

Although not yet even a United States citizen, he then served in the U.S. Army in World War II as a member of the 803rd tank destroyer battalion as a heavy machine gunner. He was the last surviving member of his company.

He earned five Bronze Battle Stars fighting some of the most consequential battles of the war, including the Normandy invasion and the Battle of the Bulge.

Michael insisted his proudest war-time experience was not one of those major engagements but, rather, the liberation of a small town in Czechoslovakia near the end of the war. Jewish prisoners were being held in the town of Volary, where they awaited transfer to a Nazi concentration camp. Fortunately, Michael and his company got there first, and they liberated them. To the people of Volary, these men were heroes.

When the 803rd was leaving town a few days later, they were ambushed by German soldiers. Indeed, the last soldier killed in Europe, Private Charles Havlat, was riding a tank directly in front of the one Michael was in. The Germans unconditionally surrendered just a few hours later.

To this day, the town holds an annual celebration to pay tribute to the American soldiers who risked their lives to free them.

I am told that Michael's one wish was to be honored for his wartime service in Europe. That is a wish that we are fulfilling right here today on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, he was a hero for a country that he wasn't even yet a citizen of. In October of 1946, he earned U.S. citizenship for his service to his new country, his new home.

Before he died, he asked to see his Certificate of Naturalization, which brought a proud smile to his face. Michael is as American as any of us.

God bless him and his family.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 6157, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1071, RECOGNIZING THAT ALLOWING ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS THE RIGHT TO VOTE DIMINISHES THE VOTING POWER OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1077 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1077

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other pur-

poses. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate; and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 1071) recognizing that allowing illegal immigrants the right to vote devalues the franchise and diminishes the voting power of United States citizens. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of September 27, 2018, or September 28, 2018, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BACON). 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 gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), 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 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 the conference report to H.R. 6157, the Department of Defense and Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act, 2019, and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019, and for an additional resolution, H. Res. 1071. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriations package in front of us represents the second of what will likely be several appropriations packages to fully fund the government for fiscal year 2019.

This represents the first time in more than 10 years that Congress will send more than one final appropriations bill to the President for signature before the beginning of the fiscal year. In years past, we have relied strongly on omnibus spending bills to fund the government; but now, with the hard work done on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses of Congress, we are returning to regular order and com-

pleting spending work through the normal legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, as I have so often said on this floor, the primary obligation of the Congress is to fund the American Government and keep it open and operating. The American people deserve no less. With this package under consideration today, Congress will do just that with respect to 2 of the 12 main spending bills: the Department of Defense and the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies.

In addition, the bill also includes a continuing resolution extending funding for other parts of the government not covered by this bill or the appropriations bill signed by the President last week.

In passing this bill, we will provide crucial funding for services across broad areas of the government and fulfill our promises to the American people: to patients, to communities, to business owners, to the military, and to Americans of all stripes.

The House is already familiar with this bill from when it was passed in June, and this conference version, agreed to with the Senate, has not substantially changed with respect to Defense. However, it now reflects the combined priorities of the Members of both sides of the aisle and in both the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, in the Defense title of the bill, the conference report appropriates a total of \$674.4 billion for the Department of Defense, including \$606.5 billion in base funding, an increase of \$17 billion above fiscal year 2018, and \$67.9 billion in overseas contingency operations and global war on terrorism funding. This increase in funding will help begin to right the wrongs committed against our military readiness by several years of chronic underfunding.

This bill provides an authorized 2.6 percent pay increase for our troops, the largest pay raise in 9 years, and it ensures we will be able to increase our Active-Duty number of military personnel by more than 16,000 soldiers.

The bill provides \$148 billion for equipment procurement, including 13 new warships, a number that includes two new Virginia-class submarines and three new littoral combat ships. It also adds 93 new F-35 aircraft, new transport aircraft, new tankers, and over 100 new helicopters.

The bill also provides \$96.1 billion for research and development of new defense systems and technologies, and \$243.2 billion for training, maintenance, and base operations, funding that is sorely needed to increase our dwindling readiness to confront threats both at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, in the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education title, the conference report appropriates \$178 billion, a \$1 billion increase over fiscal year 2018.

As the conference knows, I am fortunate to chair the Labor, Health and

Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, and I am very pleased with the results of this year's bill. We were able to increase the budget of the National Institutes of Health by \$2 billion to \$39 billion, thus ensuring that we will be able to direct significant new dollars to medical research, tackling vexing health problems like Alzheimer's disease, cancer, and the opioid crisis.

Indeed, across the entire bill, we are putting more than \$6.6 billion into the fight against the opioid crisis. We are putting \$7.9 billion into the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to make sure that we will have the resources available to battle emerging public health emergencies and fight infectious disease. We did all of this while also ensuring that popular programs like Meals on Wheels, which provides meals for our vulnerable senior citizens, can continue to be funded at current levels.

In the other areas of the Labor-HHS title, we have provided \$12.1 billion for the Department of Labor, including \$3.5 billion for job training, \$1.7 billion for Job Corps, and \$300 million to help veterans transition into the workforce.

We provided \$71 billion to the Department of Education. This includes \$12.4 billion for IDEA special education grants to States. We also funded TRIO at \$1.06 million and GEAR UP at \$360 million, both substantial increases.

□ 1230

These programs are near and dear to my heart personally and help first-generation college students succeed.

We increased the maximum Pell grant award to \$6,195, and we provided \$1.9 billion for career, technical, and adult education programs. We included significant funding for our youngest Americans, including \$10.1 billion for Head Start, \$5.3 billion for childcare and development block grants, and \$250 million for early childhood programs.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill also includes a provision acting as a continuing resolution, extending some portions of government funding out to December 7. This extension, while not ideal, gives the Appropriations Committee and both Houses of Congress time to come to an agreement on legislation funding the remaining areas of our government. Such an extension fulfills our primary obligation as legislators, which is to fund the government and keep it open and operating.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a brief look at what we have accomplished and put these bills in context.

Last week, the President signed into law the first package of three bills for fiscal year 2019, covering Energy and Water, Military Construction and Veteran Affairs, and the Legislative Branch titles. These bills covered just over 11 percent of total discretionary spending.

Today's bill, which covers the Defense and Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education titles, will

produce the vast majority of discretionary spending, just short of 65 percent of the total discretionary spending for fiscal year 2019. What is left in the remaining seven titles amounts to just shy of 24 percent of discretionary spending.

We may need to do a short-term continuing resolution for part of the government, but with these bills today, what we will have accomplished is sending over 75 percent of the total discretionary spending to the President for his signature into law before the start of the new fiscal year.

That is an amazing accomplishment, one that has not happened in Congress in over a decade. Indeed, this is the first time in more than 10 years that the Department of Defense will have its full annual funding enacted before the start of the fiscal year. This is the first time in 22 years that the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies will have been funded before the beginning of the fiscal year.

As Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN has said, this is the next step on the return to regular order. Those who would reject this bill because of the presence of a continuing resolution for part of the government are, frankly, throwing the proverbial baby out with the bath water. This bill, Mr. Speaker, is a return to regular order, and we should all be proud of what we have achieved. It also represents a compromise between the two parties in this body and between this body and our counterpart on the other side of the Capitol Rotunda.

Mr. Speaker, today's conference report represents nearly a year of strong work by Congress. I applaud my colleagues for all they have accomplished. This is just the next step, and we will have many things to do before we finish our appropriations work for fiscal year 2019. But for now, I congratulate the House and the Senate for finalizing this package.

I want to take a moment also, since this is the last one of these particular bills that Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN will present, he will have others later, obviously, but he is ending his term, and I want to congratulate our chairman for the outstanding work that he has done, and also that of his strong working partner, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, for her outstanding work.

Frankly, since we are dealing with the Labor-H portion, I want to thank my good working partner and friend, ROSA DELAUNO, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, for her hard work. I also thank our superb staff, particularly our clerk, Ms. Ross, for her work in ably helping us arrive at a monumental achievement. Again, this is the first time in 22 years that the Labor-H bill has gotten done in full and on time.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, if you are having déjà vu right now, it is because we have been here one too many times before. Our government is on the verge of yet another government shutdown this week. After yet another district work period, we return today to this rule to consider the bills it makes in order. We are left with just one last chance to do our work and one final opportunity to send President Trump a funding bill that reflects the true value of bipartisanship, one without poison pill riders which would put so many of our constituents out of work.

This rule makes in order H.R. 6157, the DOD, HHS, and Education omnibus bill; and H. Res. 1071, which is a rebuke on some localities expanding voting opportunities to immigrants.

While some of my colleagues may wish to speak about H. Res. 1071, I will focus on the good work that we are accomplishing today, not a meaningless political game House Republican leadership is choosing to waste our time with to further divide this House and instead of focusing on preventing a shutdown.

H.R. 6157, the second minibus to keep the government open in fiscal year 2019, is an example of how this body can still work together to reach a bipartisan consensus when we take politics out of the picture.

Perhaps more important than what is included in the minibus is what is not included. This minibus rejects the proposed cuts to healthcare programs, job training, education, and access to healthcare that were in President Trump's budget proposal.

This minibus also rejects President Trump's efforts to expand family separation at our Nation's border. While many children remain separated from their parents, at least this minibus agreement does not include House Republican language that would have overridden the Flores settlement and authorized the indefinite detention of immigrant children. This is a very small victory, but an important one. This minibus is a fundamental statement of our values, and the United States Congress should not condone the President's inhumane practice of family separation.

In addition, let me make this clear: nothing in this legislation will pay for one foot of the President's border wall. I hope President Trump joins this Congress and listens to the majority of the American people who don't want to fund this wall. This Congress has repeatedly rejected funding for his misguided wall, and it is about time the President gave up on such a foolish waste of taxpayer dollars while our bridges, freeways, and streets are crumbling beneath us. That does not do anything to keep America safe.

Let's talk about the good things that this bill brings to our constituents. I am happy to report that this legislation provides a 2.6 percent pay raise for servicemembers who continue to serve our Nation around the world. As a

mother of a veteran, I celebrate that even more. It is wonderful to hear that our servicemembers are finally being acknowledged for the hard work that they do keeping our Nation safe at home and abroad.

In addition to paying our servicemembers more, this agreement will protect our men and women in uniform from one of the most common harms they encounter: shamelessly stated as sexual assault. The \$5 million in additional funding we will provide will fully implement and expand the Sexual Assault Special Victims Counsel Program. The Counsel Program provides representation for survivors navigating the complicated military justice process. Hopefully, victims of sexual abuse will not have to wait years to report this crime.

The conference report also provides a \$35 million increase, for a total of \$270 million, to construct, renovate, repair, or expand elementary and secondary public schools on military installations, giving military families an opportunity to thrive and educate their young. In other words, this increase means that we are not only helping our servicemembers, but the families that support them and who provide invaluable moral support for our soldiers.

Another bipartisan achievement included in this legislation is an increase for environmental restoration by more than \$13 million. One of the shortfalls of this Congress has been a failure to address the water crises we have seen ravaging our communities. In California alone, dozens of communities have experienced recent rates of childhood poisoning that surpass those in Flint, Michigan, with one locale showing rates nearly three times higher.

It is unacceptable that in the richest Nation in the world, our children are being poisoned because we refuse to take the necessary actions to provide the infrastructure to deliver clean water to our communities. Securing this funding is a real step to helping invest in communities and the health of our children.

That is why we included yet another investment into our communities' health by increasing funding for the National Institutes of Health by \$2 billion. This rejects the cuts proposed by the President in his administration and instead supports research into cures for life-threatening diseases like Alzheimer's, cancer, HIV/AIDS, influenza, and diabetes.

Additionally, we are providing \$4.4 billion to combat the nationwide opioid crisis. This means more prevention programs, better treatment, and training for the workforce to ensure our healthcare professionals aren't making problems worse.

Finally, the last part of this agreement that I would like to highlight is what we are doing for our workforce programs. This bill invests in students, the future of America, those looking for workforce training and working families.

Included is:

\$10.1 billion for Head Start, which provides literacy programs to young children in working families;

\$5.3 billion for childcare and development block grants to provide childcare assistance to low-income families. We celebrate that mothers will finally have the support that they need to work and deliver for their families;

\$160 million for apprenticeship grants to connect businesses to workers;

\$1.3 billion for career and technical education; and,

An increase to the maximum Pell grant to help our students keep pace with the rising cost of college.

This is a good bill. This is a bipartisan bill. This is a bill that should be signed into law. I urge the President to look at what a bipartisan agreement looks like and take "yes" for an answer. The last thing any of us want is yet another government shutdown. Let's prevent that today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my good friend, my colleague on the Rules Committee, for her kind words and her acknowledgment of how many accomplishments there are that both parties have worked hard to achieve in this particular legislation. That is why I am confident that once the bill comes to the floor, we will have a substantial majority of my friends on the other side of the aisle voting for it and a substantial majority of my friends from my side of the aisle joining them in that. That is a good thing. America should be exceptionally pleased with that.

I also want to thank the President, because he is a participant in this. While this bill does represent a compromise, the reality is, particularly in the defense area, we essentially gave the President most of the things that he asked for and worked for, and we brought this. So I think he can take considerable pride in the achievements of restoring the military, because that was his suggestion, his proposal, and he worked to that end.

□ 1245

There are also particular initiatives in the Labor-H portion of the bill that the President deserves credit for. My friend cited the apprenticeship program, a great program. That was a Presidential-level proposal. A lot of the training programs are.

It was this President who declared opioids as a national healthcare emergency. I am proud Congress, on both sides of the aisle, have responded. As my friend knows, there was a budget agreement last year between the administration, the Senate, and the House that actually put an emphasis on more money at the NIH, more money for opioids.

I am the first to acknowledge there is good work and good praise here to go

all around for everybody. My friends in the House worked very hard. I have always joked with my good friend, the ranking member, that we always start out on different sides, but for four times in a row now, we have come together for the final package and both supported the legislation that authorized Health and Human Services, Labor, Education, and related agencies. Again, that wouldn't be possible without the leadership of the full committee. That wouldn't be possible without friends across the rotunda.

Far be it from me to overpraise the Senate of the United States, but I have to say that they deserve a lot of praise in this instance, because the leadership of Chairman SHELBY and Ranking Member LEAHY on that side was exceptionally important to us in reaching a resolution and working through some of the knotty issues.

Finally, I want to thank the President of the United States. We make Presidents go first in their budget proposals, largely so then we can pick them apart later and do what Congress should do, and that is to make the final decisions in this area. But we took the President's recommendations very, very seriously.

There are many good things in this bill, both in the military side and the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education side, that began with proposals of the administration.

I mentioned opioids. I mentioned apprenticeship programs. I could go on. I could mention charter schools. There are many, many proposals out of the administration that are incorporated in this.

The reality is, I think this is actually what the American people want to see. All three of the legs of this stool—the House, the Senate, and the executive branch—cooperating together, compromise, found different ways. We did that within our ranks, within this body between Republicans and Democrats. We did that across the rotunda with our colleagues in the Senate. And we certainly did it working with the President of the United States.

It takes all three of us to get it done. The reality is, this has already passed the Senate in, I must add, an overwhelmingly bipartisan manner, 93 to 7, if I recall the vote correctly. That makes a strong statement as to how well our friends on both sides of the aisle in the other Chamber work.

I think we will have a very strong vote when we get to final legislation. That, again, is something that the leadership on both sides, and particularly in the Appropriations Committee, can take a great deal of pride in.

When we send it down to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, if the President of the United States doesn't sign it, it doesn't become law. I believe we will get that signature, and I want to acknowledge how hard the President and his team worked with us to arrive at a solution with our friends in both Chambers.

Mr. Speaker, with praise all around, I am going to reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering a continuing resolution that will extend the Violence Against Women Act only until December 7. I am glad that we aren't letting this important legislation expire. However, a simple extension is not enough. We need to fully reauthorize and strengthen this landmark act.

Therefore, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative JACKSON LEE's legislation, H.R. 6545, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONOVAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership, and, certainly, I rise enthusiastically on her motion.

I rise in strong opposition to the rule governing debate for H.R. 6157. We must oppose this rule and defeat the previous question. The reason for such is not because we do not support the troops or our children but because defeating the previous question will enable this House to consider and pass H.R. 6545, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2018.

This is an opportunity that we should not squander. This bill is a bill that we have worked on for 2 years, and a bill that I introduced with over 150 cosponsors, timely, in July 2018, after working for 2 years with all of the Nation's women's advocacy groups, groups that opposed and fought against domestic violence, and all other stakeholders.

I would like to thank them for 2 years of tedious and hard work, ensuring that immigrant women were protected, ensuring that Native American women were protected, ensuring that those who had a domestic abuse warrant could not have a gun without having a lockbox. I want to say to them that we will never give up.

The Violence Against Women Act is a landmark piece of legislation, passed in 1994 following the Anita Hill moment that opened our eyes to the then overwhelming problems faced by victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. It is now even more evident with the Justice Kavanaugh confirmation hearings and the allegations that have been made by Dr. Ford and others that raise a sense

of urgency for the passage of the Violence Against Women Act.

It baffles me that Republicans can leave without passing the updated, reauthorized legislation and not just a mere extension. By passing VAWA, we can stop the revictimizing, retraumatizing, and stigmatizing of sexual assault survivors.

Enough is enough. Science tells us that trauma severely impacts recall, so let us do our jobs and help them. Women deserve to be respected, protected, and never neglected.

As we all know very clearly, VAWA is set to expire this week, and millions of innocent lives are counting on us to get this right and reauthorize VAWA now, reauthorize it with the new provisions to increase funding; increase recognition of stalking, sexual assault, dating violence, and sexual harassment; help women, men, and children everywhere throughout our great country who have and will suffer at the hands of perpetrators who commit these violent and abusive crimes.

The bill generically adds the word "people," because we know that abuse is across the lines of men, women, and children. Clearly, these victims deserve more than a mere 3-month expedient extension or piecemeal product to combat these challenges of monumental proportions.

What will we say to them? The current climate of the #MeToo movement is a wake-up call to the Nation. Let's not make this a partisan issue. It should not be—it was not in 1994—because crimes of violence against anyone must be addressed.

I remember standing next to Senator Joe Biden, and I remember standing next to Congressman Henry Hyde, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act, standing next to Republicans and Democrats to do this. Why can we not do it now?

Therefore, when we ignore an extraordinary movement such as the #MeToo movement by not reauthorizing a strengthened and improved VAWA that meets today's challenges, then we have failed the Nation. If we do not defeat this previous question, we are telling all of our constituents and all of those stakeholders and those women's centers, like the Houston Area Women's Center that are waiting for this to be reauthorized and are a place of refuge for women who are fleeing all kinds of violence and who rely heavily on VAWA and all of those who care about protecting women, men, and children's rights against violence that we do not care.

On July 26, 2018, I introduced H.R. 6545, VAWA 2018, which is a compromise version with modest improvements, because I am committed to passing a bipartisan reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. Hopefully, we can do more that is tailored to appeal to Members of Congress across the political spectrum.

My question is, why didn't the Republicans stand up? Where were they?

This is not a bill that is out of line. It is a bill that is updated in response to needs.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. This is the moment for my colleagues to do the right thing, for the right reasons, to help bring H.R. 6545 to the floor for a vote. This has always been a bipartisan effort.

Let us not let the current times and background noise sway us away from our pivotal duties. What is happening on the other side, the other body, does, in fact, emphasize our need to act.

Let us show the American people that we care about victims of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sexual assault, and sexual harassment, which have been added to the VAWA 2018.

H.R. 6545 has received the support of the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, women and men who are both Republicans and Democrats, which is a national collaboration comprising a large and a diverse group of national, Tribal, State, territorial, and local organizations, advocates, and individuals who focus on the development, passage, and implementation of effective public policy to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, the four crimes.

These modest yet vital updates we have made in the existing Violence Against Women Act are based on the needs identified by direct service providers who work daily with the victims and the survivors of the four crimes.

H.R. 6545 makes the following improvements and more.

It makes important investments in prevention, a key priority identified not only by people who work with victims and survivors daily but also by our very own Bipartisan Women's Caucus.

It provides resources to implement evidence-based prevention programs, which will make our communities safer and, ultimately, save taxpayers money. Law enforcement officers are waiting for the resources to help them protect the community.

It also safeguards important protections that ensure all victims and survivors have access to safety and justice, and provides mechanisms to hold predators who prey on Native women accountable.

Moreover, it provides law enforcement with new tools to protect their community.

It offers protections for survivors in Federal, public, subsidized, and assisted housing. It supports victims and survivors who need assistance rebuilding financially. It addresses the needs of underserved communities and improves the healthcare response to the four crimes.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It closes many of the loopholes found in dating violence.

And in response to the overwhelming victims in the #MeToo movement, it adds sexual harassment as part of the applicable crimes of violence.

In short, the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act of 2018 is a bill that should draw wide support but provides across-the-board protection for those who need it. There is no reason for this not to be bipartisan and no reason for it not to be on the floor.

Let's not play politics with people's lives. Let's not shortchange them by slashing funding in half. Let's not kick the can down the road while omitting funding. Let's not dismiss their cries and pleas. Certainly, let's not punish them because #theydidnotreport.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for all of the time, and I thank the gentlewoman from California for all of her leadership.

It is time to vote "no" in order for us to move the previous question and pass the Violence Against Women Act that is now ready to move to the floor.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by agreeing with the objective that my friends are laying out but disagreeing with the means by which they are trying to achieve it.

I couldn't agree more that passing the National Violence Against Women Act, or extending it, is the appropriate thing to do. I worked very hard the last time we did the extension.

I actually helped put together a coalition of Republicans that brought down the Republican bill, because we thought the Senate Democratic bill was superior. It extended for the first time opportunities in Indian country for Tribal governments to hold non-Tribal Members accountable for assault.

So this is a cause that is near and dear to my heart. I don't pretend to sit on the authorization committee, which my good friend from Texas does. I am not exactly sure where they are in the process. But as she did say, this is normally bipartisan.

So I look on this as a routine extension while they continue to work through. I think, if we get the legislation to the floor, I have no doubt it will pass in a very strongly bipartisan way.

I will say, if we adopt the strategy my friends recommend, we will, actually, in some ways, hurt the cause that I know she feels so passionately about.

□ 1300

The Labor-H bill actually funds the battered women shelters and the National Domestic Violence Hotline. Those are two important items in here that are actually funded in the bill. If we bring down the bill, we are going to derail the appropriations process for all Defense, for Labor, Health and Human

Services, Education, and Related Agencies, a lot of these other related programs that are extremely important.

So I have no doubt about the sincerity of my friend's position, but I don't want to, frankly, number one, disrupt funding for very, very important programs that we help, you know, sustain like, again, the National Domestic Violence Hotline and battered women's shelters, and I certainly don't want to defund it for the larger measures here either.

So I think you have to recognize we don't always get everything done on time. I don't think we got VAWA done on time the last time. I know at least it was quite a difficult struggle, but we eventually got there, and we got there with substantial votes from both parties and got it through. I think we will again.

I pledge to work with my friends on the other side of the aisle to achieve that objective. I just don't think, right now, we should derail an \$800 billion bill when this bill will actually extend the current legislation and give us the time to finish whatever the differences are, resolve whatever the differences are, if there are any, within the committee and eventually bring it forward.

Again, I think it is a worthy objective. I look forward to working with my friends to achieve it. I just simply don't want to derail this appropriations bill in the course of doing that.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, we are just two more legislative days away from the third Republican government shutdown of 2018. However, we have done our jobs to prevent that today.

H.R. 6157 is a testament that despite party differences, we can still come together to work out our differences and put the American public's interest first.

I want to be clear that I do not agree with the rule that we are considering, because this rule makes in order a wholly unrelated immigration bill. This rule fails to allow the debate on a number of amendments and marks the 98th closed rule of this Congress, an all-time record. That is why I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking my friend from California. We don't agree on every point here, but we do agree on the underlying legislation. We both, frankly, appreciate the labors of both Democrats and Republicans to come to compromises on an extraordinarily large budget item—65 percent, roughly, of the Federal budget here between Defense, Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education,

and Related Agencies. I share my friend's appreciation and admiration for all that were part of that.

My friend did bring up in her close the concern about two items in a government shutdown. I will remind my friend, it was our friends who tried to shut down the government in the House on the other side of the aisle, and the Democrats in the Senate who actually did shut down the government in 2017. So I always point out both parties have done this. It is never a very good idea. Neither has ever achieved their objectives there, so we are working hard to make sure that doesn't happen. But it wasn't Republicans that shut down the government in 2017. I think it was actually called—well, I won't use the name, but it was actually named after a Democratic Senator. So let's put that aside.

Let's focus. My friend did raise an interesting point on closed rules. And I think, you know, this is something they continue to focus on, and, I think, sometimes lost in this, we ignore the structured rule amendment process that has routinely been used actually by majorities of both sides, to be fair.

If we are going to use that metric for measuring openness, I want to clarify a couple of points for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, 16 of the closed rules cited by the minority were rolling back regulations under the Congressional Review Act, which does not allow for amendments, to ensure that only a majority vote is required in the United States Senate.

Another 12 closed rules were for bills where the minority put out a call for amendments but received no amendments. And if my friends from the other side of the aisle believe that open rules are the only measure of success, it is only fair to clarify for the American people the Democratic majority's record in this regard.

In the 111th Congress, under Speaker PELOSI, the majority had zero open rules. However, as we have already stated in the past, comparing open versus closed rules ignores the structured amendment process. The majority has made it a priority to make in order large numbers of amendments for floor consideration, a majority of those with a Democratic sponsor and/or cosponsor.

In fact, as of September 26, 2018, Republicans in the 115th Congress have provided for consideration of over 1,650 amendments on the House floor: over 750 of those amendments were offered by my friends, the Democrats on the other side of the aisle; over 635 Republican amendments were made in order; and over 280 bipartisan amendments.

So the 114th Congress, the GOP majority has actually allowed over 1,700 amendments to be considered on the House floor, and in the 113th Congress, the Republican majority allowed over 1,500 amendments to be considered on the floor. My friends, the last time they were in the majority, the 111th Congress, offered fewer than 1,000 amendments to be considered.

So there is a case to be made on both sides of these things. I think the majority has tried to move legislation as best they can, but we certainly want the active participation of our friends from the other side, and, quite often, they are very robust in taking advantage of that opportunity. That is a good thing.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to encourage all Members to support the rule. I recognize my friends on the other side probably will not do that, and that is appropriate. The rule debate is normally a partisan divide, and I respect my friend's efforts in that regard.

But I know that many of my friends will support the underlying resolution, and, for that, I express my appreciation, and, frankly, my gratitude for the good hard work that has gone back and forth across partisan aisles. This bill, though, this rule represents the next step toward fulfilling our primary obligation as Members of Congress to fund the government.

For the first time in over 10 years, we will fully fund the Department of Defense before the start of our fiscal year. We will pass a Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies appropriations bill, providing funds for healthcare, schools, medical research, job training, and thousands of other priorities for both parties for the first time in 22 years. And we will enable that the government remains open and operating to provide needed services for our constituents.

So I want to applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their hard work. I want to thank our friends in the United States Senate who have already completed their portion of this. I want to join my friend in urging the President, assuming we pass this legislation, to sign it and sign it before the end of the fiscal year.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. TORRES is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1077 OFFERED BY
MS. TORRES

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

SEC. 4. 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. 6545) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, 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. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6545.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 26, 2018.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 26, 2018, at 11:55 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 3139.

That the Senate passed S. 3389.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4958.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1315

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DONOVAN) at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1077;