

Brooks (AL)	Hagedorn	Palmer
Buchanan	Harris	Pence
Buck	Hartzler	Perry
Budd	Hern, Kevin	Posey
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Reschenthaler
Byrne	Hice (GA)	Rice (SC)
Calvert	Higgins (LA)	Riggleman
Carter (GA)	Hill (AR)	Roby
Carter (TX)	Holding	Rodgers (WA)
Chabot	Hollingsworth	Roe, David P.
Cheney	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Cline	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Cloud	Hunter	Rooney (FL)
Cole	Johnson (SD)	Rose, John W.
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Rouzer
Collins (NY)	Joyce (OH)	Roy
Comer	Joyce (PA)	Rutherford
Conaway	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Crawford	King (IA)	Scott, Austin
Crenshaw	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Curtis	Kinzinger	Shimkus
Davidson (OH)	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Duncan	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Dunn	Lesko	Spano
Emmer	Long	Stauber
Estes	Loudermilk	Steil
Ferguson	Lucas	Stewart
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Flores	Marchant	Taylor
Fortenberry	Marshall	Thompson (PA)
Fox (NC)	Massie	Thornberry
Fulcher	Mast	Timmons
Gaetz	McCarthy	Tipton
Gallagher	McCaul	Upton
Gianforte	McClintock	Wagner
Gibbs	McHenry	Walberg
Gohmert	McKinley	Walorski
Gonzalez (OH)	Meadows	Waltz
Gooden	Meuser	Watkins
Gosar	Miller	Webster (FL)
Granger	Mitchell	Wenstrup
Graves (GA)	Moolenaar	Williams
Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)	Wittman
Graves (MO)	Mullin	Womack
Green (TN)	Newhouse	Woodall
Griffith	Norman	Wright
Grothman	Nunes	Yoho
Guest	Olson	Zeldin
Guthrie	Palazzo	

NOT VOTING—23

Brady	LaHood	Swalwell (CA)
Bucshon	Moulton	Turner
Burchett	Peterson	Walker
Clyburn	Ratcliffe	Weber (TX)
Dingell	Rose (NY)	Westerman
Duffy	Ryan	Wilson (SC)
Johnson (LA)	Smucker	Young
Johnson (OH)	Steube	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

□ 1212

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to my only daughter, Amie Westerman, having her wedding rehearsal dinner on Friday, May 17, 2019, I will not be present for the vote on H.R. 5, The Equality Act. Had I been present for the vote, I would have recorded a Nay vote.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROSE of New York. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in my family, I had to miss votes on Thursday, May 16 and Friday, May 17.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "nay" on rollcall No. 210, McKinley Amendment No. 2 to H.R. 987; "yea" on rollcall No.

211 Harder Amendment No. 6 to H.R. 987; "yea" on rollcall No. 212 Wexton Amendment No. 21 to H.R. 987; "nay" on rollcall No. 213 Motion to Recommit for H.R. 987; "yea" on rollcall No. 214 Final Passage for H.R. 987; "nay" on rollcall No. 216 Motion to Recommit for H.R. 5; and "yea" on rollcall No. 217 Final Passage for H.R. 5.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on May 17, 2019, in order to deliver the Commencement Address at the Concordia Seminary in Saint Louis, Missouri. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 215, "yea" on rollcall No. 216, and "nay" on rollcall No. 217.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during this morning's vote on final passage of H.R. 5 due to travel for an unavoidable medical appointment back in Ohio. Had I been present for this vote on H.R. 5, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 215, "yea" on rollcall No. 216, and "nay" on rollcall No. 217.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from any further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important legislation that will protect equality of life for the unborn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MAY 17, 2019, TO MONDAY, MAY 20, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for next week, and I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

The House will also consider H.R. 1500, the Consumer First Act. This legislation seeks to reverse the administration's efforts to dismantle the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 1994, the Setting Every Community Up for Retirement Enhancement Act of 2019. The legislation is intended to increase the flexibility of 401(k) plans and improve access to the accounts, particularly for small businesses and employees. The bill includes a host of provisions aimed at encouraging small businesses to provide private retirement benefits to their workers.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask about the conversations and negotiations that are going on regarding the disaster supplemental. I know the gentleman is well aware that there are some good, I think, very fruitful, negotiations going on. Clearly, we want to make sure about some of the things that weren't in the bill that went out of the House, especially as it relates to the crisis at the border, as it deals with unaccompanied children, as well as making sure that we get the right kind of help to our farmers who had devastation to their crops in these disasters.

I ask the gentleman if he can give an indication of a timeline.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his question.

As the gentleman knows, we passed an initial bill some many weeks ago. The Senate didn't pass that. We then passed, more recently, a bill which did, in fact, take care of everyone we know who has had a natural disaster in the interim as well as those we had taken care of the first time around.

So, we think we have a good bill that was passed; however, as the gentleman also referenced, the President has asked for an additional supplemental of a little over \$4 billion referenced for humanitarian issues at the border. That is being reviewed.

As the gentleman probably also knows, an offer was made to our side.

That offer has now been responded to with respect to both the initial and the supplemental—initial, I mean the disaster bill—and we are looking for an answer back at some point in time to our response. But, hopefully, we can reach an agreement.

Mr. SCALISE. Hopefully, those conversations do continue on.

I am encouraged by the negotiations in terms of how both sides seem to be willing to get this resolved and, hopefully, quickly, ideally, if we could have a bill on the floor next week that would be a very bipartisan bill to address this so that we can get the relief.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Clearly, if we get an agreement—and that, of course, is the big if, but, hopefully, we can. If we can do that, then we will want to move as quickly as possible.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I do want to ask about the appropriations process because I know the gentleman from Maryland had talked earlier this week about a desire to have the entire appropriations process completed by the end of June. He also talked about a robust amendment process.

I would just ask the gentleman, as we look at this week, the concerning trend that we have been talking about a few weeks now, when amendments came out of the Rules Committee this week, 26 amendments came out that were offered by Democrats, and only 1 amendment was allowed by a Republican.

As the gentleman from Maryland talks about a robust appropriations process, I would hope he would pay closer attention to fairness in that robustness, because 26 Democrat amendments allowed and only 1 Republican amendment allowed is surely not a fair process. It might be considered robust, but in a hyperpartisan sense.

So I hope as we get into the appropriations process the gentleman, and especially the leadership from the Rules Committee, would take into account that this is a process where the House should be able to come together and offer their ideas and let the will of the House prevail, but at least allow for that debate here on the House floor on as many amendments as possible in as fair a way as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment. We have had this discussion on a number of occasions.

I am convinced that Mr. MCGOVERN, the chairman of the Rules Committee, does, in fact, want to have the kind of process that we talked about and that the gentleman just referenced. He also knows that, in the last Congress, we had the most closed rules of any Congress in which I have served, and perhaps in history, 103 closed rules.

But having said that, I am hopeful that the gentleman's side will come forth with amendments that are, as the

gentleman says, subject to rational debate and are not gotcha amendments. I am not alleging they are gotcha amendments, but that is obviously a concern that the gentleman had when he was in charge and that we have when we are in charge.

But I know that Mr. MCGOVERN wants to have a fair process, and we are talking about that, so we will continue to do that.

Mr. SCALISE. I appreciate that, and, again, we will be watching and, hopefully, see that they become more fair as we get into that appropriations process.

Finally, I would like to ask the gentleman about legislation that has been filed that is a companion to a Senate bill that passed the Senate with a vote of 77 votes to stand up against the BDS movement.

As we both know, and I know the gentleman has been supportive of these efforts, the concern is that Israel continues to come under attack by many countries around the world trying to delegitimize their economy and delegitimize their status as a Jewish state by this movement to undermine their economy, to boycott and divest from Israel.

So we have legislation. The companion bill is H.R. 336 by Mr. MCCAUL from Texas. It doesn't have the concerns. There were some concerns over the way that the Senate bill came over, but at least we do know, because of the vote, with 77 votes, it was a very bipartisan vote.

There is strong concern by the Senate to address this and strong concern by many Members of the House, Republican and Democrat, to stand up to the BDS movement, and not just in words.

Clearly, there are resolutions out there. We can all give speeches and say that we are against it, but it actually takes real action and real effort, things that are in the legislation that give teeth to our stand against BDS and for Israel.

Of course, if you look at some of the examples in the legislation, not just words, but \$33 billion in military assistance to Israel, security cooperation enhancements, things that ensure that Israel maintains a qualitative edge to defend itself from the daily threats that, unfortunately, we see from other countries and terrorist organizations that want to undermine their status as a Jewish state.

With that, could the gentleman give us an indication, would there be a timeline that we can establish to bring this bill to the floor short of the discharge petition?

There is a discharge petition with more than 180 signatures already on it to bring this bill to the floor, but it would be a lot better if it were truly bipartisan from both leadership sides saying that we are willing to stand up against this movement, not just in words, but in deeds.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. First of all, I would say words are important. That is why we all debate, because we think words are important.

But having said that, I share the gentleman's view, as he well knows, with reference to the BDS movement, which I think is contrary to the interests of our ally, Israel, and contrary to our own interests.

Having said that, as I indicated to the gentleman last week, I have been discussing this with Mr. ENGEL, and he, as you know, shares the view which I have expressed and my friend has expressed, and his committee is going to be addressing that, I expect, in the near term. When they do, we will decide what actions to take at that point in time, and I look forward to discussing it with the gentleman.

Mr. SCALISE. We will continue to discuss it. I appreciate that.

Clearly, as we have an interest in not just expressing our words, like on many other important issues, we have to back that up with laws, legislation that gives teeth to the words and gives true support to our friends, especially Israel, in such a time of need where this movement is growing. And we want to move as quickly as possible, so we will continue to have this conversation and, hopefully, get a formal timeline as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. My friend mentioned there are essentially four components of the bill to which he referred, three of which are noncontroversial, as the gentleman knows, and one of which has issues with respect to its constitutionality. Without resolving that issue, the three that are in that bill, I think, enjoy bipartisan support. They were held up in the Senate, as the gentleman probably knows, but we want to make sure those three certainly are adopted.

Mr. SCALISE. Clearly, the Senate looked at that as well and worked through that. They actually made some changes to the bill which we conformed into this. The discharge petition has a rule that will actually conform it to the Senate to address those issues.

Again, the Senate bill got 77 votes, highly bipartisan, especially on such an important issue. So, hopefully, we will continue those conversations and come to an agreement on a timeline that is expedited.

Mr. Speaker, unless the gentleman has anything else, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1230

MORAL ARC OF THE UNIVERSE BENDS TOWARD JUSTICE

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, if we hold true to the idea that America