

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)

Ruppertsberger
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

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

□ 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)

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

NAYS—188

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)
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)

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)

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine

NOT VOTING—6

Bridenstine
Brownley (CA)

Doggett
Kennedy

Pocan
Scott, David

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
Ruppertsberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Snozzzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Carterwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
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
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer