

Captain Peterson demonstrated the highest forms of courage, judgment, and unwavering devotion to duty that day. I congratulate him on this much-deserved honor. I also offer my humble appreciation to Captain Peterson for serving on my Academy Nomination Board.

Your heroic service is an inspiration to these future military leaders.

HONORING LINDA CHRISTLE

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Linda Christle, who is retiring as executive director of Economic Development Sedalia-Pettis County.

She has faithfully served the community of Sedalia for the past 12 years. Throughout her tenure as executive director, Linda has achieved many accomplishments, including the creation of three enhanced enterprise zones, resulting in over 50 companies benefiting and growing their businesses in her community. Additionally, this past year, the community was able to complete its third strategic plan in 15 years. As a result, multiple task forces were established to enhance the community, which also led to the eventual creation of the entrepreneurial program called 1 Million Cups.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to congratulate and to thank Linda Christle for her years of distinguished service in Sedalia and Pettis County. I am blessed to represent her in Congress, and I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

MEDIACRATS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we need a new word for the dictionary, a new term for the merger of the liberal media and the Democratic Party.

Obviously, the liberal media have no intention of treating President-elect Trump objectively or fairly. They want to continue to link arms with the Democrats. This is no surprise, given that 96 percent of national reporters' contributions went to Hillary Clinton.

As chairman of the Media Fairness Caucus, here is my proposal: let's combine the two words—"media" and "Democrat"—and go with "mediacrat." It is short; it gives the media first mention; and it sounds like a new species. Now, I realize the liberal media is not likely to use this word "mediacrat" very often, but there are two reasons for them to do so—first, to show they have a sense of humor, and, second, to show they have a sense of humility.

I think most Americans would be happy if the liberal media didn't display their bias every time they covered

the President-elect. Maybe the mediacrats should try balanced reporting. It surely would help their credibility.

FEDERAL IMMIGRATION LAW MUST BE ENFORCED

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a disturbing trend has developed of leading universities in their promoting lawlessness by refusing to comply with Federal immigration law; so, today, I am introducing the Federal Immigration Law Compliance Act of 2016, with co-sponsors from California to New York to Florida.

This act requires any entity that receives Federal funds, including institutions of higher learning, to comply with all lawful requests made by Federal immigration enforcement authorities. Should the entity refuse to comply with Federal immigration enforcement requests, all Federal funding can be withheld. For instance, the University of Pennsylvania, which charges \$51,000 tuition, despite its having an endowment of \$10.7 billion, would stand to lose \$700 million in Federal grants if they were to choose to continue their policy of not complying with Federal immigration law.

Congress has the responsibility to protect the rule of law in our country and to provide for the safety of our citizens. The American people have spoken loudly in this past election that they want Federal immigration law enforced. Shame on those universities that take Federal money and then promote lawlessness.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5143, TRANSPARENT INSURANCE STANDARDS ACT OF 2016; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM DECEMBER 9, 2016, THROUGH JANUARY 3, 2017; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 944 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 944

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5143) to provide greater transparency and congressional oversight of international insurance standards setting processes, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-68 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) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day of the second session of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress after December 8, 2016—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 5. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

SEC. 6. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of December 8, 2016, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 944 provides for consideration of H.R. 5143, the Transparent Insurance Standards Act of 2016. The resolution provides for a structured rule. This legislation is an important effort to protect the U.S. model of insurance supervision, provide for improved oversight,

and keep the U.S. insurance industry strong and competitive.

For over 150 years, individual States have successfully regulated insurance and coordinated their activities. This model has worked and ensured that the focus remains on the consumer.

Well, when Congress passed the Dodd-Frank Act back in 2010, the Federal Government assumed a new role in the regulation of the insurance industry. This change included the creation of the Federal Insurance Office, otherwise known as FIO, and charged FIO with representing the interests of U.S. insurers—not consumers, insurers—during the negotiation of any international agreements.

The change also allowed for both the FIO Director and the Federal Reserve to participate in an international organization known as the International Association of Insurance Supervisors. Previously, insurance regulators from the individual States participated in the international discussions. Remember, the State insurance regulators are there to protect consumers.

The International Association of Insurance Supervisors is responsible for developing regulatory guidelines and best practices for insurance supervisors around the world to adopt. Europe and the United States have very different regulatory models for insurance.

Recently, the European Union has developed a regulatory protocol known as Solvency II. Solvency II is significantly different from the successful State-based insurance regulatory system that has been successful in the U.S. for the last 150 years. The fear is that the International Association of Insurance Supervisors will adopt Solvency II as the gold standard, which would put U.S. insurers and consumers at a severe disadvantage.

More alarming, the Treasury Department and the U.S. Trade Representative are already engaged in negotiations with the European Union regarding a “covered agreement” over insurance regulations. If based on the Solvency II model, this could severely hurt the U.S. insurance industry and consumers.

That is where our legislation comes in. The Transparent Insurance Standards Act simply enhances Congress’ oversight of international deliberations relating to insurance standards. The bill sets reasonable requirements that must be met before the United States can agree to accept, establish, or enter into the adoption of any international insurance standard. The same requirements would be followed throughout any negotiations over a covered agreement with the European Union.

To be clear, this bill would not stop the international process. It simply will ensure that the United States is leading on the issues instead of being led by foreign governments.

This bill also requires that the Federal Insurance Office and the Federal Reserve report and testify before Con-

gress at least twice a year about ongoing negotiations.

I appreciate Mr. LUTKEMEYER and Chairman HENSARLING for their leadership on this very important issue, and I hope we can come together to pass this very important legislation.

I just don’t understand why anyone would be opposed to greater congressional oversight over such an important issue. Adoption of these standards or entering into an agreement with the European Union could fundamentally alter the U.S. insurance industry and, yes, hurt consumers. It only makes sense for the democratically elected Congress to play a role in the process.

This legislation is simply about improving oversight and protecting the State-based model of insurance regulation that has held up so well in our country over the last 150 years and has enjoyed wide, bipartisan support. Most importantly, this bill is about ensuring the concerns of the American people come first, not the worries of some foreign government or group.

I urge my colleagues to protect insurance consumers across America by supporting House Resolution 944 and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding to me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

I rise to debate the rule for consideration of H.R. 5143, the Transparent Insurance Standards Act of 2016. At best, this bill is unnecessary. At worst, it will harm our ability to reach vital international agreements to protect our financial system.

Mr. Speaker, the 2008 financial crisis and the subsequent Great Recession was the worst financial disaster in our Nation’s history since the Great Depression. Nearly 9 million Americans lost their jobs, doubling the unemployment rate. More than 11 million Americans lost their homes to foreclosures. Home values dropped more than 30 percent. Our Nation lost more than \$13 trillion in economic output. To put that in perspective, that is the equivalent of losing a year’s gross domestic product.

From this disaster, we learned many lessons and passed the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to ensure that we are better able to prevent such a financial calamity from occurring again.

One lesson we learned was the significant risk posed to our financial system by potentially unstable, large, globally active insurance companies, as demonstrated by the near collapse of AIG. As a result, commonsense reforms to the insurance industry were put in place, including the creation of the Federal Insurance Office to coordinate Federal efforts, develop policy, and represent the United States in the International Association of Insurance Supervisors.

This office, along with new authorities for the Federal Reserve and the

Department of the Treasury, allow our regulators to work to ensure that our unique insurance regulatory regime provides stability in our financial system, both nationally and globally. Now, however, the majority seems to have forgotten the lessons of the 2008 financial crisis.

Mr. Speaker, at best, this legislation is unnecessary. Under the guise of transparency, H.R. 5143 would require additional public notice and comment regarding potential agreements on international insurance standards. But such international agreements would only take effect domestically after regulations were promulgated in accordance with U.S. law, which already includes a notice and comment period. The transparency this bill is seeking is already enshrined in our rulemaking process.

Then, at worst, this bill will harm U.S. negotiators by tying their hands and making setting workable insurance standards nearly impossible to achieve. Mr. Speaker, by requiring our negotiators to seek consensus positions with all 50 State insurance commissioners, this bill weakens the United States’ ability to work with other countries to improve the regulation of large global insurance companies. By placing unnecessary, counterproductive, and overly cumbersome reporting and negotiating requirements on the Federal Reserve and Treasury, we will not be able to achieve the global insurance stability we need to prevent future financial disasters.

As we approach the end of the 114th Congress, I am dismayed to see that consideration of this bill is how the majority has decided we should spend what few precious legislative days remain. I guess my dismay carries over from last night’s so-called impeachment consideration of the IRS Commissioner, who will be gone from office by the time they could get through this process. I was pleased to see the chairman of the Judiciary Committee refer it to his committee, where I am sure it will die.

It just seems that we get to this important juncture and we find ourselves caught up in bumper sticker politics, as we have for most of the session of the 114th Congress. It appears that, in the final hours of this Congress, the majority is attempting to throw up roadblocks to prevent commonsense financial regulations aimed at preventing large insurance companies from once again threatening the stability of our economy.

The American people—all of them, Republican and Democrat—deserve better. Assuredly, we can anticipate that if this measure were to become law—and I predict it won’t—but if it were to become law, then I can see us, at some point, faced with another serious financial crisis.

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

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

I have listened to my colleague from Florida's remarks, and I certainly understand the concern that we all have with the aftermath of the Great Recession of 2008. But there are many of us who believe that the Dodd-Frank law, which contains the provision that we are trying to affect here, really did things that went way outside of what we should have been doing to try to prevent another recession from happening again.

How does ceding control over the U.S. insurance market to foreign governments and groups help our economy or help prevent a future recession? How does a bill like the underlying bill, that protects consumers and provides congressional oversight, hurt our economy? How does that not help our economy, help the consumers?

□ 1245

This bill is necessary because the United States faces losing control over our insurance that is so very important to everybody in the United States of America.

My colleague talked about State insurance departments. One thing we have seen these last several years is a steady effort to take power away from State governments, which is, frankly, contrary to the intent of our Constitution.

Our State governments do very important things, like they are the primary providers for public education. But they are also the primary regulators for insurance, and they have done a good job of that. We have 150 years of experience with that. We have bipartisan support for that. Why would we be taking power away from them? Why isn't continuing to allow them to have that power and utilize it as each State sees fit, why isn't that a good thing?

Finally, my colleague talked about how, at the end of this Congress, we are doing bumper sticker things. Well, I believe that passing, with a huge bipartisan vote, the National Defense Authorization Act last week was a good thing. If that is a bumper sticker, I want that bumper sticker.

We passed, last week, the 21st Century Cures Act that I really believe is going to save lives. If that is a bumper sticker, I want that bumper sticker.

And I predict on the floor tomorrow we are going to take a WRDA bill for everybody in the United States that is going to enhance the well-being of people all over this country. That is another bumper sticker I will be happy to have on my car.

So I appreciate my colleague's remarks. He knows the tremendous respect that I have for him, but I respectfully disagree with the premise for his arguments.

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

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

My colleague from Alabama and I do have mutual respect for each other,

and I agree with him the three measures that he cited, and I can cite others during the course of the 114th that were substantive legislation that rightly we should have bipartisan support for and did, and I agree with him that the WRDA bill will be one that we could equally wear proudly on our bumper stickers.

The point that I was making was that we spent a good portion of the 114th Congress, number one, doing nothing. We didn't even make any bumper stickers because we weren't here that often to undertake to do anything. At the very same time, many of the things that we did fell in the category, at least as I perceive it, of being bumper sticker measures: 60-plus times repealing the Affordable Care Act, knowing full well that the sitting President was not going to sign anything, so all we did it for was for certain people to have talking points. Now, we are entitled; that is a part of what politics is. But make no mistake about it: we did a lot of bumper sticker legislation in the last session because a lot of it went nowhere, and a lot of it was done during a period that we should have been about the business of substantive legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up a bill that would close a tax loophole that rewards companies for moving jobs overseas and would, instead, provide a tax credit for companies that move jobs back to the United States.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the bill's sponsor and my good friend, to discuss our proposal.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

In the waning days of the 114th Congress, here we are debating a bill once again to roll back Wall Street reforms. This is what it comes down to.

How tone deaf can we be? Here is a news flash: the whole country is focused on defending blue-collar jobs, bolstering our industrial manufacturing base. Folks are zoned in on that, focused on that issue. So we need to stop outsourcing now.

This Congress should start by defeating the previous question and bringing up the Bring Jobs Home Act. Around 5 million United States manufacturing jobs have been lost since 1994, good-paying jobs. Their loss has led to a somewhat demise of the middle class in America. Just ask folks in places like Ohio and Pennsylvania, who have seen steel mills and rubber factories shipped

overseas. My hometown of Paterson, New Jersey, was formerly the hub of the textile manufacturing industry, which no longer exists.

So why are we subsidizing it? Why are we subsidizing American companies to move to other shores? That is what we are doing. Right now, when companies move overseas, they can take a tax deduction for the cost of the move. That is a huge tax break. How do we defend it and why do we defend it?

So the bill that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) referred to eliminates this tax deduction and gives a tax credit of up to 20 percent of the cost of moving businesses, bringing businesses back to the United States of America through U.S. companies. That seems to me to make more sense. Why are we paying folks to leave when we could be paying them to get back into this country? I don't know how you disagree with that.

The companies would have to add jobs to claim the tax credit. That is the caveat. I think it works. I ask you to consider it. Let's stop subsidizing companies that ship jobs overseas and start bringing jobs back to our shores. Let's stop talking about it. Let's do something about it. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't get much simpler than that.

This is not a new idea at all. President Obama and the Democrats in Congress have raised this bill for years, and the Republican Congress has blocked the bill at every turn. Senator STABENOW of Michigan leads this bill in the Senate, where it cleared a procedural vote 93-7 in 2014.

I challenge you today to take up and pass the bill, to stand up for American manufacturing and the workers here at home who need help. Don't be all talk. Step up to the plate. Take a stand where it counts.

I urge a "no" vote on the previous question so we can bring up the Bring Jobs Home Act and start bringing jobs back to the United States of America, the greatest country in the world.

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

This bill, the underlying bill, has nothing to do with Wall Street and everything to do with consumers, so I respectfully disagree with my colleague from New Jersey. I know that it would be good for them to try to characterize this bill as something having to do with Wall Street, but it really has to do with you and me and the average people in this country.

I listened to his remarks about his proposal regarding doing things to try to keep American companies from going abroad and doing everything we can to attract other companies abroad, whether they are U.S. based or not, to come back here. That sounds a whole lot like what President-elect Trump is saying, and I think it is pretty clear that that is going to be a big priority for him when we come back in January.

Now, we had been talking about tax reform here in this House, and there is

a proposal moving forward that is comprehensive that will not only provide the appropriate incentives for American companies to stay here, but also provide incentives for companies that are in other countries to come here and provide jobs for the American people, which is really what this is all about.

Our tax reform proposal would actually lower tax rates for everybody in America, and we should be about that as well. Instead, our friends on the other side of the aisle, every time we talk about tax reform, they want to stick some tax increases in there.

The American people don't want a tax increase. They are tired of tax increases. They are tired of the over-extension of the Federal Government, and they are tired of ceding control over things in America to international governments and groups. What the underlying bill does is it keeps control over our domestic insurance market here in America and doesn't give that control, doesn't give any of that authority to people in other countries.

I listened with interest to the remarks that were just made. I am looking forward to President-elect Trump being President Trump so that we can have a comprehensive approach to keeping American businesses here and attracting more businesses here for more jobs. I believe that is exactly what we are going to see during this very exciting year to come.

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

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

As my friend from Alabama knows, we are currently debating the rule. This is a tool used to set the House's agenda and to prioritize consideration of legislation. For that very reason, this is, in fact, the appropriate time for us to explain to the American people what legislation we would like to prioritize and what agenda we would like to pursue in this House. That is why we have a previous question.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will also be pleased to learn that our amendment does not prevent the House from considering the majority's bill. Our amendment simply allows the House to consider our bill as well. As Mr. PASCRELL pointed out, it is not as if this isn't something that hasn't been brought up for the last 2 years; and therefore, I join the gentleman in his excitement about the possibilities going forward of us being able to address this legislation, but now is the time that we can do it if we were to vote the previous question as requested.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me reiterate that the bill before us is unnecessary; it is a waste of valuable time; and if it were ever to be enacted into law, which I predict it won't, it would be harmful to our country's fiscal well-being. Let me go back and put a caveat there. It won't become the law in the 114th session. It may very well pass the 115th session.

We need to protect and wisely continue to implement commonsense regulations and oversight passed in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis to ensure it doesn't happen again. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying measure.

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

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

In closing, I want to go back to some remarks I made at the very beginning. No one wants to see a repeat of the Great Recession. It harmed everybody in this country. But in response to it, by passing the Dodd-Frank law, which this provision is going to try to affect, we essentially took a liberal grab bag of ideas that have been hanging around for years and just threw it into a bill and then tried to pretend that somehow that was going to have something to do with preventing a future recession.

□ 1300

Virtually everything that is in the Dodd-Frank law has nothing to do with preventing a future recession, and the particular provision that we are talking about with the underlying bill has nothing to do with preventing a future recession. What it does do is take the bill we have right now—not the underlying bill but the law we have right now—and take authority away from the American people.

We have sat back the last several years and watched this administration go through negotiation and agreement after agreement that were bad for the American people. My colleague and I have agreed over and over again that the Iran deal was a bad deal for the American people. So why would we continue to cede control to foreign governments and groups?

I think the election that we just had was, in part, about taking control of our country back—taking it back from Federal overreach and taking it back from ceding authority to people in other countries.

This bill, the underlying bill that this rule deals with, gets that authority back for the American people and gets the control back to the States, where it has been successful for 150 years. That is what is good for the American people, and that is why we have chosen to bring this bill forward.

Mr. Speaker, I, again, urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 944 and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 944 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

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

SEC 7. 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. 2963) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign

outsourcing. 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 Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2963.

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 lime will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he

then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 7, 2016.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on December 7, 2016, at 12:24 p.m.:

Appointments:
United States-China Economic Security Review Commission
Virgin Islands of the United States Centennial Commission
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

INDIAN EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING AND RELATED SERVICES CON- SOLIDATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 329) to amend the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 to facilitate the ability of Indian tribes to integrate the employment, training, and related services from diverse Federal sources, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 329

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Consolidation Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF SHORT TITLE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3401 note; 106 Stat. 2302) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

“This Act may be cited as the ‘Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Act of 1992.’”

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in law to the ‘Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992’ shall be deemed to be a reference to the ‘Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Act of 1992’.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

Section 2 of the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3401), as amended by section 2 of this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking “The purposes of this Act are to demonstrate how Indian tribal governments can” and inserting “The purpose of this Act is to facilitate the ability of Indian tribes and tribal organizations to”;

(2) by inserting “from diverse Federal sources” after “they provide”;

(3) by striking “and serve tribally-determined” and inserting “, and serve tribally determined”; and

(4) by inserting “, while reducing administrative, reporting, and accounting costs” after “policy of self-determination”.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

Section 3 of the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3402), as amended by section 2 of this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) INDIAN TRIBE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The terms ‘Indian tribe’ and ‘tribe’ have the meaning given the term ‘Indian tribe’ in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).”

“(B) INCLUSION.—The term ‘Indian tribe’ includes tribal organizations (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)).”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) PROGRAM.—The term ‘program’ means a program described in section 5(a).”

SEC. 5. INTEGRATION OF SERVICES AUTHORIZED.

Section 4 of the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Act of 1992 (25

U.S.C. 3403), as amended by section 2 of this Act, is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 4. INTEGRATION OF SERVICES AUTHORIZED.

“The Secretary shall, after approving a plan submitted by an Indian tribe in accordance with section 8, authorize the Indian tribe to, in accordance with the plan—

“(1) integrate the programs and Federal funds received by the Indian tribe in accordance with waiver authority granted under section 7(d); and

“(2) coordinate the employment, training, and related services provided with those funds in a consolidated and comprehensive tribal plan.”

SEC. 6. PROGRAMS AFFECTED AND TRANSFER OF FUNDS.

Section 5 of the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3404), as amended by section 2 of this Act, is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 5. PROGRAMS AFFECTED.

“(a) PROGRAMS AFFECTED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The programs that may be integrated pursuant to a plan approved under section 8 shall be only programs—

“(A) implemented for the purpose of—

“(i) job training;

“(ii) welfare to work and tribal work experience;

“(iii) creating or enhancing employment opportunities;

“(iv) skill development;

“(v) assisting Indian youth and adults to succeed in the workforce;

“(vi) encouraging self-sufficiency;

“(vii) familiarizing individual participants with the world of work;

“(viii) facilitating the creation of job opportunities;

“(ix) economic development; or

“(x) any services related to the activities described in clauses (i) through (x); and

“(B) under which an Indian tribe or members of an Indian tribe—

“(i) are eligible to receive funds—

“(I) under a statutory or administrative formula making funds available to an Indian tribe; or

“(II) due to their status as Indians under Federal law; or

“(ii) have secured funds as a result of a competitive process, a noncompetitive process, or a specific designation.

“(2) TREATMENT OF BLOCK GRANT FUNDS.—For purposes of this section, programs funded by block grant funds provided to an Indian tribe, regardless of whether the block grant is for the benefit of the Indian tribe because of the status of the Indian tribe or the status of the beneficiaries the grant serves, shall be eligible to be integrated into the plan.

“(b) PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary shall, in cooperation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Transportation, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, after the Secretary approves a plan submitted by an Indian tribe or tribal organization under section 8, authorize the Indian tribe or tribal organization, as applicable, to coordinate, in accordance with the plan, federally funded employment, training, and related services programs and funding in a manner that integrates the programs and funding into a consolidated and comprehensive program.”

SEC. 7. PLAN REQUIREMENTS.

Section 6 of the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Act of 1992 (25