

men and women of our military who have enabled our Nation to continue to be safe and prosperous. I am honored to serve with them and the students in my district who took the time to recognize and organize the veterans at this event.

GOP TAX SCAM

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

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the Senate's version of tax reform would increase the deficit by \$38 billion in 2018. By 2027, the debt would increase by a whopping \$1.4 trillion.

I stand here today calling for tax reform legislation that would help my constituents and millions of other Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the GOP tax plan is irresponsible governing. Many of my constituents say that their families have yet to recover from the great recession, and I hear them loud and clear.

I cannot stand by silently while my colleagues on the other side of the aisle rush through a bill for which it will take years for our economy to recover. This bill raises taxes on 82 million middle class households solely to create giveaways for the wealthy few.

We have only 9 legislative days left this calendar year. It is time to focus on legislation that will give Americans a better deal. We need commonsense, reality-based legislation that will create opportunities for all Americans, not just the select few.

WE NEED LOWER TAXES

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it has been proven all over the world that the most wasteful, least economical, least efficient way to spend money is to turn it over to the Federal Government. If this was not true, then places like Cuba, North Korea, and Venezuela would be heavens on Earth. Socialism simply does not work.

Money left in the private sector does much more to create jobs and hold down prices than does any money turned over to government. A business that continually wastes money and operates inefficiently will eventually go out of business.

A government agency that wastes money or operates inefficiently just uses that as an excuse to ask for higher appropriations. This is what the tax cut bill is all about: an effort to leave more money in the private sector, where it will create jobs and hold down prices.

Wealthy elitists come out ahead, even under our socialist, Big Govern-

ment systems. Lower income people come out better when more money is left in private hands to create jobs and hold prices down.

College graduates often wonder why they can't find good jobs. In large part, it is because our Federal, State, and local corporate taxes are too high, and this has caused us to lose millions of good jobs to other countries.

Mr. Speaker, we need lower taxes.

HBCU 9

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the HBCU 9, the nine Historically Black Colleges and Universities who are celebrating 150 years of academic excellence.

These schools hail from six States and count great African-American leaders such as Eva Clayton, JOHN LEWIS, and Martin Luther King, Jr., as members of their illustrious alumni.

The nine include: Alabama State University, Barber-Scotia College, Fayetteville State University, Howard University, Johnson C. Smith University, Morehouse College, Morgan State University, St. Augustine University, and Talladega College.

Their achievements for the past 150 years are remarkable. They have cultivated a long history as incubators of innovation and continue to produce the next generation of leaders.

Twenty-five percent of African-American STEM graduates, 40 percent of African-American lawyers, 50 percent of African-American teachers, and 21 current members of the Congressional Black Caucus are proud HBCU grads.

These schools were born out of necessity and have endured the test of time to spark a movement and create the African-American middle class, fundamentally changing this country for the better.

Please stand with me in recognizing the HBCU 9 for their years of leadership in African-American communities and their dedication to helping students realize their dreams.

CONGRATULATING STATE CHAMP PRAIRIE RIDGE WOLVES FOOTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Prairie Ridge Wolves football team on their second straight Class 6A State Championship.

The team repeated last year's outstanding performance of finishing the season without losing a single game. Beating the Nazareth Roadrunners in the State final 28-21, the team now has a 28 game winning streak. Their last loss was in 2015.

The team is ranked second in the State overall by the Chicago Tribune. Coach Chris Schremp has been a critical and central figure in their success. A 21-year veteran at Prairie Ridge High School, he was named IHSA Football Coach of the Year and is now competing for the national recognition.

Another crucial part of the team is quarterback Samson Evans. He had a fantastic season. Dubbed "Superman" for his exploits on the field, Evans was named the Chicago Sun-Times 2017 Player of the Year. He will continue his career as an Iowa Hawkeye alongside teammate and lineman Jeff Jenkins.

Congratulations, Prairie Ridge Wolves, for your excellent season, and here is to a continued undefeated winning streak.

□ 1230

TAX REFORM BILL PRESERVES ADOPTION TAX CREDIT

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the importance of adoption and what Congress can be doing to help more kids get adopted into loving, caring families.

November is National Adoption Month, and it is time we talk about how the GOP tax reform bill, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, will help children in need of loving families by supporting those whose lives have been touched by adoption.

Our tax reform bill preserves the adoption tax credit, which allows taxpayers to claim expenses related to the adoption of a child, including fees, court costs, and travel expenses. This credit ultimately helps get more children into permanent, loving families, and the credit costs only about \$3.8 billion over 10 years, a small fraction of our overall budget.

Mr. Speaker, I worked tirelessly with my colleagues to ensure that this adoption tax credit was included in the House's tax bill, and I am pleased that the Senate's version also preserves it in their draft.

I urge my colleagues to work quickly to pass tax reform that preserves the adoption tax credit while bringing tax relief to all American families.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4182, ENSURING A QUALIFIED CIVIL SERVICE ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1699, PRESERVING ACCESS TO MANUFACTURED HOUSING ACT OF 2017

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 635 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 635

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. 4182) to amend title 5, United States Code, to modify probationary periods with respect to positions within the competitive service and the Senior Executive Service, 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 Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. 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. 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.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1699) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage, to amend the Secure and Fair Enforcement for Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 to modify the definition of a loan originator, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-42 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL). 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 my friend from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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 just had a chance to visit with my colleague from New York. We were talking about, well, the same thing all Members talk about when they get together: those things they have in common, those things that make their day a little bit better, those things they are struggling with that make their day a little bit worse.

I regret that so often we come to the House floor and the debate that we are having seems like we just have absolutely nothing in common whatsoever. I am sure it has been your experience. I think you can ask any freshman Member of this institution, Mr. Speaker, "What is the biggest surprise you have had in your first year in Congress?" and they will say, "I am surprised at how hardworking and conscientious and diligent and committed absolutely every single one of my colleagues is, because I was reading in the local paper back home, and it sounded like it was a big cesspool there in Washington, D.C. I am pleasantly surprised at how sincere my colleagues are at working for their 700,000 to 800,000 constituents back home."

Mr. Speaker, we have two bills that this rule makes in order for debate today, and they are two bills that I will tell you are incredibly well intentioned. I plan to support them. I plan to enthusiastically support them, but they are on issues that are hard in their minutia.

The first bill that is made in order today under a closed rule, Mr. Speaker, is H.R. 1699. It is the Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act. We had testimony in the committee yesterday, and the discussion was how do we protect buyers of manufactured housing from being exploited while still enabling those Americans who don't have other avenues for purchasing housing to get into that most affordable of housing, manufactured housing. We have common goals to protect people and to empower people, but how do we get that done?

This bill was worked through committee. I believe it is a good compromise. We didn't allow any amendments to this. There were no germane amendments presented in committee, so that is coming under a closed rule today.

This rule also would make in order a structured rule for H.R. 4182, the Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act of 2017.

Again, Mr. Speaker, when you go and read the headlines, it makes it sound like every discussion on Capitol Hill is among a bunch of partisan hacks. It is just not true.

The civil service, an incredibly important part of American Government, has dedicated men and women who

show up every day to institute the laws that you and I pass, to be the interpreters of the bridge between the laws that we pass and the way they hit folks on the ground. We all want those employees to be protected from the swinging pendulum of partisanship.

I don't want a Republican President to get elected and fire all the Democrats serving in government. There are some bright-minded scientists, some great folks in law enforcement, some really talented people in education. I don't want them to lose their jobs because of the partisanship of a President.

Similarly, I don't want to see a Democratic President get elected and fire all the folks who are Republicans. There are some fantastic Republican minds in our Department of Agriculture helping our farmers to succeed, our Department of Labor helping our workers to succeed. You go right on down the list, there are strong men and women helping folks to succeed.

But we are also facing a reality that that same civil service system that seeks to protect those hardworking, those exceptional workers trying to serve America, that same system that works to protect them also protects folks who are completely derelict in their responsibilities.

We had that discussion as a conference, as a House. In fact, in a bicameral discussion, it went to the President's desk for his signature, as it came to the VA, to say: Can't we do more to reform a civil service system, to reform Federal labor union provisions so that folks who need the protection, because they are exceptional, continue to be protected; but those folks who are failing our veterans, that those folks cease to be protected from a system that seeks to require accountability? We passed that together. We did that together here, Mr. Speaker. We sent it to the Senate. They did it together. The President signed it into law.

This Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act does one thing and one thing only: it extends the probationary period of a new civil service worker from the current 1 year to 2 years.

The Department of Defense has done this already, and it has been working exceedingly well for them. The concern is: Have I been able to adequately assess an employee's ability to perform in a 12-month period?

We are committed to trying to train people up, Mr. Speaker. Nobody is trying to run folks out before they have had a chance to learn their job. The question is: Is a year long enough to uncover the flaws in an employee or is 2 years a wider window?

You will hear folks on the other side say: ROB, why in the world can't you all figure out if an employee is talented in year one?

That is fair.

They will say: ROB, if you are going to train somebody up, why couldn't you get it done in year one?

That is fair.

But as the GAO has looked at this issue, what they found is managers aren't getting that done in year one. Whether it is because they are ineffective as managers or whether it is because they keep trying to give people a second chance and get them trained up is an open question. This bill mandates nothing, but it allows this 2-year window so that managers can give their new employees a good first, second, and third look.

The data suggests that once folks get fully protected by the civil service system, it is very difficult to move underperforming employees out. That work should be done during this probationary period. This bill aims to lengthen that probationary period to 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, reasonable men and women can disagree on these measures. I believe they are important steps in the right direction. But what gives me so much pleasure to come to the floor to bring this rule to you today is the earnestness with which these two bills were presented.

These are common challenges: How do we ensure the very best staff for the American people? How do we ensure access to homes and protection for home buyers for the American people? These are sincere concerns, legitimate disagreements.

If we pass this rule today, we will enable a debating period. We will bring these bills to the floor so that we can air our concerns and challenge our assumptions. I hope, at the end of the day, my colleagues will decide to support this rule and to support the two underlying pieces of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Home Ownership and Equity Protection Act was enacted in 1994 as an amendment to the Truth in Lending Act. It is designed to address predatory lending practices in refinancing and home equity loans with high interest rates or fees.

Loans that meet these high-cost triggers are subject to disclosure requirements and limitations on the loan terms. Borrowers are also provided enhanced remedies if it is violated.

Now, the first bill before us, H.R. 1699, would amend the Truth in Lending Act by exempting manufactured home retailers from being defined as mortgage originators. In the process, it would exempt these retailers from important consumer protection rules. That would perpetuate conflicts of interest and restore incentives for these retailers to steer customers into loans with high costs and fees. These are precisely the type of loans that are more profitable for the retailer even though they are bad deals for the customer.

My good friend from Georgia asked what could be wrong with this; how can we protect those customers? I submit:

You may not protect those consumers by taking all regulation off for them. Obviously, it was there for a reason, and we will see how it turns out.

Those may seem like arcane changes to existing law, but let me put the issue in better perspective.

According to the Manufactured Housing Institute, 22 million Americans live in manufactured homes today. That is equal to the entire State of Florida.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, why in the world is the majority prioritizing a bill that would undermine consumer protections for tens of millions of Americans. We know the legislation would create more access to affordable housing. It would only make the incredibly profitable manufacturing housing industry even more money through predatory lending.

Those who rely on manufactured housing as an affordable option deserve the same antipredatory lending standards as every other family. This bill fails that test. In fact, it was written specifically to take the protections away from the housing industry.

The second measure before us today, H.R. 4182, is completely unnecessary. It would extend the probationary period for members of the Senior Executive Service and members of the competitive service from 1 year to 2. That would double the time that new civil servants are essentially at-will employees without any employee protections or due process rights.

There is no evidence to support the need for doubling the probationary period for Federal employees. The bill would simply serve to delay employees' access to worker protection laws that ensure that they are treated fairly on the job. It would also undermine whistleblower rights and prevent them from coming forward.

These are the people who are essential to getting to the bottom of legal violations and waste and fraud in government agencies. Standing up for their rights used to be a bipartisan priority, but the majority is now prioritizing a bill that would undermine their rights and put the integrity of our Federal civil service at risk.

This comes on the heels of the majority bringing a separate bill, H.R. 3441, to the floor recently. That legislation threatened collective bargaining rights for employees and allows employers to evade liability for wage theft or even child labor violations. And just like the bill before us today, it chips away at workers' ability to do their job without retaliation or unfair treatment.

Mr. Speaker, there is a pattern here. The majority is bringing bills to the House floor that threaten worker protections while they work to advance a procorporate agenda at the same time.

There is perhaps no bigger giveaway on the agenda right now than their tax bill. Under the guise of so-called reform, the majority on the other side of the Capitol is crafting a tax bill that is

nothing but a giveaway to the rich and powerful.

And, please, don't take my word for it. On Monday, The New York Times published a piece entitled: "Senators Scramble to Advance Tax Bill That Increasingly Rewards Wealthy." The very first line of the piece gives away the majority's game plan. It said: "The Republican tax bill hurtling through Congress is increasingly tilting the United States Tax Code to benefit wealthy Americans. . . ."

I believe that is beyond dispute by now. In fact, I think every major economist and publication have told us that that is exactly what it is. The scam will raise taxes on tens of millions of middle class families in order to hand deficit-exploding giveaways to the wealthy and corporations that ship jobs overseas. In fact, I heard an economist last night, Jared Bernstein, saying that he thinks this bill encourages moving jobs overseas.

The Republican plan eliminates the alternative minimum tax, which is designed to prevent the very rich from gaming the system. And the bill passed by the Chamber eliminates the estate tax, which will benefit the wealthy, certainly—and very few of them, though, are even liable for paying that tax.

According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, the Congressional Budget Office, under the Republican plan, persons making \$40,000 to \$50,000 a year would pay an additional \$5.3 billion in taxes, combined, over the next decade. At the same time, those earning \$1 million or more a year would see a \$5.8 billion tax cut.

Note, please, the similarity of those figures. If that isn't taking money from the poor to give to the rich, I don't know of anything that could describe it any better.

This is the third time America has tried trickle-down theory. It didn't work with President Reagan; it didn't work under President Bush; and, certainly, it did not work in Kansas. There is a word for doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result. That word is "insanity."

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds just to let my colleagues know that this bill passed out of committee by more than a 2-1 margin, a big bipartisan vote out of committee to reform manufactured housing to provide more access.

Mr. Speaker, I don't profess to be an expert on that, so I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), one of my colleagues from the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of this rule that would allow the House of Representatives to debate legislation I introduced, H.R. 1699, the Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act.

Homeownership, for many, is part of the American Dream; however, overbroad and burdensome regulations arising out of the Dodd-Frank financial control law are limiting the ability of Americans to realize this dream.

Specifically, a one-size-fits-all regulation issued by the unaccountable Consumer Financial Protection Bureau makes it harder for lenders to offer mortgages to hardworking Americans who simply want to buy a manufactured home. By expanding the range of loan products considered “high cost” under the Home Ownership and Equity Protection Act, the CFPB has failed to recognize the unique nature of manufactured housing loans. Because of the increased legal liabilities and stigma associated with making a so-called high-cost mortgage, some lenders have simply stopped making these loans.

According to recent Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data, data that is submitted to the government, the number of manufactured homes of \$75,000 or less has plummeted by 22 percent since this regulation went into effect. As a result, the CFPB’s overzealous regulation harms lower and moderate-income families, particularly in rural areas, who just want to purchase a manufactured home but, now, cannot access the necessary financing. In addition, existing homeowners are harmed because they won’t be able to sell their homes.

These rules are hitting Americans in rural and suburban areas and those with modest means the hardest. Take, for example, the hospital worker, in Kentucky, who applied for a loan of \$38,500 to finance a manufactured home. He had an 8 percent downpayment. His monthly income was \$2,200 per month, plenty to cover the all-in housing costs of \$670 per month. The payment he would have been investing in his own home would have been less than what he was spending on rent, but he was unable to get financing. He contacted local banks and credit unions, but they no longer finance manufactured homes.

The reason for this crippling lack of lending is the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and its so-called high-cost loan regulations and the definitions of “mortgage originator” and “loan originator” established in Dodd-Frank. These regulations fail to take into account the unique circumstances associated with manufactured housing and the fixed costs associated with any home purchase, large or small. They fail to recognize the simple mathematical fact that fixed costs on smaller loans translate into higher percentages of the total loan.

Even if interest payments on manufactured homes are more than your average home, the payments are still more affordable than the all-in cost of a site-built home—or even rent, in many markets. That is not predatory lending. That is actually getting people into more affordable housing. This is especially the case when you consider that purchasing a manufactured home,

as opposed to renting, allows the owners to build equity, leading to financial stability for those Americans.

The Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act recognizes the unique nature of the manufactured housing industry, and it fixes these government-caused problems by modifying the definition of “loan originators” and “mortgage originators” to exclude manufactured housing retailers and sellers from the definition of “loan originator” so long as they are only receiving compensation for the sale of the home and not engaged in the financing of the loans.

The legislation also increases the thresholds for high-cost loans to accommodate manufactured home purchases of up to \$75,000 while still retaining tough restrictions on lenders to prevent any borrowers from being taken advantage of.

As Members of Congress, we have an obligation to protect the American people from regulations that harm their ability to purchase affordable homes for themselves and their families. We need to end government policies that are issued under the guise of consumer protection when those policies actually are protecting Americans right out of homeownership. Again, that is not consumer protection.

So, for these reasons and the fact that about 40 different proconsumer and probusiness trade associations support this legislation, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule.

This is not the only reason why we should vote for the rule. The other legislation, introduced by my friend from Kentucky, the Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act, is another piece of legislation that will help ensure that the U.S. Federal Government has a competent workforce.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman COMER for his hard work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her distinguished leadership and for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to focus in particular on where we are and where we have been. I think it is important, as we discuss these issues dealing with the Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act of 2017, that we really have the responsibility, as Members of Congress, to engage in safe and fair workplaces all over the Nation.

Certainly, I want to speak particularly about the Civil Service Act, which I am stunned that this would extend the period of time for a probationary period from 1 year to 2 years. But what is most striking, since I am a member of the Judiciary Committee, is that Federal employees will remain at-will employees for a period of time with virtually no due process protection.

I clearly want to try to understand an administration that, first of all, wants to make skinny the government to disallow it to do its work; and then, on top of that, it wants to have temporary employees with no due process rights.

Yesterday, we stood on the floor of the House to insist that there be mandatory training for sexual harassment and, as well, to recognize that there should be zero tolerance for sexual harassment and, of course, sexual assault.

As an African-American woman, over the years, historically, we, along with women all over the world, have seen the plight, or the devastation, of sexual harassment and sexual assault. I was disappointed that this floor could not vote on that resolution. I would really ask for that resolution to be called up again so that this House could go on record for supporting mandatory training.

At the same time, I think it balances, with due process, the work that we have to do to make sure that we have a workplace that is tolerable and allows women who feel insulted, harassed, and, God forbid, assaulted easy, quick access to a pathway of relief.

This legislation and the underlying bill on this rule specifically dealing with taking away due process rights from civil servant women strikes me as the wrong direction to go in light of where we are. So I am questioning this legislation. I think it is the wrong direction to go. I, frankly, believe it should be pulled.

And as that legislation is pulled, I believe that we would do ourselves well to reassert the resolution from yesterday and to cast a vote. Let’s get on the record of where we stand on the issues protecting women against sexual harassment and sexual assault.

Finally, let me indicate that we are in the middle of appropriations. We have not been compensated for the devastation of Hurricane Harvey. My constituents are suffering. They are suffering in Puerto Rico, in the Virgin Islands, and in Florida. The appropriation, or the recommendation from the White House, is insufferable, unacceptable, and it is time for us to move as a Congress to bring relief to the people who have suffered from the hurricane.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), a good friend and authority on the issue.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1699, the Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act, and I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this rule and the underlying bill.

As the vice chairman of the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee and a cosponsor of this legislation, I want to underscore the impact that passing the Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act would have on hardworking Americans.

□ 1300

We all agree that we should work to ensure that everyone can afford a safe place to live. Representative BARR's bipartisan bill will remove misguided barriers that block access to affordable manufactured homes while preserving consumer protections.

In many parts of this country, manufactured homes represent a cost-effective and customizable housing option. It is important to keep in mind that the challenge of finding affordable housing is not exclusively an urban problem. Housing affordability is a challenge in many rural areas as well, and manufactured homes can be a solution.

This is an industry that offers millions, including many rural Americans with moderate incomes, a chance at home ownership. In fact, nationwide, 22 million Americans live in manufactured homes.

In my State of Pennsylvania, manufactured homes comprise almost 5 percent of the housing stock. Manufactured homes account for 73 percent of all new homes sold under \$125,000. The average income of a manufactured home purchaser is less than \$40,000 per year.

The manufactured housing business also sustains thousands of families. Sixteen thousand workers in Pennsylvania are employed in that industry.

Unfortunately, misguided rules from Washington, D.C., threaten to choke off access to manufactured homes. When Washington bureaucrats sought to implement Dodd-Frank, they put forward rules that led some manufactured housing retailers and sellers to be considered loan originators. They also expanded the "high-cost loan" definition and swept many manufactured housing loans into that category.

The increased restrictions, liability, and stigma that accompany these designations have led many in the industry to cut back on lending. As a result, fewer hardworking Americans will be able to afford a quality manufactured home for their families.

The Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act will address these harmful restrictions that are making manufactured homes unaffordable for prospective homeowners while preserving important consumer protections.

This bill clarifies that a manufactured home salesperson is not a loan originator unless he or she is being compensated by a lender, a creditor, or a mortgage broker. It also adjusts the high-cost mortgage designation thresholds so that many manufactured housing loans are once again not included.

It is important to keep in mind that the Truth in Lending Act and State consumer protection laws will still apply after the enactment of this legislation.

Representative BARR's bill is a narrowly focused, commonsense, and bipartisan effort to target a specific challenge facing prospective pur-

chasers of manufactured homes. This bill will preserve access to affordable housing for millions of American families.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge support for the Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act and this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation would help thousands of young people who are Americans in every way except on paper.

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 (Mr. NORMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, this Congress faces a moral decision that we have put off making for too long, a decision that we cannot put off any longer: Will we stop the deportation of hundreds of thousands of young DREAMers or not?

This is not a partisan question. This is a question of who we are as Americans.

Are we willing to put partisan games aside? Are we willing to put to an end the fear that DREAMers have, the fear that they have been living with these past few months?

We are quickly approaching the year-end deadline for many items this body needs to address. Many of us are looking forward to seeing our families through the holidays.

What about the 122 DREAMers that lose protection every day that we don't act? Can they say the same.

This is unconscionable. This is not who we are.

When I am home, I hear from businesses, school leaders, public officials, religious leaders, and friends, and they all want us to act now, today. Failure to do so will result in tearing families and communities apart.

The fix is right here in front of us. H.R. 3440, the Dream Act, is a bipartisan, bicameral bill that will put this issue at rest once and for all.

We all know that the votes are here today in this body. Plenty of my Republican colleagues support this legislation. Plenty of my Republican colleagues stand with their business, religious, and community leaders to bring this dream to a reality for the DREAMers.

We have been clear. This Congress must not finish this year without providing a fix in certainty for DREAMers. Their families and the communities that depend on them expect that.

I ask my colleagues to allow us to vote and provide a vote against the

previous question so that we can immediately bring the Dream Act to the floor for a vote today.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would share with the gentlewoman from New York that I have no further speakers remaining, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, funding for the government expires on December 8. That is 8 days from now. We wonder why we are wasting time on unnecessary bills before us today and running us toward another shutdown.

Let me remind everyone watching here today about the last shutdown in 2013. The majority shut down the government rather than fund the Affordable Care Act, which was then and remains today the law of the land. The shutdown lasted 16 days. In just that short time, it cost our economy an estimated \$24 billion. The shutdown cost the government \$24 billion.

Federal facilities were not opened. The mom-and-pop stores and little restaurants in Federal buildings all closed. The processing of veterans' disability claims was stalled. Head Start grantees that serve an estimated 6,300 children were forced to close their doors for 9 days until some private philanthropists stepped in. Hundreds of patients were unable to enroll in possible lifesaving clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health.

Ninety-eight percent of the employees at the National Science Foundation, nearly 75 percent of the employees at the National Institutes of Health, and two-thirds of the employees at the Centers for Disease Control were furloughed. That brought new Federal research to a standstill.

An estimated \$4 billion in tax refunds were delayed, denying middle class families the money they expected and planned for. Even the National Transportation Safety Board was impacted, unable to investigate 59 plane accidents as swiftly.

Another shutdown will be devastating, but I am afraid that is what we are headed for under the leadership here.

The President recently tweeted that he doesn't see a deal on the horizon. This comes after he tweeted earlier this year that our country needs a "good shutdown."

Instead of doing anything about that here today, we are frittering away precious legislative time on bills that are, at best, not urgent and, at worst, completely unnecessary and even damaging.

The greatest Nation on Earth will be struggling to keep the lights on. This is no way to run the United States.

I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, on the rule, and the bill.

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, the gentlewoman raises a lot of important points. I am absolutely concerned about funding the United States Government, but, sadly, in a way that has become systemic as we talk about who we are as a people, Mr. Speaker, we can either be glasses half full or we can be glasses half empty.

Is it true that the number of days we have left in this continuing resolution are limited?

It is.

Is it also true that this House has fully funded the government ahead of schedule for the first time since the good people of the Seventh District elected me to Congress?

It is.

This House has nothing to be ashamed of. In fact, this House should be shouting it from the rooftops:

The United States Constitution gives the United States Congress a job to do. The House has done its. Senate, get to work.

This is the first time, Mr. Speaker, that we have been able to fund all the appropriations bills—there are 12 of them—before the end of the fiscal year since I was elected in 2011. The Senate has passed, I believe, zero appropriations bills so far this year.

Mr. Speaker, let's not give anybody a pass on getting the good work done. Let's do hold people accountable, but let's not chastise ourselves and create an atmosphere of failure.

Success begets success. We succeeded together for the first time in a long time. Let's not waste that opportunity to get that bill across the floor of the Senate.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about civil service protections today. There is not a man or a woman in this Chamber who doesn't want the absolute best Federal workforce that we could find; not one.

The question today is: Do we lock you in and give you all of those iron-clad protections that every American knows the civil service system offers?

We all know that it is hard to get fired from a government job. We all know that.

Should we extend the probationary period where folks can be monitored, trained up, disciplined, worked with from 1 year to 2 years?

If that gets us a better Federal workforce to serve the American people, the answer should be a unanimous yes.

I say to my friends who oppose this bill: If it doesn't end up in that result, I will vote with you to repeal it. But I believe it will end up with a more highly qualified workforce, that it will end up with an American taxpayer who feels like they are getting their money's worth.

I will tell you the best thing we can do for our civil service employees is to end the narrative that civil service is a place of failure instead of a place of success, it is to end the narrative that substandard people work for the Federal Government as opposed to exceptional people work for the Federal Government.

I represent employees of the CDC in my part of the world, Mr. Speaker. The Centers for Disease Control is second to no one in the intellectual firepower that they assemble to serve the American people. Those men and women put themselves in harm's way to battle those pandemics that scare the bejesus out of the rest of us. They do it as an act of service, and they should be praised for it.

The best thing we can do for them is to make sure folks don't slip through the cracks and they get saddled with a substandard partner. We want them to have access to an exceptional partner. This bill would do that.

Mr. Speaker, as to access to manufactured housing, the bill from my friend from Kentucky, it is absolutely true that every man and woman in this Chamber wants to protect the American consumer from predatory lending. That is undisputed. But as my friend in Kentucky stated, when do we protect someone right out of the opportunity to have a home? In the name of protecting people, when do we fail those very same people?

We had testimony in the committee yesterday, Mr. Speaker, presented credit union after credit union after credit union that would no longer loan money to its members to purchase a manufactured home. They wouldn't do it. They couldn't do it.

Talk about predatory lending if you want to; it is not your local credit union that is doing it. Talk about big Wall Street banks exploiting people if you want to; it is not your local credit union who is doing it.

Talk about people who want to build your community; it is your local credit union.

□ 1315

Yet credit union after credit union said: The men and women whom we strive to serve, we will no longer help access the American Dream. We can't. Why? Because of the regulations coming out of Washington, D.C.

Do we want to protect the American consumer? We do, and we can, but we can't protect them right out of home ownership. We shouldn't, yet we have.

Passing this bill today that my friend from Kentucky brings forward corrects that mistake, puts us back on track for protecting consumers and enabling consumers.

Mr. Speaker, you can pick any day of the week on Capitol Hill, and you can find a way to describe everything that goes on as nefarious, as misguided, as contrived. But, Mr. Speaker, you can also look at days on Capitol Hill and see the earnestness with which men and women work together to move this country forward. That is the day we have today. I hope it is the day we have tomorrow and the next day and the next day.

I urge my friends, support this rule. Support bringing this bill to the floor for manufactured housing. Support bringing this bill to the floor to improve the civil service system.

We can do that with a vote right now, Mr. Speaker.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 635 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children 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 the Judiciary. 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. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

MINNESOTA'S ECONOMIC RIGHTS IN THE SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3905) to require congressional approval of any mineral withdrawal or monument designation involving the National Forest System lands in the State of Minnesota, to provide for the renewal of certain mineral leases in such lands, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

A motion to recommit, if ordered;

Passage of the bill, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on H. Res. 635; and

Adopting H. Res. 635, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 237, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 642]

YEAS—182

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

NAYS—237

Abraham	Babin	Bergman
Aderholt	Bacon	Biggs
Allen	Banks (IN)	Bilirakis
Amash	Barletta	Bishop (MI)
Amodei	Barr	Bishop (UT)
Arrington	Barton	Black

Blackburn	Hartzler	Perry
Blum	Hensarling	Peterson
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Pittenger
Brady (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Poe (TX)
Brat	Higgins (LA)	Poliquin
Brooks (AL)	Hill	Ratcliffe
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Reed
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Reichert
Buck	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Bucshon	Huizenga	Richmond
Budd	Hultgren	Roby
Burgess	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Byrne	Hurd	Rogers (AL)
Calvert	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Rohrabacher
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (WV)	Rokita
Chabot	Johnson (LA)	Rooney, Francis
Cheney	Johnson (OH)	Rooney, Thomas J.
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Cole	Jordan	Roskam
Collins (NY)	Joyce (OH)	Ross
Comer	Katko	Rothfus
Comstock	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer
Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Royce (CA)
Cook	King (IA)	Russell
Costello (PA)	King (NY)	Rutherford
Cramer	Kinzinger	Sanford
Crawford	Knight	Scaife
Culberson	Kustoff (TN)	Schweikert
Curbelo (FL)	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Curtis	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Davidson	LaMalfa	Sessions
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Lance
DeFazio	Lance	Shimkus
Denham	Larson (CT)	Shuster
Dent	Latta	Simpson
DeSantis	Lewis (MN)	Sinema
DesJarlais	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Diaz-Balart	Long	Smith (NE)
Donovan	Loudermilk	Smith (NJ)
Duffy	Love	Smith (TX)
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Smucker
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Stefanik
Dunn	MacArthur	Stewart
Emmer	Marchant	Tenney
Estes (KS)	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Farenthold	Marshall	Thornberry
Faso	Massie	Tiberi
Ferguson	Mast	Tipton
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Trott
Fleischmann	McCauley	Turner
Flores	McClintock	Upton
Fortenberry	McHenry	Valadao
Fox	McKinley	Wagner
Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Walberg
Frelinghuysen	Rodgers	Walden
Gaetz	McSally	Walker
Gallagher	Meadows	Walorski
Garrett	Meehan	Walters, Mimi
Gianforte	Messer	Walz
Gibbs	Mitchell	Weber (TX)
Gohmert	Moolenaar	Wenstrup
Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Gosar	Mullin	Williams
Gowdy	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Noem	Wittman
Graves (GA)	Nolan	Womack
Graves (LA)	Norman	Woodall
Graves (MO)	Nunes	Yoder
Griffith	Olson	Yoho
Grothman	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Guthrie	Palmer	Young (IA)
Handel	Paulsen	Zeldin
Harris	Pearce	

NOT VOTING—14

Bridenstine	Jayapal	Renacci
Collins (GA)	Kennedy	Stivers
Conyers	Khanna	Taylor
Gutiérrez	Pocan	Webster (FL)
Harper	Posey	

□ 1342

Messrs. RUSSELL, DENT, GOSAR, MOONEY of West Virginia, MEADOWS, COLLINS of New York, GOODLATTE, WITTMAN, ROTHFUS, BRADY of Texas, and ROYCE of California changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. COSTA and MOULTON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.