

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise out of a concern of this administration's policies to North Korea. I urge the administration to look at recent history.

From 1994 to 2002, North Korea was not developing plutonium and there was no threat of medium- or long-range ballistic missiles. That was under President Clinton's leadership because President Clinton had come up with a deal to buy the medium- and long-range missiles from North Korea.

Then what happened?

President Bush came and disregarded both deals and put North Korea under the axis of evil, even though they had no relationship to 9/11. It was a mistake of foreign policy.

We know the solution to North Korea. We know they have an army of 200,000. They have 15,000 places of nuclear weapons. There is not a militaristic solution. The solution is to go back to the direct diplomacy that President Clinton had and to have South Korea engage in that diplomatic solution.

There is an answer to North Korea. We cannot play games with this issue when President Clinton showed the framework.

□ 1230

FIRST 100 DAYS OF BROKEN PROMISES

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, on the campaign trail, the President talked a good game on trade that appealed to working families. But now that he is President, his promises ring hollow.

He promised to stop outsourcing and shipping jobs overseas, but he issued 15 contracts since becoming President with companies that have outsourced jobs. He promised to hold China accountable and label them a currency manipulator. He reversed that pledge.

He promised to drain the swamp, but he has done just the opposite. He stacked the Cabinet with wealthy insiders; and his White House is filled with friends, family, and a stunning display of nepotism and conflicts of interest.

He said he would release his tax returns. That is a laugher. Breaking with 40 years of precedent, he has not released his taxes and claimed the American people don't care.

Seventy-four percent of Americans want to see his tax returns. And we will never know the full extent of his conflicts of interest and how he stands to enrich himself in office until we see his tax returns.

Congressional tax-writing committees can request them because they have the authority under IRC 6103, and I urge my colleagues to support this effort.

BIGGER AND BIGGER SWAMP

(Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, Donald Trump promised American voters he would drain the swamp of special interests in Washington. Instead, he is swimming in it.

He has filled his administration with billionaires, Wall Street operatives, special interest lobbyists, lawyers, and consultants who are drafting policies for the very industries they came from, and he refuses to release the White House visitor log so we have no idea what special interest lobbyists he is meeting with.

Trump has refused to release his tax returns or divest his business interests.

Can you believe the State Department posted a blog advertising his exclusive Mar-a-Lago resort? Since becoming President, he increased the fees for that resort from \$100,000 to \$200,000.

He has both close allies, Cabinet appointees, and other appointees with questionable ties to Putin and Russia.

His swamp is getting bigger and bigger.

HAPPY 75TH BIRTHDAY EARL F. HILLIARD

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with friends and family of our former colleague and my personal friend, Earl F. Hilliard, who this weekend will be celebrating his 75th birthday.

While a Member of this body, Earl and I worked very closely together preserving the integrity of Historically Black Colleges and Universities and supporting the preservation and restoration of historic sites and buildings.

This weekend, a gathering will establish a scholarship in his honor in order for more rural Alabama young men and women to have opportunities to further their education.

I want to congratulate my friend for reaching this milestone in his life—a place I got to last year this time—and wish him a happy birthday and further success in establishing benefits for young men and women throughout Alabama.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1694, FANNIE AND FREDDIE OPEN RECORDS ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 280 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 280

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 1694) to require additional entities to be subject to the requirements of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), 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 amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-14 modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of April 29, 2017, 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.

SEC. 3. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of April 29, 2017.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I have a confession to make to you. In fact, I have two confessions to make.

The first is I have got a big group up in the Rules Committee right now. It is my Gwinnett County Chamber of Commerce. It is an amazing county, tremendous diversity, tremendous record of success in solving problems. They have been up there visiting with leaders all day long.

I first met with them this morning while Mr. MCGOVERN was down here on the floor during 5 minutes. I said: Well, this is a 5-minute time. You can step right through the doors there, if you would like to see it.

They said: Who is on the floor?

I said: Well, it is this fellow right here. His name tag is there in the Rules Committee. He is down there, #endhunger.

I said: The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and I can disagree on all sorts of issues, all sorts of public policy, but there is nobody in this institution who has a heart for service on the issue of hunger more than JIM MCGOVERN does.

I said: Here he is. He is representing Massachusetts, of all places, and he has chosen to serve on the Agriculture Committee. If you are a Georgian, you serve on the Agriculture Committee because you grow cotton and peanuts and row crop after row crop after row crop. When you are from Massachusetts and you sit on the Agriculture Committee, you want to end childhood hunger, you want to feed people.

I tell you that as a confession, Mr. Speaker, because I am not going to confess to sharing my admiration for JIM MCGOVERN all that often on the House floor, but I was with folks up there today who really do commit themselves to making a difference in our county. It was nice to have a colleague on the floor—again, with whom I disagree about much—who was putting everything he had, as he does every day, into an issue that he cares a lot about.

That is all my constituents back home want, Mr. Speaker, is to believe that we have sincere, earnest folks working on sincere and difficult issues. So I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for that.

My second confession, Mr. Speaker, is that ordinarily I really enjoy listen-

ing to the Reading Clerk read the rule. It gets me all wound up about how the process is. Of course, today she was talking about all the amendments we are going to make in order. We are making every single amendment offered by both sides of the aisle in order on this underlying bill.

I found myself thinking back to the days when I was a young man and I came up here with my class. I was sitting up here in the gallery, and I walked into the floor at a time when the Reading Clerk was just standing up there reading. There was no cheat sheet that they give you in the gallery, Mr. Speaker. You don't have any idea whether they are going to read for 20 seconds or 20 minutes. For all you know, they are going to read for the rest of the afternoon, and it was hard to follow.

I get a cheat sheet here that my staff gives me before each rule. I didn't enjoy it as much today as I ordinarily do, Mr. Speaker, because there is a lot of procedural work in this rule.

We are coming up on a bunch of big deadlines. So there is the ability to bring up suspensions. These are commonsense bills that two-thirds of the House agree on. You can bring those up at any time. That provision is made in this rule.

There is the ability to bring things up the same day. If the Rules Committee goes up and passes a new rule, we can bring that bill to the floor immediately. Ordinarily that would lay over for 24 hours. But because there are so many things we are trying to get done, we waived that.

All of those procedural issues, Mr. Speaker, get in the way of my favorite part of the rule, which is that every single Member of this body had a chance to come up to the Rules Committee, offer their ideas for how we can make this bill better, and the Rules Committee made every single one of them in order. Let me tell you more about that.

This House Resolution 280, Mr. Speaker, is the structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 1694. If you happen to tune into our Rules Committee web feed, Mr. Speaker, you can see it at rules.house.gov if you are not able to get up there with us as we meet sometimes late at night.

This House Resolution 280 is for the consideration of H.R. 1694, the Fannie and Freddie Open Records Act of 2017. Now, folks know a lot about open records, Mr. Speaker. It is that procedure—it is called FOIA, the Freedom of Information Act—where any member of the United States community board of directors—that would be any United States citizen—can write and say: this is my government, and I want some information about what is going on. That has been a very fundamental part of who we are as a people for as long as you and I have been alive.

What is unusual, though, is the way the Federal Government has gotten involved in Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac

to the tune of about \$187 billion—billion with a B, Mr. Speaker. The American taxpayer bailed out these two private institutions making the American taxpayer, making the U.S. Government the largest shareholder in both of these institutions.

So we found ourselves in a unique situation of having the American taxpayers in charge of an institution with no ability, through the Freedom of Information Act, to request information from that entity. It just hadn't come up that often. Thank goodness we haven't had to bail out folks that way in the past.

Mr. Speaker, these entities that Fannie and Freddie are a part—we called them government-sponsored enterprises—they just haven't historically been the subject of that kind of taxpayer scrutiny, but times are changing.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, went through the regular order process. Hearings were held. Markups were held. It came out of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. If you have not looked into government reform, Mr. Speaker, it is not often that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is moving unanimous legislation.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is a tough committee to serve on. I served there in my first term here, Mr. Speaker. It is the hardest things about our government, how we hold each other accountable. Of course, where you stand sometimes depends on where you sit here. If you sit on the left or you sit on the right, you might feel differently about government reform and accountability.

This bill passed out of this committee on a voice vote, Mr. Speaker. The most collaborative of efforts moved this bill to the floor.

Then when we got it in the Rules Committee, we had several Members say: I think we can make this bill better. I think we can make this bill even better.

These were Members who may not have had a chance to fix those issues on the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Again, as I said, we made all amendments in order from both sides of the aisle. I believe that totals three today, Mr. Speaker. But the take-home message for me is, if you had an idea about how to fix this bill, the folks in the Rules Committee made that opportunity available to you.

Mr. Speaker, we can't do the big things every single day of the week. Every piece of legislation we pass, unless we stuff everything into it, can't do everything for everyone. Candidly, I am opposed to stuffing everything into a piece of legislation. I am glad when we have an opportunity to move one issue, one subject, one topic at a time and deliver on behalf of the American people.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, this structured rule, House Resolution 280, is a good bill. It

is a good resolution that, if passed, will provide for the consideration of the underlying legislation, H.R. 1694, which, if passed, will provide the American taxpayer, for the first time, the accountability that they deserve for the \$187 billion in taxpayer support that Fannie and Freddie have received. I am proud to be associated with that.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my friend, for the customary 30 minutes.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I first want to begin by thanking the gentleman for his kind words to his constituents about me on the floor. It means a lot to me, and I appreciate it.

I should tell him, however, that, even though sometimes people don't realize this, Massachusetts has a robust agricultural base, and, in fact, in my district, I have 1,832 farms on over 142,899 acres, compared to the gentleman who has 209 farms on 13,328 acres. So, in addition to fighting hunger, I am on the Agriculture Committee to represent my farms.

I do genuinely appreciate the gentleman's kind words, but then I look at the rule that we are debating today and it kind of spoils the mood.

Having said that, I just want to say to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that here we are again, just 1 day from our government running out of funding and confronting yet another manufactured, totally avoidable crisis, and instead of working on a bill to fully fund America's biggest priorities, we are back on the floor with—the only way I can characterize this—more filler legislation. It seems my Republican friends care more about looking busy than actually doing their jobs.

This rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 1694, as my colleague mentioned, the Fannie and Freddie Open Records Act of 2017. It is a fine bill designed to strengthen transparency at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. I support the legislation. My Democratic colleagues support the legislation. The Republican majority supports the legislation. In fact, I haven't found one person yet who doesn't support the bill.

Freedom of information is a good thing, Mr. Speaker, and I support FOIA, but what about the freedom from the threat of a government shutdown?

What about freedom from the threat of a default on our national debt?

What about freedom to know what our President's conflicts of interest are and to see his tax returns?

What about the freedom from having our healthcare protections ripped away, protections like essential health benefits and protections for people with preexisting conditions?

And what about the freedom to know what Congressional Republicans and the White House are doing to our healthcare system behind closed doors?

None of this seems to matter.

But the most troubling part of this rule is that it declares blanket martial law, through Saturday, that allows Republicans to bring anything—and I mean anything—to the floor between now and then.

Now, I understand the importance of rushing something to the floor when the government is about to run out of money; although, I would point out that we are 7 months into the fiscal year and my Republican friends set this deadline themselves back in December, so there is absolutely no excuse for Congress to come within hours of yet another shutdown. But this is just the latest example of Republican obstruction, obfuscation, and incompetence that has, once again, brought us to the edge of the cliff. And, Mr. Speaker, this is no way to govern.

This rule would allow Republican leadership to rush anything to the floor within hours of it being released. Not just appropriations, it gives them blanket authority to jam us with whatever new disaster they cook up with the White House in the backroom of Capitol Hill, and that includes this latest healthcare deal that I have heard so much about this week.

Of course, with it being a backroom deal, we were relying on news reports all week to clue us in to these terrible new provisions; and it was only last night, around midnight, when the Republicans finally posted their newest healthcare proposal that we were able to confirm just how bad it really is.

Incredibly, this new amendment will make the bill even worse than before. Honest to God, Mr. Speaker, I didn't know that was possible.

In addition to killing the requirement to provide basic, crucial, essential benefits like maternity care and prescription drugs and emergency services, this new amendment will also completely gut protections for people with preexisting conditions. In fact, this amendment directly violates the commitment made by President Trump and House Republicans to protect those with preexisting conditions.

This newest proposal will allow insurers to charge an unlimited "age tax" to older Americans, and, to make matters even worse, Republicans have set up a system that would allow women to once again be charged more than men for health coverage. It will bring us back to those bad old days when insurance companies could charge women more because they said being a woman was a preexisting condition.

Give me a break.

All of this, on top of a disaster of a healthcare bill that will cause 24 million Americans to lose their healthcare coverage. And in addition, their bill would cut Medicaid by close to \$1 trillion, and take that \$1 trillion and give

it, in the form of tax breaks, to the wealthiest individuals in the country.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the way we should be running this House. All of this is being done to appease the most conservative fringes within the Republican Conference in an attempt to deliver, I guess, a political "win" to Donald Trump so he can celebrate 100 days in office. It doesn't matter what the details are, he just wants to be able to tout a victory of some sort.

Well, this is not a victory for the American people. This would be a disaster for the American people.

It is no wonder that my Republican colleagues have been overwhelmed by angry calls from their constituents at home demanding that they oppose this reckless and heartless bill. As one Republican remarked: "I spent the whole work period hearing from people pissed about preexisting conditions. This isn't helpful." That is one of my Republican colleagues.

Now, under this rule, these dangerous backroom deals could be rushed to the floor without any proper deliberations, but they will have a very real, very serious, and very dangerous consequence for millions of Americans. Real lives are at stake here.

Now, I can't help but also note that this newest amendment exempts Congress from the terrible impacts of this proposal. Can you believe that? Knowing just how damaging these new provisions are, Republicans wanted to keep healthcare protections for themselves but set up another system for their constituents.

Now, it was only after the press caught Republicans with their hands in the cookie jar that they introduced yet another bill to unexempt themselves. But the new bill to unexempt Congress would require a 60-vote supermajority in the Senate. What are the odds that is going to happen, Mr. Speaker?

Are we seriously supposed to trust that they won't exempt themselves from this terrible plan, to trust that the Senate can muster 60 votes to pass this provision or anything else?

Let me be clear: this maneuver is a procedural sleight of hand. This is legislative smoke and mirrors designed to give Republicans, who tried to pull a fast one and got caught, a talking point.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans wrote this bill, so change the damn bill. Don't just say: "Trust us. We will pass another bill to fix the fix, and we will get the Senate not to make any changes. Oh, while we are at it, we will get a supermajority in the Senate to support it." Who do you think you are fooling, Mr. Speaker?

I urge all my colleagues to defeat this martial law rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would tell my friend that I think this is exactly the right way to be moving legislation, and I am proud that we are doing it. Big bills are hard and big

bills are sloppy. Can we do better on big bills? Of course we can. Of course we can.

But you and I have been on the Rules Committee together, Mr. Speaker. The Rules Committee process, you have seen it happen. If I am down here talking about a small bill that everybody agrees on, folks want to know why it is we are not doing something bigger. And when I bring a big bill down here tomorrow, folks are going to want to know why I have rushed it to the floor and we are not doing something that has more bipartisan agreement on it instead.

These issues are hard, and that is why they have sent serious men and women here to try to solve them. I want to do everything that my friend from Massachusetts has talked about, Mr. Speaker. I want to see a healthcare bill go across the floor. I want to see a full-year funding bill go across the floor. Shoot, I don't stop there. I want to see the budget go across the floor. I want to see a transportation and infrastructure bill go across the floor. I have got a tax bill I want to see go across the floor. The list is long.

And while my friend from Massachusetts and I are down here working on this, I have got 433 other colleagues out there working on that, and my great hope is that we are going to deliver on those things in the very near future, too.

But today, Mr. Speaker, today isn't a day for recriminations. Today is a day for celebrations, in that what we have here is a bill that we have worked through the regular order process.

You are not going to hear one person, Mr. Speaker, not one, come down to the floor and say this bill wasn't moved through the process in the right way. You are not going to hear one person come down to the floor and say their voice was silenced on this bill. You are not going to hear one person come down to the floor and say their input was turned away on this bill.

We do so much that we wish we could do better, Mr. Speaker. When we have these opportunities to celebrate those things we are doing right, I sometimes wish we would take a little more time to focus on our successes. There will always be time to turn our attention back to our failures.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleague, I don't have any problem with the underlying bill, but I would argue with him that I think most of our colleagues probably don't know what the hell we are doing here because, in the scheme of things, this is not terribly consequential. I think our problem is the fact that we are at the edge of another crisis where, if we don't fund the government by tomorrow, we shut this place down, we shut the government down, and that has an impact on the American people.

I think what our objection is is that the rule that you bring to us here today to consider the underlying bill also allows my Republican friends to bring up anything they want between now and Saturday, including, you know, an awful healthcare repeal bill.

And by the way, when we talk about regular order, it would be nice, especially when it comes to the big things like health care, that we actually do things like hearings and listen to what experts have to say and our constituents and patients and doctors, I mean, a whole bunch of people who have a stake in our healthcare system.

The bill that my friends brought to the floor, that they had to pull, never had a single hearing and, in all likelihood, whatever monstrosity they bring to the floor in the future will probably not be the result of regular order. It will be the result of a backroom deal where very few people have any input.

So I can't celebrate today. I am very concerned for my constituents. I am very concerned for the millions of people who might lose their health care. I am concerned for this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump's first 100 days have been embroiled in controversy and shrouded in secrecy. The American people deserve a heck of a lot better. They deserve transparency from their government. They deserve to know which special interests are getting face time with the President and his top aides and whether the White House is being used to personally enrich President Trump and his family.

It is our duty, as the people's Representatives, to hold this administration accountable, an administration that has so many conflicts of interest, financial conflicts of interest, that it is on a collision course with corruption. So, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative KATHERINE CLARK's resolution, H. Res. 286, which would force the White House to release information to us regarding the President's many potential conflicts of interest, including his tax returns, involvement in his business empire, and White House and Mar-a-Lago visitor logs.

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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. KATHERINE CLARK) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Massachusetts. I am glad to share in this bipartisan moment of admiration for his work with my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can bring a resolution to the floor. This resolution will ensure that the House meets its constitutional responsibility to conduct oversight of the executive branch by investigating potential conflicts of interest of President Donald J. Trump.

□ 1300

It reads: "Whereas, on October 18, 2016, then-candidate Donald J. Trump communicated via Twitter: 'I will Make Our Government Honest Again—believe me. But first, I'm going to have to #draintheswamp in DC';

"Whereas, President Trump subsequently nominated a team of wealthy and connected insiders to lead his Cabinet, many of whom have been forced to withdraw from consideration because of irrevocable conflicts of interest;

"Whereas, as President-elect, President Trump announced that he would be 'leaving his great business' to his adult children, a move he felt would be 'visually important';

"Whereas, President Trump has taken no steps to untangle his financial interest in his business holdings, to limit his ability to advise the nominal managers of The Trump Organization, or to prevent other interests from currying favor with the White House by doing business with companies that might benefit the President's bottom line;

"Whereas, President Trump has reversed White House policy and now refuses to release visitor logs to the public;

"Whereas, on May 30, 2014, President Trump stated: 'If I decide to run for office, I will produce my tax returns, absolutely';

"Whereas, on January 24, 2016, President Trump stated that he would release his 'very big returns . . . in the next period of time';

"Whereas, on February 25, 2016, President Trump changed his position and stated that, although he could not release his tax returns while under audit, he would do so 'as soon as the audit is done';

"Whereas, on May 11, 2016, President Trump communicated via Twitter: 'In interview I told @AP that my taxes are under routine audit and I would release my tax returns when the audit is complete, not after election!';

"Whereas, on January 22, 2017, White House senior adviser Kellyanne Conway stated that 'the White House response is that he's not going to release his returns';

"Whereas, President Trump has directed the Congress to act on comprehensive reform of the Internal Revenue Code;

"Whereas, without the President's tax returns, the public cannot know

how the full extent to which any proposed reforms will personally benefit the President;

“Whereas, on January 11, 2017, President Trump insisted that he has ‘no dealings with Russia’;

“Whereas, it has been widely reported that President Trump sought and received funding from Russian investors, especially when American banks stopped lending to him after his multiple bankruptcies;

“Whereas, Donald Trump, Jr., who runs day-to-day business operations for his father’s companies, has stated: ‘Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets. We see a lot of money pouring in from Russia’;

“Whereas, on March 20, 2017, James B. Comey, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, confirmed the existence of a Federal investigation into multiple connections between the Trump campaign and the regime of Russian President Vladimir Putin;

“Whereas, it has been reported that President Trump has personally guaranteed over \$300 million in loans to German financial institution Deutsche Bank AG;

“Whereas, the Trump administration is now responsible for overseeing multiple investigations into the trading and lending practices of Deutsche Bank AG and for negotiating a potentially multibillion-dollar settlement with the bank related to its trading of mortgage-backed securities;

“Whereas, these matters represent only a few of the many instances in which President Trump has broken his promise to ‘drain the swamp’;

“Whereas, under the Constitution of the United States, the United States Congress has a responsibility to conduct oversight of the executive branch of government;

“Whereas, the majority of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives rejected an amendment to have the committee’s oversight plan that would have tasked the committee with investigating the President’s conflicts of interest;

“Whereas, members of the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, Homeland Security, and Ways and Means of the House of Representatives have each advanced resolutions of inquiry designed to obtain information about the President’s ongoing conflicts of interest;

“Whereas, the majority has blocked each of those resolutions from consideration on the House floor;

“Whereas, the continuing refusal of the majority to conduct even basic oversight of the Trump administration diminishes the status of the Congress as a coequal branch of government;

“Whereas, this continued neglect undermines the credibility of the House of Representatives and raises a question of the privileges of the House;

“Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the House of Representatives directs

the following persons to take the following actions:

“(1) President Trump is directed to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any document, record, memorandum, correspondence, or other communication in possession of the Executive Office of the President, or any portion of such communication, that refers or relates to President Trump’s proposal to maintain an interest in his business holdings, while turning over day-to-day operation of those interests to his sons Donald J. Trump, Jr. and Eric Trump.

“(2) In support of transparency in government and the longstanding tradition of the disclosure of tax returns of Presidents and Presidential candidates, the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to provide the Committee on Ways and Means with the tax return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2007 through 2016 for review in closed executive session by the committee as provided under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and directs the committee to hold a vote on reporting such information to the full House of Representatives.

“(3) The Director of the Office of Government Ethics is directed to publish any waiver or exception granted to any officer or employee of the government to the January 28, 2017, executive order entitled ‘Ethics Commitments by Executive Branch Appointees’.

“(4) The Administrator of General Services is directed to provide the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives with any legal analysis supporting its March 23, 2017, conclusion that Trump International Hotel in Washington may maintain its lease with the Federal Government, despite an express prohibition on elected officials taking part in the lease.

“(5) President Trump is directed to provide visitor logs for both the White House and Mar-a-Lago to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives on a rolling and ongoing basis, and directs the committee to hold ongoing votes on reporting the contents of such visitor logs to the full House of Representatives.”

Mr. Speaker, I filed this resolution because it appears to me and the American public that Mr. Trump has drained the swamp and funneled it into the Oval Office.

Trump’s billionaire, special interest friends are now in charge of policies that impact every American, every family, and every child. Everything from education to health care to taxes are in the hands of people who have never sent their kids to public schools, who have never had to take out a loan to pay for college, and who have never had a medical bill they couldn’t afford—and all of this is in the hands of a President who refuses to release his tax returns.

While Trump fights to keep Americans in the dark about which of his

other friends he owes special favors to—whether it is Big Oil, foreign banks, lobbyists at Mar-a-Lago, or the Russians—Republicans seem to be happy to look the other way.

Transparency and accountability are not partisan ideas. Families at home deserve a Congress that works together to be the necessary check that our Constitution provides over this unaccountable administration. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that they had me at hello. When they said this was a great bill underlying this resolution and they didn’t see any controversy, they thought we ought to pass this and they thought this was a good step forward for the American people, yet you had me. I would like to do that.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine, his name was Jay Pierson. He served in this institution for over four decades. His job was not to be particularly partisan one way or the other. His job was to make sure this place functioned. I wonder what goes on over the 40 years of changes in the way that we treat each other on the House floor and the way that we work with each other on the House floor.

My friends have a perfectly legitimate concern. In fact, they brought it up as a privileged resolution already this year. It has been tabled. I recognize that my friends and I have disagreements—vast disagreements—in numerous areas of public policy, but today we have a chance to talk about one of the agreements that we have. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what folks back home watching think. Do they think, just like the media loves to report, that, golly, those guys can’t even agree on what time to start in the morning?

For Pete’s sake, we have worked a bill through the process, just like we learned about in civics class. Don’t make me sing “I’m just a bill, and I’m sitting here on Capitol Hill,” Mr. Speaker, because that is exactly the process that we all want bills to go through, and we have done that here today.

We can’t even take a moment to talk about how successfully we have worked together, not even a moment to talk about how the process worked, not even a moment to talk about how we delivered for folks. We have to shift gears to something that is not even the topic of the bill today. We will have time to talk about every controversy we want. If folks want to go fisticuffs with one another, I am certain we will make time for that, but right now we have a chance to talk about those things that unite us.

In the spirit of dispelling those myths, Mr. Speaker, dispelling those

myths that things don't get done around here, dispelling those myths that we don't respect each other, and dispelling those myths that we can't work together, I want to dispel the myth that what this underlying rule does is it provides Republicans with a pathway for doing whatever it is they want to do whenever it is they want to do it, because that doesn't really sound like fair play. I wouldn't want to support such a bill either.

What this rule does do is, contrary to the rules, allow us to bring up suspension bills at any time. Now, what a suspension bill is, Mr. Speaker, as you know, it is a bill that can pass not with a simple majority, but with a two-thirds majority. So this rule says, forbid the thought, should bipartisanship break out in the next 72 hours, you all should be able to bring those bills to the floor and deliver it for the American people.

Well, dag gum it, I support that. I don't look at that as a way of Republicans to manipulate the system. I look at it as a way for the United States Congress to deliver on behalf of the system, and I am glad we are doing it.

Number two, the bill says, if the Rules Committee, in its wisdom, passes a rule to bring a bill to the floor rather than have that bill lay over for a night, you can bring that bill to the floor directly. So my friend is absolutely right when he says that passing this rule would allow us to rush legislation to the floor. It would rush that common-sense, bipartisan legislation that two-thirds of us would agree on, we can rush those results across the finish line for the American people; and, if the Rules Committee acts and we pass that rule on the floor of the House, it will allow us to consider the legislation that that rule would bring to the floor on the same day instead of waiting 24 hours.

Now, what my friend says about having an opportunity to read the bills is critically important—critically important. I want to point out because, again, folks have so many concerns about what goes on in this institution, I got lots of things I can gripe about, but when we are getting it right, I want to make sure that we are telling folks that we are getting it right.

This tradition of self-flagellation in this institution drives me crazy because, when we tear ourselves down, Mr. Speaker, it is not us who bears the cost of that. It is our constituents. It is the board of directors of the United States of America. It is the folks who come beyond us.

We have a responsibility to lead this institution, and when we are doing it right, we ought to tell the American people that we are doing it right. For example, there might be a healthcare vote that comes to the floor of this House in the next 24, 48 hours. I don't want to get my expectations high for that, Mr. Speaker, but I sure would be enthusiastic if that happened. If that were to happen, my friend is exactly

right: we will go to the Rules Committee; we will pass a rule; we will bring it to the floor; and we will bring it up the same day. But the language was posted yesterday, and the vote wouldn't happen until tomorrow. So when folks say let's leave the language out there for folks to have a chance to read it, let's not rush something through, we have got 3 days built into the system.

□ 1315

That is not a rule of the House. I want to make that clear. There is no rule in this institution that says you have got to present a bill before you can pass a bill to read it and find out what is in it. This is not a rule of this House. It is a policy of ours. It is a policy of who we are and of let's do this; let's make this our commitment to make this happen. Mr. Speaker, it does not always happen, but most of the time it does. I celebrate that success.

Again, thinking about those things that unite us instead of divide us, I just listened to my friend, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, make an incredibly eloquent plea for her bill. She said, if we defeat the previous question—that vote is coming up very soon—we will take up her piece of legislation, which was just handed to me about 3½ minutes ago.

Mr. Speaker, I get it that sometimes people think that they have such urgent ideas that those ideas need to come to the floor in a hurry. I will settle for either outcome: that it is okay that we bring ideas to the floor in a hurry and that it is okay if you hand somebody a bill 3½ minutes ago and tell them you want to bring it to the floor 30 minutes from now. If that is okay, then let that be okay. If what we need is for bills to lay overnight, then let that be okay.

We have a process here that is built on mutual respect, that is built on years of tradition that men and women paid a tremendous price for, that they provided tremendous leadership for. In the name of short-term political gains, I want to make sure that we don't tear down those long-term policy successes.

This institution should be a source of pride for the American people. I don't believe that it is today. The responsibility of making it that source of pride falls on you and me. We are the only ones who can get that job done. We have an opportunity today to do just a little bit of that, and I hope we take advantage of that.

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

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

Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia: he had me at hello, too. If all he said was "hello" and introduced the underlying bill, we would be done. There would be no controversy. The underlying bill is being brought to the floor under a rule that is atrocious and that, quite frankly, every Member of this House should be ashamed about.

Under this martial law rule, you can bring anything up at any time you want, at a moment's notice, without people having an opportunity to actually understand what they are going to vote on.

The gentleman talked about they might bring up the healthcare bill between now and Saturday. He said: Yesterday, we posted the text of our new amendment. He used the word "yesterday" loosely. They posted it at midnight last night. I was asleep at midnight; I don't know about the gentleman.

The bottom line is, there is nothing that says that they can't change the text again and again and again and again, offer more amendments, because that is what they have been doing since they first began their effort to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act.

On something as important as health care, on something that could affect millions and millions of people in this country, that could throw 24 million people off of health care, that will cut Medicaid by a trillion dollars, that will compromise Medicare, that will take away essential benefits, people ought to know what the heck they are voting on.

We ought to have regular order on these major pieces of legislation. Why is that so controversial? How about a hearing on health care? The idea that we would like the opportunity to know what we are voting on, to do this in a thoughtful way, is so offensive to my Republican colleagues. I am flabbergasted by this—to basically defend this process.

We have to use a procedural motion to be able to try to force a debate or bring to the floor the bill of my colleague, KATHERINE CLARK, which basically calls on the President to release his tax returns and calls for some transparency with regard to visitor logs at the White House and Mar-a-Lago. We have to resort to a procedural motion because the Republican majority basically blocks us from bringing anything to the floor under a normal process.

The Rules Committee has become a place where democracy goes to die. Yet the bill that we have before us, the underlying bill that we are going to consider later today, could probably pass on a suspension.

By the way, we have no problem with giving you same-day authority on suspension bills. Those aren't controversial. We don't even have a problem, although you should have prepared for this, with you being able to bring a bill to the floor quickly to keep the government running.

It is the broad authority that you have given yourselves to bring anything at a moment's notice, without anybody having a chance to review it. That is what we have a problem with. Quite frankly, my Republican colleagues ought to have a problem with that, too.

Mr. Speaker, shortly after taking the gavel, Speaker RYAN said: "I want to

have a process that is more open, more inclusive, more deliberative, more participatory, and that is what we are trying to do." That was the Speaker of the House.

Unfortunately, Republicans do not appear to be trying very hard. The current Congress is on track to become the most closed in history, with an incredible 26 closed rules in this year's first quarter out of 42 total rules. The Republican majority shut out all amendments from both Democrats and Republicans on fully 62 percent of the legislation considered by the House under a rule.

Do Members realize that? On most bills, even they are not allowed to offer amendments. No amendments at all. Under a closed rule, you can't even offer an amendment to fix a typo.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask my colleagues to take a look at this chart. This shows closed rules in the past decade and for the first quarter of the year.

Do you see this really long red line on the top? I am happy to bring it over to my colleagues here. If you see that line, you will see that the bottom line is that this shows that this Congress has an abysmal record with regard to an open, fair process.

When we were in charge from 2007–2010, we averaged only 8 closed rules in the same timeframe. This Congress is more than three times as closed. We have 26 closed rules in the first quarter alone; that is not to mention zero open rules. You are even crushing your record for 2015, the year that you beat the all-time closed rule record. This is not something to be proud of.

What has this historically closed process brought to the House? Complete chaos. Virtually no legislative accomplishments. A lousy process usually leads to lousy legislation. We learned that from your awful, disastrous attempt to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act.

By the way, I should point out that while we were meeting here today—I guess some of the advocacy organizations had a chance to read the language you posted last night at midnight—so far, the American Hospital Association, AARP, the American Medical Association, March of Dimes, and America's Essential Hospitals have all come out against this terrible, new Republican health proposal. In fact, the American Hospital Association said: "The amendment proposed this week would dramatically worsen the bill."

I would just say to my colleagues: We don't have a problem with suspensions. We don't have a problem with a rule that will allow us to keep the government running. We have a problem with your closed, authoritarian approach to the legislation. We have a problem with the prospect that you might bring a healthcare bill to the floor that will impact millions and millions of Americans, and nobody will have read it, nobody will even have any guarantee that what you posted last night at midnight will even be what we are voting on.

This is a big deal. It affects my constituents and it affects your constituents. We ought to be doing a better job around here, and this process, quite frankly, stinks.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

Simply, again, I reiterate that everybody in this House, Democrats and Republicans alike, should be ashamed at the way this House is being run. The American people who are watching should be appalled by the way this House is being run.

I don't care whether you are a liberal or conservative or fall somewhere in the middle. You ought to have some confidence that what the people's House is doing is actually thoughtful and is actually in the best interest of the people of this country. That is not what is happening here.

Yes, the underlying bill that we are going to talk about later today, we have no problem with it. It could have passed overwhelmingly under a suspension vote. I am happy to support it. No problem.

I have no problem, by the way, with bringing up suspensions to fill up time as we try to get a resolution to the continuing resolution. We have no problem, quite frankly, with bringing up a continuing resolution in a quick fashion.

This rule continues a lousy process that has been embraced by the current Republican leadership in this House. There is no excuse for this. When it comes to big bills, big legislation, like health care, which is a very personal thing to people in this country, the American people deserve much better than this.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on this lousy rule and stand up to your leadership and demand that they open this House up not only to Democratic amendments but to Republican amendments as well. This is a deliberative body. We ought to be able to deliberate.

On big issues like health care, it ought not be some backroom deal that a few people put together. We saw the result of those backroom deals with a lousy, terrible, awful bill that would hurt millions of Americans. We ought to do it out in the open.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I heard a group of constituents ask one of our freshman Members what they found to be the most surprising part of this institution, having served here for about 100 days, and it was with no small amount of joy that they gave exactly the same answer that I would have given after my first 100 days. They said to their constituents: What really surprised me is how earnest, hardworking, conscientious, dedicated, and how committed each and every Member of this institution is.

There are a couple of bad apples that don't follow under that perspective, but, by and large, the surprise when you get elected to Congress is about the high quality of the people who you get to work with, the commitment of the people you get to work with, the conviction of the people who you get to work with.

What you have heard from my friend from Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, is 100 percent authentic. There is no one down here playing for the cameras today. I could make a powerful case that while cameras provide a great deal of sunlight, they create a great deal of unnecessary heat, as well. Folks sometimes are performing for cameras in this institution, but not my friend from Massachusetts.

What you heard from my friend from Massachusetts was absolutely sincere concern about public policy. I agree with him. I believe we should have an open and deliberative process in this institution.

You and I and my friend from Massachusetts don't work for the leadership. The leadership works for us. There is not one Member of the leadership team who votes for me. I vote for them.

We have an opportunity to direct the way this institution is led. Candidly, I couldn't be more proud than I am of the way that PAUL RYAN leads this institution. He is not the Republican Speaker. We have a Republican leader. The Democrats have a Democratic leader. PAUL RYAN is the Speaker of the House. I am incredibly proud of the way he leads this institution.

The way to make it even better, Mr. Speaker, is not to cite every single thing that we do as a failure. It is just not so. Let's find those things that we do that we can do better, and let's identify them and work together, but let's celebrate those successes.

For example, my friend pointed to the number of closed rules that have come to the floor. For folks who don't follow the process closely, a closed rule means there were no amendments allowed.

Well, many of those bills, Mr. Speaker, were bills that the Rules Committee sent out an email to all of Capitol Hill and said: We are bringing this piece of legislation to the floor. Here it is for you to read it and digest it. And if you have any ideas about how to make this bill better, you send them to us, and we will take a look.

When we did that, Mr. Speaker, not one single idea came back from the Republican or the Democratic side of the aisle for improving the bill.

□ 1330

So, yes, the bill came to the floor. The rule was closed not because we are trying to silence the minority, not because we are trying to silence elements of the majority, but because we had a completely open process, and it turned out that regular order got it right the first time. We don't need to identify that as a failure. That is an unmitigated success.

Some of those closed rules, Mr. Speaker, came because we were bringing legislation under the Congressional Review Act. Now, for folks who don't know the Congressional Review Act, that is that act that was passed so that Congress could go back and review regulations that had been passed by the administration to make sure those regulations followed congressional intent.

By definition, those bills have to be narrow and targeted. We can't have an amendment about healthcare legislation added to our waters of the U.S. Congressional Review Act bill. We can't have folks go and add a pay raise for our military men and women to that Congressional Review Act bill. We want a pay raise for our men and women in uniform. We passed it out of the House. It is sitting in the United States Senate, but it can't be on a CRA piece of legislation. So, yes, every single one of those bills came to the floor under a closed rule not because someone was trying to silence the minority, not because someone wanted to silence elements of the majority, but because that is the process that we have to work through together, and, by golly, we are doing it right.

My friend from Massachusetts talked about what has gone on in this body. I will tell you, this body has moved more legislation to the President's desk for his signature in these first 100 days than any President since Truman. We have had Republicans running the show, we have had Democrats running the show, but it is only when we collaboratively have been running the show that we have moved more bills to the President's desk than any other Congress in modern American history. I am proud of that. Some of those votes went my way, some of those votes didn't go my way, but we worked each one of those through the process, and we did each one of those things together.

Mr. Speaker, I would love to tell you what is going to happen over the next 18 months. I have no idea. But I know that to the extent that this body is full of accusations, to the extent that this body is full of mistrust, to the extent that this body is full of frustration and condemnation, we are going to go down one path.

To the extent that this body isn't afraid to tell folks back home when we are working hard together, to the ex-

tent that this body isn't ashamed that we rolled up our sleeves together and got some things done that folks thought we wouldn't be able to get done, to the extent that this body isn't afraid to confront the fact that we are always going to have disagreements, but from time to time bipartisanship breaks out and bills move a little more quickly than they do at other times. If folks are willing to accept our successes with the same zeal that they celebrate our failures, Mr. Speaker, I tell you, we are going to create a different institution over these next 18 months. Again, not under Democratic leadership, not under Republican leadership, but under PAUL RYAN's leadership as Speaker of this entire House of Representatives.

We have one such opportunity today. I encourage folks to go to the web page of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. I believe it is oversight.house.gov. Those folks are working on some of the toughest issues in this town, and often they are bitterly divided along partisan lines. They are working on those issues that tend to separate Americans rather than unite them. They have sent us a bill today that was so widely supported, it passed by a voice vote unanimously out of that committee. It then went to the Committee on Rules, where every single Member of Congress was invited to improve it. Three Members of Congress took us up on the invitation, and every single one of their amendments was made in order by this rule.

Mr. Speaker, we have lots of things that are going to bring my friend from Massachusetts and I back down to this floor, and we are going to disagree heartily about those. Today we have an example of something that brings us together. I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on this rule that brings our OGR unanimously passed bill to the floor, and vote "yes" on that underlying bill, just as our Republican and Democratic colleagues on the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform did.

Mr. Speaker, there are lots of challenges ahead of us. This is one we can put in the books as a success for our constituents back home. I ask for a "yes" vote.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 280 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 286) directing certain officials of the executive branch to provide information to the House of Representatives that will enable the House to meet its constitutional responsibility to conduct oversight of the executive branch by investigating potential conflicts of interests of President Donald J. Trump. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one

hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H. Res. 286.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing S. 496.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 193, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 229]

YEAS—230

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

Rutherford	Stivers
Sanford	Taylor
Scalise	Tenney
Schweikert	Thompson (PA)
Scott, Austin	Thornberry
Sensenbrenner	Tiberi
Sessions	Tipton
Shimkus	Trott
Shuster	Turner
Simpson	Upton
Smith (NE)	Valadao
Smith (NJ)	Wagner
Smith (TX)	Walberg
Smucker	Walden
Stefanik	Walker
Stewart	Walters, Mimi

NAYS—193

Adams	Gabbard
Agullar	Gallego
Barragan	Garamendi
Bass	Gonzalez (TX)
Beatty	Gottheimer
Bera	Green, Al
Beyer	Green, Gene
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva
Blumenauer	Gutierrez
Blunt Rochester	Hanabusa
Bonomi	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)	Jones
Cartwright	Kaptur
Castor (FL)	Keating
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)
Chu, Judy	Kennedy
Cicilline	Khanna
Clark (MA)	Kihuen
Clarke (NY)	Kildee
Clay	Kilmer
Cleaver	Kind
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi
Cohen	Kuster (NH)
Connolly	Langevin
Conyers	Larsen (WA)
Cooper	Larson (CT)
Correa	Lawrence
Costa	Lawson (FL)
Courtney	Lee
Crist	Levin
Crowley	Lewis (GA)
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted
Cummings	Lipinski
Davis (CA)	Loebsack
Davis, Danny	Lofgren
DeFazio	Lowenthal
DeGette	Lowe
Delaney	Lujan Grisham,
DeLauro	M.
DeBene	Lujan, Ben Ray
Demings	Lynch
DeSaulnier	Maloney,
Deutsch	Carolyn B.
Dingell	Maloney, Sean
Doggett	Matsui
Doyle, Michael	McCollum
F.	McEachin
Ellison	McGovern
Engel	McNerney
Eshoo	Meeke
Espallat	Meng
Esty (CT)	Moore
Evans	Moulton
Foster	Murphy (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Nadler
Fudge	Napolitano
Bucshon	Newhouse
Chaffetz	Slaughter
Marino	Smith (MO)

NOT VOTING—7

□ 1359

Messrs. VARGAS, KILMER, NOLAN, DEMINGS, HUFFMAN, and Mrs. TORRES changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

Weber (TX)	Webster (FL)
Webster (FL)	Wenstrup
Westernman	Williams
Williams	Wilson (SC)
Wilson (SC)	Wittman
Wittman	Womack
Womack	Woodall
Woodall	Yoder
Yoder	Yoho
Yoho	Young (AK)
Young (AK)	Young (IA)
Young (IA)	Zeldin

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). 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. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 192, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 230]

AYES—226

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

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

NOES—192

Adams	Fudge	Napolitano
Aguiar	Gabbard	Neal
Amash	Gallego	Nolan
Barragan	Garamendi	Norcross
Bass	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Halleran
Beatty	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Bera	Green, Gene	Pallone
Beyer	Grijalva	Panetta
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Pascrell
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Payne
Blunt Rochester	Hastings	Pelosi
Bonamici	Heck	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan F.	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Brady (PA)	Himes	Peterson
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Pingree
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Pocan
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Polis
Butterfield	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Capuano	Jeffries	Quigley
Carbajal	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Carson (IN)	Jones	Richmond
Cartwright	Kaptur	Rosen
Castor (FL)	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Ciциlline	Khanna	Rush
Clark (MA)	Kihuen	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sánchez
Clay	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kind	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Connolly	Langevin	Schrader
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Correa	Lawrence	Serrano
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lee	Shea-Porter
Crist	Levin	Sherman
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lipinski	Soto
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Takano
DeGette	Lowe y	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Lujan Grisham, M.	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
DelBene	Lynch	Tonko
Demings	Maloney,	Torres
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Tsongas
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Dingell	Masse	Veasey
Doggett	Matsui	Vela
Doyle, Michael F.	McCollum	Velázquez
Ellison	McEachin	Visclosky
Engel	McGovern	Walz
Eshoo	McNerney	Wasserman
Españillat	Meeks	Schultz
Esty (CT)	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Evans	Moore	Watson Coleman
Foster	Moulton	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
	Nadler	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Bucshon	Marino	Smith (MO)
Chaffetz	Newhouse	Stewart
Cheney	Royce (CA)	Valadao
Hurd	Slaughter	Walorski

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

□ 1407

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.

Stated for:
Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 230.
Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 230.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 230.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 1180, WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 2017

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, this morning, the Rules Committee issued an announcement outlining the amendment process for H.R. 1180, the Working Families Flexibility Act of 2017, which will likely be before the Rules Committee next week.

An amendment deadline has been set for Monday, May 1, at 10 a.m.

The text of the bill is available on the Rules Committee website.

Feel free to contact me or my staff if you have any questions.

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION COORDINATION AND PLANNING AREA REFORM REPEAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 496) to repeal the rule issued by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration entitled "Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 3, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]
YEAS—417

Abraham	Blum	Carter (TX)
Adams	Blunt Rochester	Cartwright
Aderholt	Bonamici	Castor (FL)
Aguiar	Bost	Castro (TX)
Allen	Boyle, Brendan F.	Chabot
Amash	Brady (PA)	Cheney
Arrington	Brady (TX)	Chu, Judy
Babin	Brat	Ciциlline
Bacon	Bridenstine	Clark (MA)
Banks (IN)	Brooks (AL)	Clarke (NY)
Barletta	Brooks (IN)	Clay
Barr	Brown (MD)	Cleaver
Barragan	Brownley (CA)	Clyburn
Barton	Buchanan	Coffman
Bass	Buck	Cohen
Beatty	Budd	Cole
Bera	Burgess	Collins (GA)
Bergman	Bustos	Collins (NY)
Beyer	Butterfield	Comer
Biggs	Byrne	Comstock
Bilirakis	Calvert	Conaway
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Connolly
Bishop (MI)	Carbajal	Conyers
Bishop (UT)	Cárdenas	Cook
Black	Carson (IN)	Cooper
Blackburn	Carter (GA)	Correa
		Costa

Costello (PA)	Hurd	Napolitano
Courtney	Issa	Neal
Cramer	Jackson Lee	Noem
Crawford	Jayapal	Nolan
Crist	Jeffries	Norcross
Crowley	Jenkins (KS)	Nunes
Cuellar	Jenkins (WV)	O'Halleran
Culberson	Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke
Cummings	Johnson (LA)	Olson
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Palazzo
Davidson	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Davis (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Palmer
Davis, Danny	Jones	Panetta
Davis, Rodney	Jordan	Pascrell
DeFazio	Joyce (OH)	Pauslen
DeGette	Kaptur	Payne
Delaney	Katko	Pearce
DeLauro	Keating	Pelosi
DelBene	Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter
Demings	Kelly (MS)	Perry
Denham	Kelly (PA)	Peterson
Dent	Kennedy	Pingree
DeSantis	Khanna	Pittenger
DesJarlais	Kihuen	Pocan
Deutch	Kildee	Poe (TX)
Diaz-Balart	Kilmer	Poliquin
Dingell	Kind	Polis
Doggett	King (IA)	Posey
Donovan	King (NY)	Price (NC)
Doyle, Michael F.	Kinzinger	Quigley
Duffy	Knight	Raskin
Duncan (SC)	Krishnamoorthi	Ratcliffe
Duncan (TN)	Kuster (NH)	Reed
Dunn	Kustoff (TN)	Reichert
Ellison	Labrador	Renacci
Emmer	LaHood	Rice (NY)
Engel	LaMalfa	Rice (SC)
Eshoo	Lamborn	Richmond
Españillat	Lance	Roby
Estes (KS)	Langevin	Roe (TN)
Esty (CT)	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (AL)
Evans	Larson (CT)	Rogers (KY)
Farenthold	Latta	Rohrabacher
Faso	Lawrence	Rokita
Fitzpatrick	Lawson (FL)	Rooney, Francis J.
Fleischmann	Lee	Rooney, Thomas J.
Flores	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen
Fortenberry	Lewis (GA)	Rosen
Foster	Lewis (MN)	Roskam
Fox	Lieu, Ted	Ross
Foxx	Lipinski	Rothfus
Frankel (FL)	LoBiondo	Rouzer
Franks (AZ)	Loeb sack	Roybal-Allard
Frelinghuysen	Long	Royce (CA)
Fudge	Loudermilk	Ruiz
Gabbard	Love	Ruppersberger
Gaetz	Lowenthal	Rush
Gallagher	Lowe y	Russell
Gallego	Lucas	Rutherford
Garamendi	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (OH)
Garrett	Lujan Grisham, M.	Sánchez
Gibbs	Luján, Ben Ray	Sanford
Gohmert	Lynch	Sarbanes
Gonzalez (TX)	MacArthur	Scalise
Goodlatte	Maloney,	Schakowsky
Gosar	Carolyn B.	Schiff
Gottheimer	Maloney, Sean	Schneider
Granger	Marchant	Schrader
Graves (GA)	Marshall	Schweikert
Graves (MO)	Masse	Scott (VA)
Green, Al	Mast	Scott, Austin
Green, Gene	Matsui	Scott, David
Griffith	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner
Grijalva	McCaul	Serrano
Grothman	McClintock	Sessions
Guthrie	McCollum	Sewell (AL)
Gutiérrez	McEachin	Shea-Porter
Hanabusa	McGovern	Sherman
Harper	McHenry	Shimkus
Harris	McKinley	Shuster
Hartzler	McMorris	Simpson
Hastings	Rodgers	Sinema
Heck	McNerney	Sires
Hensarling	McSally	Smith (NE)
Herrera Beutler	Meadows	Smith (NJ)
Hice, Jody B.	Meehan	Smith (TX)
Higgins (LA)	Meeks	Smith (WA)
Higgins (NY)	Meng	Smucker
Hill	Messer	Soto
Himes	Mitchell	Speier
Holding	Moolenaar	Stefanik
Hollingsworth	Mooney (WV)	Stewart
Hoyer	Moore	Stivers
Hudson	Moulton	Suozi
Huffman	Mullin	Swalwell (CA)
Huizenga	Murphy (FL)	Takano
Hultgren	Murphy (PA)	Taylor
Hunter	Nadler	Tenney