

colleagues on the committee and introduced a proposal to reform the SEC rule. Chairman HENSARLING held a full committee markup last month which allowed for full debate and amendment, and now we have the bill on the floor this week. Good process produces good policy. But perhaps equally as important, good process helps instill faith in this institution. When Americans see us take up an issue, hear their concerns, and work together to find a commonsense solution, they will trust us to tackle even bigger problems.

This may not be the largest legislative product that Chairman HENSARLING and the Financial Services Committee produce in this Congress, but, nevertheless, it is an important work that is helping us solve problems faced by American small businesses. This legislation ensures that the employees of America's small businesses can take ownership in their companies and their jobs. It reduces regulatory encroachment on America's job creators and helps our small businesses expand and grow.

I thank Representative HULTGREN for bringing this bill before us. I commend Chairman HENSARLING for working with both sides of the aisle and for following a good process on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and vote "yes" on the bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 240 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

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

SEC. 2. 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. 1869) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, 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 Education and the Workforce. 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1869.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

Mr. BUCK. 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. POLIS. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1304, SELF-INSURANCE PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 241 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 241

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1304) to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from the definition of health insurance coverage certain medical stop-loss insurance obtained by certain plan sponsors of group health plans. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill 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 Education and the Workforce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 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, in 2010, then-President Obama said: "If you like your health insurance plan, you can keep it."

Unfortunately, at least 4.7 million Americans now know that was simply not true. ObamaCare was a takeover of the American healthcare system. The law's mandates have been burdensome, destroying 300,000 small-business jobs and forcing an estimated 10,000 small businesses to close. Premiums are skyrocketing, and choices are dwindling.

House Resolution 241 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1304, the Self-Insurance Protection Act, an important part of the Republican effort to repair the damage ObamaCare has done to insurance markets. More than 150 million Americans—62 percent of workers—receive their health insurance from their employer. In fact, almost all firms with at least 200 or more employees offer health benefits, and just over half of smaller firms with 3 to 199 employees offer health insurance.

Overwhelmingly, Americans and their employers like this system of employer-sponsored health care; and for many years, employer health plans have been successfully regulated by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, or ERISA.

□ 1315

Typically, small and large employers offer healthcare coverage to employees either in self-funded arrangements or purchase fully insured plans from an insurer.

Under self-insurance plans, employers cover the costs of their employees' medical expenses. Employers can either process claims in-house or work with a third-party administrator to oversee and implement the plans.

ERISA regulates both fully insured and self-insured plans, but only self-insured plans are exempt from the patchwork of mandates imposed under State insurance law. Furthermore, employer-sponsored self-insured plans are not subject to the same requirements under ObamaCare, as are fully insured plans.

Thus, self-insurance plans are desirable and successful because they are free from many government restrictions and regulations and allow employers to tailor their plans to meet the unique needs of their employees and to innovate.

For example, these plans do not require employees to purchase government-mandated coverage options that their employees do not want or need. This helps lower costs for working families while ensuring access to high-quality health care.

In hearings before the Education and the Workforce Committee, on which I sit, we heard testimony that today self-insurance is often the only way employers can afford coverage, thanks to the burdens of ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, in Alabama, we like to say: if it ain't broke, don't fix it. Prior to ObamaCare, there were problems in our Nation's healthcare system, but the successful model of employer self-insurance wasn't one of them. Today, self-insurance remains perhaps the best way for employers to provide health care to their workers.

Unfortunately, the prior administration seemed intent on disrupting this successful healthcare model. Rather than leave self-insurance plans alone, they repeatedly explored ways to impose new regulations that would negatively impact self-insurance. Specifi-

cally, the Obama administration wanted to disrupt the model by regulating stop-loss insurance and treating it as if it were health insurance.

Employers who self-insure often purchase stop-loss insurance to cover large medical claims and to protect against the financial risks such claims can pose. Despite decades of Federal regulation on employer health plans under ERISA, stop-loss insurance has never been regulated by the Federal Government. That is because stop-loss insurance is actually a financial risk management tool designed to protect employers from catastrophic claim expenses. Remarkably, in a regulatory grab, the Obama administration tried to reclassify it as "group health insurance."

Mr. Speaker, if the last 7 years have taught us anything, it is that more Federal control over health insurance does not make health care more affordable for the American people. Stop-loss insurance is not health insurance, and it should not be regulated like it is.

The Self-Insurance Protection Act simply updates the law to make clear that Federal bureaucrats cannot redefine stop-loss insurance as group health insurance. This is about reaffirming longstanding policies and ensuring workers continue to have access to a health insurance model that is proven to lower costs and provide flexibility to consumers.

This bill will provide workers and employers alike with the regulatory certainty that they have desperately wanted and needed. They shouldn't have to worry about unelected Federal bureaucrats stepping in and destroying their healthcare system.

To put it simply, this bill is necessary in order to prevent future bureaucratic overreach that would destroy the self-insurance model that has been so successful for so many working families.

I also think this bill is an area where we should have some bipartisan cooperation. It passed out of the Education and the Workforce Committee earlier this year on a voice vote, and I hope it earns bipartisan support here in the full House.

As we continue our efforts to increase choices, lower costs, and provide better healthcare options for working families, let us not forget to shore up and protect the health insurance programs that are actually working and getting the job done.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 241 and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, 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 for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate a rule for a piece of legislation that many on this side of the aisle do not necessarily have a serious issue with.

The attempt here today is to ensure that a thing that is already happening continues to happen.

I suppose that, the next time we meet, we will take up a bill that declares that the Moon is not the Sun. Doing so is a complete waste of time, but that does not seem to necessarily be dispositive when deciding whether we should legislate on an issue these days.

Look, I get it. My friends across the aisle took one on the chin the other week when their Affordable Care Act repeal bill—a bill they spent 17 days working on, even though they had 7 long years to prepare for it—went down in flames in a most public and spectacular fashion, and now they need some time to dust themselves off and become reoriented.

The problem is, while they are doing that, while they are recovering from the miserable failure that was their attempt to strip 24 million Americans of their health care, they are burning valuable time—time that should be used to tackle more pressing issues like addressing the debt ceiling and fixing our crumbling infrastructure.

Let me also take this opportunity to remind my Republican colleagues that, while we spend our time here today debating these filler bills, there are only 7 legislative days, including today, remaining before the government runs out of funding. But are we tackling any of these importance issues or ensuring the government remains open? No.

Instead, we have before us a bill that addresses an issue that is not an issue. On top of that, this legislation was actually supposed to be the third bucket of their three-bucket strategy to end health care for millions of Americans.

We saw how sturdy the first bucket was a couple of weeks ago. In fact, the bucket we are talking about today was actually referred to as the "sucker's bucket" by Senator CRUZ. That is not exactly a glowing endorsement.

Indeed, some, like Senator COTTON, have referred to all this bucket talk as simply a bunch of political spin. Whatever it is, it is certainly a bucket that has a hole in it.

In all of the uncertainty facing my Republican friends, one thing becomes crystal clear: they have no plan whatsoever to help working Americans achieve the American Dream. They are adrift, in general, and most particularly when it comes to health care.

What do they really want? At first, it was repeal, then it was repeal and replace, then it was repeal and delay, followed finally by access to coverage, and would you believe another one: patient-centered.

That is repeal, repeal and replace, repeal and delay, access to coverage, and patient-centered. We still don't have a plan. Then it turned toward a three-bucket strategy that makes little to any sense, let alone to the American people but even to powerful elected leaders in the Republican Party.

At the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, do you know what all this talk was?

Exactly what Senator COTTON said: nothing but political spin.

My fear is that it will all come down to whatever it takes to win in the eyes of the other side of the aisle, regardless of the consequences to the American people.

While we were told there was no plan B, we now hear there is a plan B. Donald John Trump “doesn’t lose,” and doesn’t like to lose. So I guess they are going to pass something, even if it is just this bill that does absolutely nothing, just so our Republican friends can say they did something. I am sure Donald John Trump will tweet about this great victory.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans must end their secretive plan B option and embrace the opportunity to do what is right, which is to pursue a path that strengthens and builds upon the strong foundation that has been set by the Affordable Care Act.

Democrats stand ready to work with my friends in the Republican Party on this task to continue to provide affordable coverage to millions of American citizens.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Florida said that the Moon is not the Sun. Well, stop-loss insurance is not health insurance, but the Obama administration tried to make it so. Because they tried to make it so, we need to put into statutory law what I think we all agree on both sides of the aisle not only is the law but should be the law so that there is no question about it in the future. It is unfortunate we have to do that, but, because of some of the actions of the prior administration, it is necessary.

He talked about the strong foundation of the ACA, ObamaCare. That foundation is crumbling beneath the program. We now have more insurers jumping out of exchanges. My home State of Alabama is down to one carrier on the exchange. Soon enough, we may find that, in Alabama, like some other States, there are no carriers. This isn’t a foundation. It is a foundation made of sand—and the sand is leaking out. Something has to be done.

Today’s bill is a step—not the only step—in that direction. I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree with what we are doing here in substance, and I wish we would just come together and get this bill done so that we can assure that the self-insured smaller employers and larger employers have the protection that they need for the working families that participate in their programs.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Donald John Trump signed into law a measure that eliminates Americans’ internet privacy. With Trump’s signature, internet

service providers will now be able to sell your personal information to the highest bidder.

Mr. Speaker, we stand here ready to fight for the privacy of the American people.

If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation which would reinstate the Federal Communications Commission’s internet privacy rule.

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 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), a member of the Armed Services and Science, Space, and Technology Committees to discuss our proposal.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, if today’s vote on the previous question fails, we will have the opportunity to vote on my bill, H.R. 1868, Restoring American Privacy Act of 2017, which will reverse last night’s disastrous action by President Trump when he signed a partisan congressional resolution allowing internet providers to sell their customers’ personal information without their knowledge or consent.

Before my time in Congress, I started my career as a systems analyst. I have firsthand experience writing code, and I can tell you that the first thing to protect vulnerable and sensitive data is to make sure it is kept private.

S.J. Res. 34, which the House passed last Tuesday, unraveled those vital protections for sensitive information belonging to millions of Americans nationwide.

□ 1330

The resolution negating essential protections for private citizens was signed by President Trump last night. The October 2016 FCC rule was the only rule that required internet service providers to obtain consumers’ permission before selling their private internet browsing history and other sensitive information.

I am simply shocked that my colleagues across the aisle would vote for a measure that violates American privacy by selling your most personal and intimate information, including your email content and your app usage, all without your consent. Not only is this wrong and a blatant violation of policy, but it jeopardizes Americans’ personal data and puts them at risk of hacking.

Repealing the FCC rule with S.J. Res. 34 allows broadband providers to turn over your info to the highest bidder or anyone else they want, including the government, without a warrant, without ever telling you. That is right. I will repeat it. Repealing the FCC rule

with S.J. Res. 34 allows broadband providers to turn over your private information to the highest bidder or anyone else they want, including the government, without a warrant, without ever telling you.

Even worse, S.J. Res. 34 also tells providers they no longer have to use reasonable measures to protect consumers’ personal information. This is absolutely unacceptable. We are living in a time where identity theft and internet hacking has become the new norm. We must provide consumers with these protections. No American wants their most personal information to be up for grabs.

Eliminating this rule prevents the FCC from publishing rules that are substantially the same absent additional legislation, establishing a very dangerous precedent for private citizens. Americans should have the right to decide how their internet providers use their personal information.

What this bill does, Mr. Speaker, is simple. This bill makes clear that the American people’s browser histories are not for sale. The American people’s health information: not for sale. The American people’s financial information: not for sale. And the American people’s location data: not for sale.

It is a simple concept and one I hope my colleagues across the aisle will recognize and support. The American people don’t want the legislation that was signed last night. In overwhelming numbers, they are calling Congress and letting it be known that they want to keep their private information private.

I am proud to stand up for the American people by introducing the Restoring American Privacy Act of 2017, which reverses this misguided resolution and says, once and for all, that ISPs cannot sell customers’ personal information without their knowledge, without their permission. This bill says that your privacy is not for sale, period.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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

It is time for my friends on the other side of the aisle to end their self-proclaimed political spin designed to bewilder and confuse average Americans, making them believe that their Republican representatives are fighting for the future of their health care and the health care of their families, when what they are really doing is fighting for powerful corporate interests.

Now is the time for us to face facts and accept truths.

Fact: House Republicans made an attempt to replace the Affordable Care Act with a bill that caused such an outcry from their own constituents that they were forced to pull it.

Truth: There are serious issues in health care that need to be addressed for the betterment of all Americans, and it is going to take the effort of both parties in both the House and the Senate working together to strengthen our healthcare system.

No more smokescreens, no more political rhetoric, only collaborative discourse using only the well-being of the American people as our compass. It is this approach that will steer us back onto course for the betterment of this and future generations. Unfortunately, this bill does not further that effort.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the rule and underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for his remarks. I completely agree with him. Both parties should be working together to make sure that we provide what we can reasonably for the health care of the people of America, and we should be collaborating, not just in this House across the aisle but in the Senate as well. I think it is a good place to start right here with this bill because we really don't have a substantive disagreement about this bill.

Both sides understand that stop-loss insurance is not health insurance. It is just the Obama administration tried to turn it into that. This bill would stop that and bring the certainty we need back to these self-insured plans that mainly small employers have and make sure that we have in place for working families across America a system that is working for them and maintain that.

I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join with us, will collaborate with us, and that our colleagues in the other House, in the Senate, will do as well and pass this legislation because it truly is bipartisan in substance and, I hope today, in the vote.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 241 and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 241 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

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

SEC. 2. 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. 1868) to provide that providers of broadband Internet access service shall be subject to the privacy rules adopted by the Federal Communications Commission on October 27, 2016. 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 Energy and Commerce. 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 inter-

vening 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1868.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

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

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy impli-

cations. 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 pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the resolution, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 240; and adoption of House Resolution 240, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 188, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

YEAS—232

Abraham	Duffy	Knight
Aderholt	Duncan (SC)	Kustoff (TN)
Allen	Duncan (TN)	Labrador
Amash	Dunn	LaHood
Amodei	Emmer	LaMalfa
Arrington	Farenthold	Lamborn
Babin	Faso	Lance
Bacon	Ferguson	Latta
Banks (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Lewis (MN)
Barletta	Fleischmann	LoBiondo
Barr	Flores	Long
Barton	Fortenberry	Loudermilk
Bergman	Fox	Love
Biggs	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Bilirakis	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Bishop (MI)	Gaetz	MacArthur
Bishop (UT)	Garrett	Marchant
Black	Gibbs	Marino
Blackburn	Gohmert	Marshall
Blum	Goodlatte	Masie
Bost	Gosar	Mast
Brady (TX)	Gowdy	McCarthy
Brat	Granger	McCaul
Brooks (AL)	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Brooks (IN)	Graves (LA)	McHenry
Buchanan	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Buck	Griffith	McMorris
Bucshon	Guthrie	Rodgers
Budd	Harper	McSally
Burgess	Harris	Meadows
Byrne	Hartzler	Meehan
Calvert	Hensarling	Messer
Carter (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Mitchell
Carter (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar
Chabot	Higgins (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Chaffetz	Hill	Mullin
Cheney	Holding	Murphy (PA)
Coffman	Hollingsworth	Newhouse
Cole	Hudson	Noem
Collins (GA)	Huizenga	Nunes
Collins (NY)	Hultgren	Olson
Comer	Hunter	Palazzo
Comstock	Hurd	Palmer
Conaway	Issa	Paulsen
Cook	Jenkins (KS)	Pearce
Costello (PA)	Jenkins (WV)	Perry
Cramer	Johnson (LA)	Pittenger
Crawford	Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Poliquin
Curbelo (FL)	Jones	Posey
Davidson	Jordan	Ratcliffe
Davis, Rodney	Joyce (OH)	Reed
Denham	Katko	Reichert
Dent	Kelly (MS)	Renacci
DeSantis	Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Roby
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
Donovan	Kinzinger	Rogers (KY)

Rohrabacher Shuster
Rokita Simpson
Rooney, Francis Smith (MO)
Rooney, Thomas Smith (NE)
J. Smith (NJ)
Ros-Lehtinen Smith (TX)
Roskam Smucker
Ross Stefanik
Rothfus Stewart
Rouzer Stivers
Royce (CA) Taylor
Russell Tenney
Rutherford Thompson (PA)
Sanford Thornberry
Scalise Tiberi
Schweikert Tipton
Scott, Austin Trott
Sensenbrenner Turner
Sessions Upton
Shimkus Valadao

NOES—184

Adams Gabbard
Aguilar Gallego
Barragan Garamendi
Bass Gonzalez (TX)
Beatty Gottheimer
Bera Green, Al
Beyer Green, Gene
Bishop (GA) Grijalva
Blumenauer Gutierrez
Blunt Rochester Hanabusa
Bonamici Hastings
Boyle, Brendan Heck
F. Higgins (NY)
Brady (PA) Himes
Brown (MD) Hoyer
Brownley (CA) Huffman
Bustos Jackson Lee
Butterfield Jayapal
Capuano Jeffries
Carbajal Johnson (GA)
Cardenas Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN) Kaptur
Cartwright Keating
Castor (FL) Kelly (IL)
Castro (TX) Kennedy
Chu, Judy Khanna
Cicilline Kihuen
Clark (MA) Kildee
Clarke (NY) Kilmer
Clay Kind
Cleave Krishnamoorthi
Clyburn Kuster (NH)
Cohen Langevin
Connolly Larsen (WA)
Conyers Larson (CT)
Cooper Lawrence
Correa Lawson (FL)
Costa Lee
Courtney Levin
Crist Lewis (GA)
Crowley Lieu, Ted
Cuellar Lipinski
Cummings Loebsock
Davis (CA) Lofgren
DeFazio Lowenthal
DeGette Lowey
Delaney Lujan Grisham, M.
DeLauro M.
DelBene Lujan, Ben Ray
Demings Lynch
DeSaulnier Maloney, Carolyn B.
Deutch Maloney, Sean
Dingell Matsui
Doggett McCollum
Doyle, Michael F. McGovern
Ellison McNerney
Engel Meeks
Eshoo Meng
Espallat Moore
Esty Moulton
Evans Nadler
Foster Napolitano
Frankel (FL) Neal
Fudge Nolan

NOES—184

Bridenstine Grothman
Davis, Danny McEachin
Gallagher Murphy (FL)

□ 1403

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Messrs. RUSH, JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms.

Wagner Walberg
Walberg Walden
Walker Walorski
Walters, Mimi Weber (TX)
Webster (FL) Wenstrup
Westerman Westerman
Williams Williams
Wilson (SC) Wittman
Wittman Womack
Woodall Woodall
Yoder Yoder
Yoho Yoho
Young (AK) Young (AK)
Young (IA) Young (IA)
Zeldin Zeldin

NAYS—188

Norcross O'Halleran
O'Rourke O'Rourke
Pallone Pallone
Panetta Panetta
Pascarell Pascarell
Payne Payne
Pelosi Perlmutter
Peters Perlmutter
Peterson Peterson
Pingree Pingree
Pocan Pocan
Polis Polis
Price (NC) Price (NC)
Quigley Quigley
Raskin Raskin
Rice (NY) Rice (NY)
Richmond Richmond
Rosen Rosen
Roybal-Allard Roybal-Allard
Ruiz Ruiz
Ruppersberger Ruppersberger
Rush Rush
Ryan (OH) Ryan (OH)
Sanchez Sanchez
Sarbanes Sarbanes
Schakowsky Schakowsky
Schiff Schiff
Schneider Schneider
Schradler Schradler
Scott (VA) Scott (VA)
Scott, David Scott, David
Serrano Serrano
Sewell (AL) Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter Shea-Porter
Sherman Sherman
Sinema Sinema
Sires Sires
Smith (WA) Smith (WA)
Soto Soto
Speier Speier
Suozi Suozi
Swalwell (CA) Swalwell (CA)
Takano Takano
Thompson (CA) Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS) Thompson (MS)
Titus Titus
Tonko Tonko
Torres Torres
Tsongas Tsongas
Vargas Vargas
Veasey Veasey
Vela Vela
Velazquez Velazquez
Walz Walz
Wasserman Wasserman
Schultz Schultz
Waters, Maxine Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman Watson Coleman
Welch Welch
Wilson (FL) Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth Yarmuth

NOES—188

Rogers (AL) Rogers (AL)
Slaughter Slaughter
Visclosky Visclosky

CLARKE of New York changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ISSA changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 184, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

AYES—234

Abraham Fleischmann
Aderholt Flores
Allen Portenberry
Amash Foss
Amodei Franks (AZ)
Arrington Frelinghuysen
Babin Gaetz
Bacon Garrett
Banks (IN) Gibbs
Barletta Gohmert
Barr Goodlatte
Barton Gosar
Bergman Gottheimer
Biggs Gowdy
Bilirakis Granger
Bishop (MI) Graves (GA)
Bishop (UT) Graves (LA)
Black Graves (MO)
Blackburn Griffith
Blum Guthrie
Bost Harper
Brady (TX) Harris
Brat Hartzler
Brooks (AL) Hensarling
Brooks (IN) Herrera Beutler
Buchanan Hice, Jody B.
Buck Higgins (LA)
Bucshon Hill
Budd Holding
Burgess Hollingsworth
Byrne Hudson
Calvert Huizenga
Carter (GA) Hultgren
Carter (TX) Hunter
Chabot Hurd
Chaffetz Issa
Cheney Jenkins (KS)
Coffman Jenkins (WV)
Cole Johnson (LA)
Collins (GA) Johnson (OH)
Collins (NY) Johnson, Sam
Comer Jones
Comstock Jordan
Conaway Joyce (OH)
Cook Katko
Costello (PA) Kelly (MS)
Cramer Kelly (PA)
Crawford King (IA)
Culberson King (NY)
Curbelo (FL) Kinzinger
Davidson Knight
Davis, Rodney Kustoff (TN)
Denham Labrador
Dent LaHood
DeSantis LaMalfa
DesJarlais Lamborn
Diaz-Balart Lance
Donovan Latta
Duffy Lewis (MN)
Duncan (SC) LoBiondo
Duncan (TN) Long
Dunn Loudermilk
Emmer Love
Farenthold Lucas
Faso Luetkemeyer
Ferguson MacArthur
Fitzpatrick Marchant

Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott

Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup

Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—184

Adams Frankel (FL)
Aguilar Fudge
Barragan Gabbard
Bass Gallego
Beatty Garamendi
Bera Gonzalez (TX)
Beyer Green, Al
Bishop (GA) Green, Gene
Blumenauer Grijalva
Blunt Rochester Gutierrez
Bonamici Hanabusa
Boyle, Brendan Hastings
F. Heck
Brady (PA) Higgins (NY)
Brown (MD) Himes
Brownley (CA) Huffman
Bustos Jackson Lee
Butterfield Jayapal
Capuano Jeffries
Carbajal Johnson (GA)
Cardenas Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN) Kaptur
Cartwright Keating
Castor (FL) Kelly (IL)
Castro (TX) Kennedy
Chu, Judy Khanna
Cicilline Kihuen
Clark (MA) Kildee
Clarke (NY) Kilmer
Clay Kind
Cleave Krishnamoorthi
Clyburn Kuster (NH)
Cohen Langevin
Connolly Larsen (WA)
Conyers Larson (CT)
Cooper Lawrence
Correa Lawson (FL)
Costa Lee
Courtney Levin
Crist Lewis (GA)
Crowley Lieu, Ted
Cuellar Lipinski
Cummings Loebsock
Davis (CA) Lofgren
DeFazio Lowenthal
DeGette Lowey
Delaney Lujan Grisham, M.
DeLauro M.
DelBene Lujan, Ben Ray
Demings Lynch
DeSaulnier Maloney, Carolyn B.
Deutch Maloney, Sean
Dingell Maloney, Sean
Doggett Matsui
Doyle, Michael F. McCollum
Ellison McGovern
Engel McNerney
Eshoo Meeks
Espallat Meng
Evans Moore
Foster Moulton
Nadler Nadler
Napolitano Napolitano
Foster

NOT VOTING—11

Bridenstine Hoyer
Davis, Danny McEachin
Gallagher Murphy (FL)
Grothman Pelosi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1413

Mr. PETERS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1343, ENCOURAGING EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 240) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1343) to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise its rules so as to increase the threshold amount for requiring issuers to provide certain disclosures relating to compensatory benefit plans, 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.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 187, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

YEAS—229

Abraham	Ferguson	Marchant
Aderholt	Fitzpatrick	Marino
Allen	Fleischmann	Marshall
Amash	Flores	Massie
Amodei	Fortenberry	Mast
Arrington	Fox	McCauley
Babin	Franks (AZ)	McClintock
Bacon	Frelinghuysen	McHenry
Banks (IN)	Gaetz	McKinley
Barletta	Garrett	McMorris
Barr	Gibbs	Rodgers
Barton	Gohmert	McSally
Bergman	Goodlatte	Meadows
Biggs	Gosar	Meehan
Bilirakis	Gowdy	Messer
Bishop (MI)	Granger	Mitchell
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Moolenaar
Black	Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Blackburn	Graves (MO)	Mullin
Blum	Griffith	Murphy (PA)
Bost	Guthrie	Newhouse
Brady (TX)	Harper	Noem
Brat	Harris	Nunes
Brooks (AL)	Hartzler	Olson
Brooks (IN)	Hensarling	Palazzo
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Palmer
Buck	Hice, Jody B.	Paulsen
Bucshon	Higgins (LA)	Pearce
Budd	Hill	Perry
Burgess	Holding	Pittenger
Byrne	Hollingsworth	Poe (TX)
Calvert	Hudson	Poliquin
Carter (GA)	Huizenga	Posey
Carter (TX)	Hultgren	Ratcliffe
Chabot	Hunter	Reed
Chaffetz	Issa	Reichert
Cheney	Jenkins (KS)	Renacci
Coffman	Jenkins (WV)	Rice (SC)
Cole	Johnson (LA)	Roby
Collins (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Collins (NY)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Comer	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Comstock	Joyce (OH)	Rokita
Conaway	Katko	Rooney, Francis
Cook	Kelly (MS)	Rooney, Thomas
Costello (PA)	Kelly (PA)	J.
Cramer	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Crawford	King (NY)	Roskam
Culberson	Kinzing	Ross
Curbelo (FL)	Knight	Rothfus
Davidson	Kustoff (TN)	Rouzer
Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Royce (CA)
Denham	LaHood	Russell
Dent	LaMalfa	Rutherford
DeSantis	Lamborn	Sanford
DesJarlais	Lance	Scalise
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Schweikert
Donovan	Lewis (MN)	Scott, Austin
Duffy	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (SC)	Long	Sessions
Duncan (TN)	Loudermilk	Shimkus
Dunn	Love	Shuster
Emmer	Lucas	Simpson
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Faso	MacArthur	Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton

Adams
Aguliar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cardenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Bridenstine
Davis, Danny
Gallagher
Grothman
Hoyer
Hurd
McCarthy
McEchin
Murphy (FL)
Pelosi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1421

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayeas 238, noes 177, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 214]

AYES—238

Abraham	Gosar	Palmer
Aderholt	Gottheimer	Paulsen
Allen	Gowdy	Pearce
Amash	Granger	Perry
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Peters
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Pittenger
Babin	Graves (MO)	Poe (TX)
Bacon	Griffith	Poliquin
Banks (IN)	Guthrie	Posey
Barletta	Harper	Ratcliffe
Barr	Harris	Reed
Barton	Hartzler	Reichert
Bergman	Hensarling	Renacci
Biggs	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Bilirakis	Hice, Jody B.	Roby
Bishop (MI)	Higgins (LA)	Roe (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Hill	Rogers (KY)
Black	Holding	Rohrabacher
Blackburn	Hollingsworth	Rokita
Blum	Hudson	Rooney, Francis
Bost	Huizenga	Rooney, Thomas
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	J.
Brat	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (AL)	Issa	Roskam
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)	Rothfus
Buck	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Royce (CA)
Budd	Johnson, Sam	Russell
Burgess	Jones	Rutherford
Byrne	Jordan	Sanford
Calvert	Joyce (OH)	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Katko	Schneider
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Chabot	Chabot	Scott, Austin
Chaffetz	Chaffetz	Sensenbrenner
Cheney	Cheney	Sessions
Coffman	Coffman	Shimkus
Cole	Cole	Shuster
Collins (GA)	Collins (GA)	Simpson
Collins (NY)	Collins (NY)	Sinema
Comer	Comer	Smith (MO)
Comstock	Comstock	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Conaway	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Cook	Smith (TX)
Costello (PA)	Costello (PA)	Smucker
Cramer	Cramer	Stewart
Crawford	Crawford	Stivers
Culberson	Culberson	Suozi
Curbelo (FL)	Curbelo (FL)	Taylor
Davidson	Davidson	Tenney
Davis, Rodney	Davis, Rodney	Thompson (PA)
Denham	Denham	Thornberry
Dent	Dent	Tiberi
DeSantis	DeSantis	Tipton
DesJarlais	DesJarlais	Trott
Diaz-Balart	Diaz-Balart	Turner
Donovan	Donovan	Upton
Duffy	Duffy	Valadao
Duncan (SC)	Duncan (SC)	Wagner
Duncan (TN)	Duncan (TN)	Walberg
Dunn	Dunn	Walden
Emmer	Emmer	Walker
Farenthold	Farenthold	Walorski
Faso	Faso	Walters, Mimi
	Ferguson	Weber (TX)
	Fitzpatrick	Webster (FL)
	Fleischmann	Wenstrup
	Flores	Westerman
	Fortenberry	Williams
	Fox	Wilson (SC)
	Franks (AZ)	Wittman
	Frelinghuysen	Womack
	Gaetz	Woodall
	Garrett	Yoder
	Gibbs	Yoho
	Gohmert	Young (AK)
	Goodlatte	Young (IA)
		Zeldin