

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my good friend and colleague, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, in recognition of Career and Technical Education Month. As cochairs of the Congressional CTE Caucus, we are absolutely committed to ensuring that every student has the ability to achieve his or her career goals.

Mr. Speaker, it is long past time to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act. I certainly look forward to working with all my colleagues on this important legislation.

This year the CTE Caucus will also focus on expanding apprenticeships and employer-educator partnerships, as well as helping school counselors to provide students the information necessary to make informed career decisions.

To that end, I encourage all of my colleagues to join us on the Congressional CTE Caucus and also to cosponsor the bipartisan Counseling for Career Choice Act that we will introduce later this month that will ensure that school counselors have all the job training information that they need to understand in order to advise their students about the good-paying jobs that will be available to them in the future.

I want to thank, again, my good friend and colleague, Mr. THOMPSON from Pennsylvania, for being such a strong partner on these issues.

COURT REPORTING AND CAPTIONING WEEK

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the hundreds of court reporters and captioners in the Granite State and around the country as we prepare to celebrate National Court Reporting and Captioning Week next week.

Since the beginning of our Nation's history, beginning with the scribes during the Continental Congress and the drafting of our Declaration of Independence and Constitution, the act of transcribing events and important documents has always been a pillar of our democracy.

In fact, after their high school graduations, my own parents met at court reporting school and later went on to start their own court reporting business. Fifty years later, my mother still is in the business.

Court reporters are ever present right now in this very Chamber, in committee hearings, in capturing the spoken word and debate between Members of Congress, including Michele York, formerly of Candia, New Hampshire.

The court reporting and captioning industry continues to grow, estimating 5,000 new jobs over the next several

years. To the hundreds of court reporters and captioners in New Hampshire and around the country, thank you for all you do. And to the future reporters and captioners, thank you for continuing a legacy so paramount to our democracy and our country.

FUNDING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, there are 16 calendar days and only 6 legislative days until the Department of Homeland Security shuts down on February 28. Let me repeat that. The Department charged with keeping America safe is set to run out of funding in just 2 weeks, all because the Republican majority insists on pandering to anti-immigrant extremists in their party. In fact, when asked if they were going to take up a new DHS funding bill, the Republican response was: Well, why do we have to?

Well, to my brazen colleagues across the aisle who refuse to govern, here is why: because keeping American families safe should be the first responsibility of this Congress. At a time of increased threats around the world, holding the country's national security hostage for the sake of a partisan stunt is the height of irresponsibility. Without funding, DHS would be unable to manage and support the homeland security infrastructure that was built following the 9/11 terrorist attacks to keep our country safe.

Mr. Speaker, this is not leadership. The American people deserve much better than this. We must continue funding the Department of Homeland Security immediately.

HONORING LOLIS EDWARD ELIE

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Lolis Edward Elie, one of the Nation's preeminent civil rights attorneys.

Elie, a native of New Orleans, attended Howard University, Dillard University, and later earned his J.D. from Loyola Law School. Following graduation, Elie started the law firm of Collins, Douglas, and Elie, which became the most noteworthy firm in Louisiana for racial equality.

In 1960, the New Orleans chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality, or CORE, asked Elie and his firm to represent them following a sit-in. Elie and his firm defended CORE chapter president Rudy Lombard and three others who were arrested for staging a sit-in protest at the lunch counter of the McCrory five-and-ten-cent store. They appealed the case to the United States Supreme Court, which, in its decision, declared the city's ban on sit-ins un-

constitutional. Later in his career, Elie was one of seven supporters of the Freedom Riders who met with Attorney General Robert Kennedy in 1961 when Kennedy encouraged them to shift their efforts to registering Black Southerners to vote.

His son, Lolis Eric Elie, is a prominent writer and filmmaker.

Lolis, Sr., still calls New Orleans home and mentors the younger generation through his training program for new Black attorneys. Through Lolis Elie's example, many young Black men and women are able to achieve much more than they ever thought possible, myself included.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 12, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
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 February 12, 2015 at 9:09 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 295.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 644, FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 636, AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2015

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 101 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 101

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-5 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 636) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-6 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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. On Tuesday, the Committee on Rules met and reported a rule for consideration of two important pieces of tax legislation, H.R. 644 and H.R. 636.

The resolution provides a closed rule for consideration of each bill and provides for 90 minutes of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means on each bill. In addition, the rule provides for a motion to recommit on each bill.

Mr. Speaker, most of my colleagues will remember the House's consideration of H.R. 5771, the Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014, in December of last year. At that time, more than 50 individual tax extenders were retroactively extended for the 2014 tax year, giving businesses just 12 days to make complicated investment decisions. That is no way to run a business.

Every time I am at home I hear from Oklahomans who either work for or own small businesses. Without fail, they tell me that certainty is what they need most from Washington. But too often Washington tells Americans who operate and work in small businesses to "trust us." We promise to extend X or Y or Z tax provision indefinitely.

Unfortunately, those Americans can't take that to the bank. They can't

take our word that we will actually be able to deliver on the promises made by Congress. The only thing they can rely on is the law. If our tax laws expire every year, it injects an uncertainty into the business environment that inhibits economic growth.

Even though we were able to retroactively extend those tax provisions at the end of last year, they are already expired again. Instead of continuing this cycle of uncertainty, it is important to put these tax cuts in place early so that we don't end up in a situation like we did last year.

I applaud Chairman RYAN for beginning early with provisions we all agree on.

□ 1245

This rule will provide for consideration of permanent extension of seven different tax provisions, provisions like section 179 expensing and provisions like extending the deduction of IRA distributions to charities. All of us, Republicans and Democrats, have supported these measures in the past, at least on a temporary basis. These are tax provisions that we retroactively extended less than 2 months ago. Why shouldn't we make these popular tax provisions permanent and do it now, not retroactively late in the year?

Mr. Speaker, some have criticized this legislation because it "isn't paid for." I think Chairman RYAN said it best in the Rules Committee on Tuesday. These are provisions of the Tax Code which we routinely extend, year after year. They are effectively part of the existing Tax Code. Permanently reauthorizing them reflects the policy this country has maintained for years, under both Republican and Democratic administrations and Congress. And doing so provides business with the certainty that they desperately seek.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few moments to note that just as we have had to examine and pare back the discretionary side of the budget, we need to examine and pare back the tax side of the budget. There are over 200 tax expenditures—or spending on the "tax side" of the ledger—that, if all are extended, will cost the Federal Government more than \$12 trillion over the next 10 years. Many of these provisions are worthy, but many others should clearly be eliminated. The sheer complexity of the Tax Code and associated regulations should push us towards reforms so that our Tax Code works for us all in the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman RYAN for beginning this process in earnest and look forward to the consideration of additional measures at the appropriate time.

I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and 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, today we are considering two pieces of tax legislation under closed rules. These mark our 10th and 11th closed rules in the first 6 weeks of the 114th Congress. Sadly, this has become the standard operating procedure in the Republican House.

In 2011, when Republicans took the majority, Speaker BOEHNER promised "the right to a robust debate in open process." He promised many open rules. Instead, we have just ended the most closed Congress in history. And if these past 6 weeks are any indication of where we are headed, this leadership seems intent on breaking its own record for denying open debate on the House floor.

I also want to point out that the Department of Homeland Security runs out of money February 28, 16 days from now. Press reports indicate that the Republican leadership is scrambling to gather the votes necessary to pass a bill.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have some advice for my friends in the majority. Instead of yelling, instead of pouting and swearing, bring to the floor a clean Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill, the bipartisan negotiated compromise that has been ready to go since last November. This is a bill that could and should be sent to the President as quickly as possible, especially considering the international and national homeland security situation facing the U.S. and the world at this very, very moment.

So I have to say that I am a little perplexed as to why the majority has chosen this week to bring to the floor a package of tax breaks that are not paid for, that are going nowhere, 5 legislative days before the Department of Homeland Security is going to be forced to shut down because of Republican dithering.

And I say going nowhere because Senate Republicans have said quite clearly that these bills will not likely be considered in committee or by the full Senate. Let me repeat that. These bills are going nowhere because of the Republicans in the Senate. They have made it pretty clear.

So the clock is ticking on funding our Homeland Security programs, Mr. Speaker. Are the Republican leaders planning to let the clock run out, planning to create another crisis?

We should be debating a clean Department of Homeland Security bill right now. We ought to vote in a bipartisan way to pass it, have the Senate do the same thing, send it right to the President, and actually accomplish something.

I am also concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the partisan approach taken by the Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee in advancing these particular tax measures. We went through this same exercise last year

with a similar set of bills, only to pass in the final weeks of the 113th Congress a 1-year comprehensive “tax extenders” package. The Republican leadership in the House is setting the stage for a similar confrontation this year, instead of working in a productive and bipartisan manner on comprehensive tax reform.

That is something that the American people, Democrats and Republicans, all want. They want us to be working on it, and they want us to pass a bipartisan comprehensive tax reform bill.

The seven tax provisions before us today, packaged into two bills, will add more than \$93 billion to the deficit. There was a time when my Republican friends actually cared about the deficit. I guess those days are gone.

While I support the goals of many of the provisions contained in these bills, I cannot vote for legislation that targets only a handful of tax provisions, chooses to elevate them and make them permanent at the expense of other tax priorities, and then refuses to pay for them—absolutely refuses to pay for them.

This Republican package does nothing, absolutely nothing to address key priorities, like the work opportunity tax credit and the new markets tax credit. It fails to address the long-term status of the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit that work to reduce poverty.

If these tax provisions are allowed to expire in 2017, as currently scheduled, many working poor families would lose their child tax credit, and many low-income married couples and larger families would see a cut in their EITC. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that if the EITC and the CTC provisions were to expire, “more than 16 million people in low-income working families, including 8 million children, would fall into—or deeper into—poverty.”

The piecemeal, deficit-spending approach taken by this majority puts these working family tax provisions at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see members of the Republican leadership at D.C. Central Kitchen the other day talking about hunger. D.C. Central Kitchen does incredible work to feed the hungry and help people get back on their feet.

But count me as a little skeptical because time after time after time after time, Republicans have targeted poor people and the programs that help them.

If my friends on the other side of the aisle are serious about ending hunger, they need to do much more than encourage donations to food banks. First and foremost, they should stop targeting SNAP, the Nation’s premier antihunger program. They should stop treating SNAP as an ATM machine for other programs.

Instead, they should work with us to increase the minimum wage or at least give us a vote on increasing the min-

imum wage. They should work with us to expand job training programs and make child care more affordable. They should work with us to fix the major flaw in our social safety net; namely, that when someone gets a job that doesn’t pay very much, they tend to lose all their benefits and end up struggling, once again, to put food on the table, find day care for their kids, keep their house warm, and pay the rent.

We need desperately to have a serious and thoughtful discussion about the long-term sustainability of our safety net programs.

The Fighting Hunger Incentive Act makes permanent the enhanced deduction for contributions of food inventory. I strongly support our food banks and charitable organizations that work each and every day to feed the hungry in this country. I support efforts that provide incentives to donate food to these organizations. But one tax break does not constitute a plan to address hunger. And it certainly does not make up for the cuts to SNAP and other safety net programs that have been proposed and enacted by this Republican majority.

So in closing, again, I would urge my colleagues to pay attention to today’s National Journal Daily, the headline: “So Far, a Congress About Nothing.” That is what this Congress is becoming known as, “a Congress about nothing.”

Well, work with us in a bipartisan way to change this headline, and you could do that by allowing a clean Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill to come before us. We can pass it in a bipartisan way, and we can meet the national security needs of our country and actually do something before we go home on another break.

With that, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My good friend from Massachusetts covered a lot of ground. I am not going to try to deal with every single issue that he raised in my response. But let me point out a couple of facts.

First, my friend is concerned about the deficit, and I appreciate that. But this is a rather new, novel idea for Democrats. When the Republican majority actually took power, the deficit was \$1.4 trillion a year. It is under \$500 billion, which is still way too high. But this majority has taken deficits extremely seriously and has lowered them every year.

Second, my friend is worried about the cost of these tax cuts. That is amazing to me because when they were in the majority, they routinely extended these same tax credits without paying for them year after year after year. So the sudden conversion to paying for tax cuts is new and remarkable and probably worth some consideration.

Third, my friend is worried about this coming to the floor under a closed

rule. Frankly, tax legislation always comes to the floor under a closed rule. It is pretty hard to make calculations otherwise. And that was true with Democrats. It is true with Republicans. In this particular case, I am informed that the minority was offered a chance to submit an alternative proposal in the form of an amendment and chose not to exercise that right. That is certainly their right. But if they wanted an alternative, it could have been made in order. They chose not to do that.

My friend raised the issue of Homeland Security. And on this, frankly, we all are concerned. I think all Americans are worried. I think where we disagree is, this House has acted. It has fully funded and passed, and we are waiting on the Senate to do something.

Now, what is happening in the Senate? My friend alluded to the fact that the Republicans were somehow responsible for this in the Senate. As he well knows, the Republicans on three occasions have tried to bring the bill that we passed in this Chamber to the floor for consideration. The Democratic majority on all three occasions have kept them from reaching the 60 votes that Senate rules require. Why? Because they simply don’t want to vote on anything.

We lived through 4 years of a Democratic majority that never brought appropriations bills to the floor. They have already had more votes under the Republican leadership in the other body in a matter of weeks than they had all of last year. The Democratic majority in the Senate didn’t want a vote. The Democratic minority in the Senate evidently does not want a vote either. And that has frustrated, frankly, both sides and has kept legislation from coming to be. That is just simply the reality of it.

We will wait to see what the Senate does. I would not expect them to pass exactly what we pass over here. If they would simply allow consideration for a bill, something would emerge. We would go to conference. We would hammer out our differences, and we could move on and fund the Department of Homeland Security.

But right now, this is a Senate issue. This is not a House issue. And this is a question as to whether or not Democratic Senators will allow their own body to function. That is in their hands, not in ours.

Frankly, I think that we will, unfortunately, see a lot of this in the course of this session. We will send legislation over. Democrats will try to keep it from being considered. I think they will be offered the opportunity to consider that legislation over and over again. I hope we don’t see this pattern repeated time after time after time.

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

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

Again, I urge my colleagues to read the National Journal Daily today and pay close attention to this headline,

“So Far, a Congress About Nothing.” And that is basically what we are doing here today.

The tax provisions that we are talking about here today, the Republicans over in the Senate are saying that they don't intend to bring any of these before the relevant committees or bring them to the floor. They are trying to work on a more long-term comprehensive tax reform bill, as we should be here. So we can't blame the Democrats for that. It is the Republicans in the Senate who have said they aren't going to take this up.

So then the question arises, why are we doing this? Why aren't we doing something that is more urgent and more pressing, like passing a Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill?

And let's be clear about what the problem is. There is a bipartisan bill that Democrats and Republicans agree on on funding the Department of Homeland Security. What some of the more extreme elements in the House of Representatives on the Republican side have done is they have loaded it up with all kinds of anti-immigration provisions.

□ 1300

They have decided that that is where they want the debate on immigration, so all of a sudden, this bill has been loaded up with extraneous issues that don't belong on this bill. Quite frankly, we think that that is wrong, and Democrats in the Senate think it is wrong. What we are saying is actually bring before both bodies a clean bill.

What is so wrong with that? If you don't like what the President is doing on immigration, bring up a separate bill or sue him again because that seems to be what my Republican friends like to do all the time, but don't hold up a Department of Homeland Security bill for a political battle on an issue, quite frankly, that does not belong on an appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, again, there are only 16 days left until the funding of the Department of Homeland Security expires. It is 16 days, but 5 legislative days only. If it expires, it would shut down many of the crucial operations that keep our country safe.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow for consideration of a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill. With such serious consequences, it is time to put politics aside in order to strengthen our homeland and protect American families.

To discuss our proposal, I will yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this House to immediately take up and pass the bipartisan negotiated clean funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

By defeating the previous question on the pending rule, we can immediately make in order the bipartisan, clean, negotiated Homeland Security bill and stop the theatrics over the President's use of executive orders.

My colleague Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and I made a similar attempt yesterday, which was unfortunately defeated on a party-line vote. It is my sincere hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle have further discussed this issue amongst themselves and that they are now prepared to end this standoff.

Mr. Speaker, as of today, we are 135 days into what should have been the start of the fiscal year. The situation this House has caused is completely unacceptable.

We simply cannot wait 1 day longer—1 more day—to do the right thing, the responsible thing, and fund these critical agencies tasked with protecting this Nation.

As the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, I was involved in bipartisan, bicameral negotiations on the omnibus spending bill that passed the House and the Senate and was signed by the President last December.

That package could have contained all 12 annual spending bills because all 12 were negotiated in conference and every one of them was ready to go. We thank Representative PRICE for his role in negotiating the Homeland Security bill last Congress.

But an unfortunate decision was made by the leadership of this body to omit the Homeland Security bill—not because there were outstanding issues or continued disputes. That bill was stripped from the omnibus because some in this body were upset by the President's executive order on immigration.

They even admitted the President's actions had little to do with the Homeland Security Appropriations bill, yet that was the choice that was made on how to proceed.

The Homeland Security Appropriations bill was forced to operate under a continuing resolution instead of having a full-year bill. Ironically, it meant the Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement—two of the agencies tasked with defending our borders and enforcing our immigration laws—had to do without the nearly \$1 billion increase they would have gotten under the full-year bill.

Delaying the full-year bill limits the Department's ability to advance the Secretary's unity of effort initiative designed to improve coordination in our security missions, limits the ability of the Secretary to move ahead with the Southern Border and Approaches Campaign, creates uncertainty regarding ICE's capacity to detain and deport dangerous criminals, complicates the Department's ability to deal with another influx of unaccompanied children at our border sta-

tions, delays implementation of the new security upgrades at the White House and hiring increases of the U.S. Secret Service, and delays terrorism preparedness and response grants for State and local public safety personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle feel quite strongly about the President's use of executive orders on immigration policy, but I am compelled to remind those colleagues that they have every tool at their disposal to pass legislation changing the President's proposal.

This stunt has gone on too long. It is time to admit these immigration policy decisions have little to nothing to do with the appropriations process. The Homeland Security bill should never have been held hostage in this fight.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I put a statement by Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I thought it was so important for my colleagues to read.

In it, the Secretary laid out the consequences of operating under a continuing resolution and summed up the dangerous situation we face with a sobering message.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. LOWEY. “Border security is not free.”

I couldn't agree more.

Yesterday, as a result of the party-line vote in the House on bringing up a clean bill, many of my majority colleagues insisted it was the Senate's turn to act, but it is clear for all those watching that the Senate cannot pass a Homeland Security bill with the House's extraneous riders attached. Further, the President has made it abundantly clear he would veto the bill if these riders remained.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: What now? Hasn't this gone on long enough? Isn't it time we abandon the failed strategy and pass a clean bill funding the Homeland Security Department?

To that end, I urge this whole House to join me today in defeating the previous question so that my colleague Mr. MCGOVERN can offer an amendment to provide a clean, full-year appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

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

Let me return the focus for a moment at least to the matter at hand, the legislation in front of us.

In response to my good friend from Massachusetts' concerns, remember, the provisions in the tax legislation that we are considering have been routinely enacted for years under both Democratic and Republican Congresses and Democratic and Republican administrations.

They are so automatic that they are essentially part of the existing Tax

Code. Frankly, I predict once we get to the legislation, probably we will have dozens of my friend's colleagues vote in favor of these. That certainly was the case last year when similar provisions were brought to the floor. There will be a lot of Democratic votes for the very bills that are under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my friend. We do need a larger overhaul of the entire tax system. He is totally correct at that. We made some progress in that regard last year. I have no doubt that is exactly Mr. RYAN's intent.

The reason to act on these measures and others like them now that will be part of any final package is to simply give our fellow Americans—businesses, workers, and people that want to make charitable contributions—tax certainty early in the year, so they can go ahead and make their actions knowing that this legislation is in place.

I am not convinced that none of these will be taken up by the other side in the other Chamber. We will see. It is an unpredictable body, but we will see.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment my friend from New York, the gentlewoman who is the ranking member on Appropriations. We have gotten 95 percent or so of government funded in large part due to her efforts in conjunction with our colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and she was a big reason that that got done and got done in a bipartisan manner.

We passed legislation across this floor with the gentlelady's help, quite frankly. So all of us, myself included, owe you a debt in that regard.

I do point out that the legislation on homeland—we have acted on that. Now, my friends have said, Well, perhaps you should sue the President. That is a good suggestion. About 30-odd States are doing that right now.

He is in court because the action he took, in their view, is going to cost them millions and millions of dollars. My personal view is perhaps the House should somehow associate itself with that lawsuit. That is not my decision to make, but I think that is an appropriate thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, this was an action that was extraordinarily provocative by the President. The President has a long history of using immigration as a political issue rather than viewing it as a problem to be solved.

When he ran for office in 2008, he said he would have an immigration bill on the floor within 100 days. We had a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House, and we never saw the bill.

Then we didn't hear much about it for 2 years because he was busy running for his own reelection. Then later, we heard a lot about it. The President said he was going to act before the election. Then he pulled back from doing that because he thought, Well, electorally, this may not be advantageous.

But the minute afterwards when he thought it was to his political advantage, he rolled it out again. So let's be

real here about how serious this effort is, but it will be challenged in court.

In terms of this body, again, it has passed appropriate legislation on funding. It has done exactly as my friend from New York suggests, use some of the tools that are legitimately at its disposal. That bill now rests in the Senate.

If the Democratic minority in the Senate will allow it to be brought up, I would not expect it would come back exactly as this House fashioned it. They simply just need to do their job, send something back, go to conference, and we can act on it. They have had lots of time to do this. This was moved over there weeks ago—or a couple of weeks ago.

The real problem here, Mr. Speaker, is the United States Senate, because of the obstruction of the minority, is simply choosing not to act. As soon as they act, I think we will probably move pretty expeditiously, find some common ground, and address my friend's concerns because I think they are very legitimate concerns and very appropriate in terms of getting the Homeland Security bill done.

It is a good bill. The underlying bill that my friend was part of negotiating was an excellent piece of bipartisan, bicameral compromise. If the Senate would simply take up the bill in front of them, I think we could get to the point we could have an agreement in rather short order.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to hope that the Senate actually does its job.

In the meantime, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to a few of the points that the gentleman has made in his speech on the floor here.

First of all, about the process—these are closed rules that we are dealing with here today. Yes, while it has been traditional to give tax provisions closed rules, there were Members who actually brought amendments to the House Rules Committee to help pay for some of these that I think might have been able to earn bipartisan support because I think there are some Members on your side of the aisle who would like these paid for and do not want to add to the deficit, but they were not made in order in the Rules Committee.

There may be other ideas on how to pay for this so we can truly have a bipartisan vote on this and not add to the deficit, but we will not have that opportunity because of the rule.

Again, Mr. Speaker, these provisions that we are talking about would add \$93 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years. Yes, maybe Republicans and Democrats in the past have extended these without pay-fors, but that doesn't make it right. It just means we both added to the deficit. Maybe we ought to get serious about Pay-As-You-Go.

My friends on the other side of the aisle insist that emergency unemploy-

ment benefits have to be paid for, but when it comes to any kind of tax cut, they don't believe anything has to be paid for, so we should have a more open process on this.

My friend talks about certainty, that all we are trying to do is give people certainty, but that is not the case. It is not the case because the President has said that he would threaten to veto these bills if they weren't paid for. It is what Republican leaders in the Senate have said.

ROY BLUNT, our former colleague in the House, made it very clear. He said:

As long as the Finance Committee in the Senate feels there is an opportunity for overall tax reform, I think you are going to not see a quick response to individual bills coming over here. We may deal with them later on down the aisle, but there is no sense that the Senate is going to act on this any time soon.

When we talk about providing people certainty, that is not what we are doing here. This is about just kind of going through the motions for the sake of going through the motions.

Finally, on the Department of Homeland Security bill, yes, the House acted and attached all these radical anti-immigrant riders to the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill.

MITCH MCCONNELL, the Senate majority leader, told reporters on Tuesday:

I think it is clear we cannot go forward in the Senate, so the next move, obviously, is up to the House.

□ 1315

Today is Thursday. Tomorrow we leave for a break, and it doesn't seem like Republican leaders feel the same sense of urgency that we do over here that we need to get this business completed.

Republicans are obviously refusing to admit the reality of this kind of dangerous anti-immigrant grandstanding. In fact, when reporters asked House Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY whether the House would take up a new DHS funding bill, he said, "Why do we have to?"

Let me respond to the majority leader. The reason why we have to is because our primary job here is to protect the people of the United States of America. By letting this bill lapse, we are failing in our responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question on the rule so it can be amended to make in order House consideration of H.R. 861, the clean, bipartisan Homeland Security Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015.

As we have been reminded by previous speakers, today is February 12, 135 days into fiscal year 2015, and there are only 16 days remaining until the current CR expires. Of these days, the House is scheduled to be in session only 5. If some of my colleagues have a sense of *deja vu* when they hear that, I

can sympathize. I get the same feeling when I wake up each morning and find that Congress is still spinning its wheels on a full-year funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

I know some of my colleagues believe the onus to act now lies with the Senate, as we have heard. I agree, the Senate should act. While it has had multiple failed attempts to bring up the House bill containing the poison pill riders, the Senate Republican leadership has not tried to bring up the clean, bipartisan funding bill.

I feel confident that a majority of the Senate would support the bill without the poison pill riders added to the House on the floor. There is only one way to find out.

The real question is why isn't the House Republican leadership willing to bring the clean Homeland Security bill for a vote? Why wait? Why not take the initiative and make H.R. 861 in order today? We can quickly resolve the funding dilemma facing the Department of Homeland Security, and the House could then work its will on immigration policy and border security by debating the legislation reported to the House by the authorizing committees. That is the way our process was intended to work by our framers.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the clean full-year DHS funding bill was negotiated in good faith on a bicameral, bipartisan basis, and it addresses the most pressing needs of the Department to protect this country from harm. The President would sign that bill today, and we should send it to him.

I urge my colleagues to put the safety of our country first and defeat the previous question to make in order the consideration of H.R. 861, the clean Homeland Security funding bill.

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

Again, let's go back over a couple of points in the process where my friends and I disagree.

Again, tax legislation normally comes here under a closed rule—almost always. Democrats do it; Republicans do it.

The second point: I bet you that these provisions that we are discussing here today will at some point this year, if not in this legislation, almost certainly—as a matter of fact, certainly—be extended and placed. All we are trying to do is move them early so people know for sure it is going to happen and can plan and act accordingly—and, frankly, dozens of my friends who will vote for this, almost certainly, when it is actually considered on the floor. Nothing unusual or extreme here. It is just simply a way to try to give a break and a little advance notice to hardworking men and women that run small businesses all over America.

On the Homeland Security issue, again, this is now in the Senate. This body has acted. The Senate can literally do whatever it chooses to do. We have had several suggestions of what Republican leaders can do or what Democratic leaders can do.

Right now, the Democratic minority has chosen not to allow debate to occur, not to act on the bill. If they simply act on the bill, I suspect it will change. It will not look exactly like what we sent over. All they need to do is actually legislate.

Now, this is the oldest book, evidently, in the minority party on the other body's playbook, because, again, they did it when they were in the majority. They just simply refuse to legislate on things. We don't have a broken House. We certainly have differences of opinion in the House, but at least we act and actually move legislation across the floor and put it in the other Chamber.

All we are asking of Democrats and Republicans alike in the other Chamber is just do your job. Just send us something. We will go to conference with you. We will hammer out a compromise, and we will go on from there.

So this sort of *deja vu* all over again, I agree with that. We saw a Democratic majority in the Senate blocking action on almost any legislation, didn't pass a single appropriations bill last year. We now see a Democratic minority trying to do, in the same body, essentially the same thing.

So, hopefully, that lesson will be learned at some point over there and they will just simply pick up legislation and begin to move it. If they do, I think we can find a lot of common ground on a lot of important issues.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will bring up an amendment that will allow for there to be a clean vote on the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. No controversial anti-immigrant riders, just the bill that a bipartisan group of Members and the Appropriations Committees agreed on in an up or down vote.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the 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, while I have great respect for my friend on the Rules Committee, and I sometimes get frustrated by the Senate as well, the fact of the matter is, at least in the Senate, they are voting on a lot more amendments than we are in the House. We don't have an open process here. We have one of the most closed processes, if not the most closed process, in history. That is where a lot of the frustration comes from.

On these tax provisions, I think there is broad bipartisan support on the policy. I support, I think, mostly all of

them. If we worked in a bipartisan way to make sure they were paid for, I think you would get a unanimous vote here in the House.

But for some reason, this notion of working in a bipartisan way is something that my friends on the other side of the aisle just refuse to do. It is their way or the highway. It is one political message vote after another, after another, after another. I think people are getting sick of it.

I go back to the headline in the National Journal Daily: "So Far, a Congress About Nothing." The reason why it is about nothing is that this Chamber is not working.

There is no bipartisanship here when it comes to legislation; there is no give and take. Routinely, we are being forced to vote up or down on bills that, quite frankly, with a few tweaks and some improvements, would pass. And the bills that we are talking about here I think would pass overwhelmingly if we just open up the process a little bit, a little give-and-take.

Let's also be clear, we are not providing anybody with any certainty about anything. The Senate leaders of the relevant committees that would take up this tax legislation have said clearly they are not going to take it up, not any time soon. So it is not urgent that we be debating and doing these bills here today. What is urgent is the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill.

For the life of me, I don't understand why the Republican leadership can't override the views of a handful of extremists in their party who are insisting on maintaining these anti-immigration riders, holding the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill hostage, and thereby jeopardizing the security of the people of the United States of America.

We have 5 legislative days left to deal with this, and we are leaving tomorrow for a break. Again, we go home and tell our constituents when they ask, "What have you accomplished?" the answer is, "Nothing."

We have done nothing. Yes, we have had debates, we have had votes, but on things that are going nowhere. Not only because the President has threatened vetoes on most of the legislation, but because the House Republicans are saying: The stuff you are sending over to us is too extreme.

What have we done? We voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 57th or the 58th time, another waste of taxpayer money going nowhere. We voted on the Keystone bill twice, closed rules, and voted on a bill to basically deny women essential reproductive rights that was so over the top and so extreme that the Republican leadership had to pull it and substitute it with something else.

So that has been the total amount of work that has been done here. I don't know how my Republican friends go home and brag about, or even talk about, what we have been doing here when it has amounted to nothing.

Let's do something. Let's defeat the previous question. Allow me to bring up an amendment that would allow for a clean vote on a Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. We can come together in a bipartisan way, pass it overwhelmingly in the House, pass it overwhelmingly in the Senate. You will all be invited down to the White House when the President signs it into law. We all can agree on it and show our constituents, Democrats and Republicans alike, that we can work together and we can get something done, that we are not a Congress just about nothing.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let's go back to the beginning of this debate and make sure that folks are very clear about what we are talking about. We are talking about extending tax breaks that have routinely been extended for years—that Democrats have extended, that Republicans have extended—that, frankly, have not been paid for in the past, and that will most certainly be part of any overall package that is enacted.

We are simply saying let's make sure people that have a benefit bestowed in these areas know and can calculate and make business decisions accordingly early in the year instead of scramble at the very end. It simply makes sense, and it is simply fair to the American taxpayer. That is important to remember.

Also, it is important to remember that the underlying legislation is extremely bipartisan. The only part of this process that will be partisan is the normal procedural part, where it is almost a sort of shirts and skins game where Democrats all vote against a Republican rule—we do exactly the same thing when we are in the minority—and our people mostly vote for that rule, and I think probably certainly will today; and then we will actually have a vote on the underlying legislation, and many, many, many Democrats will join almost all Republicans and vote for it.

So we think it is a good piece of legislation, and we also think it is part of an incremental effort. We think Mr. RYAN will bring other bills like this to the floor but also will, in time, make an overall proposal on tax reform. Then we will see if our friends are really serious about engaging in that debate. I am not questioning my friends on this side of the aisle, but I do have some serious questions about how serious the President is about tax reform. But, again, we will see.

Finally, we have had a great deal of discussion about Homeland Security. And, again, just to be clear, this House has acted and fully funded Homeland Security. The Homeland is done. It is funded through the end of this month. We have got legislation that we have agreed on.

The President, in my view, provoked a crisis by acting unilaterally. That view, by the way, is not just a narrow view by a few people. He is in court defending his actions. Over 30 States are involved in a lawsuit against him because of what he did. He knew it was going to be controversial. He waited until after the elections to try and pick a fight and I think probably try to cover up a little bit for how poorly his side did in that particular election, anything to change the topic.

□ 1330

So now we are here.

The House has reacted to that, I think, in an appropriate form and has sent it to the Senate. In the Senate, the Democratic minority has simply refused to allow any debate. They can do that under the Senate rules—and I respect that process—but let's be clear about who is stopping the funding of Homeland Security. It is actually Democratic Senators, who won't allow a measure to even come up for debate.

Now, if that measure came up for debate, what this House passed, I would suspect that it would be changed in some ways. I do not expect the Senate will do exactly what we suggest and think they should do. They very seldom do that. If they will just do that, we will arrive at, I think, a common agreement; we will go to conference; there will be the normal give-and-take in politics; and we will reach an agreement.

My friend is concerned about the openness of the process. Again, I point out that, when we deal with this kind of legislation, it is normally a closed rule, and this has been pretty routine stuff. I commit to my friend on this point: we will actually be much more open in the appropriations process than my friends were when they were in the majority. They almost never brought bills to the floor, and when they did, they actually, for the first time, brought them under closed rules. We will bring our bills to the floor under open rules, and that is normal in the appropriations process. I think, if you actually look at the record of the two majorities side by side, you will find that there were a lot more amendments made available to Members of both sides under a Republican majority than has been the case when my friends were most recently in power.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, again, I want to point out that the legislation in question is routine, and it should be enacted on a bipartisan basis. We have the potential, if the Senate will act, to actually put it on the President's desk. I don't think he would actually veto it if we did, but, again, that would be his call.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 101 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 3. 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. 861) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 861.

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 7 Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 1 o’clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 2 p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 644, FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 636, AMERICA’S SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution

(H. Res. 101) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 636) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

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 the adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 164, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—232

Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	Massie
Allen	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy
Amash	Garrett	McCaul
Amodei	Gibbs	McClintock
Babin	Gohmert	McHenry
Barletta	Goodlatte	McKinley
Barr	Gosar	McMorris
Barton	Gowdy	Rodgers
Benishek	Granger	McSally
Bilirakis	Graves (GA)	Meadows
Bishop (MI)	Graves (LA)	Meehan
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Messer
Black	Griffith	Mica
Blackburn	Grothman	Miller (MI)
Blum	Guinta	Moolenaar
Bost	Guthrie	Mooney (WV)
Boustany	Hanna	Mullin
Brady (TX)	Hardy	Mulvaney
Brat	Harper	Murphy (PA)
Bridenstine	Harris	Neugebauer
Brooks (AL)	Hartzer	Newhouse
Brooks (IN)	Heck (NV)	Noem
Buchanan	Hensarling	Nugent
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Nunes
Bucshon	Hice (GA)	Olson
Burgess	Hill	Palazzo
Byrne	Holding	Palmer
Calvert	Hudson	Perry
Carter (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Pittenger
Carter (TX)	Hultgren	Pitts
Chabot	Hunter	Poe (TX)
Chaffetz	Hurd (TX)	Poliquin
Clawson (FL)	Hurt (VA)	Pompeo
Coffman	Issa	Posey
Cole	Jenkins (KS)	Price (GA)
Collins (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Ratcliffe
Collins (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Comstock	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Conaway	Jolly	Renacci
Cook	Jones	Ribble
Costello (PA)	Jordan	Rice (SC)
Crawford	Joyce	Rigell
Crenshaw	Katko	Roby
Culberson	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Curbelo (FL)	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Rokita
Dent	Kline	Rooney (FL)
DeSantis	Knight	Ros-Lehtinen
DesJarlais	Labrador	Roskam
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Ross
Dold	Lamborn	Rothfus
Duffy	Lance	Rouzer
Duncan (SC)	Latta	Royce
Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Russell
Ellmers	Long	Ryan (WI)
Emmer	Loudermilk	Salmon
Farenthold	Love	Sanford
Fincher	Lucas	Scalise
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Schock
Fleming	Lummis	Schweikert
Flores	MacArthur	Scott, Austin
Forbes	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Fox	Marino	Sessions

Shimkus	Tipton	Whitfield
Shuster	Trott	Williams
Simpson	Turner	Wilson (SC)
Smith (MO)	Upton	Wittman
Smith (NE)	Valadao	Womack
Smith (NJ)	Wagner	Woodall
Smith (TX)	Walberg	Yoder
Stefanik	Walden	Yoho
Stewart	Walker	Young (AK)
Stivers	Weber (TX)	Young (IA)
Stutzman	Webster (FL)	Young (IN)
Thompson (PA)	Wenstrup	Zeldin
Thornberry	Westerman	Zinke
Tiberi	Westmoreland	

NAYS—164

Adams	Gabbard	Murphy (FL)
Aguilar	Gallego	Nadler
Ashford	Graham	Napolitano
Bass	Grayson	Neal
Beatty	Green, Al	Nolan
Becerra	Green, Gene	Norcross
Bera	Grijalva	Pallone
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Payne
Blumenauer	Hastings	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Peterson
Boyle (PA)	Higgins	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pocan
Butterfield	Honda	Polis
Capps	Hoyer	Quigley
Capuano	Huffman	Rangel
Cárdenas	Israel	Rice (NY)
Carney	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Royal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Chu (CA)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Ciçilline	Kelly (IL)	T.
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clay	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kind	Schiff
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Cohen	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Langevin	Scott, David
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lawrence	Sherman
Crowley	Lee	Sires
Cuellar	Levin	Slaughter
Cummings	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lieu (CA)	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Takai
DeFazio	Loeb	Takano
DeGette	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Lowe	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
DelBene	(NM)	Torres
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Tsongas
Deutch	Maloney,	Van Hollen
Dingell	Carolyn	Vargas
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Doyle (PA)	Matsui	Vela
Edwards	McCollum	Velázquez
Ellison	McDermott	Vislousky
Engel	McGovern	Wasserman
Farr	McNerney	Schultz
Fattah	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Meng	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Moulton	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—36

Abraham	Gibson	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Roe (TN)
Brownley (CA)	Huelskamp	Ruiz
Bustos	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Loftgren	Sinema
Courtney	Lujan Grisham	Swalwell (CA)
Cramer	(NM)	Titus
Duckworth	Miller (FL)	Walorski
Eshoo	O’Rourke	Walters, Mimi
Esty	Paulsen	Walz
Fitzpatrick	Pearce	Welch
Fortenberry	Pelosi	
Garamendi	Peters	

□ 1428

Mr. POCAN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. FARENTHOLD changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

Stated for: