartisan agreement

to raise the budget caps so that we know we have a budget deal? Where is this bipartisan agreement?

My Republican friends have known that this is the deal for a long time, yet, again, they are tied in knots because they are fighting amongst themselves. Their rightwing is having a battle with their extreme rightwing; and there is even an extreme, extreme rightwing that not only does not want to raise any nondefense spending budget caps, but wants to cut domestic spending.

I would say to my colleagues that this is about more than the DREAMers. In fact, this is about community health centers. I mean, people rely on community health centers all across this country to get their healthcare. We are not dealing with that.

This is about funding our veterans. The men and women who serve our country, who we put their lives in harm's way, shouldn't we make sure that their budget is funded? I mean, Homeland Security.

So, I mean, there is a whole bunch of stuff here, but this is really simple to fix. It requires the Republican leadership and this Republican government to do its job. That is all we are asking. Do your job, negotiate a deal for a budget agreement to fund the government for the rest of the year, then we are done, and we go on to fight other things. But there is an easy way to do this: come up with some numbers, work it out with your leadership, work it out with our leadership, and let's move that.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think that if my colleague on the other side of the aisle spent more time focused on doing his job and less time on telling us to do ours, we would be in a lot better shape. I think the American people deserve to know what is going on in these budget negotiations.

What is going on in these budget negotiations, Mr. Speaker, is that the leadership on the other side of the aisle continues to move the goalpost. They enjoy this political fight, this political dance. They enjoy the sense that they can hold us hostage, they can hold the troops hostage.

They seem to not have any concern at all about the fact that we are now 30 percent of the way through the fiscal year and our troops have not been funded.

So behind closed doors, what is going on is moving the goalpost; it is Lucy and the football. They want to continue playing these games.

So I would suggest that my colleague on the other side of the aisle ought to turn his focus and attention on his own leadership and ask them to do their job.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we are in a position where we are today considering a bill that will fund the military.



I applaud my colleague's efforts to try again and again and again to make the case that he believes in funding the military, he believes we ought to have a full year appropriation, he believes we have got to get out from under the CR, and, therefore, he is going to vote "no" on this bill. It takes, really, focus and attention and talent to be able to do that, so I applaud that effort, but the reality is the reality, Mr. Speaker. We are in a position today where we have the opportunity to vote to fund the troops, and we ought to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say again, the Republicans are in charge. I wish we were in the majority. If we created this mess, the Republicans would have every right to criticize us, but we are not in charge. I regret that very much. I think it is not good for the country that we have a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and a Republican President, because I think a lot of the priorities of the American people are not being addressed.

All the Republican leadership needs to do is get together and do their job and negotiate a deal on the budget caps, and let us approve defense and nondefense spending for the rest of the year and get away from these CRs. It is in their hands.

As I said, the Senate Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations hasn't even had a markup in their committee. I mean, they are controlled by Republicans. You can't blame us for everything.

Bottom line is you are in charge. When you are in charge, you have to keep the lights on. That is your responsibility. Unfortunately, my Republican friends don't want to do this.

I have never, ever, seen this kind of incompetence in our government, ever, in all my years. This has to end. Again, the way it ends is when the Republican leadership decides to negotiate a budget agreement with the House and Senate leaders, Republicans and Democrats alike.

Mr. Speaker, we all believe that we ought to support our military, we ought to make sure we have the best military, second to none. We want to fund that, but we also understand that it is important to fund the Department of Homeland Security, which protects us from terrorist attacks here at home. I am sorry my Republican friends don't see that as a priority.

We also believe we ought to fund veterans' health. I am sorry my Republican friends don't see that as a priority.

We believe in funding community health centers. We believe in making sure that our States have the money to be able to rebuild their aging infrastructures. I am sorry that that is not a priority, but it is to us.

The entire budget is a priority to us, and I don't think it is too much to ask

the leadership of this House and the leadership of the Senate to make sure that everything is funded and that the needs of the entire country are met, and not kind of picking one over another over another.

The other thing I would say is that, if we want to have a talk about national security, we ought to focus on what is happening right here with the Republicans and the House Intelligence Committee playing politics with an investigation into Russia's attack on our democracy.

You ought to be concerned about a President of the United States who doesn't seem at all worried that the Russians interfered in our election, that according to his own CIA head says they are still trying to interfere in our election, and we can't even get this President to impose congressionally mandated sanctions.

Is there anything that Russia can do to us that will cause this President to stand up and defend our country or to even say something mildly critical about Vladimir Putin, whom he praises, a man who kills journalists and human rights defenders and political opponents?

Enough. I mean, stop this politicization of the Russia investigation. This should be bipartisan, getting to the bottom of this. Wherever it leads, it leads, but this is serious. You want to talk about a threat to our country, to our homeland, and to our democracy, look at what Russia is doing to us each and every day.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can bring up the Dream Act so we can actually protect these wonderful people who have been such great members of our community, who have been first responders, who have saved lives in the aftermaths of hurricanes, who serve in our military.

We have to stop holding them for ransom. They are not hostages. We ought to stop holding them for ransom for a stupid wall that costs \$25 billion.

When I think about \$25 billion, I can think of a lot of things to do with \$25 billion that could help the people of this country rather than building a ridiculous wall that someone could buy a ladder to climb over or a shovel to dig under.

□ 1315

We have to do better, so vote "no" on the previous question, vote "no" on this rule, and send a message to the leadership of this House: Get back to work and do your job. You are in charge. It is your job to keep this government running. Work out a deal on the budget cap. Fund everything. That is your job.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

Mr. Speaker, some things are complicated, but this one isn't. Our colleagues, if they are so concerned about the national security of this Nation, there is a very easy thing for them to do, and that is to vote for this Defense Appropriations bill.

It is really important for us, as we are having this debate, to remember the facts; and the facts of the budget negotiations are that it was the Democrat leadership that walked away from the table and stalled the negotiations. It was the Democrat leadership, Mr. Speaker, that shut down the government.

So the Republicans, right now, understanding and recognizing how crucial it is for us to get the Defense Department out from under these damaging continuing resolutions, to provide them with sufficient, secure funding, reliable funding, we are moving a clean Defense Appropriations bill.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle can yell all they want about having us do our job, and, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. Our job, our most important job, our job that is crucial and sacred above all others, is to provide funding and resources for the military of this Nation. That is what this bill does. That is why we are, today, presented with an opportunity to do the right thing.

With this bill, with a vote in support of this rule, and a vote in support of the underlying bill, we can begin to reverse the damage of the last 7 years.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, to stop with these political games. It is time to stop moving the goalposts. It is time to stop holding defense spending hostage to illegal immigration issues, holding defense spending hostage to increased domestic spending. It is time to stop. Our troops are on the front lines fighting and dying for us, and our actions in this body are putting them at greater risk.

It is not, Mr. Speaker, as though we can sit here and fail to act, and we are just delaying. Our failure to act is putting our men and women in uniform at greater risk. Our failure to act is aiding our adversaries.

I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, frankly, to look in the mirror and to recognize that they are the ones right now who hold the key, as do the Members of the United States Senate, to making sure that we get these resources to our men and women in uniform.

I would say, once again, Mr. Speaker, if we fail to do this, if we fail to do our constitutional duty, nothing else we do matters. There are no other individuals in this Nation who are charged the way we are with providing for the common defense, and it is an individual duty and obligation of every single one of us.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to mind the words spoken by Ronald Reagan 35 years ago. As we engage in the political theater that my colleague on the other side of the aisle mentioned in this House, it needs to stop,

and we need to remember what is important.

Ronald Reagan said: "It is up to us in our time to choose, and choose wisely, between the hard but necessary task of preserving peace and freedom, and the temptation to ignore our duty and blindly hope for the best while the enemies of freedom grow stronger day by day."

Mr. Speaker, it is truly up to us. It is an individual obligation on each Member of this body. Therefore, I urge adoption of both the rule and the Senate amendments to H.R. 695.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 714 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. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

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

#### THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March

15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

Ms. CHENEY. 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 232, nays 187, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—232

Abraham	Allen	Amodei
Aderholt	Amash	Arrington

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

NAYS—187

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



Garamendi	Lujan Grisham,	Ruppersberger	Coffman	Hultgren	Renacci	Kilmer	Moulton	Schrader
Gomez	M.	Rush	Cole	Hunter	Rice (SC)	Kind	Nadler	Scott (VA)
Gonzalez (TX)	Luján, Ben Ray	Ryan (OH)	Collins (GA)	Hurd	Roby	Krishnamoorthi	Napolitano	Scott, David
Gottheimer	Lynch	Sánchez	Collins (NY)	Issa	Roe (TN)	Kuster (NH)	Neal	Serrano
Green, Al	Maloney,	Sarbanes	Comer	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (AL)	Langevin	Nolan	Sewell (AL)
Green, Gene	Carolyn B.	Schakowsky	Comstock	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (KY)	Larsen (WA)	Norcross	Shea-Porter
Grijalva	Maloney, Sean	Schiff	Conaway	Johnson (LA)	Rohrabacher	Larson (CT)	O'Halleran	Sherman
Gutiérrez	Matsui	Schneider	Cook	Johnson (OH)	Rokita	Lawrence	O'Rourke	Sires
Hanabusa	McCollum	Schrader	Costello (PA)	Johnson, Sam	Rooney, Francis	Lawson (FL)	Pallone	Slaughter
Hastings	McEachin	Scott (VA)	Cramer	Jones	Rooney, Thomas	Lee	Panetta	Smith (WA)
Heck	McGovern	Scott, David	Crawford	Jordan	J.	Levin	Pascarell	Soto
Higgins (NY)	McNerney	Serrano	Crist	Joyce (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen	Lewis (GA)	Payne	Speier
Himes	Meeks	Sewell (AL)	Culberson	Katko	Roskam	Lieu, Ted	Pelosi	Suozi
Hoyer	Meng	Shea-Porter	Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (MS)	Ross	Lipinski	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)
Huffman	Moore	Sherman	Curtis	Kelly (PA)	Rothfus	Loeb sack	Peters	Takano
Jackson Lee	Moulton	Sinema	Davidson	King (IA)	Rouzer	Lofgren	Peterson	Thompson (CA)
Jayapal	Murphy (FL)	Sires	Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	Royce (CA)	Lowenthal	Pingree	Thompson (MS)
Jeffries	Nadler	Slaughter	Denham	Kinzinger	Russell	Lowey	Pocan	Titus
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Smith (WA)	Dent	Knight	Rutherford	Lujan Grisham,	Polis	Tonko
Kaptur	Neal	Soto	DeSantis	Kustoff (TN)	Sanford	M.	Price (NC)	Torres
Keating	Nolan	Speier	DesJarlais	Labrador	Scalise	Luján, Ben Ray	Quigley	Tsongas
Kelly (IL)	Norcross	Suozi	Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Schneider	Lynch	Raskin	Vargas
Khanna	O'Halleran	Swalwell (CA)	Donovan	LaMalfa	Schweikert	Maloney,	Rice (NY)	Veasey
Kihuen	O'Rourke	Takano	Duffy	Lamborn	Scott, Austin	Carolyn B.	Richmond	Vela
Kildee	Pallone	Thompson (CA)	Duncan (SC)	Lance	Sensenbrenner	Maloney, Sean	Rosen	Velázquez
Kilmer	Panetta	Thompson (MS)	Duncan (TN)	Latta	Sessions	Massie	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Kind	Pascarell	Titus	Dunn	Lewis (MN)	Shimkus	Matsui	Ruiz	Walz
Krishnamoorthi	Payne	Tonko	Emmer	LoBiondo	Shuster	McCollum	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
Kuster (NH)	Pelosi	Torres	Estes (KS)	Long	Simpson	McEachin	Rush	Schultz
Langevin	Perlmutter	Tsongas	Farenthold	Loudermilk	Sinema	McGovern	Ryan (OH)	Waters, Maxine
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Vargas	Faso	Love	Smith (MO)	McNerney	Sánchez	Watson Coleman
Larson (CT)	Peterson	Veasey	Ferguson	Lucas	Smith (NE)	Meeks	Sarbanes	Wilson (FL)
Lawrence	Pingree	Vela	Fitzpatrick	MacArthur	Smith (NJ)	Meng	Schakowsky	Yarmuth
Lawson (FL)	Pocan	Velázquez	Marchant	Marino	Smith (TX)	Moore	Schiff	
Lee	Polis	Visclosky	Flores	Marshall	Smucker			
Levin	Price (NC)	Walz	Fortenberry	Mast	Stefanik			
Lewis (GA)	Quigley	Wasserman	Fox	McCarthy	Stewart	Blumenauer	Johnson, E. B.	Pearce
Lieu, Ted	Raskin	Schultz	Frelinghuysen	McCauley	Stivers	Cárdenas	Kennedy	Tenney
Lipinski	Rice (NY)	Waters, Maxine	Gaetz	McHenry	Taylor	Courtney	Luetkemeyer	Welch
Loeb sack	Richmond	Watson Coleman	Gallagher	McKinley	Thompson (PA)	Cummings	McClintock	
Lofgren	Rosen	Welch	Gianforte	McMorris	Thornberry			
Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)	Gibbs	Rodgers	Tipton			
Lowey	Ruiz	Yarmuth	Gohmert	McSally	Trott			
			Goodlatte	Meadows	Turner			
			Gosar	Meehan	Upton			
			Gottheimer	Messer	Valadao			
			Gottheimer	Mitchell	Wagner			
			Granger	Moolenaar	Walberg			
			Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)	Walden			
			Graves (LA)	Mullin	Walker			
			Graves (MO)	Murphy (FL)	Walorski			
			Griffith	Newhouse	Walters, Mimi			
			Grothman	Noem	Weber (TX)			
			Guthrie	Norman	Webster (FL)			
			Handel	Nunes	Wenstrup			
			Harper	Olson	Westerman			
			Harris	Palazzo	Williams			
			Hartzler	Palmer	Wilson (SC)			
			Hensarling	Paulsen	Wittman			
			Herrera Beutler	Perry	Womack			
			Hice, Jody B.	Pittenger	Woodall			
			Higgins (LA)	Poe (TX)	Yoder			
			Hill	Poliquin	Yoho			
			Holding	Posey	Young (AK)			
			Hollingsworth	Ratcliffe	Young (IA)			
			Hudson	Reed	Zeldin			
			Huizenga	Reichert				

## NOT VOTING—11

Blumenauer	Curbelo (FL)	McClintock
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Pearce
Courtney	Kennedy	Tenney
Cummings	Luetkemeyer	

## □ 1343

Ms. WILSON of Florida, Messrs. GARAMENDI and WELCH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 045, “yea” on rollcall No. 046, and “yea” on rollcall No. 047.

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 236, noes 183, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

AYES—236

Abraham	Biggs	Brooks (IN)
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Allen	Bishop (MI)	Buck
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Bucshon
Arrington	Black	Budd
Babin	Blackburn	Burgess
Bacon	Blum	Byrne
Banks (IN)	Bost	Calvert
Barletta	Brady (TX)	Carter (GA)
Barr	Brat	Carter (TX)
Barton	Bridenstine	Chabot
Bergman	Brooks (AL)	Cheney

## NOES—183

Adams	Cleaver	Foster
Aguilar	Clyburn	Frankel (FL)
Amash	Cohen	Fudge
Barragán	Connolly	Gabbard
Bass	Cooper	Gallego
Beatty	Correa	Garamendi
Bera	Costa	Gomez
Beyer	Crowley	Gonzalez (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Green, Al
Blunt Rochester	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Bonamici	Davis, Danny	Grijalva
Boyle, Brendan	DeFazio	Gutiérrez
F.	DeGette	Hanabusa
Brady (PA)	Delaney	Hastings
Brown (MD)	DeLauro	Heck
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Higgins (NY)
Bustos	Demings	Himes
Butterfield	DeSaulnier	Hoyer
Capuano	Deutch	Huffman
Carbajal	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Cartson (IN)	Doggett	Jayapal
Cartwright	Doyle, Michael	Jeffries
Castor (FL)	F.	Johnson (GA)
Castro (TX)	Ellison	Kaptur
Chu, Judy	Engel	Keating
Ciциlline	Eshoo	Kelly (IL)
Clark (MA)	Espallat	Khanna
Clarke (NY)	Esty (CT)	Kihuen
Clay	Evans	Kildee

## NOT VOTING—11

Blumenauer	Johnson, E. B.	Pearce
Cárdenas	Kennedy	Tenney
Courtney	Luetkemeyer	Welch
Cummings	McClintock	

## □ 1352

Mr. MARCHANT changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

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:

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 48.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 47 and “yea” on rollcall No. 48.

## PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 1098

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1098, a bill originally introduced by Representative TIBERI of Ohio, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

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

There was no objection.

## CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2017

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. GRANGER. 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 (Mr. MITCHELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?