

[Roll No. 228]

YEAS—295

Abraham	Gowdy	Murphy (FL)
Aderholt	Graham	Murphy (PA)
Aguilar	Granger	Neugebauer
Allen	Graves (GA)	Newhouse
Amash	Graves (LA)	Noem
Amodi	Graves (MO)	Nolan
Ashford	Green, Gene	Nugent
Babin	Griffith	Nunes
Barletta	Grothman	O'Rourke
Barr	Guinta	Olson
Barton	Guthrie	Palazzo
Benishek	Hanna	Palmer
Bera	Hardy	Paulsen
Bilirakis	Harper	Pearce
Bishop (GA)	Harris	Perry
Bishop (MI)	Hartzler	Peters
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Peterson
Black	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Blackburn	Hensarling	Pittenger
Blum	Hice, Jody B.	Pitts
Bost	Hill	Poe (TX)
Boustany	Holding	Poliquin
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Pompeo
Brat	Huelskamp	Posey
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Price, Tom
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Ratcliffe
Brownley (CA)	Hunter	Reed
Buchanan	Hurd (TX)	Reichert
Buck	Hurt (VA)	Renacci
Bucshon	Issa	Ribble
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Rice (NY)
Bustos	Jenkins (WV)	Rice (SC)
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Calvert	Jolly	Roby
Capps	Jones	Roe (TN)
Carney	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Carter (GA)	Joyce	Rohrabacher
Carter (TX)	Katko	Rokita
Chabot	Kelly (MS)	Rooney (FL)
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Clawson (FL)	Kilmer	Roskam
Coffman	Kind	Ross
Cole	King (IA)	Rothfus
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Rouzer
Collins (NY)	Kinzing (IL)	Royce
Comstock	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz
Conaway	Kline	Ruppersberger
Connolly	Knight	Rush
Cook	Kuster	Russell
Cooper	Labrador	Ryan (OH)
Costa	LaHood	Sanchez, Loretta
Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Sanford
Cramer	Lamborn	Scalise
Crawford	Lance	Schrader
Crenshaw	Larsen (WA)	Schweikert
Cuellar	Latta	Scott, Austin
Culberson	Lipinski	Scott, David
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Sessions
Davis, Rodney	Long	Shimkus
DeFazio	Loudermilk	Shuster
Delaney	Love	Simpson
DelBene	Lucas	Sinema
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Dent	Lujan Grisham	Smith (NE)
DeSantis	(NM)	Smith (NJ)
DesJarlais	Luján, Ben Ray	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Dold	Lummis	Stefanik
Donovan	MacArthur	Stewart
Duckworth	Maloney	Stivers
Duffy	Carolyn	Stutzman
Duncan (SC)	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Ellmers (NC)	Marino	Thornberry
Emmer (MN)	Massie	Tiberi
Eshoo	McCarthy	Tipton
Farenthold	McCaul	Trott
Farr	McClintock	Turner
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Upton
Fleischmann	McKinley	Valadao
Fleming	McMorris	Vela
Flores	Rodgers	Visclosky
Forbes	McNerney	Wagner
Fortenberry	McSally	Walberg
Foxo	Meadows	Walden
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Walker
Frelinghuysen	Meng	Walorski
Gabbard	Messer	Walters, Mimi
Garamendi	Mica	Walz
Garrett	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Gibson	Moolenaar	Wenstrup
Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Goodlatte	Mullin	Whitfield
Gosar	Mulvaney	Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)

Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—129

Adams
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Esty
Fincher

Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lynch
Matsui
McCullum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Norcross
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Roybal-Allard
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

one to tell us the schedule for the week to come.

Pending someone telling me about the schedule for the week to come, let me observe, as someone who has served, Madam Speaker, in this House for a very extended period of time—some 36 years—I was here in the era not too long ago, but long ago—when, if we had done to the Republicans what was done to us, what was done to switch votes so that discrimination could prevail, there would be outrage expressed long into the night from our Republican colleagues who would accuse us of undermining democracy, undermining this House, and making the House less than it should be.

217 people stood up and said: We ought not discriminate. And then, very frankly, Mr. Speaker, the leadership on the Republican side started its activity. And I have been the majority leader, I have been the whip. I understand that process. And they reached out to people and said: No, let us be able to discriminate. Let contractors be able to discriminate.

Mr. Speaker, seven people who had voted not to allow discrimination decided perhaps that principle was not as important as they thought just a minute or so before. I have a list of those names here—a lamentable list of people who did the right thing, who stood up for nondiscrimination, and then were opportuned to change their vote. And the RECORD reflects, Mr. Speaker, sadly, that they changed their vote.

I won't characterize those votes, because that would not be in order on this floor. And they will have themselves to look at tonight in the mirror and explain to themselves whether their first vote was a principled vote, or whether they had a Damascus Road experience in the few minutes that transpired between their voting not to allow discrimination, until they later—just a few minutes later—at the opportuning of some of their leaders, voted to allow discrimination. A sad day, Mr. Speaker, in the history of the House.

□ 1215

I still see no leader, unless Mr. DENT, who I have great respect for, wants to tell us what the schedule is for next week. I would be glad to yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the majority leader is not here. The majority leader has a very happy day today, and I congratulate him. His son is graduating from Georgetown, and he obviously needs to be there.

I was hoping someone else could tell us the schedule.

At this point in time, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), my friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to politely offer a viewpoint. I believe that we do not view that the issue was discrimination. We have the viewpoint that, earlier in the week, we

NOT VOTING—9

Fattah
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa

Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Quigley

Salmon
Swalwell (CA)
Takai

□ 1209

Ms. PINGREE and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

Madam Speaker, I thought I saw the whip. I am prepared to yield to some-

brought forth a bill that passed 40–2 in the Committee on Armed Services, and that bill was brought forth to the Rules Committee, and we held hours and hours and hours and hours of hearing that Republicans and Democrats were not only welcome to attend, but did attend. The debate that we had on the issue was very full and was brought forth not only at the Rules Committee, but also on this floor. A decision therein was made. There was an opportunity for our Members to vote, and that is exactly what they did.

And I am sure the gentleman would want every single Member to vote and have time to think about that vote until the time that the vote closed, and that is exactly what happened.

So a characterization that this was discrimination would not be, in my opinion, fair or correct, from our perspective.

And I appreciate the gentleman allowing me a chance to amplify that every Member of this body is entitled to their vote, and every Member of this body, without questioning, in my opinion, that vote, should be afforded that opportunity.

So I stand on behalf of Republicans to say that we followed processes; we are following procedures; and we are following the opportunity for a Member of Congress to vote as they choose, and try not to impugn or to test that with applying the word “discrimination,” which I feel is not accurate under our intent.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. And the gentleman will observe, I have neither mentioned the names, nor did I impugn their integrity or their motivation.

What I said and what I will repeat is, initially they voted for an amendment that said there shall not be discrimination by contractors who get government money. That is what the amendment said. And they voted against discrimination, and for that amendment.

But in a short period of time, they changed that vote, resulting in, not becoming law yet, but this House saying to the administration: You cannot require contractors not to discriminate. That was the effect of it. And characterizing the effect of a vote is what our debate is about, what our country's values are about, what our country's future is about, and the respect we have for every citizen in this country, endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. And we ought not preclude those through discrimination.

That I can characterize without impugning motives. But the effect of the vote, we had 217 people for non-discrimination right up until the last moment. And by the way, the last moment was far beyond what Speaker RYAN has said ought to be the end of votes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. If I could just finish my sentence, I will certainly do that.

I talked to the Parliamentarians. Interestingly, the presiding officer did not ask: Does any Member want to change his vote? Because once that, as I understand it, is intoned, then the ability to change one's vote, except to come forward and be seen in changing your vote, was not stated, which I suggest to the chairman of the Rules Committee, who knows the rules very well, is unusual—perhaps not against the rules—but unusual.

And the vote was an extended vote. The Speaker, Speaker RYAN, has talked to us from the rostrum, saying that we want to keep votes to a limited period of time. Particularly, I would suggest, we all want to keep votes to a limited period of time when it is a so-called getaway day.

But in this instance, that did not occur. In this instance, to change from 217 to a lesser number that was a losing number—215–214, I believe, was the final vote—excuse me, 212–213, 212 “ayes.” So five votes were switched, net. However, one person voted late. Again, seven people changed their vote.

You are correct. They had a right to do that, but the consequences of that vote are subject to debate. And I raise for you, for this House, and for the American people, that the changing of those seven votes resulted in this House saying to the President of the United States: You cannot tell contractors that they cannot discriminate.

That, I think, was unfortunate.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. SESSIONS. Thank you very much.

First of all, let me state this: I am a Republican. We do not discriminate. We attempt to follow the law, and the gentleman knows that.

We make laws, and those laws can be subject to interpretations of what is and what is not, but we follow the law, and the gentleman knows that. And we follow the law, and my party follows the law.

Secondly, the decision had previously been made the night before. We were not trying to do that today. It was, once again, allowed under the rules because the gentleman accurately—whether it is appropriate or not, that is up to him—brought forth, under an open rule, a limiting amendment.

But we had decided this the night before. And when people recognized what had happened, that this was a vote that had happened the night before, off of a committee vote out of the Committee on Armed Services that was 40–2, there were people who then recognized what they were doing.

It is not unusual to have people vote and then change their vote. I have done that also. But the rules were followed despite, perhaps, different procedural ways in which a person is in the Chair.

So I will tell you, I respect the gentleman, and you know me well.

Mr. HOYER. I do.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would not stand up here if I were for fear of one second of not being able to understand you and you understand me. I understand you.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SESSIONS. And I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

But let me make an observation. I wish the gentleman would stay in the well because he might want to respond.

I did not accuse the Republican Party of discriminating. I will not, at this point in time, hazard an opinion on that fact.

However, I want to recall to the gentleman that, in the Armed Services Committee, after due consideration, the Armed Services Committee voted not to discriminate, not to discriminate against women, not to say to women: Yes, you can serve, but you don't have to sign up for the draft.

Many of us felt that if you are going to ask young men to sign up for the draft, young women ought to be treated equally. We felt not to do so was discrimination.

That amendment passed in the committee and came to the Rules Committee—my understanding is—without a vote, without discussion. The rule that was issued from the Rules Committee said that, upon adoption of that rule, the adopted amendment in the Armed Services Committee, without a singular vote on this floor of the House, would be defeated.

That, I say to the gentleman, was neither regular order, nor was it giving us an ability to make a decision on that issue. And I believe, I personally believe, that it results in continuing discrimination against young men and young women, one of which has to sign up, the other whom does not; but they both have to serve, or can serve voluntarily in the Armed Forces of the United States.

So we may have a difference of opinion on whether or not that was, in fact, discrimination. But I will tell the gentleman that I was not happy, and I am still not happy that we did not have a vote on the floor about what we perceive to be discrimination.

And I regret that the Rules Committee chose to hide in its rule the repeal of what the Armed Services Committee adopted.

If the gentleman wants to respond, I will yield to him.

Mr. SESSIONS. I will concur that I, in fact, did offer in the bill a self-executed portion. Not trying to take advantage of the gentleman, it had nothing to do with the draft. So I will agree that I did take a piece.

And to save this body, because a number of people who did vote for it in committee—which became a voice vote—did wish to change their opinion. But it had nothing to do with the draft, sir.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, it seems what the gentleman is saying is that people vote not to discriminate, and then some time a little later on, they have an epiphany that perhaps discrimination is okay. Perhaps that is what the gentleman said.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would ask an indulgence. It had nothing to do with discrimination. It had to do with a new policy.

And it is true that I did rule and put a self-executing rule in that did answer the question about the desire of the committee to handle this issue, and I did it accordingly. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that no one is going to be able to tell me what the schedule is for the week to come. I will tell you that that is unfortunate.

I hope there is a schedule for the week to come because there is a lot to be done. We haven't finalized Zika. We passed a bill here which we think was inadequate.

We haven't dealt with Flint.

We need to pass Puerto Rico restructuring. I think they have made some progress on that. I congratulate the Speaker and the leader for facilitating that progress.

We don't have a voting rights bill scheduled. We need to do that.

There are a number of other serious pieces of legislation this House needs to consider. We are going to go out next week, and we will have no colloquy next week, Mr. Speaker. There will be no opportunity to discuss the schedule for, obviously, the break, and we will have no schedule for June or the weeks thereafter to do some of the serious business that confronts us and to help some of the people in this country who need help.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that nobody on the other side is going to have any response.

I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2814. An act to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Sevierville, Tennessee, the Dannie A. Carr Veterans Outpatient Clinic.

□ 1230

COMMENDING COMMUNITIES BATTILING THE OPIOID AND HEROIN EPIDEMIC

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend several communities in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District that are taking a stand in the battle against our Nation's opioid abuse and heroin epidemic.

Last evening I chaired a hearing here on Capitol Hill on this epidemic, and just this morning I learned of two townhall meetings, one held last night in Titusville in Crawford County and

the other held Tuesday evening in Ridgway in Elk County.

These communities, like countless others across Pennsylvania and our Nation, have witnessed firsthand the tragic impact of this epidemic. Elk County is ranked ninth in Pennsylvania in overdose deaths per population of 100,000 people, while Crawford County has seen its overdose deaths double in the past 4 years.

I am proud to see these communities come together to see what can be done to help turn the tide against the scourge of prescription drug abuse and heroin use.

I am also proud of the package passed last week—18 bills—here in the House which will make grant funding available to State and local governments for the creation of opioid reduction programs, create a task force to review prescribing practices, and care for babies who are born opioid dependent.

In the future, I look forward to further partnerships with Federal, State, and local officials, along with these communities, in winning this battle.

VA MEDICAL MARIJUANA

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, today the House did do one good thing, and that was to take a major step forward with the historic passage of an amendment that removes the barriers for our Veterans Administration health professionals to discuss alternative treatments—specifically, medical marijuana—with their patients in States like Nevada, where it is legal.

This comes on the heels of action last week addressing the opioid epidemic that is plaguing our Nation, and it is especially heartbreaking in our veteran community where these drugs are being overprescribed for pain treatment and PTSD.

The amendment passed today, which I was pleased to offer and to support, will provide additional tools for our medical professionals in the treatment of our veterans so they won't have to resort to opioids.

I am proud that this amendment did have bipartisan support; but moving forward, we must continue to reform our outdated policies and laws and bring Congress into step with the State legislatures in over half of the States in the country that have moved forward on this issue.

RECOGNIZING GREG PARKER

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Greg Parker, founder and president of Parker's Market and gas stations in coastal Georgia and South Carolina.

Mr. Parker found his way to an immensely successful business through

hard work and dedication. Mr. Parker's father ran a gas station in Midway, Georgia, allowing Mr. Parker to learn the business through pumping gas and cleaning customers' windshields.

After graduation from the University of Georgia, Mr. Parker began to work relentlessly in his father's gas station. He managed a convenience store, cooked food for customers, and also pumped gas and cleaned windshields.

Now Parker's has 45 stores up and down the coast of Georgia and South Carolina, with a total of 600 employees. Furthermore, Parker's Market plans to build 17 new stores in the next 13 months. The Savannah Morning News even named him the 2013 Entrepreneur of the Year.

Mr. Parker's service to the First Congressional District of Georgia does not end with his successful business, as he also generously donates each year to local schools and hospitals.

PROVISIONS HARMFUL TO IMMIGRANTS AND AMERICA

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, last night we voted on the National Defense Authorization Act, and today we voted on a military construction and Veterans Affairs bill. Both contain provisions that are harmful to immigrants and America.

I proposed two amendments to the NDAA, and I am disappointed that they were not given a chance to be voted on.

The NDAA bill that passed prohibits the use of unused military grounds to house unaccompanied immigrant children while their asylum case is being processed. My amendment would have allowed the Office of Refugee Resettlement to increase its shelter capacity by temporarily housing unaccompanied children in unused DOD facilities.

I also offered an amendment that would guarantee DACA recipients with in-demand skills to enlist in our military through the MAVNI program for as long as the program exists. To deny brave and dedicated men and women the opportunity to defend this great Nation is just un-American.

SUPPORTING OUR MEN AND WOMEN IN UNIFORM

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend my colleagues for supporting and passing the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

The NDAA reaffirms our commitment to supporting our men and women in uniform by enhancing pay and benefits for our servicemembers and their families, providing not only for the country as a whole, but also for back home in the 12th Congressional District of Georgia.