



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2017

No. 200

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BRAT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 7, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVE BRAT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL MINERS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Nation observed National Miners Day, which was designated by Congress to honor the contributions and sacrifices of miners both past and present.

Mr. Speaker, I am the proud grandson of a Pennsylvania coal miner. National Miners Day does mark the anniversary of the worst mining accident in

history on December 6, 1907, in Monongah, West Virginia. The disaster resulted in the death of 362 miners.

While technology in mining has continued to improve, mining remains difficult work. Every day, our Nation's miners work so hard excavating minerals for energy production and raw materials for many forms of manufacturing. In particular—my family heritage—I am very proud of our Pennsylvania coal miners who really dug the coal that fueled the industrial revolution and provided the energy for fueling our preparations to win World War I and World War II.

From coal to copper, and from gold to granite, miners work to provide materials that play an important role in our everyday lives. American miners today deliver the same commitment to the industry that they historically have. But thanks to advancements in technology, we are seeing the industry operate smarter, faster, and, most importantly, safer.

Americans benefit from the energy, metals, and minerals made available to us thanks to mining. It is as fundamental today as it was centuries ago.

Mr. Speaker, to all of our miners, I say: Thank you for all you have given to this important industry.

CONGRATULATING THE TITUSVILLE AREA HOSPITAL

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Titusville Area Hospital on a national recognition for overall excellence in patient perspective.

The award, which is presented by the National Organization of State Offices of Rural Health, was announced on National Rural Health Day. Titusville Area Hospital CEO Lee Clinton called the award a true honor and added that he is very proud of the care provided and the level of expertise offered to the citizens served at the Titusville Area Hospital.

He said: "All of our staff strives to provide each patient with the best pos-

sible experience every time. This award demonstrates our ability to exceed as a small, rural community hospital."

Mr. Speaker, our rural hospitals face complex challenges that range from financial concerns to a shortage of healthcare professionals. Thankfully, the Titusville Area Hospital is being recognized as a top performer that is increasing patient satisfaction, and I am proud that it sets the standard for other rural hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly congratulate CEO Lee Clinton and all of the staff of the Titusville Area Hospital on this outstanding achievement.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES THOMAS ESCO, SR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. James Thomas Esco, who was born in Canton, Mississippi in 1942, which is home to my good friend, Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON, who represents that area. It is also home of The Canton Spirituals, one of the most outstanding gospel singing groups in the country.

Mr. James Thomas Esco was born a unique person. He was the 29th child of 30 in a blended family of Mr. Percy Lee and Mrs. Earline Esco. He loved his family and fell in love with his wife's 16 brothers and sisters. He was married to Mrs. Sadie Pearl Esco for 55 years.

He was as solid as a rock and a humanitarian with a heart of gold. He was always concerned about and looked out for the well-being of others. He was a hard worker. He worked in a factory and drove a taxi. He brought dignity to any work task which he performed. He stressed the importance of education and taught his children to get the best grades. He adored his wife's 16 siblings and supported them in their endeavors.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H9711

He instilled in his children and seven grandchildren to be kind, to be respectful of others, to work hard, to get the things you want in life, to be active citizens of the United States, and, most importantly, to know Jesus.

These words and this biography were put together by the daughter of Mr. Esco. What a man. What a daughter. What a family.

Mr. Speaker, these are the kind of people who I am fortunate to represent, and I am indeed pleased to share them with the rest of the world.

With much love and respect, I am U.S. Representative DANNY DAVIS from the Seventh District of Illinois.

MONTHLY MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING MILITARY MEMBERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, in 2008, I introduced a resolution amending House rules, which would require that we open the first session day of every month with a moment of silence in honor of the military members who had been killed in war. Speaker NANCY PELOSI got word of my resolution and her office informed me that amending the rules would not be necessary.

Speaker PELOSI decided that she, and only she, would open the legislative month with that moment of remembrance. She kept her word and, monthly, met her commitment to our fallen American heroes.

Yesterday, I introduced the same legislation, H. Res. 643, and I called on the Speaker of the House to initiate this policy of honoring the military members we have lost fighting for this country.

Since Mr. RYAN became Speaker of the House in 2015, at least 165 brave American men and women have been killed in service. We in Congress have not sufficiently recognized or remembered those who have died for America.

It is my belief that since Speaker RYAN is in the line of succession to become President of the United States and Commander in Chief, it is his constitutional responsibility, and solely his responsibility, to show gratitude to those who have died for this country. I wrote to Speaker RYAN on December 5 asking that he begin this tradition in January of 2018.

In closing, I hope all of my colleagues will join me in support of H. Res. 643. America is at war. American military members are fighting and dying for this country. It is only through remembrance and prayer that the United States House of Representatives can truly show the bereaved families of those we lost that we share in their sadness.

Mr. Speaker, when I come to the floor to talk about death and war, I try to show the pain in the faces of those who have lost loved ones. The least we can do in this House is, once a month,

have a moment of prayer in remembrance of those who have died for this country.

COMMEMORATING ADMIRAL LLOYD R. "JOE" VASEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HANABUSA) for 5 minutes.

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Hawaii and the veterans of the Pacific war, I speak today in support of H.R. 4300, the Admiral Lloyd R. "Joe" Vasey Pacific War Commemorative Display Establishment Act, which will establish a Pacific war memorial at Pearl Harbor.

Pacific Historic Parks, a nonprofit organization based in Honolulu, will design and build the memorial in coordination with the National Park Service. The project will not require Federal funds, and I am grateful for their partnership.

My sincere thanks to my friends and colleagues, Congressman ROB BISHOP, for joining me in introduction of this bill, and working with Ranking Member RAÚL GRIJALVA to ensure its swift consideration by the Natural Resources Committee.

"Thank you," "mahalo," to our over 990 cosponsors who built bipartisan support for this measure. I understand it will pass by unanimous consent later today.

Seventy-six years ago today, Imperial Japan attacked Pearl Harbor, pulling our country into World War II in the Pacific. The Pacific Theater was the scene of fierce fighting, and more than 150,000 U.S. casualties on the Philippines, Guam, the Solomon Islands, and many places in-between.

Brave Americans lost their lives in defense of our Nation. Today, at Pearl Harbor, the USS *Arizona* symbolizes the start of the war, and the USS *Missouri* marks its conclusion. But there is no memorial recognizing the experiences and sacrifices of those who fought in the Pacific.

Admiral Vasey served on the USS *Gunnel* during the Pacific war, and it is his vision that we are realizing with this memorial. After fighting for his country, he dedicated his life to the pursuit of peace in the Asia-Pacific region.

In addition to his service in the U.S. Navy, he founded the Pacific Forum Center for Strategic and International Studies—CSIS. Admiral Vasey served as the Senior Adviser for Policy, Pacific Forum CSIS; the former chief of strategic plans and policies for the U.S. Pacific Command; and the Secretary to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Admiral Vasey is 100 years old, and he will turn 101 on January 31, 2018. He carries with him the memories of those lost in combat and the honor and responsibility of the veterans who survived. Hopefully, with passage of H.R. 4300, Admiral Vasey and the remaining survivors will find some peace, knowing that the fallen soldiers will be

properly honored and future generations will visit the memorial and learn of the battles that they fought.

We must share their stories of sacrifices in the hopes that we prevent future generations from waging war and participating in the historical racism that resulted in the internment of Japanese Americans, including both of my grandfathers.

This spirit of American history must not be forgotten. The lessons were hard, but they helped shape a better nation. This country owes Admiral Vasey and the members of the Greatest Generation a heartfelt "thank-you," "mahalo."

□ 1015

THE KATE STEINLE VERDICT AND THREE PRINCIPLES FOR IMMIGRATION POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, on July 1 of 2015, Kate Steinle was walking with her father on a pier in San Francisco. While she was on the pier, she was shot to death by an illegal immigrant who had been deported five times. He had been convicted of seven felonies.

Before he murdered Kate Steinle, the Federal Government had asked the city to turn him over so that he could be deported again. The city, following its policy of not cooperating with Federal immigration officials, released him from jail. He murdered Kate Steinle 3 months later. A few days ago, her killer was declared not guilty by a San Francisco jury. For now, there is no justice for Kate Steinle.

There is a question in this, though, for all of us. It is a question we should ask when we are confronted by a terrorist attack conducted by the asylees like the Boston bombing or the San Bernardino massacre, where one of the attackers was in the United States on a K-1 visa.

The question is: Why was this person in our country? In the case of Kate Steinle, we now know exactly why: the city of San Francisco's policy. The city is an accomplice to Kate Steinle's death. It is pure and simple.

They have defied and continue to defy Federal law. They defied it in general by refusing to cooperate with Federal immigration authorities as a blanket policy, and they defied it in the specific case that led to the death of Kate Steinle.

This is a radical policy, and I don't use that word lightly. You have an illegal immigrant convicted of multiple crimes, in addition to coming here illegally five times. The Federal Government tries to send the guy home a sixth time, and the city lets him go because they ignore the law, and then he murders someone.

The results of this city's extremism is a shattered family. The result is a

father who will never see his daughter again. The result is a mother who has to face the worst nightmare of every parent. These are the terrible facts of this tragedy, Mr. Speaker, and there is nothing we can do in this body to change them.

What we can do is move forward towards an immigration policy that is based on sound principles. For the radicals, this will be a radical change. For everyday Americans, this is just common sense.

On this front, there are three fundamental principles to a sane immigration policy. First, Americans have the right to determine who becomes citizens through laws. It is right there in the Constitution. Article I, section 8, provides Congress with the explicit authority to regulate naturalization. A country without borders is not a country. It is just a geographic destination.

Second, who comes here should be in the best interest of Americans. The number of known criminals we need to be letting in is zero. The number of people who cannot read and cannot speak English we need to be admitting is zero. The number of radical Islamists and of drug addicts we need to be letting in—zero. We are ready and willing to welcome hardworking immigrants who are ready to pay taxes, to follow our laws, and to build our country together.

Third, we have the right to enforce our choices through immigration laws. We should stop sanctuary cities and enforce sanctions against those who hire illegal labor. We should build President Trump's border wall, a policy that has worked unbelievably well in Israel. Most people agree that law enforcement is an effective deterrent against committing crimes. Illegal immigration is no different.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Pew Research Center, the population of illegal immigrants in my State of North Carolina has gone up 1,400 percent from 25,000 people in 1990 to 350,000 in the year 2014. We have got to get this under control. Any country where the Kate Steinle tragedy can happen is not a country with a sane immigration policy.

I hope we never again have to ask the question after a tragedy: Why is this person in our country? Because I hope the answer will be widely known, that we have a reasonable immigration system that benefits all Americans and does everything within reason not to bring in people who will hurt us. Kate Steinle proves that we are not there yet. But I believe that we can get there one day.

FOREIGN OWNERSHIP OF FEDERAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the American public has caught on to our Republican colleagues' tax scam. They

know their bill takes from our struggling middle class and rewards bountifully the billionaire class and transnational corporations—the very ones that will use the money to ship more of our jobs overseas.

In fact, the only permanent tax giveaways this bill will cause are for big corporations. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates their bill will add \$1 trillion additionally to our debt minimum, and that doesn't count the interest.

This chart shows over time how much more of our gross domestic product—our economic prowess, what we produce every year in our country—is related to the national debt. The national debt has been exploding over time. Their bill makes it worse, not better. We should not so highly leverage our economy.

Their bill flies in the face of fiscal responsibility, and to what end? The bill would decrease Federal revenue by a projected \$5.5 trillion, tragically putting our national economic security at grave risk. What is put on the table for cuts? Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid—all on the chopping block.

There is little in the Republican bill good for average Americans. With their legislation, our Republican colleagues will actually push America into deeper financial servitude to foreign investors buying our debt like China and Saudi Arabia. How does this make America great again? Foreign investors will be financing more and more of U.S. debt.

This chart shows how much now is being financed by foreign interests. Way back, the American people used to buy Treasury securities, and we financed our own debt. But over time, what has happened is that because we were leveraging our economy too highly with debt—borrowed money—foreign interests started to buy our securities. They now own nearly half. Do you know what? That means we owe not just the principal they have borrowed, but interest. So over time, the hole is being dug deeper, and foreign interests literally have now become the largest holder of U.S. debt.

Under their scheme, foreign nations will snap up and buy more U.S. Treasury securities, and this will rob future investments that would benefit Americans because we are required to pay back not just the principal but the interest to foreign creditors. Imagine if that money that we are paying on interest to foreign creditors could actually be invested here in America through tax cuts that actually target middle class families to increase their buying power. But with this massive debt, the American Government is sliding on a slippery slope more beholden to foreign creditors, not the American people.

China is now our largest foreign creditor. If you look at the debt that we owe, you will see China has been growing as an owner of the United States of America. Over time, they already own \$1.2 trillion along with other Asian

powers, or 19 percent of our foreign-owned debt. Our taxpayers are paying China principal plus interest—not a good formula for American independence.

Yet China's authorities are not hesitant to undermine American interests starting with democracy itself. But on economic issues, they dump steel to such an excessive level on global markets that it has crushed our domestic steel industry. They manipulate their currency to advantage the yuan, and they continue to rob intellectual property from American companies and universities every day. Being in the pocket of China to finance our debt is not in America's interest.

Other top countries buying U.S. debt include—get ready for this—the Cayman Islands with \$260 billion, and India and Saudi Arabia with between \$135 billion and \$248 billion; and that is a conservative estimate. Even Russia—Russia—owns \$86.2 billion of our debt—a country that interfered in our election process and in our closest allies in Europe's elections.

America best be careful because we are ending up in foreign servitude through the ownership of the U.S. debt. Defeating the Republican tax plan is one way to start righting the ship of state.

NORTH CAROLINA IS THE NUMBER ONE STATE FOR BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, recently, Forbes magazine reported something that we North Carolinians have known for some time: North Carolina is the number one State for business.

To give credit where it is due, the Tar Heel State's successful business atmosphere is in large part due to the North Carolina Legislature which has cut personal and corporate tax rates since Republicans assumed the majority in 2010. This year the legislature enacted a budget that reduces the State's flat personal income tax rate from 5.499 to 5.25 in January of 2019.

In 2013, elected officials in Raleigh created an impressive probusiness policy agenda that reduced the State's corporate income tax from 6.9 percent in 2013 to 3 percent in 2017, which will drop to 2.5 percent in 2019. This progrowth corporate income tax reduction has played a pivotal role in making North Carolina attractive to businesses.

The State of North Carolina is a wonderful place to start a business and to live, and people from other States are moving to the State in droves. Migration rates to North Carolina consistently rank in the highest percentiles in the Nation. Our State ranks second in lowest business costs in terms of labor, energy, and taxes. With rankings like that, it is no wonder that businesses rightly choose to operate out of North Carolina.

As a former small businessowner, it is a pleasure to hear that Forbes had recognized North Carolina's business bona fides. Thanks to the North Carolina Legislature, small and big businesses in North Carolina are competitive on a domestic and global scale.

Mr. Speaker, the officials in Raleigh worked hard to ensure North Carolina would become the most competitive State for business in the country. Here in Washington, we are building upon the success of North Carolina and bringing about a tested policy recipe for economic growth: fairer, simpler, and lower taxes.

Whether you are an individual struggling to make sense of your tax burden before April 15, or an American corporation that is trying to compete with America's competitors, or a small business that has faced the IRS's stifling complexity, you know that our Tax Code is broken. I have heard enough from Fifth District families, businesses, millennials, and other budding entrepreneurs to know that Congress must act now to bring about the economic expansion that Americans need and deserve.

That is why I was proud to cast my support in favor of H.R. 1, the Tax Cuts and Jobs bill. This bill is Congress' answer to the will of the people. It delivers much-needed tax relief to taxpayers by lowering every marginal tax rate on the books that applies to working Americans. It enables our businesses to win here at home and expand our Nation's job growth. It will boost paychecks for generations to come.

By doubling the standard deduction, even more Americans will no longer need to itemize their deductions. For married couples filing jointly, this translates to \$24,000 yearly that is free from Federal taxes. By lowering the crippling taxes on businesses, workers will see an increase in their wages.

A report from the nonpartisan Tax Foundation found that a middle-income family in North Carolina would see its aftertax income increase by \$2,366. The same foundation found that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will create 975,000 new jobs nationally and grow wages by 4.4 percent for middle-income households.

As we have seen in North Carolina, when governments simplify and lower taxes, citizens reap the rewards of economic expansion, job growth, and higher wages. Despite all of the hard work done by North Carolina's Legislature and despite our State being rated the number one in which to do business, it is being held back by the Federal Tax Code. The current Tax Code is littered with trillions of dollars in special interest tax breaks that have held people back.

Even though North Carolina is number one, you will find that the four highest earning counties in the United States are all near Washington, D.C. The spending of the Federal Government fueled by the Tax Code and its giveaways undermine the foundations of our economy.

□ 1030

These special-interest tax carve-outs are driven by—you guessed it—special interests. It is time we stop rewarding the closely connected here in Washington and keep taxpayer dollars where they belong, with American workers, job creators, and businesses.

It is time the Federal Government stopped using the Tax Code to engineer people's decisions and allow Americans to live their lives based on their desire for higher wages, entrepreneurship, service, and economic exchange.

I urge my colleagues to follow North Carolina's lead and support the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act to lower taxes and increase paychecks, wages, and job growth, and to fix the Tax Code.

RECOGNIZING THE SONG "KUMBAYA"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very important song to the history of the State of Georgia, "Kumbaya."

The first known recording of "Kumbaya" took place in 1926 near Darien, Georgia. The original name was "Come By Here," but now the song is internationally known as "Kumbaya."

While the exact origin of the song is uncertain, scholars believe it originated with the Gullah Geechee people, who are descendants of enslaved African Americans who lived on the Sea Islands in the coastal regions of Georgia.

It is largely believed that the song was a plea for God's intervention for this group of African Americans, asking Him to relieve them from a number of different hard times in the community: a sick family member, oppression, and more.

Robert Winslow Gordon, a staff member and eventually founder of the Library of Congress' Archives of Folk Song, was temporarily living in Georgia in 1926 and took the first recording of "Kumbaya" on a wax cylinder recorder numbered A839, still located in the Library of Congress today. He recorded a person in the Gullah Geechee community named H. Wylie, who sang the lyrics: ". . . need you Lord, come by here. Somebody need you, Lord, come by here . . ." This recording of "Kumbaya" is one of the earliest items located in the Library of Congress' Archive of Folk Song. Today, Robert Winslow Gordon is buried in Darien, Georgia, home of that first recording of "Kumbaya."

Scholars think that "come by here" simply sounded like "kumbaya" to some listeners, a nonexistent word at the time that evolved into the song that we have here today. Other scholars think that the original song was not even "come by here," but instead "come by ya."

Since that time, the song has spread throughout our Nation and the world.

Recordings can even be found sung by Americans throughout all different times in our Nation's history.

There are 1930s recordings from central Texas and in Florida, while many Americans were finding solace during the Jim Crow period. In the 1950s and 1960s, "Kumbaya" was sung by Pete Seeger; Peter, Paul, and Mary; and Joan Baez. The song has even been traced to Angola, transported by missionaries.

Even today, "Kumbaya" means something different to different groups of people, but we should never forget the original meaning of the song and who we believe may be the original creators of the song, the Gullah Geechee people.

The Gullah Geechee people live on the southeastern coast, from St. Augustine, Florida, up through Georgia and South Carolina, to their northernmost area of Wilmington, North Carolina. Most of these areas refer to the people as Gullah, but in Georgia, we call them Geechee. They are the direct descendants of enslaved Americans who arrived here from west and central Africa to produce rice for slaveholding Americans.

There are many aspects of their culture that are unique, complex, and beautiful. Their language is based in creole and is the only distinctly African creole language in the United States. The Gullah Geechee people make sweetgrass baskets designed for rice production as a craft passed down to both men and women.

Although this culture and their traditions have modernized since the 19th century and early 20th century in America, today you can still see the Gullah Geechee people weaving sweetgrass baskets and living their culture in other ways if you drive through coastal Georgia.

I cannot overstate the importance this group of people has had on the development and history of the First Congressional District of Georgia, and I want to thank them for their contributions to this area.

Further, as creators of the song "Kumbaya," they have changed lives and have been a significant force not only in the First Congressional District of Georgia, but across the world and throughout American history. To recognize just how widespread this song has become, the Georgia General Assembly passed a resolution officially stating the impact this song has had on our State.

I hope you all will join me in our Nation's Capitol by also recognizing the importance of this song. I am very proud that it originated in the First Congressional District of Georgia, a district that I have the honor and privilege of representing. It is also an honor to have members of the Gullah Geechee community from my district here at the Capitol today.

Welcome to our Nation's Capitol. Thank you for your contribution to our Nation's history.

I WILL NOT BE MOVED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once again, I enjoy the preeminent privilege of speaking from the well of the House of Representatives. I am so honored to have this great opportunity.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge that, yesterday, a historic event took place right here in this House. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, 58 persons voted to impeach Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America. Mr. Speaker, that is 57 more than a good many people anticipated.

Mr. Speaker, there are some who would have the event be nothing more than a footnote in history. Some would just have it be a nonevent. But, Mr. Speaker, it won't happen. It will not be just a footnote. It won't be a nonevent.

Mr. Speaker, this event will be looked upon by scholars as they look through time to understand what happened at this time. They will ponder it and find that those 58 persons were the first 58 to vote to impeach Donald John Trump—the first 58, not the last 58, Mr. Speaker. There will be another opportunity for us to remove Donald John Trump from the Presidency.

Mr. Speaker, when I took my vote yesterday, I voted for a lot of constituents. I just want to single out a few.

I voted for the man who stood on a corner under a bridge, cup in his hand, asking for help. When he saw me, he had a big smile on his face. I voted for him because his words to me, paraphrasing, were: I am so proud of what you are doing with that impeachment. This is a man standing in the streets of life, who sleeps in the streets of life.

I voted for the person who was on a serving line at a cafeteria—I eat in cafeterias quite regularly—who said: Right on; keep on.

I voted for the woman who saw me at church and said: AL GREEN, you are a troublemaker, but don't you stop until you impeach Trump.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for people who would never have this preeminent privilege that they have accorded me to stand here in the well of the Congress. I am not going to let them down, Mr. Speaker.

This was round one. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I don't give out, I don't give up, and I don't give in. I know that I am on the right side of righteousness, and I am going to stay there.

Here is where I stand. I will not be moved.

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

HONORING ALICE FUQUA MCCALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank an exceptional North Carolinian, Alice Fuqua McCall, who has spent nearly three decades working for Members of Congress.

Alice first began her career with Senator Jesse Helms back in 1986 as a special assistant. Alice was fresh out of college when she came to Washington, D.C., and was immediately hired to work for the Senator on Capitol Hill.

It was during this time, Mr. Speaker, that I first met Alice. We both served on Senator Helms' staff together, bringing conservative North Carolina values—and, in Alice's case, Southern charm—to our work in the Senate.

When Senator Helms retired in 2003, Senator Elizabeth Dole welcomed Alice to her staff in Raleigh to handle constituent services. Mr. Speaker, Alice spent 6 years working for Senator Dole in that role. During that time, she became well known in North Carolina for her personal attention to casework. She helped countless constituents navigate the many problems that arise when dealing with Federal agencies.

Following her time working in the Senate, Alice moved over to the House side, serving on the staff of former Congresswoman Renee Ellmers as her constituent services director. Alice's caring and compassionate demeanor made her a logical choice for that position.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, when I was first elected to serve as a Member of Congress, I couldn't think of anyone better suited to serve as my district director than Alice McCall. Her devotion to her work and the people of North Carolina made her an excellent hire.

This past summer, Alice retired from her Federal service after almost 5 years on my staff. The people of North Carolina were lucky to have her as an advocate. My office certainly misses her and will not be the same without her.

I will always think of Alice as a colleague and good friend from our time together with Senator Helms, and I wish her and her family well as she enjoys her much-deserved retirement.

STOP THE BLEED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, when I say the term "CPR," everybody in the room knows what I am talking about; but when I mention "Stop the Bleed," few of us know what it is.

This past summer, I had the opportunity to take part in a Stop the Bleed training program offered for my good friends and fellow physicians at the American College of Surgeons. This simple training teaches individuals how to treat bleeding injuries and help save a life.

Every year, almost 200,000 Americans die from traumatic injuries sustained as a result of events, including vehicle

crashes, falls, industrial and farm accidents, shootings, and natural disasters. The most common preventable cause of these deaths is losing too much blood in the minutes before trained responders can arrive. This is something we need to change.

The ability to recognize life-threatening bleeding and the ability to intervene effectively can save a life. Whether the injury was the result of a car crash, home accident, or farm accident, one person who is there at the right time and has the right skills can make all the difference.

Just like CPR training, a civilian familiar with basic bleeding control techniques is better equipped to save a life. The effort to make this training available to the public is driven by the goal to reduce or eliminate preventable death from bleeding.

The American College of Surgeons, working in partnership with many other organizations, has now made the training needed to address such incidents available to the public. Through nationwide advocacy efforts, the American College of Surgeons will work to ensure that all people have access to training opportunities.

I would implore and encourage folks like the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, American Red Cross, and other organizations that teach CPR to add this very simple course on Stop the Bleed to that training course program. It is a very simple concept of putting pressure where the bleeding is occurring or how to make a quick tourniquet out of a belt or a piece of clothing.

Today, I also take this opportunity to encourage fellow congressional Members of Congress to get trained in Stop the Bleed.

□ 1045

CONTINUING RESOLUTION AND TAX BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we should not shut down the government of the United States. Democrats do not want government to shut down. It is, however, not in our hands. It takes a majority to pass any bill in this House: 218 votes. Our Republican colleagues have over 240 votes. We have 193. So it is not in our hands, Mr. Speaker.

The Republican Party has been given the responsibility and the duty to enact legislation to ensure the proper functioning of government. As the governing party, they can pass whatever they want to pass on this floor. Indeed, as the governing party, they have a responsibility to use their votes to keep the government running. They control the House, they control the Senate, and they control the White House. All the levers of power of legislating are in their hands.

But, we are here, Mr. Speaker, on the verge of a shutdown because of a familiar pattern where Republicans cannot

unite as a party. They cannot agree among themselves on spending priorities. This has happened again and again and again. In fact, each time Congress has successfully enacted a funding bill since the majority took the majority in 2011, they had to have Democratic votes to pass that legislation every single time.

When we passed the continuing resolution in September, just about 3 months ago, we did so because Republican leaders asked for more time to work on the priorities that confront this country and, responsibly, keeping government working. They had 3 months to do so, yet here we are with 1 day remaining and nothing to show for it.

Instead, they have spent the past 3 months—on priorities that I will outline in just a minute—working on a tax bill that is reckless, deeply unpopular, and harmful to the lives and livelihoods of millions of Americans and the economic well-being of our country that I call a death tax because it will explode the debt of the United States; a bill that would raise taxes on 78 million middle class households and kick 13 million Americans off of their health insurance coverage; a bill that would increase, as I have said, the deficit by \$1.5 trillion—indeed, much more than that, because we have to pay interest on the money that we are going to borrow to do the tax cut, while we fail to pay our bills—a bill that would trigger an automatic cut of Medicare by \$25 billion next year; a bill premised on a falsehood that tax cuts magically pay for themselves.

That is what the past 3 months have been wasted on, Mr. Speaker.

Not a single appropriations bill has been enacted by this Congress, not a single one. There are 12. They control the House, they control the Senate, and they control the Presidency.

Now our Republican colleagues, Mr. Speaker, are asking for 2 more weeks. Two more weeks, they say. Republicans are asking us for 2 more weeks because they claim they haven't had time to write a funding bill they can pass.

Ninety days. Every Democrat voted for what I call the "no drama" CR in September. Ninety Republicans voted "no" on an agreement we had to use the next 90 days to address the priorities of America. But 90 Republicans voted "no."

They have had time to write and rewrite and rewrite and rewrite again a tax bill that advantages the wealthiest in America at the expense of the majority of Americans. That, Mr. Speaker, is how they have spent their time these past 3 months.

Write a funding bill to avert a shutdown?

No.

Reach an agreement that is responsible to fund the priorities of America?

No.

Write a tax bill that kicks millions off of their health coverage and raises

taxes on millions more. That is what they have done for 90 days. That is what they chose to do.

Two more weeks?

If they want 2 more weeks, they have 240 votes to give themselves more time. But I am certainly not going to vote to give them 2 more weeks simply to work on the tax bill, which they have pledged to pass by Christmas.

However, if they passed it a year from now, it would have the same impact on America's taxes. The critical they have ignored and delayed. The political has been their sole focus.

I say to my Republican friends, Mr. Speaker: You won control of the government. Govern, govern. Be responsible. Focus on that which is critically important to the American people. Don't say you haven't had time to do the most important job you had. You had time. We voted—every one of us—to give you 90 days, to work either in a partisan sense, as you have done so much of the year; or in a bipartisan sense, which was much more positive and would have been much more productive.

There is a to-do list, Mr. Speaker, of critical legislative items that this House has to complete before the end of the year. It is a long and compelling list. Six of them have hard deadlines and must be done before we leave for the end of the year. For 90 days we didn't do them.

None of the six is a surprise either. Neither are any of the others that the American people expect us to do by the end of the year as well.

The majority has had months to work on bringing legislation to the floor on each one of them—months—yet here we are, in December, pushed up against the wall of a funding deadline.

And Republicans want 2 more weeks so they can focus on passing their tax bill before Christmas?

Not the priorities of America, but a tax bill, a deeply unpopular, appropriately so, tax bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me list what we need to do, what we ought to do, and what we should have done over the last 90 days. Let me just share with the American people who sent us here what the Republican majority has not gotten done in all of the months they have had complete control of the government:

Keep the government open and functioning by passing funding bills and sending them to the President for signature;

Reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program so that millions of our children will not lose healthcare insurance;

Provide funding for VA Choice to help care for our veterans, which must be done;

Reauthorize the flood insurance program, which is so critical to so many millions of Americans;

Extend expiring health programs, such as community health centers, on which so many others rely;

Reauthorize portions of the Intelligence Act to protect America's security, which will end before the end of the year.

Ninety days we have had to consider all of those items.

The American people also expect us to:

Provide the necessary resources to address the opioid addiction crisis, which they had 90 days to do that;

Reach an agreement on spending levels for critical priorities of the American people. We call it dealing with sequester, which is somewhat jargon, but we haven't done that;

Pass funding to keep government effectively serving our people. Ninety days to do that, and here we are;

Pass the Dream Act to provide certainty for those young people who were brought here as children and have grown up as Americans;

Take action to stabilize our health insurance markets. We haven't done that. We had 90 days;

Extend the expired Perkins Loan Program so college students, with the most need, can complete their degrees. We haven't done that in the last 90 days;

Reauthorize fire grants so that our domestic defenders and our first responders can have the resources they need for training, for personnel, and for equipment to keep our communities safe. We had 90 days to do that;

Prevent nearly 1 million people from losing access to Medicaid in Puerto Rico;

And I will end with: making sure that the people of Texas, the people of Florida, the people of Puerto Rico, and the people of the Virgin Islands have resources to rebuild and restore their communities devastated by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

All of this we need to do by December 31.

What do we focus on?

A tax bill.

When will that tax bill take effect for taxes in 2018? When will you pay those? By April 15, 2019.

Yet that is what we spend all of our time on. That is what we have spent all of our time on, not the priorities that I have just read, but a tax bill that will hurt America, hurt its financial status, hurt its middle-income workers, and, most of all, hurt the children who will pay back the money we will borrow to give the wealthiest in America a tax cut, those people making over \$900,000 a year. That crowd will get 62 percent of the resources, yet the Speaker says that we need to help struggling Americans.

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, there is not a person at any one of my town meetings who came up to me and was worried about the people making \$900,000 or more—not one. Maybe it has happened to you, Mr. Speaker, but it hasn't happened to me.

Why are we at this point?

Because we have a governing party that refuses to govern; because we have

a majority that has failed to do the business of the American people, even for something as fundamental as providing for the operations of government.

Mr. Speaker, we Democrats welcome the opportunity to sit down with our Republican colleagues and reach a compromise agreement to meet our responsibilities and address many of the pressing issues I have outlined earlier in this address.

My time is about up. Had we utilized the 90 days that we all voted—we on our side of the aisle, the Democrats voted—with our Republican friends, although 90 Republicans voted “no,” but we all voted “yes” to take 90 days to meet our responsibilities to the American people. It hasn’t been done. We have no confidence that giving 2 more weeks will make it happen.

Let’s get to work right now. Not on the tax bill. That could be passed at some point in time. I am against it. I will vote against it. I hope it fails. It is a bad bill. But let’s address these priorities. That is not what the intent of these 2 weeks are. It is to give 2 weeks so we can pass a bad tax bill that will hurt America, will hurt our children, and will hurt the middle class.

□ 1100

PEOPLE ARE PAYING ATTENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the House Democratic whip lay out the case for the American public, I was struck by how stark the choices are and how much we are looking at failure at home and abroad.

We are watching the reckless action of Trump with his declaration that we are going to move the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem, further isolating America. We are alone in this instance. People who are in the Arab world, European allies, are deeply concerned that this will have a destabilizing effect.

We are watching the countdown here as we are kind of scrambling to keep government open, when, for heaven’s sake, these have been clear for months. Republicans occupy all the levels of power. Why can’t they simply act to be able to send clear signals so the appropriators can work and government operates.

We have watched the expiration of the Children’s Health Insurance Program, wildly popular with people across the political spectrum to be able to have this significant enhancement of health for children in this country, even more important because of the Republicans’ relentless assault on the Affordable Care Act and destabilizing insurance markets. Yet State after State, including my home State of Oregon, is facing the difficult task of sending out notices to families that they are no longer going to have access to this critical healthcare.

In the backdrop of all of this, we are watching a Republican tax program which would be the largest transfer of wealth in our Nation’s history paid for by mortgaging the future of our children and grandchildren a trillion and a half extra debt. When you put in the fact that we will have to pay interest on that, \$2.3 trillion to be able to give some of the largest corporations and the wealthiest Americans even more tax benefit, and we are neglecting fundamental responsibilities.

\$2.3 trillion tax benefits for some who don’t need it, and we still don’t have an infrastructure plan, which the President promised a trillion dollars of infrastructure spending to rebuild and renew America.

Well, I will tell you, there would be bipartisan support for any reasonable plan going forward. In fact, we have people in the American transportation industry who are saying: Raise our taxes.

The fuel tax has been raised in over half the States, including a number of red Republican States. There is a deal to be had when AAA and the American Trucking Associations say: Let’s provide the leadership, make the investment, put hundreds of thousands of Americans to work in ways that will enhance the environment, improve the economy, and give people a sense of pride that we can actually come together and get something done.

It is waiting there. Yet we are spending \$2.3 trillion to largely benefit the top 1 percent and the largest corporations, and we are ignoring needs like that.

The Treasury, we are told, has been doing studies that will prove that this will just pay for itself, and the Secretary of the Treasury has been asked: Show us the studies. What is the research? Where do you pick this number out of the air that is rejected by virtually every independent economist as well as past experience?

We see nothing.

The tax bill is constantly in flux. That is one of the prices that we pay, because they never followed regular order, they didn’t attempt to work on a bipartisan basis. There were no hearings held on this bill. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I was shocked. This bill changed sometimes hour by hour. They still don’t know what they have passed. They are talking about changing corporate tax rates, they are talking about dealing with some of the deductions that have been taken away, like for State and local taxes. It is in a state of flux.

What we do know is what was passed in the House is wildly unpopular. How do you take a tax cut that is unpopular by 75 percent of the population? It is because people are starting to look at it, and the closer they look, the more they are going to find it distasteful.

I am hopeful that we will be able someday to come to our senses, work together on things that will actually make a difference for the American public rather than make things worse.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o’clock and 5 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Steven E. Boes, Boys Town, Boys Town, Nebraska, offered the following prayer:

Today we remember the lives lost at Pearl Harbor and all the young men and women who serve today.

Lord God, in these troubled times of fires, floods, hurricanes, terror attacks, and mass shootings, help us to rely on Your strength to envision and build a stronger, more secure America.

Give us more visionaries like Father Edward Flanagan, who founded Boys Town on December 12, 100 years ago. Father Flanagan was an Irish immigrant who lived the American Dream and taught us all that even the most troubled child could grow up to be a useful citizen if given half the chance. He saw the best in the kids that others rejected as useless.

Help us, but especially each of our Representatives, to see the best in those who have different political or social views so that we can, together, build an America that enables and calls forth the best in its citizens.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DAVIDSON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND STEVEN
E. BOES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank and recognize Father Steven E. Boes, who joined us today to deliver the opening prayer.

Father Boes is the fifth executive director of Boys Town, which is in Nebraska's Second Congressional District and is celebrating its 100th birthday this month.

Father Boes was ordained as a priest in 1985 for the Archdiocese of Omaha and assumed his post at Boys Town in July 2005. He regularly attends sporting and school events at Boys Town High School and dines with kids in their family homes, and I have joined them.

Under his leadership, the number of children served through Boys Town's on-campus, family-style care and programs serving children in their homes and communities has doubled. The Family Home Program, started in 1974, has served 36,000 children to date.

Boys Town Foster Family Services program has cared for nearly 9,000 youth to date, and the In-Home Family Services program has helped approximately 102,600 youth without having to remove them from their homes. Boys Town also has emergency services that have served over 45,000 youth.

The man who started this all 100 years ago, Father Edward Flanagan, was truly a visionary for changing how America cared for families and children. He worked to close reformatories and juvenile facilities where children were abused, eventually opening Father Flanagan's Boys' Home, which became Boys Town. He has made a lifelong impact on thousands upon thousands who were given a rough start in life.

Boys Town now has nine locations across the country including Nevada; Louisiana; north Florida; central Florida; south Florida; Washington, D.C.; New England; Iowa; and Nebraska.

From Father Flanagan to Father Boes, many lives have been impacted.

I recognize Boys Town for 100 years of service to the community and America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING EDDY ACEVEDO

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today is a bittersweet day for our office because we bid farewell to my senior foreign policy adviser and subcommittee staff director, Eddy Acevedo—a native Miami boy and a proud Nicaraguan American.

For over a decade, Eddy and I have worked side by side to advance the issues critical to U.S. interests at home and around the globe. Eddy's depth of knowledge and his political acumen are only eclipsed by his passion and his kindness.

But don't let that fool you, Mr. Speaker. He is a bulldog when it comes to advancing our core ideals, like the respect for human rights and the promotion of democratic principles. That is why he is an ideal fit for his next role as deputy assistant administrator and chief legislative strategist with the USAID. I have no doubt that we will hear many great things from Eddy in the future.

Mr. Speaker, Eddy is more than just my most trusted adviser. He is my dear friend, and he will be very much missed. So our staff and our family wish him and his wife, Luly, all the best as they enter this next new, exciting chapter of their life together.

GOP TAX SCAM

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this holiday season the Republican majority has been working overtime on a tax plan that gives permanent tax cuts to wealthy families and corporations funded by raising taxes on middle class families.

As the Republican majority tries to disguise its tax plan as a beautifully wrapped gift, the American people need to know that there are negative healthcare effects hidden inside the plan.

By passing this tax plan, there would be automatic cuts to Medicare to the tune of \$25 billion a year. In addition, this plan could cause an extra 13 million people to become uninsured. The tax bill will explode our debt or will cut Medicare and Medicaid.

It has been more than 2 months since Congress should have reauthorized the Children's Health Insurance Program and federally qualified health centers. This is the first time in history that these programs have been held hostage to the legislative process.

Instead of racing to reauthorize these popular bipartisan programs, the Republican majority instead has neglected children across the country solely to provide tax cuts to corporations and wealthy individuals.

Mr. Speaker, this plan is not for the many, but it is only for the few.

RECOGNIZING JERUSALEM AS THE
CAPITAL OF ISRAEL

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to President Donald Trump and Ambassador Nikki Haley—South Carolina's former Governor—for the announcement that the United States will recognize Jerusalem as the capital city of Israel and relocate the American Embassy to the holy city which protects all religions.

As President Trump said at the White House: "This long overdue recognition of reality is in the best interests of both the United States and the pursuit of peace between Israel and the Palestinians."

America's bond with Israel is unique, and its strength is the foundation for peace through stability for all of the Middle East providing for prosperity for all countries.

The President's announcement strengthens that alliance, and I appreciate his honoring another of his campaign commitments. Friends of Israel know they have a true friend in the White House, which was heartfelt when I met last month with Sheldon and Miriam Adelson at the Washington Convention Center.

President Trump's team is leading boldly. The President is clear: peace is never beyond the grasp of those willing to reach for it.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism, just as America had resolved December the 7th, 1941.

END HUNGER NOW: FRUIT AND
VEGETABLE PRESCRIPTION PRO-
GRAM

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, my dear friend and colleague from Maine, Representative PINGREE, hosted a panel discussion on the Fruit and Vegetable Prescription Program.

Experts from Wholesome Wave, the American Heart Association, and War on Poverty—Florida briefed congressional staff on how we can improve health outcomes for people living in poverty by increasing access to healthy, fresh produce. It is a simple concept with incredible results.

Currently, healthcare providers at 34 clinics across 10 States provide individuals and family members with prescriptions for fruits and vegetables and \$1 per day per family member to purchase these nutritious foods.

The program has significantly increased food security among its participants and has enabled these families to increase their vegetable consumption by an astounding 206 percent.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the Local FARMS Act, H.R. 3941, Representative PINGREE's bipartisan legislation to expand the support and effort, and let us all work together to end hunger now.

THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR VICTORY

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

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, today, on this day that lives in infamy, we recall MacArthur's message from the Philippines. He said famously:

From the Far East, I send you one single thought, one sole idea written in red on every beachhead from Australia to Tokyo: There is no substitute for victory.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Corps of Cadets at the United States Military Academy to remember that on the football field on Saturday.

Go Army. Beat Navy.

DUCKS UNLIMITED

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the great contributions of Ducks Unlimited.

For 80 years, Ducks Unlimited has played an important role in the wetland conservation process in our country by fighting for critical conservation policies in our national and State capitols and conducting outreach and education to bring the next generation of sportsmen and -women into play.

They have raised billions of dollars to conserve more than 14 million acres, and they have biologists on the ground working with local partners to bring these projects across the finish line.

Ducks Unlimited has had great success in making critical habitat improvements to wetlands that support healthy flyway populations, clean air and water, and strong local economies.

RECOGNIZING DARREN LUTTRELL

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Darren Luttrell from Ohio County, in the First District of Kentucky.

Darren was named the 2017 Farmer of the Year by the Kentucky Farm Bureau at their 98th annual meeting held in Louisville, Kentucky. Throughout an extensive interview process, Darren's steadfast commitment to agricultural modernization, education, and community involvement shone through every facet of his career and personal life.

During his decades of experience in farm management and agricultural technology sales, Darren has not only

doubled the size of his family farming operations, but has been an outstanding leader in the Ohio County Farm Bureau and his local chamber of commerce. Known to the students as Farmer Luttrell, he has inspired the next generation of agricultural leaders through his involvement with local schools.

I am thankful for Darren's advocacy for Kentucky agriculture, and I join Kentucky Farm Bureau and all those Darren has served throughout his career in wishing him the best of luck as he competes at the Swisher Sweets-Sunbelt Ag Expo Southeastern Farmer of the Year competition in Georgia in 2018.

RUSSIA'S EXPULSION FROM 2018 OLYMPICS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the International Olympic Committee has banned Russia from the 2018 Winter Olympics due to rampant and state-backed doping. The Olympic Committee says that Russia's scale of cheating is unprecedented.

Unfortunately, this is yet another example that the enemy of democracy knows no limits under the Putin regime. Russia's Government and its corruption—some say depravity—is so pervasive that it even tarnishes the dignified and ancient tradition of the Olympic Games.

Russia dishonors athletes around the world who make countless sacrifices and give their blood, sweat, and tears to compete. While this decision rightly penalizes Russia, Russia is looking ahead to host the 2018 World Cup in soccer. Putin will relish this global platform to spew out his propaganda to the world while thousands of Ukrainians are killed and millions more throughout central Europe are stifled under his repressive thumb.

The global community must be on alert. We must stand for liberty. We must counter Russia's corruption, interference, and aggression in all its forms.

As the 2018 World Cup nears, I call upon the international community to choose again an honorable field on which the world's athletes can compete.

Mr. Speaker, I include in today's RECORD a news article from The New York Times dated December 5, 2017, titled "Russia Banned from Winter Olympics by IOC."

□ 1215

PEARL HARBOR REMEMBRANCE DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 76 years ago today, our Nation witnessed a devastating attack at a naval base in Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. That event hastened our entry into World War II.

The surprise attack by the Japanese on the morning of December 7, 1941, left 2,403 people dead. Among them were members of the U.S. Navy, Army, Marines, and also civilians. It was one of the deadliest attacks in American history. President Franklin D. Roosevelt described it as "a date which will live in infamy."

On this solemn day of commemoration, we remember and we reflect. Flags throughout our country are flown at halfstaff in honor of Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day.

Mr. Speaker, let us remember and honor the lives of those brave Americans who perished on this day 76 years ago. As President Roosevelt said: "No matter how long it will take us to overcome this premeditated invasion, the American people in their righteous might will win through to absolute victory." And we did.

God bless all of our Pearl Harbor victims and survivors, and God bless the United States of America.

GOP TAX BILL

(Ms. ROSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, this week, Republicans are continuing to work behind closed doors to put finishing touches on their disastrous tax bill that will hurt countless families in Nevada and across this country.

Let's be clear: This monstrosity of a bill would eventually slam many of Nevada's hardworking families with a tax increase, while adding more than \$1 trillion to our national debt. To make matters worse, the Senate version of this bill would spike healthcare premiums and cause millions to lose their healthcare coverage. Also, billionaires and giant corporations can receive an unnecessary tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, Americans can clearly see that this is a bill that is just a giveaway to wealthy campaign donors and giant corporations at the expense of hardworking families. We need a Tax Code that is focused on putting money back in the pockets of all families, not one that creates even worse wealth and income inequality—and certainly not one that puts profits before people.

CONGRATULATING THE PENN MANOR FIELD HOCKEY TEAM

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Penn Manor field hockey team on their 2017 State championship victory.

It was a remarkable season for these young women. The State championship

victory capped off a perfect 28-0 season, and 23 of those victories were shutouts. Mr. Speaker, they scored 148 goals and only allowed 5. Leading scorers Gabby Bitts and Emma DeBerdine combined for 64 goals and 54 assists.

But what is also special about this team is their combined GPA. It is 3.63. It speaks volumes about the team, but also about their coaches and parents, because we know that success like this isn't achieved alone. I couldn't be prouder to represent these young women, and I look forward to the continued success of this program.

Congratulations to the Penn Manor field hockey team, the coaches, their families, and the faculty, staff, and students that helped make this championship possible.

REMEMBERING PEARL HARBOR

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, my heart is in Hawaii today as we commemorate the 76th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, a day that forever changed Hawaii and our country.

We remember those who paid the ultimate price on that fateful day and the millions of Americans who answered the call to serve in the months and years that followed, including two of our former U.S. Senators, Inouye and Akaka.

We remember the famed "Go for Broke" 442nd Infantry Regiment and other units made up of young men who, despite seeing their friends and family members be sent off to internment camps, still stood up and volunteered to serve, putting their lives on the line for this country. They served bravely, sacrificed greatly, and became the most highly decorated unit in all of the U.S. Army's history.

We must never forget what happened at Pearl Harbor, the lessons learned, and the sacrifices of those who served. There is no question that the stories of the Greatest Generation will live on forever in the hearts of a grateful nation.

PEARL HARBOR

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was a calm, cool Sunday sunrise over the Hawaiian Islands when the planes came over the horizon. They were carrying the emblem of the rising sun on their wings and fuselages, the symbol of the imperialist regime of the Kingdom of Japan. They were headed for a surprise attack on a place called Pearl Harbor, an American naval base. It was December 7, 1941.

Meanwhile, here in Washington, D.C., hypocritical diplomats from Japan were talking peace with the United States.

The Japanese planes bombed American battleships in the harbor. They

bombed American aircraft on the ground. After the destruction was over, 2,403 Americans lay dead, murdered by the imperialist kingdom. It was the beginning of America's entry into World War II.

Nearly 4 years later, over 416,000 Americans were killed in the Second World War. Victory over Japan occurred on August 14, 1945, and the "rising sun of aggression" sank into the sunset of history.

We honor and remember Pearl Harbor and all the men and women of the Greatest Generation who served in that war.

And that is just the way it is.

NET NEUTRALITY

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to sound the alarm against the Federal Communications Commission's misguided proposal to repeal net neutrality rules.

Now, let me be clear. Net neutrality rules protect Americans' access to an open, free, and fair internet. The rules prevent internet companies from blocking websites or slowing down their load time simply because they disagree with what the website says. Repealing them would be undemocratic and very dangerous.

What is worse, we know that gutting net neutrality would have a detrimental impact on communities of color. From entrepreneurs to social justice advocates, the internet has been a powerful tool for communities of color to help draw attention to injustices in our society.

This new proposal will essentially kill this free expression and innovation. This is ridiculous. We can't allow democracy and access to the internet to be restricted in the name of corporate profits.

I urge the FCC to reject this plan and stand with the vast majority of Americans who want to keep the internet open and free.

REMEMBERING PEARL HARBOR

(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 in remembrance of the attack on Pearl Harbor and in memory of those who gave their lives on that tragic day.

Today marks 76 years since the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, where 2,403 Americans lost their lives. Many years have passed since that day, and, sadly, there are fewer and fewer survivors of the attacks left with us; however, it is vital that we never let their memory fade.

In my own district, a group of Pearl Harbor survivors, other veterans, and community members have dedicated themselves to preserving the memory

of this attack. Every year, the city of Mission, Kansas, hosts a memorial to observe this date.

One of my constituents, Dorwin Lamkin, is a veteran, Pearl Harbor survivor, and has played a key role in organizing this event. I have had the privilege of attending this ceremony in the past, and I applaud them for continuing this important tradition.

Let us never forget the fallen and the survivors of Pearl Harbor, and may we work every day to honor their memory and sacrifice.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, Republicans continue to rush their tax scam through Congress, raising taxes on tens of millions of people, borrowing over \$1 trillion, just to give massive tax breaks to the people at the very top of the economy.

For the last 3 months since we passed the temporary spending bill, what has been their focus?

Has it been to deal with the lack of reauthorization and full funding for children's health? No.

Have they focused at all on the need to deal with the Dream Act and those DREAMers who are here, knowing no other place than the United States? Have they done anything on that? No.

They have an obsession about one thing: tax cuts for the wealthiest.

Have they done anything at all to deal with this opioid crisis? The President talked about it, declared an emergency.

What have we seen from the other side? Nothing, except an obsession to give tax breaks to the people at the top. For 3 months since we passed that temporary spending bill, that has been the singular obsession of the Republican majority.

That is not what the American people are looking for. That is not what they sent us here to do. We should do the work of the American people.

FEDERAL HISTORIC TAX CREDITS

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Republican corporate tax cut bill is a massive takeaway from middle America and a massive giveaway to corporate America.

The Treasury Secretary says that these tax cuts will pay for themselves, and more. News flash for the Treasury Secretary: Tax cuts don't pay for themselves. They never have, not once, in human history.

What does pay for itself are Federal historic tax credits. When Federal historic tax credits are used to renew historical buildings, \$1.20 for every \$1 in tax credits is generated. When historic buildings are renewed, including in my

community of Buffalo, New York, Main Streets across America are restored, jobs are created, and new business income and property tax revenues are generated.

The Federal historic tax credit does, in fact, pay for itself, and more, by helping cities and communities to become economically independent and self-sufficient.

MEDICARE AND MEDICAID CUTS

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, Leo Rosten, the author of "Joys of Yiddish," defines chutzpah as "that quality enshrined in a man who, having killed his mother and father, throws himself on the mercy of the court because he is an orphan."

Here is a new definition. Yesterday, Speaker RYAN reconfirmed that, after pushing through a tax scam that adds \$1.5 trillion to the deficit by giving tax cuts to the richest, Republicans will insist on slashing Medicare and Medicaid to reduce the deficit. He said: "We're going to have to get back next year at entitlement reform, which is how you tackle the debt and the deficit."

This is not just chutzpah. It is actual cruelty and callousness.

So I ask my Republican colleagues: Did you really come to Congress to take healthcare and long-term care from children, pregnant women, people with disabilities, families, and seniors? Who are you?

GOP TAX PLAN

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues who control the House, the Senate, and the White House are on the verge of another government shutdown. They have brought us to the brink, and now they are asking for more time to get their work done.

Why do they need more time? We have seen this coming. We have already granted one extension. But instead of working with Democrats to avoid a shutdown, they have been rushing through a tax scam. They have been obsessed with this reverse Robin Hood scheme to take money from the middle class and give it to corporations and the wealthiest 1 percent.

Meanwhile, we need to keep the VA open for business. We need to restore the Children's Health Insurance Program and community health centers. We need to provide safety for DACA recipients who are living in fear. We need to provide wildfire victims in California and the victims of the disastrous hurricanes who are waiting for emergency disaster funding the support they need to rebuild their lives.

Each of these priorities has bipartisan support. But instead of working

together on these bipartisan solutions, a unified Republican government has been focused solely on further rigging the system to benefit special interests and billionaires.

No more extensions. Let's work to keep the government open and to address the real priorities of the American people.

□ 1230

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I come down here again finding myself in a position, not planning on speaking. I am down here to speak on a bill that I have on the floor—a bipartisan bill, I might add. I can't help but address what I am hearing from the other side.

First you are hearing: This is getting rushed through. We need to slow this down. We need to be thoughtful.

I ran in 2010 talking about tax reform. Many of my colleagues ran in 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016 talking about tax reform and the need for it. Even President Obama talked about this, when he was saying we needed to lower the corporate rate from 35 percent down to 25 percent. Why? Because we are uncompetitive. We are uncompetitive as a country.

Now you are hearing the other side saying: Wait a minute. Wait a minute. We have to slow this down, slow the whole train down.

What they want to do is protect the status quo. They want to protect the status quo, which I believe is unacceptable.

We know that there is great agreement between the House version and the Senate version, delivering \$24,000 on a standard deduction, which is going to bring real tax relief to working families; making sure that pass-throughs, those small businesses, those S-corporations and LLCs and sole proprietorships, actually get treated better and, at the least, the same way that a C-corporation would.

Here we are on the cusp of making sure that we advance the ball.

TAXES

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, "Kill the bill, don't kill me"; "Tax the rich, not the sick"; these are the chants of hundreds of protestors who have taken to the Halls of Congress. I have never seen anything like it.

The American people know this GOP tax scam is one of the most dangerous pieces of legislation to come before this body. This legislation adds trillions to the deficit, cuts Medicaid, and increases healthcare premiums. It is an unpopular bill pushed by an unpopular President and an unpopular Congress.

Mr. President, the American people don't want your bill. They want healthcare, Medicaid, and Medicare. They want CHIP and community health centers.

Trump, RYAN, and McCONNELL are bankrupting America's priorities to give tax cuts to the wealthy. Their bill is welfare for Wall Street.

In the past year, Republicans have attacked our healthcare, ignored our gun crisis, abandoned our DREAMers, failed to pass a long-term budget, and now this.

Enough is enough. It is time for Republicans to start working for their constituents, not their donors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

TAX-AND-SPEND REPUBLICANS

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I just heard a Member from the opposite side of the aisle come to the floor to talk about what we are talking about. I am only talking about tax-and-spend Republicans.

Can you believe the Republicans who have been singing the song of conservatism for years? They called us "tax-and-spend liberals." And they talk about the deficit. They even run signs talking about how much it is costing the American public every minute. But guess what. They are creating a deficit of \$1.5 trillion in this tax scam that they are passing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my outrage over this harmful tax scam legislation passed by tax-and-spend Republicans. That is what I am saying: tax-and-spend Republicans.

Both the House and Senate bills explode the deficit by over \$1 trillion and raise taxes on the middle class in order to spend on tax cuts for the wealthy. After 10 years, those making \$75,000 or less would see a tax increase, while those making \$1 million or more would see their taxes decrease.

Under the House bill, tens of millions of working families nationwide would experience a tax increase by 2027.

I hope that the tax-and-spend Republicans on the other side of the aisle will come to their senses before sending a final bill to the President's desk.

Tax-and-spend Republicans: over a \$1 trillion deficit. Can you believe it?

TAX BILL

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

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise again in strong opposition to H.R. 1, the so-called Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. This bill is an example of what happens when the wealthy exert their rule over hard-working Americans. Their bill should be called the "Job-Killing Tax Cut Act."

A leading organization fighting to combat hunger, Feeding America, has said that H.R. 1 would undermine efforts to assist those struggling with adequate food access.

In addition, the GOP leadership has yet to take up the CHIP bill.

This is wrong. Let's stop the games and get something done. We shouldn't have to sacrifice the health and wellness of one population for another, and that is exactly what this divisive GOP bill does. It puts the healthcare of our children, our families, and our seniors at risk by pitting their needs against one another.

Healthcare is not a choice, it is a right. The kids in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, who rely on CHIP for their basic healthcare needs, deserve more than this foolish game of politics. We need to come together, roll up our sleeves, do the right thing for our kids, and not engage in the sham version of this tax scam.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to engage in truth in advertising, calling the bill a true tax scam.

I oppose this bill because it is unnecessary, grows the national debt, is a giveaway to big corporations and the wealthy, and takes our attention away from the real problems facing the American people—like jobs.

GOP TAX CUTS

(Miss RICE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this deficit-exploding tax cut for the wealthy and big corporations.

This bill will raise taxes on middle class families in my district on Long Island and add trillions to the deficit—and my Republican colleagues want to pay for it with cuts to education, healthcare, and Social Security.

They seem to think that the biggest problem in America is that corporations and millionaires are struggling to pay their taxes, but that is not what I am hearing from my constituents.

My constituents are asking: When will we take action to protect the DREAMers? When will we reauthorize CHIP? When will we take up the infrastructure bill that the President promised would be a priority?

Instead of solving those real, urgent problems, Republicans spent the first 9 months of the year trying to take away people's healthcare and the next 3 on trying to cut taxes for corporations on the backs of the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues once again to reject this ridiculous trickle-down fantasy, stop the backdoor assaults on healthcare and Social Security, and work with us to solve real problems for the people we serve.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 477, SMALL BUSINESS MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, SALES, AND BROKERAGE SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3971, COMMUNITY INSTITUTION MORTGAGE RELIEF ACT OF 2017; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 123, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 647 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 647

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 477) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempt from registration brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies. 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 115-43 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) the further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3971) to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify the requirements for community financial institutions with respect to certain rules relating to mortgage loans, 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 115-44 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be

subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 123) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any 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 Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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 gentlewoman 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 on House Resolution 647.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I hope you were listening as the Reading Clerk was going through this rule, because there was a lot of meat in this rule today.

Ordinarily, and, in fact, historically, we will do a bill and we will do a rule; we will do a rule and we will do a bill. This rule today makes three bills in order, three important bills in order.

I am proud to be able to carry this rule today. I hope my colleagues will see the merits of it as I do.

The rule provides a structured rule for the debate of two bills out of the Financial Services Committee. One is H.R. 477, Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2017. The second is H.R. 3971, the Community Institution Mortgage Relief Act. The rule also provides for consideration of a continuing resolution, H.J. Res. 123, which provides appropriations through December 22, as final year decisionmaking and negotiating goes on. It also allows the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, CMS, to reallocate existing funds for the CHIP program through December 31, 2017.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start off talking about the Financial Services bills. We will have some members from the Financial Services Committee come down. They can talk about it in details that I cannot.

It was a fascinating hearing that we had in the Rules Committee last night, Mr. Speaker. We had the chairman, Mr.

HENSARLING from Texas, and we had the ranking member, Ms. WATERS. It was a conversation about how we protect people, how do we serve people better.

Now, the Community Institution Mortgage Relief Act, Mr. Speaker, is the result of small community banks and local credit unions saying: We are having a tough time providing mortgages to our members because the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has created rules designed to protect consumers that are protecting them right out of access to a mortgage at all.

Mr. Speaker, it is a legitimate disagreement that we have here from time to time about how to protect people best, about how to love people best, but it is the right kind of conversation to be having. If we pass this rule today, we will be able to get into debate on that underlying bill.

The debate will not be about should we protect people, because we all agree that we should.

□ 1245

The debate will be about how should we protect those people, an issue on which legitimate, well-intentioned, thoughtful men and women can disagree. I look forward to this body working its will.

The second bill, Mr. Speaker, from the Financial Services Committee, H.R. 477, was introduced by a classmate of mine in that big class of 2011, Mr. HUIZENGA from Michigan. He has worked this bill through the process one step at a time, trying to build consensus so that, Mr. Speaker, as we were in the Rules Committee last night, the conversation between the chairman and the ranking member was: Hey, if we can make one more amendment in order, one more amendment that Mr. HUIZENGA and Mr. SHERMAN had worked out together, if we can make one more round of changes, we believe we can get this through on a bipartisan majority coming out of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, we don't celebrate those things, we don't talk about those things. The newspaper will be filled with discord coming out of this city tomorrow morning, but I can tell you that it gives me great pride to come on behalf of the Rules Committee today bringing forward these bills, not that are going to change the world overnight, but are going to make a big difference for real people facing real challenges across this country.

It turns out, Mr. Speaker, my experience is if we do a little bit together every day, a little bit today, a little bit tomorrow, a little bit the next day, we wake up a year from now finding out we have done a whole lot together on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, finally, the continuing resolution. I am not a fan of continuing resolutions, I just want to tell you. I got to talk to you about my enthusiastic, optimistic part of this rule earlier. I am going to lay some tough love

on you now, Mr. Speaker. We are not supposed to be in the continuing resolution business. You know with your leadership, the leadership of the gentlewoman from New York, the leadership of the two gentlemen from Michigan here on the floor, this House passed on time, ahead of schedule, the funding bills to fund the priorities of the American people for fiscal year 2018.

Folks said we couldn't get it done, folks said we couldn't do it all. We did, and we did. We sent that to the Senate, Mr. Speaker, before the end of the fiscal year, which was back on September 30. The Senate hasn't been able to take it up yet, Mr. Speaker. The Senate hasn't been able to debate it yet, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know if the Senate is going to get it done in the next 2 weeks, but there are folks in this institution, Mr. Speaker, who say: You know what? We couldn't get it done in the Senate over these last 2 months, so let's just go ahead and pass a continuing resolution for all of fiscal year 2018.

A continuing resolution, for folks who don't follow the appropriations process, means, hey, if it worked well last year, let's just do the same thing next year. Mr. Speaker, that is awful public policy.

We came together debating almost 500 amendments. Having moved every single appropriations bill through the Appropriations Committee, we came together not just in a bipartisan way in the committee, we came together here on the House floor, debated these issues, grappled with these issues, and produced a work product with which the American people can take great pride.

I don't want to give up on that work product, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to settle for the way things have been. I believe that we can do better.

By passing a 2-week continuing resolution today, we ensure that all the features of government continue to operate as the American people expect them to, and we provide another window for the Senate to come together and pass those appropriations bills as we have done here in the House.

I am optimistic about that coming to fruition, Mr. Speaker. I believe that we can get that done together.

Mr. Speaker, we can take up these bipartisan efforts from the Financial Services Committee, we can take up this important effort to continue the funding of the government if we pass this rule today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have great fondness for Mr. WOODALL. I think he is one of the best, most pleasant persons on the Rules Committee, and it grieves me that I have to, right off the bat here,

take issue with him, but I have to take issue with the claim that Republicans completed their appropriation work on time.

I have got a timetable of the budget process that came from the website of the Budget Committee majority, on which my colleague, Mr. WOODALL, serves. Let's review the most important deadlines.

First, the President must submit his budget to Congress by the first Monday in February. The truth: this year, the administration released what they called a skinny budget on March 16 and didn't release the full budget until May 23. From our reckoning, that is 4 months late.

Second, the Congress must complete action on the budget by April 15. The truth: this year, Republicans weren't able to get the fiscal year 2018 budget through Congress until October 26, over 6 months late and nearly a month into the new fiscal year.

Now, here is another deadline, again available on the Republican Budget Committee's website. The Appropriations Committee is supposed to complete their work by June 10. The truth: this year, they didn't report out any appropriations bills until after that deadline had passed.

Another deadline: the House is supposed to complete action on annual appropriations bills by June 30. The truth: not only did the Republican majority fail to meet that deadline, they weren't able to pass any of them separately at all. Instead, they lumped four bills together and passed them on July 27 and then passed an Omnibus with all 12 bills together on September 14, leaving 2 weeks only for the House and Senate to work out their differences, but the law said that they should have 3 months to do it.

I wouldn't bring this up except I know Mr. WOODALL believes, with all his heart, that what he is saying is right, because we have heard it before.

That leads me to the final deadline that they missed. Fiscal year 2018 began October 1, but here we are more than two months later on December 7. The Republican majority has still failed to fund the government, because they have been too busy working to kill the Affordable Care Act and to give big tax breaks to corporations and billionaires.

On time, Mr. Speaker? Any school child could tell you that you don't get credit for an assignment that is 2 months late.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the timetable of the budget process from the website of the House Budget Committee majority.

TIME TABLE OF THE BUDGET PROCESS

Title III of the Congressional Budget Act establishes a specific timetable for the congressional budget process.

On or Before, Action to be completed:

First Monday in February, President submits his budget; February 15, Congressional Budget Office submits report to Budget Committees; Not later than 6 weeks after the President submits the budget, Committees

submit views and estimates to Budget Committees. (Frequently, the House Budget Committee sets own date based on Legislative Calendar); April 1, Senate Budget Committee reports concurrent resolution on the budget; April 15, Congress completes action on the concurrent resolution on the budget. (This is not signed by the President)*; May 15, Annual appropriation bills may be considered in House; June 10, House Appropriations Committee reports last annual appropriation bill; June 15, Congress completes action on reconciliation legislation. (If required by the budget resolution); June 30, House completes action on annual appropriation bills; October 1, Fiscal year begins.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the majority has put before us today a 2-week continuing resolution to fund the government through December 22.

I have heard some in the majority question why anyone would take issue with this approach, but, Mr. Speaker, the question that should be asked is this one: What is the majority actually willing to get done over the next 2 weeks? Because it has now been more than 2 months since some vital national priorities have lapsed under their leadership.

The Children's Health Insurance Program, which provides healthcare to more than 9 million children across this Nation, expired on September 30. So did the community health centers, which serve more than 25 million people. Now, this expiration has put 2,800 centers in danger of closure and 9 million people at risk for losing their access to their healthcare.

The Perkins Loan Program, which many low-income students rely on for their education, was allowed to expire by the majority with no reauthorization in sight, despite broad bipartisan support for a bill to do just that. Unfortunately, the majority has been unwilling even to bring it up for a vote.

Are they now ready to take meaningful action to protect our children, our students, our public health, and our Nation?

Democrats haven't just been fighting to reauthorize programs that expired 2 months ago, we are also trying to address the priorities that we know our Nation will face in the weeks ahead. That includes passing hurricane relief funding to help the families that are still recovering from this horrendous hurricane season; and as all of us are fearful of and sad about, California is burning once again; reauthorizing section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, which we depend on, which is due to expire at the end of this month. The FISA court helps to keep our country safe.

Mr. Speaker, if past is prologue, this majority will be missing in action 2 weeks from now, just as they have been for months.

Just consider, for a moment, how they have squandered this year, wasting months on fruitless attempts to repeal the Affordable Care Act until persuaded by their constituents that they did not want that done. It remains the law of the land today after the public overwhelmingly demanded the majority stop that crusade.

Now they are trying to pass a tax cut for the wealthy that, if enacted, would represent one of the largest transfers of wealth from working families to the wealthy that our Nation has ever seen.

I want everybody to please pay attention to this, because it is proof positive of what is happening with this majority. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office, under the majority's plan, those making \$40,000 to \$50,000 would pay an additional \$5.3 billion in taxes combined over the next decade. Now, remember, they are going to pay more into the number of \$5.3 billion.

At the same time—attention, America—those earning \$1 million or more would see a \$5.8 billion cut. Have you ever seen anything as cut and dry? They absolutely want to take from the poor to give to the rich—Robin Hood in reverse.

So we are 2 months into the fiscal year, and the majority has been so preoccupied with the special interest agenda, that we haven't passed full year appropriations. This has robbed the Federal agencies and our economy of the certainty that they need.

The majority holds the House, the Senate, and the White House and still can't get anything done. So when Democrats see a continuing resolution for 2 weeks, we don't see a simple extension of the status quo; we see it for what it really is: kicking the can down the road in order to pursue reckless partisan politics, and it comes without any plan to tackle the major issues that face our Nation today.

Let me remind my colleagues how important it has been for both parties to work together, because in this process, both the CR and the tax bill, there are no Democrat fingerprints on any of it. For a lot of this stuff, there has even been no committee action.

Democrats have helped the majority pass every major funding bill since they assumed control in 2011. That is the result of bipartisanship.

This time, the majority decided not to compromise with us to reach a deal. Let's see if they can cobble together the votes to get this proposal over the finish line.

Even if it passes, we will be back here later this month to consider another short-term continuing resolution, and we still have no idea whether this bill, the one we are working on today, could even pass the Senate.

This is no way to run the United States of America. The lives of our countrymen are hanging in the balance.

All we do under this majority is to lurch from one self-inflicted crisis to the next. Our constituents deserve much better than this.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't disagree with a lot of what my friend from New York had to say when it comes to the facts.

I do disagree with the conclusions that are reached there, Mr. Speaker.

We do need to do a better job of working together. Now, sometimes that means Republicans and Democrats, sometimes that means the House and the Senate, sometimes that means the White House and the Congress. We need to hold each other accountable, but we also need to give each other credit for our successes.

The gentlewoman talked about important issues relating to education and improving workforce. We passed together in this institution a continuation of career and technical education funding. We reauthorized that program together, led by G.T. THOMPSON on my side of the aisle, by Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY on your side of the aisle, by Chairwoman FOXX on our side of the aisle, by Ranking Member SCOTT on your side of the aisle. We grappled with that issue together. We did it together, because it was the right thing for the American people, and now it sits in the United States Senate without action.

□ 1300

We came together, and we funded the government. We grappled, line by line, section by section, we did it together, and now it sits in the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, what needs to be said, one can describe it as Republican incompetence. One can describe it as Democrat intransigence. But we, as a House, have come together and gotten our work done. The Senate cannot, and why the Senate cannot is because it requires 60 votes to get something done over there under Senate rules. In order to have 60 votes, you have to have Democrat votes.

If the Senate changed its rules tomorrow and made it just a Republican majority institution, they could move all of these bills without delay. Far from being a reflection of incompetence, it is a reflection of a commitment to a bipartisan effort on the Senate side.

We can poke them and poke them and poke them and, just one day, folks might get their wish, and we may make that a completely Republican streamlined process over there. But be careful what you wish for.

We don't have to kick each other in the shins all day long, every day, over here. We have success after success that we have earned together. We should spend more time celebrating those successes, Mr. Speaker. Among those successes is the bill I mentioned earlier, offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) to talk about the hard work, the effort, and the success that he has been able to accomplish in a bipartisan way.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and classmate from Georgia, Mr. WOODALL, for the opportunity to be here.

Mr. Speaker, more and more baby boomers retire every day, and it has been estimated that approximately \$10 trillion of privately owned, small, and family-run businesses will either be closed or, if possible, sold to a new generation of entrepreneurs in the coming years.

Mergers and acquisitions—or M&A as it is oftentimes referred to—brokers play a critical role in facilitating the transfer of ownership of these smaller, privately held companies. However, today's one-size-fits-all system of broker-dealer regulation unnecessarily burdens business sellers and buyers with the pass-through of heavy regulatory compliance costs that do not provide significant incremental benefits in privately negotiated M&A transactions.

Today, Federal securities regulations technically require local mergers and acquisitions brokers to be registered and regulated by the Securities and Exchange Commission and FINRA, just like Wall Street investment bankers. Those bankers are trying to sell or buy publicly traded companies. That is right; anyone brokering the sale of a hometown small business in your district or in mine, like in Holland, Michigan, must be federally registered and regulated as a securities broker-dealer, in addition to State law requirements, regardless of the size of the business or the sale transaction.

Federal securities regulation was primarily designed to protect passive investors and public securities markets. Privately negotiated mergers and acquisitions transactions facilitated by these small business brokers are vastly different and do not typically relate to the transactions meant to be protected by the SEC and FINRA regulation and registration.

That is why I have continued to introduce bipartisan legislation known as the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act. This bipartisan bill would create a simplified system for brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller, privately held companies.

I would like to thank Representatives SHERMAN and MALONEY, along with the work of Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for what they have done. And as my friend from Georgia had pointed out, not every day do we have to just keep kicking each other in the shins. We actually can work together, and this is an example of doing that.

So the impact of this legislation would significantly reduce transaction costs, promote competition among these small business brokers, and facilitate private businesses and acquisitions of these small businesses.

This initiative promotes economic growth and development through these sales, and there is really substantial relief of regulatory burdens on small business professionals who serve these smaller business owners.

Business brokerage services are critically important to entrepreneurs who

start, build, and eventually want to sell their private companies. Similarly, these services help new entrepreneurs acquire these businesses, while helping existing companies grow, thus preserving and creating jobs in the communities that we all serve.

We have worked very closely with our colleagues across the aisle, and this has been a multi—not just multiyear—a multi-Congress effort over the last few different Congresses, and I am just pleased today that we can show the American people positive, effective, bipartisan work that is coming together.

It is legislation like H.R. 477 that demonstrates, frankly, that Congress can act in a bipartisan manner to positively impact the lives of Americans, and I urge swift consideration and passage of this important bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentlewoman, the ranking member, for yielding, and I thank Mr. WOODALL for his comments. He and I have worked together on issues in the past. We worked together to try to protect our solar manufacturers in this country, so there are areas of agreement that we come to.

I think we also agree, I now hear, on this question of continuing resolutions. We both don't like them. And I think we do have to keep in mind that, today, we are 48 hours from the government closing, so I won't address any other subject than that question and the process that has led us to this moment where we are looking at another continuing resolution for 2 weeks.

I won't address the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act. While it may be an important piece of legislation, it is difficult to forget what has brought us to this moment where we are 48 hours from the government shutting down.

What is interesting to me about it is, it is true that the Republicans hold the majority in this House and set the agenda here; hold the majority in the Senate, set the agenda there. You have your Republican President, the leader of your party, your leader, who sets the agenda from the White House.

You have had the entire year to get a package of spending bills to the floor and through to the President. And here we are, 2 days away from a shutdown, because 2½ months ago, after nearly a year, the process came to a halt, and this body had to approve a 2½ month extension because we couldn't get the work done.

Now, instead of, over the last 2½ months, coming up with a full plan to fund the government and provide the certainty and security that the American people and our economy depend upon, after 2½ months, the best we can do is promise the people of the country and our economy 14 more days.

I mean, why are we here?

In the last 2½ months, have we seen any action? No, not on disaster relief for those places that are struggling through the worst moments that they have experienced; not to make sure that we have healthcare, health insurance, which was a bipartisan program, the Children's Health Insurance Program. Anything? No.

So that DREAMers aren't deported? People who only know this country?

And think about this: since the President, himself—and this is an area where we have some agreement—declared that we have a national emergency, our people, our children, are dying due to this opioid crisis, and where is the solution there?

Where is the debate there?

Where is the effort on the floor of this House to deal with these big, pressing problems that our country faces?

We have had the last 2½ months; we could have done it during that period.

But what has been the focus? A singular obsession around a piece of legislation that is purported to be tax reform, but at close examination by just about any significant economist, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents is the greatest, most significant, massive shift of hard-earned wealth from working Americans to people who make more than \$900,000 a year.

The notion that, with all the difficulty we are facing in this country, with all the struggles we are having, with disasters that are yet to be corrected, with an opioid crisis that is yet to be attacked, with DREAMers who have uncertainty, with children with no certainty of healthcare, the most significant priority is not funding the government, but ensuring that people who make more than those suffering people, who make more than \$900,000 a year, get more?

That is not a reflection of the priorities of the American people; and that is why it is so difficult for us, who are ready, honestly—honestly ready to work hand in glove, knowing we are not going to win every fight, but give us a chance to sit at the table and have a conversation about where we might find some common ground.

And we do from time to time. It is not impossible. Even with my friends in this Chamber right now, we have found ways to work together. But we cannot do it, we cannot do it unless there is a commitment to do the work of the American people, and we have not seen that.

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

I would be interested sometime, Mr. Speaker, having a team building expert take a look at some of our proceedings here on the House floor and see if they think that the conversations that happen here bring us closer to working together on serious solutions, or push us further away.

I agree with my friend from Michigan; we need to get about the business of the American people. The business of

the American people is not figuring out who to blame, it is figuring out how to fix things. And to continue to perpetuate the inaccurate message that we don't collaborate on those issues is to do our bosses, the American people, a terrible disservice.

On bill after bill to combat the opioid epidemic, we have come together in this institution. We have passed these bills in a collaborative way and sent them to the United States Senate. Bill after bill on human trafficking, we have come together in this institution. We have passed these bills. We have sent those bills to the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about funding the American Government. I have been in this Congress since 2011. I got to vote, for the very first time, on funding the Centers for Disease Control, which sits right in my back yard in the great State of Georgia.

I got to vote, for the very first time, on funding the National Institutes of Health, which do such amazing research, both for our seniors and for our children. The kind of talent that we have there, Mr. Speaker, boggles the mind. We came together, and we funded those institutions in the annual appropriations bill for the first time ever.

Now, we can spend our time together talking about who hates children and who hates old people, and why it is everybody is an untalented buffoon; or we can recognize that, on issue after issue, we come together and get about the business that our bosses sent us to get about.

I don't think any of us are going to be rewarded by figuring out who to blame. I think we are going to be rewarded by getting it fixed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY), who has worked, through the Financial Services Committee, again, in a bipartisan way, to deal with local community financial institutions and local home buyers who are getting shut out of the process by an overly burdensome Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Georgia, Mr. WOODALL, for yielding and for his great comments about bipartisanship.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 10 years, the community financial institution industry has undergone a dramatic transformation. Since 2006, more than 1,500 banks have failed, have been acquired, or have merged due to economic factors and the overwhelmingly expensive regulation brought forth by the passage of Dodd-Frank.

During that same period, there has been a drought in de novo banks. In fact, only five new bank charters and 16 new credit unions have chartered since that time.

Today, for the first time in 125 years, there are fewer than 6,000 banks and roughly 6,000 credit unions serving all consumers in the United States. This is proof that community financial insti-

tutions need smart, commonsense, regulatory relief so they can properly serve local communities by assisting them with small business startups and consumer credit, particularly in a region like mine in upstate New York.

It is important that we pass this rule today to consider my bill, H.R. 3971, the Community Institution Mortgage Relief Act.

□ 1315

This bipartisan measure would offer real relief for institutions that are barely surviving in an excessive regulatory environment.

I thank my colleague, Mr. SHERMAN, for assisting us in a bipartisan way to bring this bill forward and to make it even better than we originally conceived it.

H.R. 3971 would exempt small community institutions from mandatory escrow requirements and would provide relief from new regulations that have nearly doubled the cost of servicing, with direct impact on the consumer for the cost of mortgage credit.

I know that certain institutions wish to continue to provide escrow services to their consumers, and under current law and under this provision, they are welcome to do that. However, for the smaller institutions, like the ones in my district, like GPO Federal Credit Union, for example, that rely on relationship banking, customers that walk in the door and know who your neighbors are and know who your friends are and whose children serve on the same sports teams and go to the same schools, this bill will greatly help them and help our consumers continue with that relationship.

By mandating that all institutions follow escrow requirements, it raises the cost of credit for those borrowers who can least afford it, and harms our small local institutions who can barely afford to stay alive.

This is a great commonsense bill. It is bipartisan, as every bill I have ever proposed in this Chamber has been since my first year as a freshman, and I will continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill. I again thank my colleague from Georgia for his work. I urge everyone to support this commonsense bill that will help our small community banks and our credit unions.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me and also for her tremendous leadership on so many issues, especially on the Rules Committee.

As a members of the Appropriations and Budget Committees, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill, H.J. Res. 123, the fiscal year 2017 continuing resolution.

This bill kicks the can down the road for 2 weeks just so Republicans can continue focusing on the greatest tax scam in history.

As Ranking Member LOWEY has said: What do Republicans think that they can accomplish in the next 2 weeks that they haven't accomplished in the last 2 months?

Well, I say: Except, of course, trying to give tax breaks to their wealthy donors, millionaires, billionaires, and corporations, and raising taxes on middle-income and low-income families. That is what this is about.

This reckless, short-term resolution ignores many of our critical year-end priorities, like passing a clean Dream Act, a temporary protective status provision we need in the CR; raising budgetary caps; and emergency disaster funding for hurricanes and wildfires, children's health insurance programs, and community health centers. I could go on and on. That is what we should be debating and what should be in this resolution. Now is not the time for Congress to be asleep at the wheel. We need action, Mr. Speaker, and we need it now.

Despite the fact that Republicans control the House, the Senate, and the White House, once again, they refuse to do their job. It is so wrong to string people and communities out not knowing whether their government will function or stay open.

How irresponsible can you get?

We need to fully fund the government. Across the country, millions of people are living on the edge. Forty million Americans are living in poverty. Millions more are struggling to put food on the table and keep a roof over their head.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. We are passing a short-term funding bill that underfunds education and workforce training at a time that Americans need it the most.

Instead, once again, what are they doing?

They are taking time to give tax cuts to corporations to send jobs overseas.

The American people expect us to create jobs, to strengthen our economy, to provide a basic standard of living for all. With sequester cuts looming, it is past time that we focus on our spending here at home and stop these increases to a bloated military budget, which really does nothing for our national security.

Instead of bringing our Nation to the brink of self-inflicted crisis, Republicans should work with us to meet the needs of our Nation and a strong national security, which requires resisting these cuts to our State Department and to our foreign assistance. Unfortunately, this 2-week continuing resolution does just the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and "no" on the underlying bill, and let's do our job. Let's do what the American people expect us to do, and that is to fully fund

the government and look out for them in terms of not giving tax cuts to millionaires and billionaires and raising their taxes, because they deserve better from us.

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

Mr. Speaker, I opened with a discussion about how we all care about these American homeowners who are trying to get, oftentimes, into their first home, and how it is that we protect them better.

We disagreed about how to protect them.

Do you do it through the CFPB and Federal regulation? Or do you do it through more local hometown institutions being governed by their neighbors?

We agreed on what the need was, but we disagreed on how to get there.

What is so frustrating to me—I still feel like a relatively new Member of this institution, Mr. Speaker. I guess I am not any longer—is that we seem to have one standard when we are in the majority and a completely different standard when the other guy takes over the institution. It seems to me that principles should be principles irrespective of who sits in your chair.

The very first big vote I took when I got here in 2011, Mr. Speaker, was to fund the United States Government in February.

Why?

Because when Democrats ran every single facet of government—they controlled the House, they controlled the Senate, and they controlled the White House—they didn't get it done. They couldn't get it done. It is hard to do sometimes, Mr. Speaker.

I will take you back. You weren't in this institution at that time. The year is 2010. The first CR that they passed went from October 1 to December 3, about the same length of time as the one that we passed.

They weren't up to anything nefarious when that happened, Mr. Speaker, and I resent the implication that we have been during that same path. They needed a little extra time and they took it.

When that CR expired, Mr. Speaker, they then went and passed, lo and behold, a 2-week CR—a 2-week CR from December 4 to December 18. They needed a little more time. They passed one for 2 more weeks to get themselves a little more time.

That didn't work out, Mr. Speaker. They still weren't able to get it done in those 2 weeks, so their next CR, Mr. Speaker, went from December 19 to December 21. Three days is what they found to be the right number to extend funding of the Federal Government so they could continue to get their work done, Mr. Speaker.

When that 3-day CR didn't work, they then punted altogether; and when my freshman class came in in 2011, we took over and we funded the government instead.

Mr. Speaker, we can describe what happened when my friends last con-

trolled this institution as an abominable failure, or we can describe it as a frustrating failure but something that happens in this institution. It happened when my friends ran it. It happens when we run it. We need, on behalf of the American people, to get on a better track. Let me stipulate that is true.

But let me ask my friends to stipulate, Mr. Speaker, that for the first time in a long time we are on a better track because we came together in this institution and we got our work done. The Senate hasn't, and I am frustrated by that, but I want to give them a little more time.

For my friend from Michigan who asked the question, "What difference does 2 weeks make," I would ask anyone who has that question to Google "continuing resolution" and "Department of Defense."

If you think that continuing to fund the government one day at a time with a continuing resolution, or even 12 months of the time during a continuing resolution, if you think that is the definition of success, Google "continuing resolution" and "Department of Defense."

Every single day that we fail to take up in the United States Senate the large full-year funding appropriations bill, we do a disservice to every single man and woman in uniform.

If we have a choice here today, Mr. Speaker, between doing that disservice to those men and women for 2 weeks or 6 weeks or 8 weeks or 12 months, I choose to.

If you wonder what difference it makes, ask any man or woman in uniform. There is a reason, Mr. Speaker, as hard as the appropriations process is, that you and I took up the defense portion, the Homeland Security portion, the national security portion all the way back in the summer and passed it out of this House before the end of July, because we knew how important it was. We knew how mission critical it was, and we wanted to give the Senate the most time we possibly could.

I am frustrated, too, but let us not describe these failures as partisan failures, as an effort by one side or the other to subvert the process. These are failures. But 2 weeks, Mr. Speaker, is going to be less of a failure for our men and women in uniform than would be 3 weeks, 4 weeks, or 12 months.

I am sorry that we are here, but this is the best circumstance that we can create to allow our Senate time to succeed.

They cannot succeed alone. Republicans cannot succeed there alone. It requires a bipartisan majority to succeed. Let us not pretend this is a partisan problem. This is an American challenge, and I believe we are up for it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia said they need the Democrats. He must be aware that they only need us when the votes come.

There is not a Democrat fingerprint on that tax bill. We had nothing to say about any of it. And while we begged almost on our hands and knees to be a part of what they are doing, we are not. It always sounds good when we hear it on the floor: Bipartisan. Oh, look, we want to work together.

But then, oftentimes, as you know, Mr. Speaker, bills come to the Rules Committee with no committee action whatsoever and no possible description to be bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, for years we have endured relentless Republican attacks on the Affordable Care Act, including just last week in the Senate's disastrous tax bill. By repealing the individual mandate, the Senate bill has knocked 13 million people from their health insurance.

I must have asked 20 times when they were doing those 60 times to try to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act: Why do you want to take healthcare away from people?

I have never, to this day, gotten an answer as to why it is they so despise a healthcare bill that is working and has literally insured more Americans than have ever been insured before.

Then suddenly, just on a whim, one party decides—the one that has been fighting to kill it over and over again—that they will come at it piecemeal and just try to render it helpless by taking away the ability to even say it is time to go sign up again.

I am sure they thought they would do grievous harm, but it didn't work that way, and millions of people came out to sign up again because healthcare is one of the most critical needs for any American family.

To make matters worse, the bill also repeals most of the State and local tax deductions, and that is a deduction that helps middle class families in my State of New York.

New York, on average, gives back to the Federal Government of the United States \$40 billion; money that we send to Washington and get nothing back for it, the way we are rewarded for that. I think that probably will not be happening anymore since the taxes are going to go up so much higher on the people of my State, unless they do away with what is absolutely one of the most atrocious things I have ever seen them do.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the tax bill was not designed to help middle class families put food on their table, but, instead, it gives corporation tax cuts to line the pockets of their shareholders.

I have yet to read or see the Senate tax bill, but I understand there are gifts in there for people who own jet planes. I don't represent any of those.

□ 1330

But taking care, again, of the rich, as demonstrated in the figures that supported my speech a while ago, that just

short of \$6 billion, that goes from the poor people who make under \$40,000 to the rich people, the same office, the same amount of money, dollar for dollar, and absolutely proves what we are saying.

But you don't need to hear from it me. Don't take my word for it. Republican Congressman MARK SANFORD recently said in a moment of great candor: "From a truth-in-advertising standpoint, it would have been a lot simpler if we just acknowledged reality on this bill, which is it's fundamentally a corporate tax reduction and restructuring bill, period."

There is no tiny scintilla of reform in this bill. It is simply, as he points out, a way to lower the corporate tax and take care of the extraordinarily wealthy in this country who don't need it.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we could provide health for middle class families, which is what I believe the President of the United States thinks he did. I hear him say all the time that there is nothing in there to benefit him—except, probably, the estate tax, which we understand would save him about \$1 billion.

So, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment that will prohibit any legislation being considered on the floor that limits or repeals the State and local tax deduction or repeals the ACA individual mandate.

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 New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me take a moment and remind everyone watching of the impacts of the majority's last shutdown in 2013. The impacts on our economy were significant. We lost \$24 billion in just those 2 weeks. The impacts on our economy, as I said, were very significant:

Federal loans to small businesses, homeowners, and families were brought to a halt.

Banks and other lenders were unable to access government verification services, which delayed private sector lending to small businesses and individuals alike.

Federal permitting was brought to a standstill, which delayed job-creating projects in the transportation and energy sectors.

Experts have estimated that all told, this 16-day shutdown cost our economy an estimated \$24 billion.

So, during this shutdown, again, vital services were put on hold.

At the National Institutes of Health, hundreds of patients were unable to enroll in possibly lifesaving clinical trials.

Federal agencies like the Food and Drug Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency were unable to conduct health and safety inspections.

Federal scientific research was also halted, and we lost a lot of scientists in this country because of all that. Five Nobel Prize winning scientists who worked for the Federal Government at the time of the shutdown, four of the five of them were laid off.

This is all according to a report issued by the Office of Management and Budget.

The public knows how devastating another shutdown could be. According to a poll conducted by Morning Consult and Politico released this week, there is bipartisan opposition, with 68 percent of Democrats, 62 percent of Republicans, and 61 percent of Independents all opposing a government shutdown.

I forgot to mention up there about Social Security checks and things for the Veterans Administration. They came to a halt.

So that is what makes this so frustrating. I agree with Mr. WOODALL. This is a frustrating part of what we are trying to do here. Every day it seems we get up and we face some kind of new disaster.

We could have crafted a bipartisan bill—we sure could have—that would have removed any question of whether a continuing resolution would pass the House and Senate.

We could have reauthorized the Children's Health Insurance Program, community health centers, Perkins loans, and more months ago, if only the majority were willing to work with Democrats. Instead, bipartisanship is all too often becoming a dirty word under the majority. I sadly say: It is the American people left to pay the price.

So I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, the rule, and the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I thank my friend from New York for helping me to bring the rule today.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in truth in advertising, and of all the things that you heard the Reading Clerk read, when he went through word for word for word from this rule, you heard not one word about taxes today. Why? Because we are not talking about taxes today at all. Because nothing that we are doing today has anything to do with taxes at all. Because of all the successes that we are down here to partner on today, tax is not one of them.

What is on the list today?

Well, in the spirit of truth in advertising, Mr. Speaker, shutdowns aren't on the list either. In fact, the opposite is true. If we pass this rule today, we will fund the government. We will prioritize keeping the doors open.

Mr. Speaker, habits are hard things to break, and we are in two very bad habits in this institution. One is failing to see the merit in what the other side is offering. We have two Financial Services bills today that break that pattern, that see the merit in working together and collaborating together, and we bring two bills to the floor that this entire institution can be proud of.

We have another bad habit of ascribing to the other side's motives that I believe are not worthy of this institution at all. A government shutdown would be one of those things. We are, in good faith, working together—Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate, Congress and White House—to get about the business of the American people, and it is hard. But it is worth doing, and it is worth doing right.

If I have to choose between fast and right, I choose right. We have got a chance today, with the passage of this rule, to bring up two bills that our colleagues, in bipartisan ways, have worked through on the Financial Services Committee that will make a big difference to families and businesses across this Nation.

We have an opportunity today, if we pass this rule, to bring up a continuing resolution that guarantees to every single American that the doors are open, the lights are on, and we continue and have an opportunity for the Senate to move final legislation.

I want my colleagues to support this rule. I want my colleagues to support the underlying bills. But, Mr. Speaker, more than anything, I want my colleagues to take pride in the successes that we have achieved here today.

CHIP funding, Children's Health Insurance funding, is at risk, but not because we haven't succeeded. We have. All we need is one more signature from the Senate.

CDC funding may be at risk, but not because we haven't succeeded. We have. We just need that bill to get across the floor in the Senate.

Our troops are on the cusp of receiving a well-deserved pay raise. Why? Because we came together and we passed it here. We just need it to get across the floor of the Senate.

And there is not one of those items or a dozen more that I could list, Mr. Speaker, that will move across the floor of the Senate in anything but a bipartisan way.

Do you want bipartisanship? If you want cooperation, if you want success, we have our chance today. Vote "yes" on this rule, Mr. Speaker. Vote "yes" on these underlying bills, and let's get together and get the Senate across the finish line as well.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 647 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

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

"SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX BILL THAT RAISES TAXES ON MIDDLE CLASS FAMILIES BY ELIMINATING OR LIMITING THE STATE AND LOCAL TAX DEDUCTION.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that repeals or limits the State and Local Tax Deduction (26 U.S.C. § 164).

(b) WAIVER IN THE HOUSE.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subsection (a). As disposition of

a point of order under this subsection, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the rule or order, as applicable. The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.”

“SEC. 5. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX BILL THAT REPEALS THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE UNDER THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that repeals or limits the individual mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (26 U.S.C. § 5000A).

(b) WAIVER IN THE HOUSE.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subsection (a). As disposition of a point of order under this subsection, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the rule or order, as applicable. The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.”

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 pre-

vious 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 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adopting House Resolution 647, if ordered;

Suspending the rules and adopting H. Res. 259; and

Agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 190, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 665]

YEAS—236

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abraham | Bucshon | DeSantis |
| Aderholt | Budd | DesJarlais |
| Allen | Burgess | Diaz-Balart |
| Amash | Byrne | Donovan |
| Amodei | Calvert | Duffy |
| Arrington | Carter (GA) | Duncan (SC) |
| Babin | Carter (TX) | Duncan (TN) |
| Bacon | Chabot | Dunn |
| Banks (IN) | Cheney | Emmer |
| Barletta | Coffman | Estes (KS) |
| Barr | Cole | Farenthold |
| Barton | Collins (GA) | Faso |
| Bergman | Collins (NY) | Ferguson |
| Biggs | Comer | Fitzpatrick |
| Bilirakis | Comstock | Fleischmann |
| Bishop (MI) | Conaway | Flores |
| Bishop (UT) | Cook | Fortenberry |
| Black | Costello (PA) | Foxx |
| Blackburn | Cramer | Frelinghuysen |
| Blum | Crawford | Gaetz |
| Bost | Culberson | Gallagher |
| Brady (TX) | Curbelo (FL) | Garrett |
| Brat | Curtis | Gianforte |
| Brooks (AL) | Davidson | Gibbs |
| Brooks (IN) | Davis, Rodney | Gohmert |
| Buchanan | Denham | Goodlatte |
| Buck | Dent | Gosar |

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Gowdy | MacArthur | Rouzer |
| Granger | Marchant | Royce (CA) |
| Graves (GA) | Marino | Russell |
| Graves (LA) | Marshall | Rutherford |
| Graves (MO) | Massie | Sanford |
| Griffith | Mast | Scalise |
| Grothman | McCarthy | Schweikert |
| Guthrie | McCaul | Scott, Austin |
| Handel | McClintock | Sensenbrenner |
| Harper | McHenry | Sessions |
| Harris | McKinley | Shimkus |
| Hartzler | McMorris | Shuster |
| Hensarling | Rodgers | Simpson |
| Herrera Beutler | McSally | Smith (MO) |
| Hice, Jody B. | Meadows | Smith (NE) |
| Higgins (LA) | Meehan | Smith (NJ) |
| Hill | Messer | Smith (TX) |
| Holding | Mitchell | Smucker |
| Hollingsworth | Moolenaar | Stefanik |
| Hudson | Mooney (WV) | Stewart |
| Huizenga | Mullin | Stivers |
| Hultgren | Newhouse | Taylor |
| Hunter | Noem | Tenney |
| Hurd | Norman | Thompson (PA) |
| Issa | Nunes | Thornberry |
| Jenkins (KS) | Olson | Tiberi |
| Jenkins (WV) | Palazzo | Tipton |
| Johnson (LA) | Palmer | Johnson (OH) |
| Johnson (OH) | Paulsen | Trott |
| Johnson, Sam | Pearce | Turner |
| Jordan | Perry | Upton |
| Joyce (OH) | Pittenger | Valadao |
| Katko | Poe (TX) | Wagner |
| Kelly (MS) | Poliquin | Walberg |
| Kelly (PA) | Posey | Walden |
| King (IA) | Ratcliffe | Walker |
| King (NY) | Reed | Walorski |
| Kinzinger | Reichert | Walters, Mimi |
| Knight | Renacci | Weber (TX) |
| Kustoff (TN) | Rice (SC) | Webster (FL) |
| Labrador | Roby | Wenstrup |
| LaHood | Roe (TN) | Westerman |
| LaMalfa | Rogers (AL) | Williams |
| Lamborn | Rogers (KY) | Wilson (SC) |
| Lance | Rohrabacher | Wittman |
| Latta | Rokita | Womack |
| Lewis (MN) | Rooney, Francis | Woodall |
| LoBiondo | Rooney, Thomas | Yoder |
| Long | J. | Yoho |
| Loudermilk | Ros-Lehtinen | Young (AK) |
| Love | Roskam | Young (IA) |
| Lucas | Ross | Zeldin |
| Luetkemeyer | Rothfus | |

NAYS—190

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

Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

NOT VOTING—6

Bridenstine
Brownley (CA)

□ 1404

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 188, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 666]

YEAS—238

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)

Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Snozzzi

Franks (AZ)
Kennedy

Pocan
Ryan (OH)

Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin

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

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Schrader
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeke
Meng

Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine

Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1411

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.

EXPRESSING CONCERN AND CONDEMNATION OVER THE POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN VENEZUELA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 259) expressing concern and condemnation over the political, economic, social, and humanitarian crisis in Venezuela, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 8, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 667]

YEAS—419

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)

Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle, Michael
F.
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa

Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaezt
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie

Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Hultz
Huijenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley

Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood

LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert

Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Bonamici
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Cook
Cooper
Courtney
Crawford
Cuellar

Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)

Amash
Biggs
Brooks (AL)

Barton
Bridenstine

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

□ 1418
So (two-thirds being in the affirma-
tive) the rules were suspended and the
resolution, as amended, was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on
the table.

THE JOURNAL
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The un-
finished business is the question on
agreeing to the Speaker's approval of
the Journal, on which the yeas and
nays were ordered.
The question is on the Speaker's ap-
proval of the Journal.
This is a 5-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—yeas 212, nays
205, answered "present" 2, not voting
13, as follows:

[Roll No. 668]
YEAS—212

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clay
Clyburn
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Cook
Cooper
Courtney
Crawford
Cuellar

Culberson
Curtis
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
Demings
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Donovan
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Engel
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Poster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Green, Al
Griffith
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hensarling
Higgins (LA)

Himes
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson, Sam
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Khanna
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Marino
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks

Meng
Messer
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Pingree
Polis
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher

Rooney, Francis
Ross
Rothfus
Royce (CA)
Ruppersberger
Russell
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik

Stewart
Suozi
Takano
Taylor
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Wagner
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IA)

O'Halleran
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Price (NC)
Raskin
Reed
Renacci
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smucker
Soto
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Serrano
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smucker
Soto
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Babin
Barragán
Bass
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Budd
Burgess
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crist
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Ellison
Emmer
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Foxy
Fudge
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gosar

Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Grothman
Gutiérrez
Hartzler
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (NY)
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kihuen
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger
Knight
LaHood
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Mast
Matsui
McGovern
McKinley
McSally
Meehan
Mitchell
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gohmert Tonko

NOT VOTING—13

| | | |
|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| Bridenstine | Kennedy | Rooney, Thomas |
| Brownley (CA) | Lowenthal | J. |
| Cramer | Pocan | Sewell (AL) |
| DeSaulnier | Quigley | Vargas |
| Eshoo | Rice (NY) | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1425

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in consideration of H.J. Res. 123.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BACON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 647, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 123) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 647, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 123

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DIVISION A—FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

SEC. 101. FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS.

The Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (division D of Public Law 115-56) is amended by striking the date specified in section 106(3) and inserting "December 22, 2017".

This division may be cited as the "Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018".

DIVISION B—CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM (CHIP) ALLOCATION REDISTRIBUTION SPECIAL RULE

SEC. 201. CHIP ALLOCATION REDISTRIBUTION SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN SHORTFALL STATES DURING FIRST QUARTER OF FISCAL YEAR 2018.

Section 2104(f)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(f)(2)) is amended—

(1) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) DETERMINATION OF REDISTRIBUTED AMOUNTS IF INSUFFICIENT AMOUNTS AVAILABLE.—

“(i) PRORATION RULE.—Subject to clause (ii), if the amounts available for redistribution under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year are less than the total amounts of the estimated shortfalls determined for the year under sub-

paragraph (A), the amount to be redistributed under such paragraph for each shortfall State shall be reduced proportionally.

“(ii) SPECIAL RULE FOR FIRST QUARTER OF FISCAL YEAR 2018.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—For the period beginning on October 1, 2017, and ending December 31, 2017, with respect to any amounts available for redistribution under paragraph (1) for fiscal year 2018, the Secretary shall redistribute under such paragraph such amounts to each emergency shortfall State (as defined in subclause (II)) in such amount as is equal to the amount of the shortfall described in subclause (II) for such State and period (as may be adjusted under subparagraph (C)) before the Secretary may redistribute such amounts to any shortfall State that is not an emergency shortfall State. In the case of any amounts redistributed under this subclause to a State that is not an emergency shortfall State, such amounts shall be determined in accordance with clause (i).

“(II) EMERGENCY SHORTFALL STATE DEFINED.—For purposes of this clause, the term ‘emergency shortfall State’ means, with respect to the period beginning October 1, 2017, and ending December 31, 2017, a shortfall State for which the Secretary estimates, in accordance with subparagraph (A) (unless otherwise specified in this subclause), that the projected expenditures under the State child health plan and under section 2105(g) (calculated as if the reference under section 2105(g)(4)(A) to ‘2017’ were a reference to ‘2018’ and insofar as the allotments are available to the State under this subsection or subsection (e) or (m)) for such period will exceed the sum of the amounts described in clauses (i) through (iii) of subparagraph (A) for such period, including after application of any amount redistributed under paragraph (1) before such date of enactment to such State. A shortfall State may be an emergency shortfall State under the previous sentence without regard to whether any amounts were redistributed before such date of enactment to such State under paragraph (1) for fiscal year 2018.

“(III) APPLICATION OF QUALIFYING STATE OPTION.—During the period described in subclause (I), section 2105(g)(4) shall apply to a qualifying State (as defined in section 2105(g)(2)) as if under section 2105(g)(4)—

“(aa) the reference to ‘2017’ were a reference to ‘2018’; and

“(bb) the reference to ‘under subsections (e) and (m) of such section’ were a reference to ‘under subsections (e), (f), and (m) of such section’; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed as preventing a commonwealth or territory described in subsection (c)(3) from being treated as a shortfall State or an emergency shortfall State.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

I rise today to present H.J. Res. 123, a continuing resolution that maintains funding for Federal Government operations and prevents a shutdown.

Current funding legislation expires tomorrow, Friday, December 8. Con-

gress must act now to prevent a government shutdown and preserve vital Federal programs that Americans rely on. This action is critical to our Nation's stability, our national security, our economic health, and the well-being of the American people.

This simple, clean extension of funding provides fiscal year 2018 funding for government programs through December 22, an additional 2 weeks, and will allow time for leadership to reach a deal on overall topline spending levels for the 2018 fiscal year.

□ 1430

I would note that the executive branch supports adoption of this continuing resolution. Yesterday's Statement of Administration Policy says: "This legislation funds the Federal Government at current spending levels without unnecessary extraneous provisions."

It concludes that his advisers would recommend that the President sign the bill into law.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the December 6 Statement of Administration Policy regarding H.J. Res. 123.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.J. RES. 123—FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018—REP. FRELINGHUYSEN, R-NJ

The Administration supports House passage of H.J. Res. 123, the Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018.

This legislation funds the Federal Government at current spending levels without unnecessary extraneous provisions through December 22, 2017, while the Congress continues to work on a longer-term funding agreement. The legislation also includes language to ensure that States and Territories have adequate funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) through December.

The Administration believes that funding for national security, including for our military, to secure the Southern Border, and to enhance missile defense capabilities, must be prioritized in a long-term funding agreement, and will continue working with the Congress to achieve that goal.

If H.J. Res. 123 was presented to the President in its current form, his advisers would recommend that he sign the bill into law.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the House has completed our appropriations work over 80 days ago, passing all 12 bills before the end of the last fiscal year for the first time in nearly a decade. This included critical, important funding for national defense and other important matters.

Unfortunately, the Appropriations Committee cannot proceed without an agreement with the Senate on overall funding levels. The reality is that we are running into a deadline this week, and this resolution is our best and only option at this time.

Once a broader budget agreement has been reached, which I hope will be soon, the committee will continue its work to complete final negotiations with the Senate on all 12 of the regular appropriations bills that will fully fund the Federal Government through September of next year.

Our committee is also moving quickly to act on a third emergency supplemental funding bill to help our communities across the Nation recover from recent major disasters.

In the meantime, Congress must do its job and pass the continuing resolution and then another one into the new year to keep the government open and ensure that all important Federal services are available to all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this necessary and responsible legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

It is extremely regrettable that we find ourselves here today. Democrats have said all year that there must be a deal to raise statutory budget caps in a manner that allows responsible investments in both defense and nondefense priorities, because both are critical to our continued safety, security, and prosperity.

The majority failed to engage all year, choosing instead to pass partisan appropriation bills that can never be signed into law.

More than 2 months ago, President Trump and Democratic congressional leaders struck an agreement to avoid a government shutdown and buy time for negotiations on new spending caps that would make it possible to enact a responsible, bipartisan full-year spending law. Precious little has been accomplished since then.

Now here we are again with the majority asking support for a 2-week stopgap continuing resolution. So I ask the majority: What do you expect to accomplish in the next 2 weeks that we have been unable to accomplish in the last 2 months? I want to repeat that. I would really like to know what you expect to accomplish in the next 2 weeks, when we haven't been able to accomplish anything in the last 2 months.

The rationale to support a short-term stopgap continuing resolution is that the parties are engaged in good faith negotiations to develop a responsible, bipartisan spending package; negotiations are on a positive trajectory and additional time is simply needed to seal a deal. Can anyone in this Chamber claim that this is the case today?

The President continues to irresponsibly threaten a government shutdown and launch ad hominem attacks. Majority leadership is playing games with the contents of this and future continuing resolutions. Negotiations on new spending caps for defense and nondefense investments are stalled.

The majority is grasping for excuses as to why they have failed to protect 700,000 young Americans from deportation, reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, or move expeditiously on critical disaster assistance.

Is there any evidence whatsoever that this majority intends to fulfill these vital responsibilities to the American people?

Given these failures, I believe it is incumbent on Members of Congress to

say enough is enough. The American people are sick of the games. They want results.

It is time for the Republican leadership and President Trump to get serious, engage with Democrats. We stand ready and willing to help develop a framework for a responsible, bipartisan spending agreement and to negotiate the details of a full year's spending package.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), my colleague, and the distinguished chairman of the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of the second fiscal year 2018 continuing resolution this year, which will fund the Federal Government through December 22 of this year.

This bill is a necessary measure to continue vital government programs and services. It also prevents uncertainty and harm in a shutdown.

This year, the committee worked at a historic pace to produce and then pass all 12 bills to fund the government. Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN should be recognized for this feat of leadership. It is important that we eventually send these bills to the President's desk.

As chairman of the State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I want to highlight that the funding provided in our bill supports continued leadership by the U.S. and advances our national security and economic interests. This funding is critical to addressing the many challenges that we face around the world.

Mr. Speaker, while CRs are never our preferred course of action, the bill before us today will give us more time to complete our work with the Senate and put together a final bill that will support the American people. Our current continuing resolution expires tomorrow, so we must act today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the CR.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Congresswoman LOWEY from New York, for the phenomenal job that she has done this year, and commend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for trying to herd cattle on a very vast range.

Mr. Speaker, here we are again, mere hours away from a needless shutdown, a cliff created by the Republican majority.

Already we are 3 months into the 2018 fiscal year, and Congress is no closer to finalizing one of our chief constitutional responsibilities, and that is

funding the departments of our Nation to do their jobs.

For a nation at war, the Department of Defense, the largest Department in this bill, can't let contracts because of this adolescent dallying by Congress.

I rise with frustration today, as the Appropriations Committee's subcommittees did their job over the last year. They toiled away for months, chipping away in each subcommittee bill, but that proved to be a fruitless effort since we had no agreed upon budget caps within which to make those decisions, because the Republican majority produced no budget.

There is simply no good reason why we are here again kicking decisions down the road, and for 2 weeks. Let me remind my colleagues, we were over 7 months late last fiscal year before we fully funded our government.

This fits and starts, fits and starts surely is not what the American people deserve. For example, we know a million people, our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico, still don't have energy and power, and vast numbers lack access to fresh drinking water. We need that FEMA budget certain so contracts can be let for 2018. Federal funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program covering more than 220,000 children in Ohio expired 68 days ago.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this disruption to those responsible for managing healthcare adds an unnecessary burden under the circumstances they confront daily. Many States are now preparing to shut down their CHIP program in case Congress doesn't act. How is that for a Christmas or Hanukkah present to the children of America?

The Republican majority's priorities are out of line, and no leadership on budgetary caps, no leadership on working with Democrats to find common ground on funding priorities, no leadership to finalize government funding for the entire 2018 fiscal year, which began 3 months ago. Unacceptable.

Instead, Republicans choose to avoid doing what is critical. Rather than pass a tax bill that rewards the wealthiest in our country and wreaks havoc on America's hardworking middle class families, they ought to do the dutiful work of managing the funds to operate the departments that serve the people of the United States. The American people are worried, Mr. Speaker, and the majority has abdicated their leadership.

I urge my colleagues to keep their powder dry on any hasty vote on this bill, and demand the majority come to the table to finalize the fiscal year 2018 spending plan.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), the chairman of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise also in support of H.J. Res. 123, which obviously would extend funding for the Federal Government for the next 2 weeks.

We have had a highly condensed schedule this year, but the Appropriations Committee has made tremendous progress in an open and very deliberative process as we have moved forward over the last several months.

As an example, the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, which I have the privilege to chair, received input from over 350 individual Members, and we produced our bill in less than 2 months.

Just a few months ago, as most of my colleagues here in the House know, the House took up and we passed all 12 appropriation bills. The chairman and the leadership delivered on the promise that they would do so.

Now we are coming to the end of the year; there are final negotiations to be done. I and my colleagues agree that a CR is not the best option; however, I would ask my colleagues to support this resolution to ensure that we have basic services that continue for our constituents until we have the final time to complete our work.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), the ranking member of the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this continuing resolution, which is yet again a complete abdication of our responsibilities.

Instead of adopting fully funded appropriations bills or an omnibus with an actual chance of passing this Congress, we remain mired in this unbreakable habit of passing continuing resolutions. This not only creates needless legislative and economic uncertainty, it costs the government, especially our military, billions in wasted taxpayer dollars. Moreover, this abdication reflects the Republican leadership's complete abandonment of our values and the needs of our constituents.

For one, we have yet to pass the Dream Act. Despite widespread support nationally and with growing fear of deportations, this Congress has ignored the 122 DREAMers who lose their protected status every day. These are Americans by any definition, and this is their home. I will not stand by as this President cruelly threatens to send these brave young people back to countries about which they have no memory.

When will this body fully address the horrific disasters that have ravaged Florida, Texas, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and California? Countless communities, including my own, are anxiously awaiting vital recovery assist-

ance that only the Federal Government can provide. These abdications are simply immoral. It doesn't end there.

Congress has failed to renew the Children's Health Insurance Program. States and families across America are scrambling to find replacement funds and healthcare alternatives for their children.

□ 1445

When did CHIP and protecting the health of our children become a partisan issue?

My Republican colleagues want to add more than \$1 trillion to the deficit for tax cuts for big corporations and the top 1 percent, while they are at it; but then they say we can't afford to spend a fraction of that on healthcare for children?

These priorities are backward and morally indefensible.

Instead of protecting Americans from the scourge of gun violence, Republicans are weakening our already feeble gun laws by passing more legislation that ensures more deadly gun violence in our towns and cities.

We need to pass an omnibus budget that doesn't threaten programs for our veterans and children or make drastic cuts to the Medicare and Medicaid programs that our seniors rely upon.

Instead of handing massive tax cuts to millionaires and powerful corporations, we should pass a budget that supports education, expands women's health, and provides real economic relief to the middle class.

In short, we have to break this body's obsession with promoting the interests of the well-off and special interests, and ignoring the needs of children, DREAMers, seniors, and the middle class.

This continuing resolution does nothing more than provide another short-term fix for the Republican leadership's unhealthy addiction. It is abominable, it is irresponsible, and we should set it aside and focus on making long-term decisions for the American people.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the chairwoman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this continuing resolution.

Our most solemn responsibility as Members of Congress is to provide for our Nation's security.

The world is more dangerous and unstable than at any time in recent history. The threat from North Korea grows each day. Russia continues to create instability in Ukraine, the Baltics, and the Balkans. Chinese is militarizing the South China Sea and modernizing their military at an alarming pace.

Meanwhile, ISIS and al-Qaida continue to spread their perverted version of Islam across Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Middle East.

We must send a clear message to our adversaries that our military is prepared to confront anyone who threatens us at any time.

A shutdown in the Department of Defense will only embolden our adversaries and threaten our national security. Our military needs stable, predictable, and timely funding to ensure it is prepared to meet the threats we face now and in the future.

Members demonstrated their commitment to rebuilding our military this past summer by passing the Make America Secure Appropriations Act, which included the defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2018. Only a budget agreement that gives our men and women in uniform the funding they need and removes the threat of sequestration will provide them that certainty.

The House must pass this continuing resolution to allow time for an agreement to be reached that will fully fund our Nation's defense. Shutting down the government is not an option.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this very important legislation.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment on this continuing resolution and on the past year of this Congress.

The biggest economic challenge of our time is that people are in jobs that do not pay them enough to live on. Wages are not keeping up with rising costs for healthcare, childcare, and housing. Too many families struggle to make ends meet, let alone put money in a college fund or go on vacation. That is what we should be focused on. We ought to be creating jobs and raising wages.

Yet, for the first 9 months of this year, this Congress attempted again and again to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which would have raised premiums and deductibles, thrown millions off insurance, and made healthcare unaffordable.

Then we spent our entire fall on the Republican tax scam. Big corporations, millionaires, billionaires write the rules to make this government work for them, and Republicans are their comrades-in-arms in rigging the game against the middle class.

Just a few days ago, Senator ORRIN HATCH said: "I have a rough time wanting to spend billions and billions and trillions of dollars to help people who won't help themselves, won't lift a finger, and expect the Federal Government to do everything."

Get out of the Senate Chamber. Understand what people's lives are about today. Walk in their shoes and understand their struggles.

But this is the ugly truth of the Republican tax bill. This is what the vote was about. These are their values on display.

This tax scam is going to raise the deficit, and the Republicans will use it as an excuse to cut vital social safety net programs: Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, LIHEAP, TANF, education programs, SNAP, food stamps.

Right now, funding is insufficient to provide childcare assistance to all who are eligible; yet, if we pass this tax bill, we will be under intense pressure to cut this assistance. That is what they want to do. This is wrong.

Now we are punting one of our core obligations as a Congress: funding our government programs.

This is unacceptable. It is a disturbing pattern and it is unsustainable. We should be negotiating spending levels for 2018.

The majority can never again speak about regular order. This year has been one partisan attempt after another to harm working class and middle class Americans so that they could fulfill their campaign promises.

We have no budget agreement. We have no resolve on the Children's Health Insurance Program. We have no resolve on a myriad of programs that people rely on to live their lives every day. There is no resolve on the DREAMers.

Why would we need another 2 weeks when they have had all this time to work on these issues?

The American people deserve better. I say: Shame on this Congress, and vote "no" on this continuing resolution extension.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), the chairman of the Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to acknowledge the chairman of the Appropriations Committee (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN). Under his leadership, the committee reported and the whole House considered and passed all 12 appropriation bills for fiscal year 2018. This year is the first time since 2010 that the House passed all 12 appropriations bills.

I would hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would listen for just a minute.

In 2010, the Democrats controlled both the House, the Senate, and the White House.

Guess what. They passed all of the appropriations bills on time.

But you know what they also did?

They passed a CR until December 19. When they hadn't completed their work yet, even though they had passed all 12 appropriations bills in the House, they passed another CR until December 22. When they hadn't completed their work, guess what. They passed another CR until January.

Then, when we took the majority, we ended up finishing the appropriations process. So their outrage now is a little bit misplaced.

Now we need to finish the final details with our colleagues in the Senate,

and we must do this to ensure that the government stays open.

Continuing resolutions at this time or of any length are not anyone's ideal solution to funding our government. Ideally, all 12 appropriations bills would be enacted by October 1. That process provides the Congress with its best opportunity to set priorities across government programs, and it provides the most stability for agencies to carry out these programs in an efficient and effective manner.

But when we need more time to complete those negotiations, supporting a CR to keep our government functioning is the only responsible vote for national security, for our economy, and for the general welfare of the American people.

As chairman of the Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, I am very familiar with the positive impacts the Federal Government has in each of these areas. Whether it is the Department of Energy maintaining our nuclear weapons stockpile, the Corps of Engineers dredging our ports and waterways so that goods and materials can move freely, or the Bureau of Reclamation providing tens of millions of people with water, we must avoid disruptions to these vital activities by passing this continuing resolution before us today.

Will we get all our work done by December 22?

I don't know.

But one thing I can guarantee is that we will not get it done by tomorrow, and a vote against this resolution is a vote to shut down the government. So if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to shut down the government, all they have to do is vote "no."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I really rise on behalf of the American people. All it takes is a simple pen and cooperation between appropriators to get the job done.

Just a few days ago, I listened to representatives from the city of Houston. They are only a sample of the hurting people who have suffered after hurricanes—one of the toughest hurricane seasons in the history of the United States. They indicated that there are 300,000 single-family homes and multi-family homes still under.

In my district alone, among other districts, from one part of the State to the next, there are people living in shells of a house. We have yet had a response to be able to help those individuals who have either maxed out or don't have the insurance because they were not in a flood zone. That requires us to not do a CR, but to work on the appropriations.

I have got health clinics and the Texas Children's Hospital coming to me every day wondering about the

Children's Health Insurance Program because people are hurting.

You see, I am not trying to oppose a bill for myself. I am opposing a bill that doesn't have the needs of the American people. It doesn't have healthcare in it. It doesn't have the hurricane funding in it. It doesn't have the funding we need for the Army Corps for pending projects to stop the major catastrophic flooding in Houston, Harris County; and it has low non-defense spending.

Let me be very clear. I want a prepared military. I want them to have the training and the equipment that they need. It doesn't have that as well.

So, frankly, I believe that we have to stand against a war on the American people, a tax bill that is moving along, but the appropriations is not; \$1.4 trillion taken out of the fat that does not exist so the bones of the American people's budget—so that a tax cut can go to the top 62 percent and 80 percent, but we can't have the funding that we need for the American people.

This is a war on the American people and, for once, Mr. Speaker, I have got to be on the winning side and fight for the American people.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the chairman of the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, and I look forward to having her vote in support of this continuing resolution because she is committed, as I am, and everyone in Texas is committed to making sure the money continues to flow to the victims of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

As Congresswoman JACKSON LEE knows, if this continuing resolution is defeated, if she votes against it, she is voting to stop the flow of money to the hurricane victims in Houston, and I know she doesn't want that to happen.

That is one of many reasons I rise today in support of this continuing resolution, because we want to ensure that the military has the funds it needs to operate.

As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, I want to be sure that the FBI and the Department of Justice has the funds that they need to continue to protect the people of America against terrorism, to protect women and children against violence, to stop the scourge of human trafficking and sex trafficking, to stop the scourge of opioid trafficking and abuse, and to stop the international drug cartels from pouring their poison into this country.

I am proud of the work that this full committee has done, and the hard work of my subcommittee—the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Subcommittee—to ensure that the law enforcement agencies in this country have the funds they need; to ensure the

Department of Commerce, the National Science Foundation, and NASA have the funds they need to make sure America continues to be the world leader in scientific and space exploration.

My colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, working along with the Houston delegation, including Ms. JACKSON LEE, we are working together arm in arm with the Florida delegation to create a hurricane relief package that will ensure that the people of Texas and Florida and Puerto Rico are adequately compensated for their losses, that we repair the damage to our flood control infrastructure.

But this is going to take time, Mr. Speaker. The Senate has not passed any appropriations bills, while the House has passed all 12 of them. We do not yet have an overall spending agreement on what level of funding is necessary for the military and for domestic purposes, and we have got to finish that hurricane relief package that Ms. JACKSON LEE and all of us have been such strong advocates for.

So I urge Ms. JACKSON LEE and the entire House to vote in support of the CR to make sure our hurricane victims are taken care of and the government continues to function.

□ 1500

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, my good friend just spoke on the floor of the House, and I certainly look forward to working with him and being committed to standing against any legislation that does not provide Hurricane Harvey funding, and the CR does not.

There is nothing in the CR that has anything to do with those who are suffering, with houses that are in disrepair or destroyed, as well as other items, Army Corps of Engineers items. That is why I stand ready not to be in a dispute, but to really raise the issue with my colleagues of how urgent it is to move to the appropriations process.

I mentioned in my remarks that I am concerned as much about military preparedness as I am about nondefense discretionary spending. I want everybody to be helped. I want the American people to be helped.

So my vote, whatever it might be, is going to be to drive this engine forward to make sure resources get down to Harris County, Houston, Corpus Christi, and all the parts of Texas that are in need, and my fellow brothers and sisters in Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Florida.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), the chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this 2-week continuing resolution. This

short-term CR is a necessary stopgap to keep the government operating until we can finalize an agreement for the top line numbers and finish our work on all 12 appropriations bills.

As some of my colleagues have noted, the House Appropriations Committee completed its work several months ago, passing all 12 of the bills out of this Chamber back in September, about 80 days ago. The other Chamber has not made the same progress, and the resolution before us today will buy us a little time to negotiate with our counterparts who are behind.

Once our budget deal is done, we will be able to begin those negotiations, and I am very confident we will be able to quickly finish our work.

I cannot overstate the importance of getting all 12 appropriations bills conferenced and across the line, but I would be remiss if I did not emphasize the critical operations funded in my bill. A final FY18 bill for the Department of Homeland Security is necessary to ensure our Nation is safe, secure, and resilient against terrorism and other threats.

Mr. Speaker, the American people count on us to get the job done. I urge my colleagues to support this short-term CR to avert a government shutdown and allow us to complete our work.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the continuing resolution, or the CR. I want to commend Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and the committee staff for their work on this legislation which provides for continuity of government operations through December 22. This CR will provide Congress time to work with the administration on a comprehensive budget agreement, which is necessary for Congress to complete its work on the fiscal year 2018 budget.

The House Appropriations Committee has worked tirelessly this year. Each of the 12 Appropriations subcommittees scrubbed the fiscal year 2018 budget request, held numerous oversight hearings, marked up individual bills in subcommittee and full committee, and each of those bills came to the House floor where they were amended and passed in the full House.

In the case of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, which I have the privilege to serve as chairman, 80 amendments were offered by both Republicans and Democrats prior to final passage. This is a demonstration that the House Appropriations Committee continues to be the workhorse committee in the House. Even with all this work completed, a great deal of work remains.

This CR provides a bridge necessary to give our bipartisan leadership the time it needs to determine the top line number in both defense and nondefense discretionary spending for fiscal year 2018. Once that agreement is in place, my Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee and other subcommittees will get to work negotiating a comprehensive fiscal year 2018 budget. It is vitally important that we complete this work.

Another reason why I support this short-term continuing resolution is so we have time to determine the needs to ensure that sufficient funds are available to respond to the fires burning in my home State of California. There are three major fires burning today in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties. The largest, the Thomas fire, which is north of Santa Paula, has already burned 96,000 acres. Earlier this morning, there was only 5 percent contained.

All Californians know about the infamous Santa Ana winds. They are blowing now. When these hot winds mix with the high temperatures and low humidity we are experiencing now in southern California, they make for very dangerous conditions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, just one spark can result in devastating wildfire, putting life and property at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the continuing resolution.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the chairman of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, and I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge support for H.J. Res. 123, the short-term continuing resolution.

I want to begin my remarks by, frankly, congratulating the chairman. It is his leadership, and my good friend on the other side, they have put together the bill in April that actually is funding the government today. A majority of Democrats voted for that in the House and the Senate. A majority of Republicans voted for it. The President signed it.

Under the chairman's leadership, all 12 bills passed well before the deadline that fund the government of September 30. He has been prepared to negotiate for 80 days. He hasn't been sitting around in those 80 days. He also passed two disaster relief bills and is working on a third one right now. I think you probably have the hardest working chairman and committee in Congress. The rest of the government, the Senate

in particular, needs to catch up with us.

Now, to their credit, they are actually sitting down with the President today, and we are beginning to see some progress. We need this additional time to allow us to fund the government.

To my friends who oppose it, what is your alternative? Shutting down the government? I know they don't want to do that. They have always argued against it. I have always thought they were right when they argued against it, but if we follow their advice and reject this amendment, the government will shut down on Friday. That doesn't do any American any good.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman has offered the responsible alternative here. I urge its passage.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), the chairman of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank the chairman for, again, bringing the 12 bills, once again, through the process. This is just a short-term continuing resolution. It is a clean date extension, and this CR will give an opportunity to continue to move forward quickly, by the way, towards finalizing appropriations bills.

It is important to note that, for example, in the Transportation and HUD bill, we considered 22 amendments in committee, 39 amendments here on the floor. You see, this has been an open and fair process the entire way. Now we must—we must—move quickly to finish the job and conference all 12 of these bills.

In the meantime, however, we must keep the government open and funded. This is especially, by the way, important now that our communities are pulling together to recover from three devastating hurricanes, as well as the thousands of families threatened by raging wildfires in California.

Look, we can't take the risk of short-changing our first responders, our military, given the natural disasters at home and the threats from our adversaries abroad. A vote against this CR would do just that.

Again, just for the Transportation and Housing segment, this CR will support ongoing transportation and safety missions, air traffic control, housing for vulnerable citizens, including our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge a "yes" vote on the CR. We cannot let those folks down. We cannot shut the Federal Government down, and it allows us to finish the job, and I thank the chairman for his steadfast leadership.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), the

chairman of the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to join my colleagues in urging the House to pass the continuing resolution before us. This is not the course of action any of us would prefer, obviously, but the House passed all 12 appropriations bills, and it was on the path to complete action on appropriations before the start of fiscal year 2018, but our ambition was overtaken by events, whether you want to blame the ponderous pace of the Senate or time devoted to important issues like ObamaCare or tax reform.

In any event, we need to pass this short-term continuing resolution to prevent disruption of important governmental programs and create a window in which budget caps discussions can occur.

All of us stand ready to conference our appropriations bills once a debate on budget caps is resolved.

I want to emphasize how important it is for us to pass each of the 12 appropriations bills. It is important that each be enacted rather than cherry-picking a few that may have the broadest support. It is dangerous to allow any part of the government to run on CR autopilot for a full year, when we have worked hard to include oversight provisions and targeted funding reductions in our bills. All of these would be lost with a yearlong CR.

And speaking about the programs in the Military Construction-VA bill, which I chair, a full-year CR prevents DOD from starting 204 new projects. This is the core of our MILCON program. Each year we appropriate funding for hundreds of new projects. DOD can manage in a short-term CR, but a full-year CR would be devastating.

On the VA side of our bill, while some of the VA programs are advance-funded to prevent a government shutdown from cutting off services to veterans, there are important new VA activities that would be blocked by a full-year CR, like the new electronic health record VA is unveiling, or the Choice Program, or its successor for care outside the VA system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote "yes" for this short-term measure to give us the time and tools we need to move forward on passage of all 12 appropriations bills, and also to avert a government shutdown. Again, I urge an affirmative vote on the CR.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee from New Jersey for his great work on this and so many other issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the continuing resolution and espe-

cially to highlight a very important short-term provision in here that provides certainty for children, families, and States that rely on the Children's Health Insurance Program, known as CHIP.

This adjustment, which was introduced by Mr. COSTELLO from Pennsylvania and Mr. EMMER from Minnesota, will provide the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services with greater flexibility over existing dollars so that the agencies can ensure that CHIP programs across the country, including now in my home State of Oregon, can continue to have vital Federal funding that they need this month to continue CHIP.

This emergency funding will help families and States while Congress finishes the job of providing funding for children's health insurance, public health priorities, our community health centers, Medicare extenders that seniors rely on. All that work needs to get done.

It is important to note, we did not arrive at this place of needing a stop-gap funding resolution because this House failed to act. We acted. We did our part. We did our part. I am disappointed that the House has passed CHAMPIONING HEALTHY KIDS Act, which passed this Chamber a couple months ago with bipartisan support, has yet to be hammered out in the Senate. Of course, over there they need 60 votes to get anything done. So a minority of the minority can lock things up, which they have done.

What makes the inaction on CHIP even more frustrating is that the House-passed bill mirrors the bipartisan policy framework that was voted out of the Senate Finance Committee under the able leadership of Chairman HATCH more than 2 months ago. Unfortunately, though, again, Democrats over there have failed to agree on how to fund these programs. That is different than what we did.

Here in the House, the CHAMPIONING HEALTHY KIDS Act delivers high-quality healthcare, peace of mind to millions of Americans, providing 5 years of funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, which is one of the longest extensions ever for the program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, it would mean continued access to healthcare for approximately 9 million children across the country who are enrolled in CHIP, another 122,700 in Oregon alone.

Our House bill was fully funded. We did the heavy lift. We funded it through responsible reforms like asking seniors who make \$40,000 a month, that is \$480,000 a year, to pay about \$135 more for their Medicare. Rich seniors pay a little more, and I am sure these grandmothers and grandfathers would do that to help kids afford their health

insurance, and that is what happened here.

Mr. Speaker, we paid it. It is ready to go. We need the Senate to act. I commend the Appropriations Committee and the leadership there for putting this provision in so we won't let kids fall through the gap.

□ 1515

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), chairman of the Health Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I must confess, today I was astonished to read an article in one of the online magazines that House Democratic leadership had asked their Members to vote against this stopgap funding bill because of the stalemate over the funding of the State Children's Health Insurance Program. We just heard the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee detail the work that has already been done on this bill.

Let me assure this Congress, there are probably people in here saying: What do you mean? We voted on this bill. We voted this bill out of the House weeks ago. It was offset. Everything that the Senate asked for, they were delivered: the 5-year timeframe, the funding levels the Senate asked for. They got everything they wanted.

Yes, it was offset in a responsible fashion, but now we are told House Democratic leadership says vote "no" on this continuing resolution because we don't like the stopgap funding for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

What in the devil do they want to happen? We did our work. We did our work. We had our legislative hearings on this bill in the summertime. We did delay things, unfortunately, 1 day. There was a shooting at a House baseball game—you may remember that—that caused us some delay, but we came back 2 weeks later. We got our work done.

We had a responsible bill. It was reflective of everything that was requested by the Senate. It was offset, as was requested by a number of Members of this body, and it has languished over in the Senate since the early part of October. It is time for the Senate to take up and pass that bill so we don't have to have this continued discussion.

This continuing resolution is important because it stops a problem that some of our States are going to face. It was completely unnecessary. The other body could fix it, and they should.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chair of the Appropriations Committee. I appreciate the time.

Mr. Speaker, in my home State of Minnesota, the Children's Health Insurance Program, better known as CHIP, provides coverage for thousands of low-income, pregnant women as well as new mothers and their children.

When funds for my State's CHIP program ran out, these Minnesotans were left wondering the fate of their healthcare. That is why we teamed up with Representative RYAN COSTELLO, Chairman WALDEN, and Subcommittee Chair BURGESS to introduce the CHIP Stability Act to bring certainty and support to Minnesotans and millions of families across the country. I am so grateful that our responsible, short-term funding solution is incorporated into this continuing resolution today.

But let me be clear: This is not enough. When the House passed the Championing Healthy Kids Act, a fully paid-for and long-term CHIP reauthorization solution, we put politics aside and America's most vulnerable first. It is my hope that the Senate will do the same very soon.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this continuing resolution so CHIP recipients are able to receive the coverage they need.

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

I reiterate, the Democrats have said all year there must be a deal to raise spending caps in order to enact appropriation bills. Instead of heeding that advice, the majority is once again stumbling from crisis to crisis trying to fund the government 2 weeks at a time.

Without a path forward to keep our country secure and make investments to grow our economy, we should immediately lift the caps on defense and nondefense spending.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this responsible, necessary legislation. Let's keep the Federal Government open for business to serve our constituents across the Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I voted against H.J. Res. 123, a stop-gap resolution that keeps the government open for another two weeks, through December 22, 2017. Once again Republicans, who control both the House and the Senate, cannot get their work done. Instead they continue to kick the can down the road.

The resolution keeps funding transportation at last year's levels rather than the higher funding levels provided by the FAST Act for 2018, meaning it cuts the mandated increases in transportation investment by more than \$950 million for Federal-aid highways and almost \$200 million for public transit investment. As a result, this bill withholds \$1.2 billion from

Federal highway, public transit, and highway safety investments—preventing States, local governments, and public transit agencies from making critical investments, letting contracts, creating good-paying jobs, and working to relieve the Nation's crippling traffic congestion.

A two-week resolution gives Republicans more time to complete their massive tax scam bill, which benefits corporations and the wealthy at the cost of middle class workers, seniors, students, and our national debt. PAUL RYAN has said after the bill passes, Republicans will move to cut Medicare and Medicaid benefits.

Further, the resolution does not reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). Instead, it includes a technical fix to ensure no state runs out of CHIP funding in December. If Congress does not reauthorize CHIP by December 31st, Oregon will not have enough funds to fully fund CHIP on January 1, 2018.

The resolution does not include a permanent fire borrowing fix or additional disaster aid for communities devastated by wildfire or other natural disasters. Oregon suffered through one of the worst fire seasons in decades. Congress has twice provided USFS emergency funding to repay non-wildfire accounts this year. Without a permanent fire borrowing fix, USFS will continue to have to rob forest management accounts to pay for fire suppression—meaning our forests will continue to be overgrown and infested with insects and disease, powder kegs waiting to burn next year.

Finally, the resolution does not include any solutions for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program. Roughly 800,000 law-abiding individuals are at risk of deportation otherwise. Congress must work together to ensure that individuals who were brought illegally into this country as children, through no fault of their own, are not targeted for deportation.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely disheartening that this Congress is once again debating the merits of a temporary funding measure to keep the federal government funded. The American people sent their elected representatives to Washington to fulfill basic promises to fund the federal government and provide for the safety and prosperity of all Americans. A stopgap funding bill like the two-week extension before us today falls drastically short of our responsibilities to properly serve our constituents.

A continuing resolution should only be used as a temporary measure. Instead, the passage of CRs has become regular order. That is not how Congress was intended to work. This continued inaction is costing taxpayers billions in wasted dollars, not to mention the opportunity costs associated with short-term extensions. I find the complete lack of bipartisan talks in Congress alarming, particularly since countless families, seniors, and others rely on these programs for their wellbeing and safety.

In addition to our basic responsibility to fund the government, it is vitally important that we work to lift the crippling budget caps that have

been holding back critical investments in our nation's infrastructure, benefits for our veterans, and other defense and nondefense priorities. Democrats in Congress were promised an opportunity to negotiate new spending caps after the last CR was adopted in September. Instead, the only spending measures we have seen leave this Chamber are partisan bills that can never reasonably expect to make it into law.

There also needs to be a recognition that many Americans have come to rely on the federal government for basic services or benefits they were promised after serving in our military. For example, I was deeply troubled by the Administration's recent effort to eliminate \$460 million for the HUD-VA Supportive Housing program, which provides rent assistance to homeless veterans and their families. It was only until veterans' advocates, state officials, and Members of Congress protested the dramatic reduction did VA Secretary Shulkin reverse course on the planned cuts.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans in Congress are putting politics over the wellbeing of our nation by passing temporary spending bills while also proposing dramatic cuts to social programs. Ultimately, it will be the American people and the U.S. economy who will be stuck dealing with the consequences. I urge my colleagues across the aisle to come together to engage in good-faith negotiations with me and my Democratic colleagues on bipartisan, full-year legislation to fund the federal government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 647, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. 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.

SMALL BUSINESS MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, SALES, AND BROKERAGE SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 647, I call up the bill (H.R. 477) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempt from registration brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 647, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee

Print 115-43 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 477

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.

Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(13) REGISTRATION EXEMPTION FOR MERGER AND ACQUISITION BROKERS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an M&A broker shall be exempt from registration under this section.

"(B) EXCLUDED ACTIVITIES.—An M&A broker is not exempt from registration under this paragraph if such broker does any of the following:

"(i) Directly or indirectly, in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, receives, holds, transmits, or has custody of the funds or securities to be exchanged by the parties to the transaction.

"(ii) Engages on behalf of an issuer in a public offering of any class of securities that is registered, or is required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the issuer files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

"(iii) Engages on behalf of any party in a transaction involving a public shell company.

"(C) DISQUALIFICATIONS.—An M&A broker is not exempt from registration under this paragraph if such broker is subject to—

"(i) suspension or revocation of registration under paragraph (4);

"(ii) a statutory disqualification described in section 3(a)(39);

"(iii) a disqualification under the rules adopted by the Commission under section 926 of the Investor Protection and Securities Reform Act of 2010 (15 U.S.C. 77d note); or

"(iv) a final order described in paragraph (4)(H).

"(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit any other authority of the Commission to exempt any person, or any class of persons, from any provision of this title, or from any provision of any rule or regulation thereunder.

"(E) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

"(i) CONTROL.—The term 'control' means the power, directly or indirectly, to direct the management or policies of a company, whether through ownership of securities, by contract, or otherwise. There is a presumption of control for any person who—

"(I) is a director, general partner, member or manager of a limited liability company, or officer exercising executive responsibility (or has similar status or functions);

"(II) has the right to vote 20 percent or more of a class of voting securities or the power to sell or direct the sale of 20 percent or more of a class of voting securities; or

"(III) in the case of a partnership or limited liability company, has the right to receive upon dissolution, or has contributed, 20 percent or more of the capital.

"(ii) ELIGIBLE PRIVATELY HELD COMPANY.—The term 'eligible privately held company' means a privately held company that meets both of the following conditions:

"(I) The company does not have any class of securities registered, or required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or with respect to which the company files, or is required to file, periodic information, documents, and reports under subsection (d).

"(II) In the fiscal year ending immediately before the fiscal year in which the services of the M&A broker are initially engaged with respect to the securities transaction, the company meets either or both of the following conditions (determined in accordance with the historical financial accounting records of the company):

"(aa) The earnings of the company before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization are less than \$25,000,000.

"(bb) The gross revenues of the company are less than \$250,000,000.

"(iii) M&A BROKER.—The term 'M&A broker' means a broker, and any person associated with a broker, engaged in the business of effecting securities transactions solely in connection with the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company, regardless of whether the broker acts on behalf of a seller or buyer, through the purchase, sale, exchange, issuance, repurchase, or redemption of, or a business combination involving, securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, if the broker reasonably believes that—

"(I) upon consummation of the transaction, any person acquiring securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, acting alone or in concert, will control and, directly or indirectly, will be active in the management of the eligible privately held company or the business conducted with the assets of the eligible privately held company; and

"(II) if any person is offered securities in exchange for securities or assets of the eligible privately held company, such person will, prior to becoming legally bound to consummate the transaction, receive or have reasonable access to the most recent fiscal year-end financial statements of the issuer of the securities as customarily prepared by the management of the issuer in the normal course of operations and, if the financial statements of the issuer are audited, reviewed, or compiled, any related statement by the independent accountant, a balance sheet dated not more than 120 days before the date of the offer, and information pertaining to the management, business, results of operations for the period covered by the foregoing financial statements, and material loss contingencies of the issuer.

"(iv) PUBLIC SHELL COMPANY.—The term 'public shell company' is a company that at the time of a transaction with an eligible privately held company—

"(I) has any class of securities registered, or required to be registered, with the Commission under section 12 or that is required to file reports pursuant to subsection (d);

"(II) has no or nominal operations; and

"(III) has—

"(aa) no or nominal assets;

"(bb) assets consisting solely of cash and cash equivalents; or

"(cc) assets consisting of any amount of cash and cash equivalents and nominal other assets.

"(F) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—On the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2017, and every 5 years thereafter, each dollar amount in subparagraph (E)(ii)(II) shall be adjusted by—

"(I) dividing the annual value of the Employment Cost Index For Wages and Salaries, Private Industry Workers (or any successor index), as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the adjustment is being made by the annual value of such index (or successor) for the calendar year ending December 31, 2012; and

"(II) multiplying such dollar amount by the quotient obtained under subclause (I).

"(ii) ROUNDING.—Each dollar amount determined under clause (i) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$100,000."

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and any amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part A of House Report 115-443, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, if it weren't for the last moment, a lot of things wouldn't get done in life, but last evening, the ranking member and I came to a meeting of the minds on a path forward for H.R. 477. So in the interest of efficiency of time for the House, I want to thank the ranking member for her willingness to work on a bipartisan basis to move this bill forward.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, our small businesses labor under a gazillion regulations, some of which are quite good and quite helpful; but, in the aggregate, they can be a very heavy burden and cost upon our small businesses. One is an unnecessary registration system for small business brokers.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) for his leadership to ensure that they have a simplified registration regime, which can help our small businesses as they are ready to engage in sales or mergers or other transactions. It is a good, bipartisan piece of legislation. I thank him for his leadership.

Again, I thank the ranking member for working on a bipartisan basis, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

H.R. 477 seeks to provide a statutory exemption from registration with the Securities and Exchange Commission, or SEC, for certain brokers who facilitate the merger or acquisition of small businesses, known as M&A brokers.

When Congress first considered this exemption in a similar bill during the 113th Congress, our goal was to prompt the SEC to provide regulatory relief for these brokers from ill-fitting restrictions designed for persons helping companies raise capital rather than facilitating their transfer of ownership.

We succeeded. Two weeks after the House passed that bill, the SEC issued a no-action letter, which contained staff's view that, if an M&A broker complied with the terms and conditions of the letter, it would recommend that the SEC not take enforcement action against that broker for failing to register with the Commission.

Specifically, the no-action letter required the M&A broker to abide by certain commonsense restrictions to prevent such an exemption from being misused to raise capital or abused by bad actors.

According to the bill's proponents, H.R. 477 is still necessary to provide legal certainty since the no-action letter is merely the nonbinding opinion of SEC staff. I understand that concern; however, the bill inexplicably omits several of the conditions contained in the no-action letter that protect small businesses and their investors.

I am pleased that this Congress, Representative SHERMAN and Representative HUIZENGA have worked on a bipartisan basis to add these protections back in through an amendment. If so amended, I will support H.R. 477, which would strike the right balance between regulatory relief and the protection of small companies and their investors.

In particular, the amended bill would require an M&A broker that represents both the seller and the buyer to provide them with clear, written disclosures and obtain their consent to that conflict of interest; prohibit M&A brokers from misusing the exemption to raise capital rather than transfer ownership of small businesses; prohibit shell companies from using the exemption as a backdoor way to take a small business public; and prohibit fraudsters and other bad actors from using the exemption.

In addition, the bill would not change the statutory definition of broker, thereby preserving the SEC's ability to investigate and bring enforcement actions for violations of the antifraud provisions in the securities laws.

The bill also would limit the relief to mergers and acquisitions involving companies with less than \$250 million in annual gross revenues, which is the total income of the company, or \$25 million in annual earnings, which is the amount of income minus expenses. The amendment would then provide the SEC with the authority to modify these thresholds as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

As our Nation's baby boomers head into retirement and look to sell their privately owned businesses to a new generation of entrepreneurs, it is important that they are able to do so in

an efficient and cost-effective manner. If amended, H.R. 477 would allow them to do just that, and so I would support the bill.

I would like to thank my colleagues. I would like to thank Mr. HENSARLING. I would like to thank Mr. SHERMAN.

This is an important bill for all of us. We are all so supportive of our small businesses. We want them to do well, and we do not want them to be hindered by unnecessary regulations.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 477, and I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Chairman HUIZENGA for their hard work on this effort.

While we are finally seeing improvements in our economy, we will not experience its full potential until we fully unleash American small businesses.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I frequently hear from small-business owners that regulations are preventing their growth and expansion. The bill before us today addresses one of the many regulatory hurdles that stand in the way of small business development. Reducing red tape on brokers would decrease the burdens on small businesses that are going through the next phase of their growth, including transitions in ownership.

This should be a time of expansion and increased opportunities, not higher cost and bureaucratic red tape. Let's work together on behalf of our Nation's small businesses so they can continue to grow today and create the jobs of tomorrow.

□ 1530

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), who is the sponsor of the legislation and the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's hard work on this.

The mission of the Securities and Exchange Commission is to protect investors; maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets; and facilitate capital formation. As part of that mission, the SEC was mandated by law to conduct an annual forum focusing on small business capital formation.

For nearly a decade, the SEC Government-Business Forum on Small Business Capital Formation has highlighted the merger and acquisition broker proposal as one of its top recommendations to help small businesses.

The MAB proposal would address securities regulation of business brokers

and merger and acquisition advisers who are in the business of facilitating the purchase and sale of privately held small companies. This proposal would significantly reduce their Federal regulation compliance costs, which can initially exceed \$150,000 per broker and, after that, cost \$75,000 per additional year. However, the SEC has never acted on this, despite their recommendation.

As we see more and more baby boomers retire, it has been estimated that \$10 trillion—with a T—of equity is locked up into these small, family-owned typically privately held businesses.

Today the Federal securities regulations require an M&A broker to be registered and regulated by the SEC and FINRA just like a Wall Street investment banker buying or selling publicly traded companies.

Anyone who is trying to sell a hometown business, like a family hardware store, a jewelry store, or even a pizza parlor, suddenly has to be treated like they are being sold or bought by a Wall Street investment bank regardless of their size. We don't think that is right.

But the impact of this legislation is meaningful because it reduces transaction costs, promoting competition among those small business brokers and facilitating private business merger, acquisitions, and sales of these small businesses. This small business initiative promotes economic growth and development.

So we have worked very closely across the aisle with our colleagues, and I thank them. Even in today's politically charged environment that we have, it is nice to show the American people that we can actually do some positive, efficient, and effective initiatives with bipartisan support.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Representatives POSEY, HIGGINS, SHERMAN, and MALONEY, as well as Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for their efforts to reach a bipartisan consensus and to get the important legislation across the finish line.

I have been working on this now for three Congresses, and we believe that we have a very positive spot here where we can all support this. I want to encourage my colleagues to support and vote for H.R. 477 and demonstrate that Congress can actually work in a bipartisan manner and get some things done for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge swift consideration.

Mr. HENSARLING. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by saying that, again, this is a commonsense reform. It is a balanced reform. It is good for small business. It is bipartisan. I urge all of my colleagues to adopt H.R. 477.

Again, I thank the ranking member and the gentleman from California for

their leadership to work on a bipartisan basis.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 18, strike "public".

Page 2, line 19, insert before the period the following " , other than a business combination related shell company".

Page 2, after line 19, insert the following:

(iv) Directly, or indirectly through any of its affiliates, provides financing related to the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company.

(v) Assists any party to obtain financing from an unaffiliated third party without—

(I) complying with all other applicable laws in connection with such assistance, including, if applicable, Regulation T (12 C.F.R. 220 et seq.); and

(II) disclosing any compensation in writing to the party.

(vi) Represents both the buyer and the seller in the same transaction without providing clear written disclosure as to the parties the broker represents and obtaining written consent from both parties to the joint representation.

(vii) Facilitates a transaction with a group of buyers formed with the assistance of the M&A broker to acquire the eligible privately held company.

(viii) Engages in a transaction involving the transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company to a passive buyer or group of passive buyers. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a buyer that is actively involved in managing the acquired company is not a passive buyer, regardless of whether such buyer is itself owned by passive beneficial owners.

(ix) Binds a party to a transfer of ownership of an eligible privately held company.

Page 3, after line 16, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent clauses accordingly):

"(1) BUSINESS COMBINATION RELATED SHELL COMPANY.—The term 'business combination related shell company' means a shell company that is formed by an entity that is not a shell company—

"(I) solely for the purpose of changing the corporate domicile of that entity solely within the United States; or

"(II) solely for the purpose of completing a business combination transaction (as defined under section 230.165(f) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations) among one or more entities other than the company itself, none of which is a shell company."

Page 4, line 1, strike "officer exercising" and insert "corporate officer of a corporation or limited liability company, and exercises".

Page 4, line 4, strike "20" and insert "25".

Page 4, line 7, strike "20" and insert "25".

Page 4, line 12, strike "20" and insert "25".

Page 5, after line 18, insert the following flush-left text: "For purposes of this subclause, the Commission may by rule modify the dollar figures if the Commission determines that such a modification is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors."

Page 7, strike lines 15 through 25 and insert the following:

"(v) SHELL COMPANY.—The term 'shell company' means a company that at the time of a transaction with an eligible privately held company—

"(I) has no or nominal operations; and
"(II) has—".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 647, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 477, the Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act of 2017.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) for working with me on this amendment. It has been a pleasure to work with him on this bill over a period of three Congresses.

With the adoption of this amendment, the bill will be in a form that will secure support from both sides of the aisle, not only my support, but, more importantly, the ranking member's support.

In the 113th Congress, the House of Representatives supported a similar bill to provide relief to the M&A community by providing that, in certain circumstances, a small business merger or acquisitions broker would not have to register.

As a result of that action by the House, which was not matched by action in the Senate, the Securities and Exchange Commission understood the wisdom of this House and introduced a no-action letter dated January 2014 to provide the same level of relief requested by the House.

In their no-action letter, however, the SEC placed several limitations on the exemption from registration that were not included in the House bill, but, with this amendment, will be included in this year's bill.

These limitations provided additional protections for investors and small businesses. It excluded bad actors and shell companies. It prohibited passive buyers in the M&A transaction to ensure that companies cannot use this exemption from registration as a capital-raising mechanism. It prohibited an M&A broker from providing financing for the transfer. It prohibited M&A brokers from binding a party to a transfer of ownership. I think this is most important: it required that, to be eligible, a broker would have to disclose to both parties and get their consents if they are being paid by both parties. So if there is both a seller's commission and a buyer's commission, you have to tell the buyer and the seller.

Now, those who want to step outside this safe harbor can simply register. But those who will be exempt from registration need to comply with these six elements.

The Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act will codify the SEC's no-action letter and provide certainty to

small business merger and acquisition brokers.

In the last Congress, I opposed the bill because it included only two of the six restrictions that were included by the SEC. With this amendment, the bill will include all of the restrictions. This is a bipartisan amendment and it includes all the limitations of the SEC's no-action letter. It has been a pleasure to work with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) on it.

In addition, our amendment provides that the SEC has the rulemaking authority to determine the correct thresholds for gross revenues and of EBITDA—that is to say, earnings of the company before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization—in determining whether a company qualifies as an eligible company under this bill.

The SEC is the agency with the expertise to do this. I encourage them to examine this issue closely and to ensure that any threshold in place is evidence-based. I encourage them in future years to inflation-adjust whatever limitation dollar figures they have in their regulations.

I am pleased to offer this amendment with my colleague, Mr. HUIZENGA, whom I may have previously identified as the gentleman from Michigan. I offer it also with the support of the ranking member. I urge the passage of this amendment, as it will ensure bipartisan support for the bill.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the amendment and the work of Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. MALONEY, the ranking member, and, obviously, our chairman as well. So I do agree and accept this amendment as a friendly amendment.

It does confirm what the no-action letter has put in place. I believe it properly makes sure that the SEC's role is preserved but that Congress has its imprimatur on this as well. It aligns the bill with the principles outlined in the SEC's no-action letter.

I think this is a good, reasonable amendment. I am pleased to work with the gentleman from California as well. I am glad that we can get this settled in a timely manner.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1614

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 477;

Passage of H.J. Res. 123; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2658.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

SMALL BUSINESS MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, SALES, AND BROKERAGE SIMPLIFICATION ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 477) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempt from registration brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies, 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 passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 426, nays 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 669]

YEAS—426

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Abraham | DeGette | Johnson (GA) |
| Adams | Delaney | Johnson (LA) |
| Aderholt | DeLauro | Johnson (OH) |
| Aguilar | DeBene | Johnson, E. B. |
| Allen | Demings | Johnson, Sam |
| Amash | Denham | Jones |
| Amodei | Dent | Jordan |
| Arrington | DeSantis | Joyce (OH) |
| Babin | DeSaulnier | Kaptur |
| Bacon | DesJarlais | Katko |
| Banks (IN) | Deutch | Keating |
| Barletta | Diaz-Balart | Kelly (IL) |
| Barr | Dingell | Kelly (MS) |
| Barragán | Doggett | Kelly (PA) |
| Barton | Donovan | Khanna |
| Bass | Doyle, Michael | Kihuen |
| Beatty | F. | Kildee |
| Bera | Duffy | Kilmer |
| Bergman | Duncan (SC) | Kind |
| Beyer | Duncan (TN) | King (IA) |
| Biggs | Dunn | King (NY) |
| Bilirakis | Ellison | Kinzinger |
| Bishop (GA) | Emmer | Knight |
| Bishop (MI) | Engel | Krishnamoorthi |
| Bishop (UT) | Eshoo | Kuster (NH) |
| Black | Espallat | Kustoff (TN) |
| Blackburn | Estes (KS) | Labrador |
| Blum | Esty (CT) | LaHood |
| Blumenauer | Evans | LaMalfa |
| Blunt Rochester | Farenthold | Lamborn |
| Bonamici | Faso | Lance |
| Bost | Ferguson | Langevin |
| Boyle, Brendan | Fitzpatrick | Larsen (WA) |
| F. | Fleischmann | Larson (CT) |
| Brady (PA) | Flores | Latta |
| Brady (TX) | Fortenberry | Lawrence |
| Brat | Foster | Lee |
| Brooks (AL) | Fox | Levin |
| Brooks (IN) | Frankel (FL) | Lewis (GA) |
| Brown (MD) | Franks (AZ) | Lewis (MN) |
| Buchanan | Frelinghuysen | Lieu, Ted |
| Buck | Fudge | Lipinski |
| Bucshon | Gabbard | LoBiondo |
| Budd | Gaetz | Loebsack |
| Burgess | Gallagher | Lofgren |
| Bustos | Gallego | Long |
| Butterfield | Garamendi | Loudermilk |
| Byrne | Garrett | Love |
| Calvert | Gianforte | Lowenthal |
| Capuano | Gibbs | Lowey |
| Carbajal | Gohmert | Lucas |
| Cárdenas | Gomez | Luetkemeyer |
| Carson (IN) | Gonzalez (TX) | Lujan Grisham, |
| Carter (GA) | Goodlatte | M. |
| Carter (TX) | Gosar | Luján, Ben Ray |
| Cartwright | Gottheimer | Lynch |
| Castor (FL) | Gowdy | MacArthur |
| Castro (TX) | Granger | Maloney, |
| Chabot | Graves (GA) | Carolyn B. |
| Cheney | Graves (LA) | Maloney, Sean |
| Chu, Judy | Graves (MO) | Marchant |
| Ciçilline | Green, Al | Marino |
| Clark (MA) | Griffith | Marshall |
| Clarke (NY) | Grijalva | Massie |
| Clay | Grothman | Mast |
| Cleaver | Guthrie | Matsui |
| Clyburn | Gutiérrez | McCarthy |
| Coffman | Hanabusa | McCaul |
| Cohen | Handel | McClintock |
| Cole | Harper | McCollum |
| Collins (GA) | Harris | McEachin |
| Collins (NY) | Hartzler | McGovern |
| Comer | Hastings | McHenry |
| Comstock | Heck | McKinley |
| Conaway | Hensarling | McMorris |
| Connolly | Herrera Beutler | Rodgers |
| Cook | Hice, Jody B. | McNerney |
| Cooper | Higgins (LA) | McSally |
| Correa | Higgins (NY) | Meadows |
| Costa | Hill | Meehan |
| Costello (PA) | Himes | Meeks |
| Courtney | Holding | Meng |
| Cramer | Hollingsworth | Messer |
| Crawford | Hoyer | Mitchell |
| Crist | Hudson | Moolenaar |
| Crowley | Huffman | Mooney (WV) |
| Cuellar | Huizenga | Moore |
| Culberson | Hultgren | Moulton |
| Cummings | Hunter | Mullin |
| Curbelo (FL) | Hurd | Murphy (FL) |
| Curtis | Issa | Nadler |
| Davidson | Jackson Lee | Napolitano |
| Davis (CA) | Jayapal | Neal |
| Davis, Danny | Jeffries | Newhouse |
| Davis, Rodney | Jenkins (KS) | Noem |
| DeFazio | Jenkins (WV) | Nolan |

Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Posey
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Bridenstine
Brownley (CA)

Green, Gene
Kennedy

Lawson (FL)
Pocan

□ 1640

Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. NAPOLI-TANO, Messrs. CAPUANO, LYNCH, Miss RICE of New York, Messrs. SIREN, HUFFMAN, and CARDENAS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER CONTINUING
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 123) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 193, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 670]
YEAS—235

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gottheimer
Gowdy

Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Byrne
Kelly (MS)
Carter (GA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Peters

Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

Bridenstine
Brownley (CA)

Kennedy
Lawson (FL)

□ 1640

Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. NAPOLI-TANO, Messrs. CAPUANO, LYNCH, Miss RICE of New York, Messrs. SIREN, HUFFMAN, and CARDENAS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAYS—193

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.

Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (MD)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)

DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallo
Garamendi
Garrett
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Harris
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating

Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Torres
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi

Perlmutter
Perry
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—5

Bridenstine
Brownley (CA)

Kennedy
Lawson (FL)

Pocan

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

□ 1647

So the joint resolution was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the purpose of making a scheduling announcement.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank all the Members for their flexibility in coming back to town this past Monday. As such, Members are advised that votes are no longer expected in the House tomorrow, Friday, December 8.

Members are further advised to be prepared for the House to be in session the week of December 18. First votes of that week will be expected at 6:30 p.m. on Monday, December 18.

We all know we have important work to do, including passing the historic Tax Cuts and Jobs Act for the American people. I think that will be an excellent Christmas present.

If there are any further changes to our schedule, I will be sure to let all Members know.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the majority leader for yielding.

Normally, of course, we would have a scheduling discussion tomorrow at the end of business, but in light of the fact that we are not meeting tomorrow, we will not have that colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, can the leader give us some indication of what might be considered next week? As we know, there are numerous items that need to be resolved before we leave here this year, and we need to obviously have some BCA, Budget Control Act, numbers arrived at so that the Appropriations Committee can move forward either on an omnibus or appropriations bills. We need to do flood insurance. We need to do FISA section 702. We need to do, obviously, the Children's Health Insurance Program, and other matters.

Mr. Speaker, can the leader, who has just said that we will be in—is he anticipating 4 days next week? Four days next week, and presumably 4 days or 5 days the following week? So let's say we have 9 legislative days.

Mr. Speaker, can the leader give us some idea of how we might accomplish the work that needs to be done in that timeframe?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I will miss the colloquy tomorrow. I always look forward to speaking with my friend.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, the Rules Committee has met, so we will see a Financial Services bill that they met on. Members will also get a list of all the suspensions. That will be by close of business tomorrow.

But the gentleman is right. There is a lot of work to be done. We have passed CHIP going forward. As the gentleman knows, in this bill that we just voted on, for those who voted yes, it continues funding for them for the rest of this year.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, this House has passed all 12 appropriations bills, but we have more work to get done.

Knowing my friend is concerned, coming from the Appropriations Committee as well, I would hope you join with us. We would like to see the Senate take some actions. I know leadership from both sides of the aisle has just visited with the President. I hope we can come to an agreement so we can finish this out.

I also hope the gentleman would join with me in encouraging the Senate, not just on the appropriations bills, but the 352 bills that we have out of this House sitting over there.

Mr. Speaker, the part that the American people must know, most of those bills have very broad bipartisan support.

I am looking forward to a busy 9 days. It will not come up next week,

but if it could, I would bring it up as soon as we come out of conference because I do believe the American people are waiting for the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act to continue what we have gone through.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I hear the majority leader's hope that we will move appropriations bills on the Senate side. Obviously, one of the things that we have been trying to work on for the last 90 days, Mr. Speaker, has been trying to get to an agreement on the numbers that will replace the sequester numbers that certainly many people on your side don't want for the defense side of the budget.

Obviously, we believe that we had an agreement over the last 4 years for parity in spending. We would hope that we could reach an agreement similar to that agreement.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Mr. MCCONNELL, the majority leader, could bring appropriations bills to the floor, and he has not done that. We don't control the Senate, and those bills have not been brought to the floor. You can't pass them if they aren't brought to the floor.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, they need to be bipartisan bills, because the history is that the majority party, Mr. Speaker, has not been able to get a majority of votes. They did today, but the history is, since 2011, that has not happened; therefore, failing that, you need to work in a bipartisan fashion, Mr. Speaker, the Senate does, in order to get these bills done.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, I won't go into all the pieces of legislation that are pending that need to pass for the welfare of our country, the security of our country, and the assistance to our people. I would hope that we could proceed and proceed now. Frankly, I am available tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure others are, to start talking about how we reach agreement on these critical issues, because 9 days, as we all know, is not very much time.

We have had 90 days. We unanimously voted for a continuing CR. Ninety of your members voted against it. I say respectfully, the reason we got 90 days to hopefully reach agreement on a number of critical issues, critical to us, and I think critical to you, was because every one of us on this side of the aisle voted for the CR, and 90 of the Republicans voted against it. It could never have gotten to a majority but for our votes.

I would hope that now that we have another 2 weeks that we start sitting down together, reaching agreement, and are prepared next week to start voting on bipartisan bills that both sides can support. Neither side will get

all it wants, but that is the way I think that this House will proceed as a credit to the House and a credit to the American people.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is right, we have a great amount of work to do. We just voted on a bill that, I will guarantee you, 221 Members on this side who carried it, was not the bill they were seeking. They do not want to look at the troops and say they are not funded and they are not getting their pay raise that we voted on earlier.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, my friend, has told me, time and again, funding government is not a game. There was nothing in the bill that we just passed that both sides could not say that it was a bipartisan bill. There was nothing on our side of the aisle that we put into that bill that would give anybody on either side heartache.

But it was not a bill that we should have to have voted on, on this floor. We did 12 appropriations bills. We should not be voting for continuing resolutions. That is not why we are elected.

So let's do this. As we make our travel plans back, knowing that we will be back next week, let's make a commitment to one another, let's make a commitment to this country, that we will get our work done, that we will find the common ground, that we will not whip against a bill just to try to shut a government down, but will find the very best that this body could come to conclusion with, and that means funding our troops, and I look forward to working with all of you in the coming weeks.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, my presumption is that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who voted against the CR in September, did not do it because he wasn't for funding the troops; did not do it because he didn't want to protect the security of our country; did not do it because he wanted to shut down the government, I presume. None of us did either.

We did it because we are very concerned about the fact that 90 days ago we voted for a CR that was noncontroversial, notwithstanding the fact that 90 on your side voted against it. It was noncontroversial, however. The President agreed to it. You agreed to it. I agreed to it. We had an agreement.

But the fact of the matter is that we have not used those 90 days productively in a bipartisan way to get to constructive resolutions of these issues. I agree with the gentleman, we ought to do that.

I will pledge to the gentleman that I and my leadership here and our Members will come at least 50 percent of the way. You are in charge. You have the responsibility. We understand that. But, as we have in the past, almost every time, whether it was Speaker

Boehner or Speaker RYAN, it was this side of the aisle that kept the government open. It was this side of the aisle that made sure we didn't default on our debts.

So I want to be constructive. There is no point in further argument on this. It is to say, however, to all of us, I have talked to some of your Members privately. They are shaking their heads.

Why are we in this position?

We ought not to be in this position. Every one of us who sits in this body—every one of us ought to be saying to ourselves: we need to act constructively. Confrontation is not constructive; the failure to reach agreement.

You say you passed SCHIP. I pleaded with the gentleman not to put a partisan bill on the floor. We had agreed on the authorizing side. Unfortunately, we couldn't agree on the funding side because you wanted to cut things we thought ought not to be cut. Clearly, we could have gotten to an agreement.

In fact, you passed a bill on IPAB, \$17.6 billion unpaid for that would have paid for all of that. So, Mr. Leader, I will yield to you, if you want to; but I just plead with every one of the Members of this body: This is not good for the American people. You say you don't want a CR. You had 90 days to come to an agreement with us or with yourselves. You have 218 votes. You just showed us.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, not to continue a debate, because I know people have places to go, but you said we needed 218 to show it. We just showed 221. But the one thing I will tell you, when you talk about bipartisan, when you talked about that CR, 133 on this side voted for it; more than the majority of the majority. That is where bipartisanship comes.

I can sit back and we can rehash how many times we met about SCHIP. We can rehash coming to you and saying: Tell me where you want to go with that at the end of the day.

We can rehash where your ranking member asked us to pull back on the markup, and we did. But they still never came. I don't need to rewrite history and I don't need to walk away from where we tried to get to.

I am proud of the fact that we were able to pass it, with or without you. But we wanted you with us. You made the decision not to be with us, and that is okay. That is your decision. But, today, when you talked and bragged about all of the other times you were there, my only question is: What is different today?

Let's not make today continue for the future. Let's find the way that we work together. But at the end of the day, when they look back in history, there will be 221 on this side and there will be 175 on the other side that said government should shut down; and I don't think that is right.

I hope you have a good weekend.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear my friend saying that when John Boehner, Eric Cantor, and the whip asked for votes to keep the government open.

They got 84 of their colleagues on your side of the aisle to join them, making a total of 87, and the majority of your Members voted against your own leadership on the bill that they were proposing. So don't lecture me about voting "no."

I voted "no" because I think we should not have had a CR. I voted "no" because I think there are too many things left undone. I voted "no" because the American people expect us to get our work done, not to twiddle our thumbs while Rome is burning.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all Members to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to each other in the second person.

VENEZUELA HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND DEFENSE OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE ACT OF 2017

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 (H.R. 2658) to provide humanitarian assistance for the Venezuelan people, to defend democratic governance and combat widespread public corruption in Venezuela, and for other purposes, as amended, 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 California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 29, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 671]

YEAS—388

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Abraham | Bost | Castro (TX) | Courtney | Jenkins (KS) | Paulsen |
| Adams | Boyle, Brendan | Chabot | Cramer | Jenkins (WV) | Payne |
| Aderholt | F. | Cheney | Crawford | Johnson (GA) | Pearce |
| Aguilar | Brady (PA) | Chu, Judy | Crist | Johnson (LA) | Pelosi |
| Amodei | Brady (TX) | Cicilline | Crowley | Johnson (OH) | Perlmutter |
| Arrington | Brooks (IN) | Clark (MA) | Cuellar | Johnson, E. B. | Peters |
| Babin | Brown (MD) | Clarke (NY) | Culberson | Johnson, Sam | Peterson |
| Banks (IN) | Buchanan | Clay | Cummings | Joyce (OH) | Pingree |
| Barletta | Buck | Cleaver | Curbelo (FL) | Kaptur | Pittenger |
| Barr | Bucshon | Clyburn | Curtis | Katko | Poe (TX) |
| Barragan | Budd | Coffman | Davis (CA) | Keating | Poliquin |
| Barton | Burgess | Cohen | Davis, Danny | Kelly (IL) | Polis |
| Bass | Bustos | Cole | Davis, Rodney | Kelly (MS) | Posey |
| Beatty | Butterfield | Collins (GA) | DeFazio | Kelly (PA) | Price (NC) |
| Bera | Byrne | Collins (NY) | DeGette | Khanna | Quigley |
| Bergman | Calvert | Comer | Delaney | Kihuen | Raskin |
| Beyer | Capuano | Comstock | DeLauro | Kildee | Ratcliffe |
| Bilirakis | Carbajal | Conaway | DelBene | Kilmer | Reed |
| Bishop (GA) | Cardenas | Connolly | Demings | Kind | Reichert |
| Bishop (MI) | Carson (IN) | Cook | Denham | King (IA) | Renacci |
| Bishop (UT) | Carter (GA) | Cooper | Dent | King (NY) | Rice (NY) |
| Blumenauer | Carter (TX) | Correa | DeSantis | Kinzinger | Richmond |
| Blunt Rochester | Cartwright | Costa | DeSaulnier | Knight | Roby |
| Bonamici | Castor (FL) | Costello (PA) | Deutch | Krishnamoorthi | Rogers (AL) |
| | | | Diaz-Balart | Kuster (NH) | Rogers (KY) |
| | | | Dingell | Kustoff (TN) | Rohrabacher |
| | | | Doggett | LaHood | Rokita |
| | | | Donovan | LaMalfa | Rooney, Francis |
| | | | Doyle, Michael | Lamborn | Rooney, Thomas |
| | | | F. | Lance | J. |
| | | | Duffy | Langevin | Ros-Lehtinen |
| | | | Duncan (SC) | Larsen (WA) | Rosen |
| | | | Dunn | Latta | Roskam |
| | | | Ellison | Lawrence | Ross |
| | | | Emmer | Lee | Rothfus |
| | | | Engel | Levin | Rouzer |
| | | | Eshoo | Lewis (GA) | Roybal-Allard |
| | | | Espallat | Lewis (MN) | Royce (CA) |
| | | | Estes (KS) | Lieu, Ted | Ruiz |
| | | | Esty (CT) | Lipinski | Ruppersberger |
| | | | Evans | LoBiondo | Rush |
| | | | Farenthold | Loeb | Russell |
| | | | Faso | Loeb | Rutherford |
| | | | Ferguson | Long | Ryan (OH) |
| | | | Fitzpatrick | Loudermilk | Sánchez |
| | | | Fleischmann | Love | Sarbanes |
| | | | Flores | Lowenthal | Scalise |
| | | | Fortenberry | Lowey | Schakowsky |
| | | | Foster | Lucas | Schiff |
| | | | Foxx | Luetkemeyer | Schneider |
| | | | Frankel (FL) | Lujan Grisham, | Schraeder |
| | | | Frelinghuysen | M. | Schweikert |
| | | | Fudge | Lujan, Ben Ray | Scott (VA) |
| | | | Gabbard | MacArthur | Scott, Austin |
| | | | Gallagher | Maloney, | Sensenbrenner |
| | | | Gallego | Carolyn B. | Serrano |
| | | | Garamendi | Maloney, Sean | Sessions |
| | | | Garrett | Marino | Sewell (AL) |
| | | | Gianforte | Marshall | Shea-Porter |
| | | | Gibbs | Mast | Sherman |
| | | | Gomez | Matsui | Shimkus |
| | | | Gonzalez (TX) | McCarthy | Shuster |
| | | | Gottheimer | McCaul | Simpson |
| | | | Gowdy | McClintock | Sinema |
| | | | Granger | McCollum | Sires |
| | | | Graves (GA) | McEachin | Slaughter |
| | | | Graves (LA) | McGovern | Smith (MO) |
| | | | Graves (MO) | McHenry | Smith (NE) |
| | | | Green, Al | McKinley | Smith (NJ) |
| | | | Green, Gene | McMorris | Smith (TX) |
| | | | Grijalva | Rodgers | Smith (WA) |
| | | | Grothman | McNerney | Smucker |
| | | | Guthrie | McSally | Soto |
| | | | Gutiérrez | Meadows | Speier |
| | | | Hanabusa | Meehan | Stefanik |
| | | | Handel | Meng | Stewart |
| | | | Harper | Messer | Stivers |
| | | | Harris | Mitchell | Suozi |
| | | | Hartzler | Moolenaar | Swalwell (CA) |
| | | | Hastings | Moulton | Takano |
| | | | Heck | Mullin | Taylor |
| | | | Hensarling | Murphy (FL) | Tenney |
| | | | Herrera Beutler | Nadler | Thompson (CA) |
| | | | Higgins (LA) | Napolitano | Thompson (MS) |
| | | | Higgins (NY) | Neal | Thompson (PA) |
| | | | Hill | Newhouse | Thornberry |
| | | | Himes | Noem | Tipton |
| | | | Holding | Nolan | Titus |
| | | | Hollingsworth | Norcross | Tonko |
| | | | Hoyer | Norman | Trott |
| | | | Hudson | Nunes | Tsongas |
| | | | Huffman | O'Halleran | Turner |
| | | | Huizenga | O'Rourke | Upton |
| | | | Hultgren | Olson | Valadao |
| | | | Hurd | Palazzo | Vargas |
| | | | Issa | Pallone | Veasey |
| | | | Jackson Lee | Palmer | Vela |
| | | | Jayapal | Panetta | Velázquez |
| | | | Jeffries | Pascarella | Vislousky |

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|------------|
| Wagner | Watson Coleman | Wittman |
| Walberg | Weber (TX) | Womack |
| Walden | Webster (FL) | Yarmuth |
| Walker | Welch | Yoder |
| Walorski | Wenstrup | Yoho |
| Walters, Mimi | Westerman | Young (AK) |
| Walz | Williams | Young (IA) |
| Wasserman | Wilson (FL) | Zeldin |
| Schultz | Wilson (SC) | |

NAYS—29

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| Allen | DesJarlais | Labrador |
| Amash | Duncan (TN) | Marchant |
| Bacon | Gaetz | Massie |
| Biggs | Gohmert | Mooney (WV) |
| Black | Goodlatte | Perry |
| Blackburn | Gosar | Rice (SC) |
| Blum | Griffith | Roe (TN) |
| Brat | Hice, Jody B. | Sanford |
| Brooks (AL) | Jones | Woodall |
| Davidson | Jordan | |

NOT VOTING—15

| | | |
|---------------|-------------|----------------|
| Bridenstine | Larson (CT) | Pocan |
| Brownley (CA) | Lawson (FL) | Scott, David |
| Franks (AZ) | Lynch | Tiberi |
| Hunter | Meeks | Torres |
| Kennedy | Moore | Waters, Maxine |

□ 1711

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMIRAL LLOYD R. "JOE" VASEY PACIFIC WAR COMMEMORATIVE DISPLAY ESTABLISHMENT ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4300) to authorize Pacific Historic Parks to establish a commemorative display to honor members of the United States Armed Forces who served in the Pacific Theater of World War II, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4300

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Admiral Lloyd R. 'Joe' Vasey Pacific War Commemorative Display Establishment Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ASSOCIATION.—The term "Association" means Pacific Historic Parks, a corporation that is—

(A) a cooperating association with the National Park Service;

(B) organized under the laws of the State of Hawaii; and

(C) described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of that Code.

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term "Director" means the Director of the National Park Service.

(3) COMMEMORATIVE DISPLAY.—The term "commemorative display" means the Pacific Theater of World War II Commemorative Display authorized to be established under section 4(a).

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) honor the brave members of the United States Armed Forces who fought on behalf of the United States of America in the Pacific Theater during World War II;

(2) provide a place to mourn the more than 150,000 American and allied lives lost in the Pacific Theater during World War II; and

(3) educate the public about United States battles in the Pacific Theater and its role in World War II.

SEC. 4. PACIFIC THEATER COMMEMORATIVE DISPLAY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE DISPLAY.—The Association may establish and maintain a commemorative display to honor the members of the United States Armed Forces and Allies who served in the Pacific Theater during World War II.

(b) USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS PROHIBITED.—Federal funds may not be used to design, procure, prepare, install, or maintain the commemorative display, but the Director may accept and expend contributions of non-Federal funds and resources for such purposes.

(c) LOCATION OF COMMEMORATIVE DISPLAY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director may allow the commemorative display to be established at a suitable location at the Pearl Harbor site of the World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument in Honolulu, Hawaii.

(2) CONDITION.—The commemorative display may not be established at any location under the jurisdiction of the Director until the Director determines that an assured source of non-Federal funding has been established for the design, procurement, installation, and maintenance of the commemorative display.

(d) DESIGN OF THE COMMEMORATIVE DISPLAY.—The final design of the commemorative display shall be subject to the approval of the Director.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2017, TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate, and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1715

CONGRESSIONAL APP CHALLENGE

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jack Hong from Edina High School who won this year's Congressional App Challenge in Minnesota.

Every year, the Congressional App Challenge encourages students to create an original app by writing computer code. The competition inspires students across the country to explore computer science and STEM fields, fos-

ters innovation, and promotes involvement by some who are historically underrepresented in tech fields.

Jack won this year's competition by designing an app called Pomo Timer that blocks distracting websites on the user's computer for short periods of time.

I would also like to recognize Madiha Rizvi of Brooklyn Park who won runner-up for creating an app called Jobscope that helps young adults find jobs in their communities.

Zara Thomas and Omar Elamri from Minnetonka Middle School were also both honorable mentions for their apps.

Mr. Speaker, these students have shown ingenuity, imagination, and intellectual curiosity, and their inventive talent will take them far. I congratulate them on their achievement and wish them the best in future academics.

CONGRATULATING THE SHABAZZ HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Shabazz High School Bulldogs football team for winning their State championship game against the Weequahic High School Indians. These schools—both in my neighborhood and in my district—have been rivals since 1938.

This is the second year in a row that they have gone head to head in the championship, but this year Shabazz beat Weequahic with a score of 35-0 to win the State championship for north Jersey, section 2, group 1. The Shabazz Bulldogs had a perfect season, finishing the year with a 12-0 record. It was their first perfect season since 1966.

The Shabazz Bulldogs were led to victory by Coach Darnell Grant, whose brother Barris Grant coached the Hillside High School Comets football team to its State championship this year as well. Both teams are in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Coach Grant and the Shabazz High School Bulldogs football team for their perfect year in sports this weekend.

CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to plead on behalf of our country for immediate Senate action on the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2017. The House passed this bipartisan bill on November 1, following a record wildfire season with millions of acres going up in smoke and ash.

Just this week, fires have flared up again in southern California with more than 110,000 acres currently burning

and more than 200,000 individuals forced from their homes. Many schools are closed, residents hundreds of miles away are advised to stay indoors to avoid the smoke, and, more urgently, lives and property are at risk across Los Angeles and Ventura Counties.

The time for the Senate to act was 2 years ago when they failed to act on similar legislation. We can't afford for the Senate to continue to do nothing. Pass the Resilient Federal Forests Act. Give the Forest Service the tools it needs to prevent and combat catastrophic wildfires. Fires are raging, lives are in danger, and the situation will get worse in the future if the Senate continues to fail to act.

HONORING RICHARD CULLEN OF VIRGINIA

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

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a fellow Virginian, Richard Cullen, who is in the midst of transitioning his law practice into "becoming one of the boys" again.

Richard Cullen is a dedicated public servant who has served our great Commonwealth in different capacities during his longstanding career at both the Federal and State levels.

Mr. Cullen was raised in Staunton, Virginia—located in our State's cherished Shenandoah Valley—and completed his education at the University of Richmond's T.C. Williams School of Law where he served as the editor-in-chief of the school's law review.

Richard began his career at the Federal level with former Congressman Butler of the Sixth Congressional District. He continued to serve Virginians at the State level when he was appointed in 1991 as the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Richard also served at the State level, from 1997 to 1998, as the attorney general of Virginia. He is a Virginian's Virginian who values his community.

On behalf of our great Commonwealth, we thank Richard Cullen for his continued service.

HONORING PEARL HARBOR SURVIVOR AND WORLD WAR II VETERAN CLARENCE VAROS

(Ms. CHENEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, on this historic day in this Chamber where President Roosevelt appeared the day after the Pearl Harbor attack, I rise to honor a World War II veteran and Pearl Harbor survivor, Mr. Clarence Varos, who will turn 100 this weekend.

Born on December 10, 1917, Mr. Varos has served our country and State in many ways. As a member of the U.S. Navy, Mr. Varos fought through and

survived the attack on Pearl Harbor. He risked his life in the defense of freedom as a gunner on the USS *Hyde*, transporting marines in the Pacific theater. After bravely serving our Nation in uniform, Mr. Varos went on to dedicate 30 years of his life to the Union Pacific Railroad.

I want to thank Mr. Varos for all he has contributed to our great Nation and State. His sacrifice, bravery, and grit are an example to us all. I look forward to congratulating Mr. Varos in person at celebrations in his honor this weekend in Cheyenne. I would like to say happy birthday to Mr. Varos and thank him for his service.

OPPOSING OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS EXPLORATION IN THE EASTERN GULF OF MEXICO

(Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to, once again, vigorously and unrelentingly oppose offshore oil and gas exploration in the eastern Gulf of Mexico. I know this is an imperfect graphic, but what I have got here is a map of the Gulf of Mexico showing the Military Mission Line, longitude 86 degrees, 41 minutes, where the military doesn't want offshore drilling east of it, and neither do we citizens of Florida.

This big blob here is where the oil companies want to go get oil and gas and tear up our Gulf of Mexico and change our coast from high-quality residential development to things like this: huge, steel-hulled offshore supply vessels coming in our residential bays and estuaries.

This is Sanibel Lighthouse. We don't want to see a commercial vessel like this in Sanibel Lighthouse, nor do we want to see one in the Gordon River of Naples surrounded by beautiful homes, trees, and second homes of retirees who have come to Naples to make it their home. This thing could be replicated in Fort Myers as well.

We can't let our coast be changed irreparably by industrialization to support unnecessary offshore drilling.

HONORING JOE GEORGE, AN AMERICAN HERO

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

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Joe George, a sailor who showed exceptional bravery during the attack on Pearl Harbor. Joe defied direct orders from his superior officer and saved the lives of six men trapped on the embattled USS *Arizona*.

Mr. Speaker, for years, Joe's family and two veterans he saved have petitioned the Navy to acknowledge his bravery. I first heard his story from Warsaw, Indiana, middle school students Keller Bailey, Jason Benyousky, Ryun Hoffert, Geoffrey Hochstetler,

and their adviser, Richard Rooker, regarding the National History Day project.

I introduced a resolution that highlights Joe's courage and calls for the Navy to recognize his selfless actions during the attack. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Navy has recently announced that Joe George will be posthumously awarded the Bronze Star for his heroism. Joe George was an American hero and a shining example of the courage of the Greatest Generation.

TO ATTACK STUDENT LOAN DEBT, EMPOWER STUDENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address this Chamber and, indeed, America about the challenges that we face at this time in our country. There are many. Some exist within this Nation, some exist overseas, and some have many answers being batted around in Washington; whereas, others have nearly none.

One of those challenges that has hamstrung our youngest generation is the massive, dark cloud of student loan debt. When our colleague, Senator SANDERS, from the other side of the aisle addressed student loan debt during the Presidential campaign last year, he was correct in identifying a problem. The way that he chose to address it I would disagree with, as he suggested that we should provide for people something from the government. I would suggest that the people should provide for themselves.

There are two schools of thought, one that the people rely on the government, and one that the government should rely on the people.

So how do you address this massive black cloud of student loan debt that is handicapping our youngest and most creative generation? That is something that we have started to do today with the filing of H.R. 4584, the Student Security Act.

I speak to you tonight about a brighter future, a future where individuals are empowered to make decisions for themselves and where they can escape this looming cloud of debt so they might be free to do things that we have, heretofore, perhaps taken for granted in this country, like buy a new car, like start a family, or, in the words of former Presidential candidate Hillary Clinton, move out of mom and dad's basement.

But the most important thing that they are not able to do because of the black cloud of debt that faces them, Mr. Speaker, I would submit, is harness the creativity and the energy that is embodied by their ideas. This is a nation of ideas, and certainly when you

are encumbered with over \$40,000 of loan debt per person on average, you are not able to get that small business loan, and you are not able to start that new business to put those ideas into action and create jobs.

In fact, a recent poll last month indicated that the majority of millennials would sacrifice their very franchise, that is the right to vote, in exchange for relief from their student loan debt. All too often, heretofore, the words "student debt" in the Halls of Washington have scared up images of free college. Anyone knows—even Mr. SANDERS knows—that nothing is free; someone pays. But that is no excuse to ignore the problem. Why not allow individuals the option and opportunity to pay their own debt?

Over 40 million Americans—myself included—are paying back \$1.3 trillion in student debt, yet we have done nothing realistic to address this problem.

How do you address new problems? You must address new problems with new ideas. H.R. 4584, the Student Security Act, is just that.

I will stop as an aside to take a moment to thank a young man, Elliot Harding, a recent student from Charlottesville, Virginia, who came to me with this idea: What do we do as a nation if we lose the creativity of an entire generation because of this burdensome debt? Because that is what we are on the precipice of.

I contemplated it and decided that this isn't something I was able to let happen on my watch. So as a result, I was all ears as he explained the idea that became student security.

It is as follows: right now we know that the Social Security plan that our seniors—indeed, my very mother—rely upon to get by on a day-to-day basis is facing an imminent bankruptcy, that solvency is in question, and that by 2034, according to most estimates, there will be no solvency. That is a problem, too.

Many of you at home are wondering how I moved from student loan debt to Social Security, and that is the beauty of this idea. To empower individuals to make decisions for themselves and address these very real challenges, the Student Security Act would allow a student to write off \$550 of student loan debt for every month that they were willing to voluntarily forgo a Social Security benefit. The time value of money, my friends. We have forced no one to do anything. We have in no way, shape, or form changed one scintilla of the promise that is Social Security that we have made for generations to our seniors. But at the same time, we have provided an 11 percent increase in the solvency of that program, extending the life of that promise without raising taxes and without forcing a single soul to do a single thing against their will.

That would translate into \$6,600 per student, per year, that they were willing to voluntarily forgo receipt of Social Security benefits.

The bill would cap at a maximum of \$40,150 in debt relief. This would correspond to a 6-year delay in receipt of Social Security benefits, and, again, no one would be forced to do a thing, but students who sought to remove from their lives the black cloud of student loan debt would be empowered to, at their own discretion, make this decision for themselves.

□ 1730

As they say in the TV world: But wait; there is more.

We ran this program past the Congressional Budget Office and then later past the Social Security Administration. What would the impact on Social Security be when empowering people to make decisions for themselves? And, by the way, how would we defray the costs as to people who are young now, who won't invest in Social Security until later, versus the fact they are students now?

The numbers are not good; they are great. We would allow cosigners on loans this option as well, to avail their children or grandchildren of these benefits should they choose to defer receipt of Social Security benefits, again to the amount of \$40,150. That would begin immediately.

That would also save, according to the Social Security Administration, \$700 billion, while also addressing the very real needs of American students currently hamstrung by a broken college finance system.

So what do we do with the Student Security Act?

We are delighted to welcome Congressman FERGUSON, Congressman BRAT, Congressman ROKITA, and Congressman MESSER. We invite our colleagues from both sides of the aisle to look at this outside-the-box, dynamic new way of addressing the solvency of Social Security and the insolvency of our youngest, most creative generation.

The data indicates that we would extend the viability of the Social Security program by 11 percent of what is needed to make it wholly solvent in perpetuity. That would be the equivalent of a 0.3 percent increase in the payroll tax, but without a tax increase and without taking anything from anyone without their voluntary entry into the program.

It would lift the black cloud of student loan debt to the tune of over \$40,000 per person in a world where 90 percent of debtors have less than \$40,000 in debt, and it would return to the coffers of this indebted Nation, by the Social Security Administration's estimates, \$700,000,000,000—seventenths of \$1 trillion.

So I stand here today and ask you to ask yourselves:

Do you trust people to make good decisions for other people?

Do you believe that people should rely on government or that government should rely on people?

Do you believe that this country can harness the ideas and the vision and

the energy of what is inherently the most creative generation if we are able to free these young people from burdensome debt that stops them from engaging in key life events like buying a home and buying a car and getting married and starting a business?

Do you believe that we need to think outside the box to ensure that we keep the promise that is Social Security, which has been made in this country for generations?

If you, like me, believe this and are a Member, I invite you to join as a patron of H.R. 4584, regardless of your party affiliation or ideology. If you, like me, as a citizen, believe this is a good idea, I invite you to speak to your Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, this is an opportunity not only to change how we do business, but to empower people to empower themselves to create greater opportunity and prosperity in this country by harnessing the energy and ideas of our youngest and largest living generation and to keep the promise that we have made for generation after generation and to people like my mother that Social Security will remain reliable and solvent.

Again, I invite you to join on this legislation or contact your Representative and encourage them to join. H.R. 4584, the Student Security Act, is a new way of addressing an old problem that relies on the oldest solution, and that is individuals empowered to work for themselves.

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

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS: GOP TAX SCAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

We are going to have some discussion about recent developments in Congress over this week, and we are going to focus on the proposed tax legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), vice chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. She is going to talk about what that plan means for working people in America.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. RASKIN for his continued leadership in our caucus. It is such a pleasure to serve next to him on the Judiciary Committee. We have a lot of work to do. It is really terrific to be able to do it with him, to talk about the tax plan.

I don't think this is a tax plan. I think it is tax scam. I think it is a heist. I think that the middle class in this country is not going to benefit from this. Middle class Americans who are hoping for a tax break for the holidays are going to be sorely disappointed. Maybe they get a few lumps of coal.

In fact, polling shows, across the country, that this is the singularly most unpopular bill that Congress has considered in a very long time. Seventy-five percent of Americans across this country don't think it is a good idea. They are not fooled by the promises that are being made about what this bill does.

Let's really talk about what this bill does.

We know that the wealthiest will benefit. The wealthiest 1 percent will receive 50 percent of the tax cuts. In 2019, 18 percent of the tax cuts in this bill will go to the wealthiest 1 percent. But by 2027, that number climbs to 62 percent, with an average tax cut of \$33,000.

What else do we know about this bill?

We know that the largest corporations will benefit. To pay for this massive tax cut for corporations, the Senate tax bill will repeal the individual mandate part of the Affordable Care Act, something that Republicans have tried to do over and over again this year.

The American people have spoken up and said: No, we know that healthcare is a right, not a privilege. We want our healthcare. We know the Affordable Care Act is not perfect, but it has done much to protect the healthcare of people across this country.

Yet, in spite of that, the repeal of the individual mandate has been put into the Senate tax bill, and it would result in 13 million more people being uninsured. It would also result in a 10 percent increase in premiums for Americans across the country, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

We know, also, that this bill is wholly fiscally irresponsible. It is funny. For years, Republicans have yelled and screamed about the huge deficits we have, yet this bill would add between \$1 trillion and \$1.5 trillion in deficits to what we already have. That would lead to a mandatory cut in critical programs.

Let's just talk for a minute about what exactly this tax scam will mean for ordinary Americans across the country.

In order to pay for the tax cuts that we have talked about for the wealthiest and the largest corporations, it means that millions of working families and poor folks across this country are going to end up paying more. Not only that, there are incentives in this bill that would actually create an incentive for American companies to take jobs off of Main Street, close factories here in the United States, and move those jobs overseas. It will make it harder for families to make ends meet.

The Senate bill would raise taxes on 78 million middle class families, and millions of families across the country would lose their healthcare. In my district alone, nearly 31,000 constituents would lose their healthcare.

This bill would also put real roadblocks in the way of young people looking to get ahead.

Two of the eliminations of tax exemptions in this tax bill that offend me the most and should offend all Americans across the country are, number one, there is, essentially, a tax on being sick. There is a tax on long-term care for Americans across this country.

Right now, if you have a family member who is in long-term care or has a serious illness, the expenses that you pay for that individual, that family member, you can deduct those medical expenses. With this tax scam, the tax heist that is being proposed, you would no longer be able to deduct those medical expenses. So you are being taxed for being ill or for needing care as you get older.

In addition, we are taxing education. We already know that there is \$1.4 trillion in student loan debt across this country, more than even credit card debt in this country. Young people have to make these terrible choices about whether they are going to go \$80,000 into debt or whether they are not going to get higher education. That is wrong.

This tax bill would actually take away some of the tax benefits that we give to graduate students, for example, when they get help to be able to complete their graduate education. It would take away the exemptions that currently exist.

If you are a teacher and you buy pencils or paper or supplies for your classroom, that is currently a deductible expense. It would take that away for teachers, but not for corporations. If corporations buy supplies, that is tax deductible, but not if you are a teacher. That is just crazy.

It prioritizes the wealthy by allowing wealthy families to avoid the estate tax. Let's talk about the estate tax for just a minute.

There are 5,400 families across the country that pay the estate tax. It is a very small number of the wealthiest families. But, in fact, what this does is say that is even too much. We are going to double the exemption. Now, \$11 million, even fewer families are going to pay that, but it is going to cost middle class families a couple of hundred billion dollars in revenue.

The experts across the spectrum are arriving at the same conclusion: this bill is bad for regular working families.

The National Association of Realtors has said this: The Senate tax bill "puts home values at risk and dramatically undercuts the incentive to own a home . . . our estimates show that home values stand to fall by an average of more than 10 percent, and even greater in high-cost areas."

How about the Fraternal Order of Police? "The FOP is very concerned that the partial or total elimination of SALT deductions," something very important to my home State of Washington, "will endanger the ability of our State and local government to fund these agencies and recruit the men and women we need to keep us safe."

That is a quote from the Fraternal Order of Police.

The American Council on Education has said this: "As a result, we are deeply concerned that at a time when post-secondary degrees and credentials have never been more important to individuals, the economy, and our society, the tax reform proposal approved by the Senate could make college more expensive and undermine the financial stability of higher education institutions."

Let's be clear about what is happening here. The Republicans have a plan, and it is like a little three-step dance:

First, transfer trillions of dollars of wealth from middle class families and the poorest amongst us to the wealthiest corporations who are already not paying their fair share.

Second, when you do that transfer, explode the deficit. The estimates are that \$1.4 trillion, \$1.5 trillion would be added to the deficit.

Finally, use the fact that you are exploding the deficit to actually cut programs that are critical to Americans across the country, like Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. We know that, as written, this bill would trigger mandatory spending cuts to Medicare and Medicaid of significant amounts.

So the reality is that we are in a situation where this is incredibly unpopular. The polling shows right now that Americans are not buying this tax scam: 68 percent say that the tax bill helps the wealthiest; 54 percent say the tax bill favors big Republican donors; 61 percent say that Medicare and Social Security cuts would ultimately end up being the vehicle that is used to pay for these tax cuts to the wealthiest; and 68 percent say that changes to the Affordable Care Act should not be in this tax bill.

□ 1745

Here is where we are. The House passed its bill on November 16. In the early hours of December 2, just last Friday, the Senate passed its version.

We are going into conference committee now, which means that a group of legislators from the House and a group of legislators from the Senate get together and they try to work out the differences between the two bills. Then, ultimately, whatever that compromise is, if it is worked out, would come back for a vote in the House and the Senate.

So, now, more than ever, we need the voices of people across the country to call and to talk about the concerns that working people across this country have. We do need a real reform of the tax system to simplify it, to make sure that people are paying their fair share. But that is not what this is. This is a tax scam. It is a heist. It is transfer of trillions of dollars in wealth from middle class families and the most vulnerable to the wealthiest who do not need that money.

The reality is that we need to be investing in the American people. We

need to be investing in jobs and in education. We need to be making sure that middle class families are getting a break, that they can actually think about a future for their kids, for the next generation, that is better than the one they have.

We have very little time, but, Mr. Speaker, I am very sure that we in the Progressive Caucus and we in the Democratic Caucus are going to do everything we can to fight for working people, for the most vulnerable among us, and to protect things like CHIP, the Children's Health Insurance Program, to protect temporary protected status for immigrants across the country, and to make sure we are passing a clean Dream Act. These are the kinds of priorities we should be focusing on, not lining the pockets of the wealthiest corporations and transferring jobs from the United States to tax havens elsewhere.

We have a lot of work to do to make sure that, in this very short period of time, people speak up and speak out and make sure that we do not pass this bill, make sure that we, instead, work together in a bipartisan way for tax reform that actually benefits working families.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative RASKIN for his leadership on the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative JAYAPAL for her wonderful remarks and her terrific leadership here on behalf of the people of Washington and on behalf of middle class and working class Americans all across the country.

Mr. Speaker, may I trouble you to ask how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida). The gentleman from Maryland has 47 minutes remaining.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Caucus greatly appreciates this time to talk with the American people. For me, it is always one of my favorite moments in the tremendously busy weeks that we have got here on Capitol Hill and in Congress.

I represent 800,000 people in Maryland's Eighth Congressional District, which includes Montgomery County, Frederick County, and Carroll County. I have the honor of going to work for them, essentially, 7 days a week. I live just about 25 minutes from Capitol Hill, and I take the Metro or drive to work, come back home, and I get to spend pretty much every day both with my district and with my colleagues here in Congress.

This is a special time of the week for me because so many of my colleagues are on airplanes or on trains going back to where they come from, and they spend a lot of their time on Mondays and Fridays traveling. I get to be here, and I get to work. I have a little more time to think, Mr. Speaker.

Because we are so buffeted by events, tweets, conflicts, and controversies, we don't always have time to think. I get

to use the time on Mondays, Thursday nights, and Fridays to be a little bit more reflective and deliberative about what it is we are doing here in Washington.

I want to start by just bringing everybody up to date about an alarming new legislative development before I get back to the tax bill, which will be next week's problem.

Yesterday, the House of Representatives passed something that they call the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act of 2017. The entire bill is fraudulent, beginning with its name, because it asserts that it has something to do with reciprocity, but it doesn't.

Right now, any State that has a law governing the issuance of concealed carry permits to its citizens can decide to work with its neighbor to allow a reciprocal arrangement. About half of the States have done that; they have deals with their neighbors.

But this act would wipe all of the reciprocity agreements out. It would impose one national standard on everybody in America, reducing everybody to the lowest, most permissive States in the Union in terms of concealed carry.

Now, in my State, in Maryland, we have a number of very serious hurdles to get over before you get the right to carry a loaded concealed weapon. You can't be mentally unstable or dangerous. You can't be a domestic offender. You can't be a violent criminal convict, a felon, or a misdemeanant. You have got to show that you know how to use weaponry, and so on. We take it very seriously.

Several dozen States have similar laws; others have much laxer and much looser laws. That is federalism. Everybody decides for themselves.

But this legislation that they passed yesterday would wipe out the State laws of every State in the country and drag us down to the bottom. It is not a race to the bottom; it is a plunge to the bottom.

They say that if you can get a concealed carry permit in any State—and in some States like Florida, there are 1.7 million people with concealed carry permits—you can go anywhere in the country. It is a passport to override the laws of every other State in the Union.

There are more than 14 million concealed carry permits in the United States, and now, suddenly, that is 14 million more people with guns who can come to your State, over your State laws, when you don't want it.

Oh, and guess what else they have snuck in here. The people who claim not to like litigation have created a whole new cause of action. They can sue the police officers if they feel the police officers have detained them too long. But, of course, the police officers are going to detain them too long because they have to figure out whether or not they have a right to the gun.

In the nationalization of concealed carry, have they created a bureaucracy, a computer where we are able to

figure out whether someone is carrying a real concealed carry permit or a fake ID concealed carry permit? No, not at all. That is put upon you, your State, to try to figure it out. If you hold the person too long, they can sue you, and guess what: attorneys' fees for the police officers, attorneys' fees awarded against the sheriffs, attorneys' fees against our law enforcement officers for trying to keep us safe by trying to enforce our State laws.

Now, we have two opportunities to stop this. One is in the U.S. Senate.

I already spoke to one Senator who was absolutely dumbfounded and amazed that such legislation would even be introduced, after more than two centuries of the history of the United States, somebody would put in a bill to try to extinguish the State concealed carry laws all across the country and give other people who wouldn't have the right to get a gun in your State the right to come there; and this after some of the worst firearms massacres and disasters in our history: the Las Vegas attack, which led to the deaths of 59 of our countrymen and countrywomen, and the attack in Sutherland Springs, Texas, which killed dozens of people.

The gun violence has even come here to Washington and to the Capitol and to the Members of Congress, ourselves, and still we haven't done anything.

We don't take up a universal criminal background check to close the internet loophole, to close the private sale loophole of people selling guns in the parking lot at 7-Eleven, so we close the loopholes that make us an absolute outlier in terms of the civilized world. We don't take that up.

We don't take up legislation to ban military-style assault weapons, like the ones that were used in Newtown, Connecticut, to assassinate 20 schoolchildren at pointblank range. We don't take up that legislation.

We don't even take up the legislation that they promised, which we thought that they wanted to do, which was to get rid of the bump stocks. No, that faded away, too.

Instead, they bring us this proposal to drive us deeper into the cycles of gun violence and misery that the NRA and the GOP have taken us to in America.

So, there are two opportunities to stop this madness. One is in the United States Senate, but the other is this: the pretended champions of the U.S. Constitution are violating the Constitution; they are trampling the Constitution.

Why?

Well, the Congress of the United States is an institution with limited enumerated powers. We don't have the right to do whatever we want as Congress. We have to exercise a real power.

Well, what power is being exercised here?

Well, there are only a couple of possible candidates. One, they say we are regulating commerce, but that is patently absurd. There is no commerce

that is being regulated in any way at all. It doesn't say anything about business and it doesn't say anything about money. There is no commerce.

The Supreme Court authority is very clear about that. That is why the Supreme Court struck down the Gun-Free School Zones Act, which my friends across the aisle were totally opposed to. They said: Well, that has nothing to do with commerce. The possession of a gun within a school zone has nothing to do with commerce. You have to strike it down.

Well, equally, the possession of your concealed carry weapon has nothing to do with commerce either. So that doesn't help them.

Then they would say: Well, really what we are doing is we are vindicating the Second Amendment. The Second Amendment gives you the right to do it.

There are a couple of odd things about that. One is that, if the Second Amendment gave you the right to take a concealed carry gun anywhere you want in the country, why has no court ever said that, and why aren't they just bringing a lawsuit?

The Federal courts across the land have been overwhelmingly clear that the Second Amendment does not give you a right to carry a loaded concealed gun. You don't get that right under the Second Amendment. If you have that right, you get it from your State government.

I thought that was something that my friends across the aisle believed in: federalism and State powers and State rights. But, no, they would say: Well, this is an enforcement of the Second Amendment.

I suppose the Supreme Court also struck down that bit of trickery in a case called *City of Boerne v. Flores*, which dealt with the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. There, Congress said, overwhelmingly—I think it was unanimous—we are going to overrule, essentially, the laws of the States and say that any burden on people's religious free exercise is presumptively unconstitutional, unless you can show that there is a compelling interest in your State against it.

The Supreme Court said: Wait, where does Congress get the power to do that?

Congress said: Well, we are just enforcing people's free exercise rights.

The Supreme Court said: You don't enforce people's rights by changing the meaning of the right.

Similarly, you don't enforce the Second Amendment right, which, undoubtedly, exists under the 2008 *Heller* decision, which said you have a right to a handgun for self-defense, you have a rifle for purposes of hunting and recreation, but you don't extend those rights, change the meaning of those rights in the name of the Second Amendment and then say that is where Congress gets its power. On that theory, the Supreme Court said in the *RFRA* case—striking down the Religious Freedom Restoration Act as it

applies to States—there would be no limit at all to Federal power, and that can't be right.

My friends celebrated yesterday having passed an unconstitutional bill—unconstitutional. We have no power to trample the handiwork of the States all over the country. The State legislatures have the power under the 10th Amendment, and Congress lacks the power in Article I to define what concealed carry policy is going to be in the States. That is up to the States.

So, if they want to become the absolute enemies of the State legislatures and State power and State rights, be my guest. But what they have is an unconstitutional piece of legislation as well as a deeply dangerous and ill-thought-out piece of legislation.

The last thing I want to say about it is, like almost everything else they bring to us now, there were no hearings on it.

Now, think about that. Here we are, one of the greatest legislative bodies on the planet Earth—Abraham Lincoln sat in this body; John F. Kennedy sat in this body; some of the greatest legislators who ever existed were here—and they are passing bills without so much as a single hearing. They just bring it up for a vote.

So we whip out our phones, and we are trying to google to find out about the issue. That is how I found out, for example, that more than 1,100 people carrying concealed carry weapons had committed homicides or mass shootings or killing of police or suicides—with their guns. And now they want open season.

If you want to allow anybody in your State to get a concealed carry weapon, be our guest. Don't impose that rule on the people of Maryland. We don't want it, thank you very much. We have already decided what we have got, and that is true of State legislatures all across the land.

□ 1800

Their so-called reciprocity legislation is actually a demolition of reciprocity, because lots of States have entered into reciprocal agreements that will be extinguished by their law.

So without so much as a hearing, without any real debate or discussion, without them even realizing that they are violating the Constitution, they go ahead and pass this law.

All right. But that, of course, is just a distraction from the main order of business this month, which is demolition of America's middle class. I am sorry to put it in such cogent and compressed terms, but there is no other way to describe what *The New York Times* calls the worst piece of tax legislation ever introduced in the history of our country.

Now, America has gotten the point about the GOP tax plan. People know it is highway robbery. People know it is a mugging of the working class and the middle class by the largest corporations and the richest people in the

country. They know it is an outrageous decision to drive the country into \$1.5 trillion more deficit, more debt, all to enrich the robber barons and the cyber barons of our time.

They want to cut corporate taxes from 35 percent to 20 percent at a time of record corporate profits.

Why? Why would you do that?

They say that if we bestow this extraordinary windfall, bonus present on corporate America, that somehow we are going to get more jobs out of it. But wait a second. We are at a time of record corporate profits right now. If all they needed was more profits, more dividends to create jobs, then we would be seeing them right now.

We are in a time of economic growth, and any economist you ask, who is not in the pay of the proponents, will tell you it is a deranged thing to cut corporate taxes at a time of record corporate profits.

Why would we do that?

They say it will lead to economic development. Nonsense. Show me one example where trickle-down economics has ever worked. It doesn't work, for a very simple reason. You give more money to the people at the top of society, they pocket it, they send it overseas to their Swiss bank accounts or to the Cayman Islands or more yachts. That is what they do with it.

If you want economic growth, you do what Franklin D. Roosevelt did. You invest in the middle class, you invest in working people.

Business growth comes from demand, and demand comes from a strong middle class that is able to buy stuff. If you starve the middle class, there is no demand. The rich take their money and they park it overseas. That is what our oligarchs do. That is what the Russian oligarchs do.

That is how Donald Trump has stayed in business. The Russian oligarchs have been renting out his condos and offices in the Trump Tower in New York and coming to the Trump Hotel. They have got their surplus profits they are exporting from Russia going right into the Trump enterprises. Our oligarchs do the exact same thing.

You want real growth, you want strong growth, you want fairness, you want a democratic society, you invest in the middle class, not the largest corporations, not the wealthiest people in the country.

Now, there is a strong link here to our campaign finance regime. Again, every public opinion poll shows Americans know it. You think you can fool the American people. You cannot fool the American people.

Americans know this tax bill is a great deal if you have your own lobbyist; it is a great deal if you have your own Political Action Committee; it is a great deal if you are in the Trump Cabinet, it is going to be perfect for you; and if your last name is Trump, this is absolute utopia. But if you don't have your own PAC, if you don't have your own lobbyist, watch out, watch out in this bill.

The Boston Globe's Annie Linskey had a great article with the title: "The Koch brothers (and their friends) want President Trump's tax cut. Very badly."

Tim Phillips, president of Americans for Prosperity, a Koch group, said: "It's the most significant Federal effort we've ever taken on."

Congratulations to the Koch brothers. They are about to get their own signature tax bill. All the GOP politicians are saying the same thing in the newspapers. You can just check it out.

They say the same thing: We are calling up the millionaires and billionaires for campaign contributions, and they say, "You deliver us that tax bill first. You get nothing from us until you deliver us that tax plan. You guys haven't done anything in Washington. You haven't thrown 30 or 40 million off their healthcare yet. We haven't gotten what we wanted. You deliver us that tax bill. That is what we want."

Of course, Trump's Cabinet needs no outside push even from the campaign donors. It is the wealthiest Cabinet in U.S. history.

Guess what it is worth. \$20 million? \$50 million? \$100 million? \$1 billion?

No. The Trump Cabinet is worth \$4.3 billion. \$4.3 billion is what their Cabinet is worth.

They all love the tax plan, and they should.

You know why?

They wrote it.

You know who they wrote it for?

Them.

Just like for the Trump family, they are going to abolish the estate tax, which applies to only 2 out of every 1,000 richest people in the country. It is only the wealthiest people who pay the estate tax now, and they want to wipe it out, costing the rest of us \$65 billion or \$70 billion.

They want to collide, they want to contradict, they want to trample an essential principle of America that our Founders started off with, which is opposition to hereditary government, like kings, and opposition to hereditary wealth, hereditary aristocracy. The Founders, like Ben Franklin and Tom Paine and Alexander Hamilton, they knew that the intergenerational transmission of huge fortunes was a threat to democracy.

At a certain point, people don't want to just buy a bigger house or another house or a third house or a fourth house or a yacht. At a certain point, they want to buy a governorship, they want to buy a U.S. Senate seat, they want to buy the Presidency of the United States.

So what is at stake here is not just whether we are going to have some semblance of fairness in the economy. It is bad enough that we have got one of the most unequal economies on Earth today. That is bad enough. They want a government that is plutocratic, a government that responds only to the wealthiest class in society.

So they want to abolish the estate tax. They want to abolish the alter-

native minimum tax. That is the only reason that Donald Trump paid any taxes at all in the one year that we know he paid any taxes in the last 2 decades, the alternative minimum tax. So of course they want to get rid of that.

For the middle class, well, no breaks there. They want to get rid of the college student loan interest deduction. If you are struggling to get into the middle class, to go to college, if you had a deduction on the college student loan interest: Gone. They don't want it.

Healthcare expenses. You spend more than 10 percent of your income on healthcare expenses, long-term care for someone in your family who has Alzheimer's disease; you have a kid in your family who has autism going into a private school for kids with special needs, right now you can deduct that. They want to get rid of that.

They want to get rid of the State and local tax deduction, which half of my communities use, targeted right at those States, like Maryland, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, California, and Illinois, that invest heavily in education and infrastructure. So they just want to get rid of that.

Here's something else, another snake writhing in the grass of this terrible bill. They want to repeal the Johnson amendment. This is named after Lyndon Johnson when he was a Senator. So we are taking you back to the 1950s and 1960s. It was a very simple amendment that is essentially a logical corollary to the First Amendment, to the Establishment Clause and the Free Exercise Clause. It says that 501(c)(3) organizations, churches, universities, not-for-profit entities cannot engage in political campaigning, in electioneering.

Guess what the Koch brothers and the Mercers have tucked into this one. They are going to get rid of the Johnson amendment. So the Koch brothers, if they want to spend \$1 billion trying to define American politics in the name of plutocracy, now it will be tax deductible. Right now, they can spend it under Citizens United, they can spend whatever they want, but they have got to pay for it.

Now they put it into a church or to churches, the "Church of the Golden Plutocracy," and then they can deduct it on their taxes and the church can now be involved in politics, it can spend money in politics, it can electioneer, it can endorse candidates for office, and it remains a tax-exempt entity.

Now, the smart churches, which is most churches, have opposed it. They said: Don't give us that power, because the next step is people are going to turn around and say, "Wait a second. Why are we getting tax deductible contributions in churches? Why are we tax exempt if we are getting involved in politics like everybody else?"

That will be the logical question. Indeed, it threatens the very existence of the 501(c)(3) organization by tearing down that wall over tax-exempt con-

tributions, which Sheldon Adelson and the Koch brothers and the Mercers want so badly. Very clever, their divine dark money loophole, very clever.

They are going to find a way that they can control our politics, deduct it from their taxes, and corrupt the entire not-for-profit sector, the churches and the synagogues and the mosques and so on.

I wish I could leave you with cheerier news tonight, but the U.S. Congress is on the verge of passing the worst tax proposal in American history that offends every value that we cherish in this country.

Why are the people who are pushing it, who are doing quadruple backflips in the middle of the night, hiding it from us?

It took us 2 years and 10 months to pass the 1986 bipartisan tax legislation. Here, this is behind the scenes in the dark, speed of light, dark of night, the whole thing.

Why are they willing to do it even though it is rejected now by 2-1 or 3-1 in every public opinion poll?

People understand it is highway robbery.

Why are they willing to do it?

Well, what is the worst that could happen to them?

Think about it. The worst that could happen to somebody who votes for this is they lose and they go to work for the Koch brothers, they go to work for the Mercers, they go to work for Sheldon Adelson, and the highway robbery is complete.

Now, popular protests stopped the plan to throw tens of millions of people off their healthcare. Despite the fact that the GOP controls the House, the Senate, the White House, and even the Supreme Court—they control all of it—yet popular protests around the country stopped it.

Mr. Speaker, that is the only thing that can stop us now, because so many of my colleagues across the aisle have decided to walk the plank for the Koch brothers and for the billionaire cabinet. They have decided to throw in with the oligarchs, the American oligarchs, and the plutocrats.

So popular protests, people speaking out and contacting their Members, will be our only hope of showing that this is an absolute insult and affront to American democracy; not just middle class economics, economics for everybody, but democratic politics; politics for everybody, not just the elite.

I thank the Speaker for granting us this opportunity to allow us to express our intense anxiety about what might happen next week. I wish the Speaker a good weekend. I hope that everyone will have the opportunity to consider the implications of what is taking place.

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

□ 1815

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of big things going on. More things will be coming out. We have had an interesting day of it today.

Hopefully, the House and Senate—I think we are going to get a tax cut bill done. I think it is unfair to just call it a tax reform because it doesn't explain. We did tax cuts for everybody. We didn't change the percentage on the wealthiest Americans.

And I understand the thinking. Look, if we, as Republicans, change, we lower all the tax rates, then the Democrats will say: See, you're doing a big tax cut for the wealthy.

So I get it. But as the old saying in Washington goes: No matter how cynical you get, it's never enough to catch up; not in Washington.

Okay, so we didn't change the top percentage rate of tax on the wealthiest Americans. That is the only one we didn't change. And so what has happened?

Our friends across the aisle have said: See, this is a tax cut to help the rich. That is the one tax rate we didn't change, so it wouldn't have mattered.

I would love to have just seen—all right, we are getting rid of all of these tax rates. We are going to have one tax rate, and I would love it to be the tax rate that the Bible suggests in the synagogue or church; and that is 10 percent of your firstfruits. And why not 10 percent to the government after 10 percent of the firstfruits to the church or synagogue, if those are your religious beliefs?

Let's see. I forget which candidate, one of the candidates used to say: Hey, if 10 percent is good enough for God, why shouldn't it be good enough for the government?

But anyway, it was a nice thought. But we are still doing a little bit of social engineering by trying, apparently, in the tax bill, to give a lot of help to the folks who need it. There are some things that I hope will return.

I have heard from folks in my district, some accountants who have clients that, they do pay enough in medical expenses. If they don't get to deduct that, they are going to be bankrupt so, hopefully, that will be something that comes back and gets put in our version.

The last people we need to harm are the people who have got no other place to go. They are on Social Security, they are heading toward the end of life on this planet, and then the government stabs them in the back. I mean, that is what Bill Clinton did back in 1993. Not only did he put a tax on their Social Security in 1993, he made it retroactive. So it wasn't just taxing Social Security for the future, it made it

retroactive, and that was terribly tragic.

I wish we were making our tax cuts retroactive so that the working poor would get the help much quicker. But everybody in America is going to get some help with reduction, massive reduction of the largest tariff that any industrialized nation puts on its own goods when they are produced. It is called the corporate tax.

They make you think, oh, these greedy corporations, they are paying that tax. They don't pay that tax.

Just like Warren Barnett—Warren Buffett. Warren Barnett was a great trial lawyer. I don't know if he is still alive or not. I have heard him; he is an amazing guy, Democrat, amazing lawyer, really amazing trial lawyer.

But Warren Buffett, although he keeps saying publicly he wouldn't mind paying more taxes, his actions seem to indicate that they are paying massive amounts of money to lawyers to keep his company from paying the billions of dollars that I am told is owed. But anyway, we will see what happens there.

I am very hopeful that we are going to get a tax deal done, and we are going to bring it to the floor of this House, and we are going to pass it, and we will sing God bless KEVIN BRADY and the Ways and Means Committee, at least those who made it possible, made it happen. PAUL RYAN has been very helpful in moving that direction on the tax bill, so that will be a great thing if we can get it done.

I am also grateful to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee today for the hearing that he required that we have. We had the FBI Director, Director Wray, come over and testify in front of us, and I am optimistic, with Director Wray. Of course, I was optimistic with Director Comey when I first got to question him because I saw Comey, oh, this is great. Finally, we have gotten rid of Mueller and all the damage he has done to the FBI.

As I pointed out to Director Wray today, he took over a very weakened FBI from the one that he took over as FBI Director under Bush, because when Director Mueller took over as FBI Director—I have tried to figure out why he would do this, and the only thing I can figure is he wanted a bunch of young, "yes people" working for him; because it goes pretty common sense that people with the most experience are going to be in a position to tell you, as the new FBI Director, when you are choosing to go down a road that is going to create problems; because FBI agents who have been there for 25 years, like so many of ours were, had been, they are an oddity now, but that was because Mueller wanted young, fresh, saluting "yes men" who would salute the flag, salute him, and not be in a position to say: Well, Director, could I make a suggestion, sir? You know, we did exactly what you were suggesting back in 1996, or 1993, or 1988, or 1986. We did that back then, and here

is what happened. So if you would allow me, sir, I would recommend that we look at this, that, or the other.

Apparently, Director Mueller didn't want those kind of people in the FBI, so he started a 5-year, up-or-out program. So our thousands of FBI agents across the country, in the hundreds of offices that are apparently around—the 5-year, up-or-out program is basically this: if you are in a supervisory position anywhere in the world for 5 years, at the end of the 5 years, you either must get out of the FBI, or, the way it was interpreted by so many FBI agents, you are going to have to come ride a cubicle up here in Washington.

People all over the country and world who were working for the FBI said: I'm not taking my family to Washington, D.C., and, with all my training and experience, going to ride a cubicle somewhere. I need to be out protecting people, helping people.

As The Wall Street Journal pointed out in an article that wasn't—didn't seem like it was all that far into his 10 years—actually, it turned into 12, I believe, Director Mueller had, in devastating the FBI.

He made some huge mistakes, cost millions of dollars. Whether it was a software program, this program, that program, he had all these ideas, and there were plenty of people who had had enough experience in the different areas that, if he hadn't run them off, could have said: This is not a good idea, sir, if I could suggest—

He didn't want to hear from those people. He ran them off; thousands and thousands of years of law enforcement experience. He ran them off.

It would be interesting to see what the average age of the FBI agents were when he left, compared to when he started. And I realize, there are so many old goats that get long in the tooth, but you don't run them off because they are older. Those are some of the most valuable people you could have. The only reason you should run anybody off is if they have just been so cantankerous that it is a problem, they are not doing their job.

But he ran them off because they had been in a supervisory position for 5 years.

So you would see offices that had an agent in charge, 20, 25, 26 years of experience, and they would finish their 5 years and say: I'm getting out. I didn't want to get out. I wanted to serve my country, even though I make a lot less in the FBI. But you are forcing me out, so I will go make a whole lot more money. Wish I could still be here.

But FBI Director Mueller had other ideas. Director Mueller severely hampered the FBI. There was a lot of damage that was done. And perhaps if he hadn't run off so many good, experienced people, all those thousands and thousands of years of experience, perhaps there would have been more elder statesmen in the FBI when he was allowing FBI agents to manufacture, fabricate evidence, hide evidence, and just

fabricate a case out of whole cloth against Senator Ted Stevens.

I have met him. He was kind of short with me, but that is no reason to prosecute somebody. But it was for the FBI, as Director Mueller created it, the way he wanted it.

But there was, apparently, nobody who would step up. The people who had enough experience and enough confidence in their positions to say: Director Mueller, you have got a grave injustice going on here. You are creating a case where there was none. You hammered this guy. You took all his evidence. You took his computer, all his documents. You raided his bank, got his bank records. You got all his records. He has got nothing except what you allow him to have back. You took everything.

And all of the evidence is pretty clear. He overpaid by hundreds of thousands of dollars for the improvement. There is no case here for saying he got \$600,000, \$700,000 improvements, whatever it was, to his home for free. He overpaid dramatically more than the improvements were worth or cost anybody else.

Supposedly, there was even a message that the contractor said: You are overpaying. And the Senator made clear: They watch me like a hawk. Just cash the check. I'd rather overpay than have them come after me someday.

□ 1830

And what happened?

You had an FBI that had run off too much experience—well, Director Mueller did—and there was nobody before the verdict that would step up and say: The FBI is doing the wrong thing here. This is injustice. We have rogue FBI agents that have got to be reined in. At least one.

Fortunately, there were FBI agents with consciences, unlike the lead agent that Mueller allowed to stay on, even after he got rid of the whistleblower. Mueller didn't want a whistleblower around; not somebody that would be honest, not somebody that would step forward and say: You created a case against a U.S. Senator when there was no case. He had done nothing wrong, and you tried it the week before his election, and he lost by, what, 1,000 or so votes?

And he would have won but for the FBI, under Director Mueller, destroying a man and robbing him of his finances, destroying his reputation, and Director Mueller, as FBI Director, got this man fired for nothing. Because the truth was he overpaid. He should have gotten adoration for what he did. But not in Mueller's FBI.

I haven't seen anything to indicate the prosecutors knew of the fabrication and the fraud by the lead FBI agent. If that ever materializes, then I would want to find out where those prosecutors are and make sure the world knows of the injustice that they participated in—actually, crime. It is a crime when you fraudulently charge

and convict somebody of a crime and you know there is no crime. You know you fabricated the case, but such was Director Mueller's FBI.

I had great hope for James Comey coming in. Some things were asked today in our hearing about: Well, did President Trump ask for a loyalty oath from you?

Something like that.

I mean, there is nothing wrong with a President saying to a person that he has the power to remove or put in office: Now, I expect you to be loyal to me. What that would mean for a normal person is I expect you to come tell me if there is a problem. And I expect you to be loyal to me so that if there is some problem I am creating, you come tell me, and you don't go do a memo and twist the memo around to try to make it look like I did something wrong. I expect you to be loyal to me and not do anything to me different than you would any other President; that you would serve your country and the President with distinction and just not go leaking things to try to hurt me. You know, just be loyal. That is not asking for anybody to commit a crime. It is not asking for anybody to obstruct justice. It is asking that you just be fair to me as your boss. Will you do that?

It makes sense to ask a question like that when you have already seen so much injustice done to you by the Justice Department.

We didn't even know when President Trump took office just how horrendous the injustices were that were lurking behind the closed doors at the Justice Department because it wasn't a Justice Department. It was a "Just Us" department. The way it sounds like it was going is: We will protect the people who we think will be in the next administration, and heaven help the people if they knock our chosen out of the executive office at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, because we will perform a coup, we will get them out. We will use the Justice Department because, let's face it, after all, there is just a very thin veneer at the top of political appointments. We are just under that level. We will still really control things.

That is kind of the way it sounds like it was going.

When you have got a guy like Andrew McCabe—you know, the Bible says, when you are married, the two become one—his wife running for office, getting hundreds of thousands of dollars, according to what we understand from Donna Brazile, you know, Hillary Clinton basically took over the Democratic National Committee. So if the DNC was giving money to McCabe's wife, they all knew who to thank. Let's face it, they knew Hillary Clinton deserved a thank-you note.

And the one who owed the thank-you note to Hillary Clinton has a husband who is going to prosecute her?

Probably not. Probably not.

Those are the kinds of things we are finding.

Today, in our hearing, FBI Director Wray was asked a series of questions about Peter Strzok. I thought about asking some questions about Strzok, but I figured so many people would have questions, I would go a different direction.

But Strzok was a former number two for counterintelligence. He was removed from Mueller's investigation team this summer after an inspector general discovered he was exchanging politically charged messages with a mistress, Lisa Page, who is an FBI Attorney in the Office of the General Counsel.

We heard from Director Wray today that: Though many of us think of the FBI and think of "Federal Bureau of Investigation," that many FBI agents think the F doesn't stand for "Federal," but stands for "fidelity."

But apparently in the case of the number two person in counterintelligence, Peter Strzok, that fidelity was not an F; it was an I, "infidelity," because he was being unfaithful. He was engaged in infidelity and not fidelity. Nobody is selling that to us. He was engaged in infidelity and was enjoying, in the course of his infidelity, being disloyal to the man who would be and ultimately was his boss, the President of the United States, Donald Trump.

But instead of being fired for his improprieties, for his bias that was clearly affecting his job, Director Mueller, the man who did so much damage, ran off thousands of years of experience that could step forward and guide younger agents away from pitfalls. He ran them off. You are going to have younger agents without the proper guidance from the white hairs or no hairs. He ran them off. He didn't want people with too much experience and might question something that he ordered.

And when there is no accountability, there is nobody with more experience that can come alongside and say: Look, I have been here. I have seen a lot of things. Let me tell you, I see how you are going in this direction. Let me encourage you. Don't go there. I have seen too many people go that way.

No. Mueller made sure the consciences of the FBI, at least as many as he could run off, were gone. So instead of being fired, though, when they found out that Strzok hated President Trump's guts and worshipped Hillary Clinton and skewed the case—I mean, Strzok knew that if FBI Director Comey went out and said that Hillary Clinton had been grossly negligent, then he would have been stating on the record that Hillary Clinton had committed a crime. And since he wanted to protect Hillary Clinton so she could be President, he changed the language. So that Director Comey would not implicate Hillary Clinton in committing a crime, he changed the words "grossly negligent" to "excessively careless," as I understand it, and that wasn't necessarily a crime.

He was covering up. The man should have been gone.

So what do they do?

Well, he was reassigned to the FBI's HR department. It is unclear what Strzok's job duties were in his new position, but when he was asked about the nature of that move today, Director Wray stated that he did not consider it to be a demotion. It wasn't a disciplinary action. Director Wray did not want to discipline the guy for covering up for Hillary Clinton, for skewing the case, for mishandling the case to make sure that Hillary Clinton wasn't implicated. No, no, no. Clearly, he has a bias. Clearly, he hates Donald Trump before and after he is President, but that is no problem.

We sure don't want to lose a guy just because he hates Donald Trump and loves Hillary Clinton and excuses the Justice Department to suit his love for Hillary Clinton and his hate for Donald Trump. No, let's not demote him, let's not fire him. Let's just have a move here, maybe even make his life easier, I guess.

But in quoting from the response of Director Wray to a question posed by my friend ANDY BIGGS from Arizona, Mr. BIGGS said: "Okay, Mr. Strzok was reassigned. It seems it was an odd lateral move. Are you saying that was a lateral move for him?"

Director Wray said: "Reassigned away from the special counsel investigation to the human resources department. I understand that may sound to some of you like a demotion, but I can assure you that in a 37,000-person organization with a \$9 billion budget and offices all around the country and in 80 countries around the world, that I think our human resources department is extremely important, and a lot of what they do is cutting edge, best practice stuff. So it is a very different kind of assignment, certainly, but that is why I don't consider it disciplinary or a demotion."

So based on what Director Wray said, Peter Strzok was neither punished nor demoted after the IG discovered him engaging in politically biased conduct during the course of a key investigation that was of a political nature.

Look, nobody is demanding that our FBI agents not go vote on election day. They have that right. In some cases, they have an obligation because they know so much about what is going on. It is just very unfortunate when they know so much of what is going on and they know the people they are voting for appear to have committed crimes so we have got to change language and cover for them.

Not only was he not punished nor fired, but Peter Strzok was put into a position that Director Wray described as extremely important.

Strzok was sending these messages to a fellow FBI agent that he was having an extramarital affair with.

Why on Earth would you give someone who was caught sleeping around on his wife with a fellow employee an extremely important position? Why would you give them an extremely im-

portant position in the human resources department if you are Director of the FBI?

□ 1845

Mr. Speaker, I want to start fresh with a great FBI Director, but I am a little concerned here. Do you think it is a good qualification when someone is caught being engaged in infidelity—not the fidelity you talked about the F in FBI standing for, but engaged in infidelity.

They broke their marriage oath, their marriage vow, and that is who you want handling your human resources? Because that is an extremely important position. So we need the guy who was skewing justice, that is who we need? It is kind of ridiculous. Strzok wasn't punished.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence.

I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1266. An act to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with nonprofit organizations to investigate medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on December 06, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 228. To amend the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 to facilitate the ability of Indian tribes to integrate the employment, training, and related services from diverse Federal sources, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 11, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3332. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Report to Congress entitled "Corrosion Policy and Oversight Budget Materials for FY 2018", pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2228; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3333. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter stating that the report on the amount of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities, for FY 2017, will be submitted by the end of May 2018; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3334. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Office of Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress for the period April 1, 2017, through September 30, 2017, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, Public Law 95-452; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3335. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a notification of a designation of acting officer, change in previously submitted reported information, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3336. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a notification of a designation of acting officer, change in previously submitted reported information, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3337. A letter from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress, for the period April 1, 2017, through September 30, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3338. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Semiannual Management Report to Congress for the period of April 1, 2017, through September 30, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3339. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Semiannual Report to the Congress by the Office of Inspector General and the Corporation's Management Response for the period April 1, 2017, through September 30, 2017, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3340. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's Inspector General's semiannual report for April 1, 2017, through September 30, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3341. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period ending September 30, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4015. A bill to improve the quality of proxy advisory firms for the protection of investors and the U.S. economy, and in the public interest, by fostering accountability, transparency, responsiveness, and competition in the proxy advisory firm industry (Rept. 115-451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4324. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to make certifications with respect to United States and foreign financial institutions' aircraft-related transactions involving Iran, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1638. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-453, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Foreign Affairs discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1638 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 4581. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop best practices for utilizing advanced passenger information and passenger name record data for counterterrorism screening and vetting operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 4582. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve access to rehabilitation innovation centers under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4583. A bill to suspend all diplomatic presence in Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. BRAT):

H.R. 4584. A bill to provide loan forgiveness to borrowers of Federal student loans who agree to delay eligibility to collect social security benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4585. A bill to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from relying on the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in the matter of restoring internet freedom to adopt, amend, revoke, or otherwise modify any rule of the Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 4586. A bill to provide for the National Academies to study and report on a research agenda to advance the understanding of albedo modification strategies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4587. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to award grants to fund research on orthotics and prosthetics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COOK (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 4588. A bill to establish the Abraham Lincoln Medal for Public Sacrifice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GALLEGGO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SIREN):

H.R. 4589. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to expand the military student identifier program to cover students with a parent who serves in the reserve component of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. COLE, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 4590. A bill to provide an exception to certain mandatory minimum sentence requirements for a person employed outside the United States by a Federal agency, who uses, carries, or possesses the firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence committed while on-duty with a firearm required to be carried while on-duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. NUNES, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 4591. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iranian persons that threaten the peace or stability of Iraq or the Government of Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 4592. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the two-year

waiting period for divorced spouse's benefits following the divorce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 4593. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for full benefits for disabled widows and widowers without regard to age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 4594. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for increases in widow's and widower's insurance benefits by reason of delayed retirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 4595. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the 7-year restriction on eligibility for widow's and widower's insurance benefits based on disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico (for himself and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 4596. A bill to make funds available to the Department of Energy National Laboratories for the Federal share of cooperative research and development agreements that support maturing Laboratory technology and transferring it to the private sector, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MACARTHUR (for himself, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 4597. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow for the deferment of certain student loans during a period in which a borrower is enrolled in a drug treatment program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. SOTO, and Miss GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico):

H.R. 4598. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require public communications about disaster assistance resources to be made in multiple languages; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4599. A bill to redesignate Rock Creek Park in the District of Columbia as Rock Creek National Park; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SIREN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PASCARELL, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 4600. A bill to waive and repay certain debts relating to assistance provided to individuals and households; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 4601. A bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 4602. A bill to authorize the full funding of part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act by making certain spending cuts to the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each

case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. DONOVAN):

H.R. 4603. A bill to provide for the continuation in effect of sanctions with respect to Yemen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 4604. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide a fiduciary safe harbor for the selection of a lifetime income provider, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BANKS of Indiana:

H. Res. 648. A resolution expressing support for the designation of August 3, 2018, as "National Ernie Pyle Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself and Mr. EVANS):

H. Res. 649. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to Marcus Garvey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. KILMER):

H. Res. 650. A resolution recognizing the results of the free and fair elections for the new Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Falkland Islands held on November 9, 2017; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. HULTGREN, and Ms. BASS):

H. Res. 651. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Burundi is at risk of mass atrocities, and that the Government of Burundi should comply with constitutional limits on presidential terms and re-engage in regionally-brokered peace talks; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. NORTON):

H. Res. 652. A resolution supporting the practice of community-oriented policing and encouraging diversity hiring and retention in law enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CORREA, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SOTO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H. Res. 653. A resolution recognizing the 69th anniversary of the Universal Declara-

tion of Human Rights and the celebration of "Human Rights Day"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. LANCE):

H. Res. 654. A resolution expressing support for the designation of January 23, 2018, as "National Handwriting Day" and recognizing the importance of handwriting for cognitive, artistic, and educational benefit; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 4581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE 1, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 1

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 4582.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4583.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 4584.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4585.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 4586.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4587.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 4588.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 4589.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 4590.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached language falls within Congress' enumerated authority to provide for

the common defence and general welfare of the United States, found in Article I, Section 8, clause 1, and to make rules for the government, found in Article I, Section 8, clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 4591.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 4592.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 4593.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 4594.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 4595.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 4596.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 4597.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 4598.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4599.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 4600.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 4601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 4602.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 4603.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 08

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 4604.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 51: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 113: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 154: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 169: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 377: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 435: Mr. ROYCE of California and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 544: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 632: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. REED, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 681: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 731: Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. BERA.
H.R. 798: Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 867: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 930: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 1044: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1114: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1192: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1204: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1406: Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 1444: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 1456: Mr. ISSA and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1457: Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 1458: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1552: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1563: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1614: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1734: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1802: Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 1898: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1987: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 1997: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2166: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MEADOWS, and Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 2215: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 2267: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2319: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2412: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 2421: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 2431: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 2472: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2514: Mr. NADLER, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2616: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2651: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2670: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2707: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2790: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2820: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 2899: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 3079: Mr. FASO and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3092: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 3095: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 3224: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 3314: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 3338: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 3395: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 3397: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3442: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 3445: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 3477: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3495: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 3510: Ms. NORTON and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3558: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 3596: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. WALZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. ROBY, and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 3600: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 3635: Mr. HARPER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 3654: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BASS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 3692: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 3730: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 3759: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 3767: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. FASO.
H.R. 3776: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 3780: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 3842: Mr. LANGEVIN and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 3931: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 3976: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SIREs, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. PALAZZO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4006: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 4007: Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CRIST, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. LUTKEMEYER.
H.R. 4022: Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. POE of Texas, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4058: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 4143: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 4152: Mrs. DEMINGS and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4202: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 4215: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 4229: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 4238: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 4271: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 4323: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 4324: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 4369: Ms. NORTON and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4392: Mr. COMER, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. TURNER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 4396: Mr. WELCH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CRIST, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 4397: Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 4446: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 4473: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 4485: Ms. NORTON and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4505: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
H.R. 4507: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4513: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 4518: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIND, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CRIST, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 4526: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 4535: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4536: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4541: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HECK, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 4548: Mr. LAWSON of Florida and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4570: Mr. BACON and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 4573: Ms. LEE and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 4577: Mr. KING of New York and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. COOK and Mr. ENGEL.
H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. SIREs.
H. Con. Res. 95: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 69: Mr. PERRY and Ms. MATSUI.
H. Res. 199: Mr. ROUZER.
H. Res. 252: Mr. DUFFY.
H. Res. 257: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 269: Mr. RUIZ.
H. Res. 466: Mr. CRIST and Mr. POE of Texas.
H. Res. 495: Mr. YARMUTH.
H. Res. 564: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H. Res. 637: Mr. GROTHMAN.