

□ 1346

Messrs. MITCHELL and HARPER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 10, 2018, I missed rollcall votes 5–7 on the motions to adjourn from Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. GRIJALVA. I was attending meetings off-campus and was not able to return for these unexpected votes that were not on the House schedule. If I had been present for these votes, I would have voted: “Nay” on rollcall vote 5 on the motion to adjourn from Mr. ESPAILLAT, “Nay” on rollcall vote 6 on the motion to adjourn from Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and “Nay” on rollcall vote 7 on the motion to adjourn from Mr. GRIJALVA.

INCLUDE E-VERIFY IN  
IMMIGRATION REFORM PACKAGE

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Congress should include an E-Verify employment eligibility verification program in any immigration reform package. E-Verify is the most effective deterrent to illegal immigration because it shuts off the jobs magnet and saves jobs for hardworking Americans. It is no surprise that E-Verify receives the most public support—82 percent—of any proposed immigration reform.

The E-Verify legislation, the Legal Workforce Act, approved by the Judiciary Committee, has the support of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and immigration enforcement groups. It provides employers with an efficient and workable system to verify their employees' work status, and the requirement for employers to verify their workers only applies to new employees, not existing workers.

Members should hesitate to support any immigration reform package that does not include requiring employers to use E-Verify. Congress should put the interests of American workers first.

LET STATES REGULATE  
MARIJUANA

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I was gravely concerned last week when Attorney General Sessions removed the guidance of the Cole memo regarding the way that the Department of Justice treats marijuana in jurisdictions where it is legal for medicinal or commercial circumstances. I happen to represent one of those States, the State of Colorado, which has a regulatory system for

marijuana that has now been called into jeopardy through a Federal overreach.

Effectively, Attorney General Sessions has left the entire fate of not just the industry and those who work in it but also consumers in my State in the hands of 93 U.S. attorneys, including the one for our State who, if they wake up on the wrong side of the bed one morning, could engage in a mass enforcement action against residents of Colorado who are following our State law.

I call on President Trump to overturn his attorney, and I call upon this body to put the appropriate funding restrictions, based on the McClintock-Polis amendment, into the final funding bill in the next few weeks to prevent the Department of Justice from using funds given to them by Congress to contravene State law in jurisdictions that have chosen to regulate marijuana.

RECOGNIZING THE BICENTENNIAL  
OF SPENCER COUNTY, INDIANA

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of an important milestone in Indiana history, the bicentennial of Spencer County, Indiana.

Founded in 1818 by Captain Spier Spencer, this rural county along the Ohio River was the boyhood home of Abraham Lincoln. Years later, when recalling his time in Spencer County, the man who became our 16th President stated quite succinctly: “There, I grew up.”

In addition to the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial and a scenic state park, Spencer County is home to St. Meinrad Archabbey and Indiana's premier tourist destinations, Holiday World and Splashin' Safari. Wildly recognized as the world's first theme park, Holiday World draws hundreds of thousands of visitors to the county each year.

Today, strategically connected to the world by Interstate 64, US 231, rail, and the Ohio River, Spencer County has become a leader in agriculture, manufacturing, maritime and ground logistics, steel production, power generation, and world class family entertainment.

I proudly salute the citizens and the wonderful hometowns of Spencer County on this notable occasion.

CONGRATULATING CENTRAL  
PENNSYLVANIA INSTITUTE OF  
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
LANDSCAPING STUDENTS

(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, I rise today to congratulate the landscaping students at the

Central Pennsylvania Institute of Science and Technology for their fourth consecutive first-place win at the Pennsylvania Farm Show.

CPI students again took home the top prize this year in the agricultural education landscape exhibits. In total, eight schools entered this competition at the Farm Show, which is the Nation's largest indoor agricultural event.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the following students who are a part of the winning team: Charlee Marshall, Alexis Witherite, Landon Wagner, Jarod Williams, Robert Ficarro, and Calen McCool.

The students have learned from CPI's horticulture and landscaping instructor Joe Luther. Just a couple of weeks ago, Mr. Luther was named the National Career and Technical Education Teacher of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Congressional Career and Technical Education Caucus, I am most proud of these CPI students and Mr. Luther for being four-time first-place champions at the Pennsylvania Farm Show.

I congratulate them, and I know that they will continue this fine tradition of being the team to beat at the Pennsylvania Farm Show.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF S. 140, AMENDING THE WHITE  
MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE  
WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION  
ACT OF 2010

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 681 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 681

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 140) to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund. 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 115-54 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 among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), 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. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of a very important measure. The resolution provides for consideration of S. 140, to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the White Mountain Apache Tribe Settlement Fund. This bill also includes the text of S. 249, a bill to provide that the pueblo of Santa Clara may lease for 99 years certain restricted land; and H.R. 986, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2017.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, 30 minutes of which will be equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, and 30 minutes of which will be equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the first two items are noncontroversial; however, I am very pleased that within S. 140, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act is included. This language would allow Tribal governments to be excluded from requirements for employers under the National Labor Relations Act. When President Franklin Roosevelt signed the NLRA into law in 1935, Congress wisely excluded governments, all governments, from the definition of “employer.”

At the bill signing of the NLRA, President Roosevelt said: “This Act defines, as a part of our substantive law, the right of self-organization of employees in industry for the purpose of collective bargaining, and provides methods by which the Government can safeguard that legal right.”

The President made clear in his speech at that time that the intent of the law is that it should apply only to workers in the private sector. Tribes are governments and should be treated as such. The intent of the law was and is clear: Tribal governments supervise the employees within their governments and enterprises, not the Federal Government.

From 1935 until 2003, nearly seven decades, the National Labor Relations Board agreed and interpreted the statute in a way that did not apply to Indian Tribes because they were governments. In 2004, the NLRB abruptly changed course and, for the first time, held the act applicable to Indian Tribes. The NLRB did this by highlighting the fact that the act did not expressly include Tribal governments

among those excluded from the phrase “employer.” This is simply an egregious act of bureaucratic overreach.

Let me be clear. In this case, acting on its own, the NLRB expanded its jurisdiction. Neither the existing administration at the time nor Congress asked or ordered the NLRB to take this action.

The impacts of labor strife on Tribal governments and economies are more harmful than on other governments because there is no effective tax base in Tribal communities. Indian lands are held in trust by the United States and are not subject to taxation. The high unemployment rates and legal restrictions make income taxation an unfeasible option.

As a result, the businesses operated by Tribal governments, gaming operations, Tribal agriculture, energy and timber operations, and other Tribal government enterprise constitute the sole source of revenue that is used to fund essential government services for Tribes.

This bill has drawn bipartisan support in our effort to reverse the decision of the NLRB. In the 114th Congress, the same language passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 249-177.

□ 1400

This bill will strengthen Tribal sovereignty and correct this overreach, directing the NLRB to enforce the NLRA, National Labor Relations Act, as it was originally intended. In the end, Mr. Speaker, all we are doing here today with this bill is affirming what was Congress’ original intent. The NLRA does not have jurisdiction over Tribal governments.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, over 3 months ago, the funding for the Children’s Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, expired. Today, families throughout the country, including 90,000 children in my home State of Colorado, face great uncertainty about the future of their healthcare.

When CHIP was first passed, over 20 years ago, it was done in a bipartisan manner, and, until recently, CHIP has always been a bipartisan, nondivisive issue. It is unfortunate to see that, today, here, we are in this body under Republican leadership and, somehow, even children’s health insurance has become a political football while we while away our time, our precious legislative time, on bills that have passed this body before and don’t go anywhere.

In our most recent Band-Aid for government funding, House Republicans made a claim that CHIP was extended until March 31, but that wasn’t the

case. By some reports, States could run out of funding in the next few weeks. In fact, in Colorado, our own budget experts predict the State will run out of children’s health insurance money by the end of February. Cancellation letters are literally scheduled to go out at the end of this month.

Mr. Speaker, this simply isn’t a way to govern, crisis to crisis, ignoring the real issues people care about in order to consider special interest legislation. Republican leadership and the Trump administration continue to refuse to work on finding a bipartisan solution for the hundreds of thousands who have Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival—or DACA recipients—who are in limbo. We can simply put that bill on the floor today, the Dream Act, and I feel it would pass.

We have the votes to do so, Mr. Speaker. Let’s simply have a vote. It is a purely manufactured crisis.

I am happy to say we will be giving the opportunity for Members of this body to defeat the previous question and move to a vote on the Dream Act, shortly. My colleague, Mr. CORREA, has joined us to offer that motion in a few minutes.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle often say that the real deadline for a DACA solution isn’t until March, but, in reality, every day, already over 100 Deferred Action recipients lose their protected status, are unable to work with their situation unresolved.

For those DACA recipients, the deadline isn’t March. The deadline has already passed, hence, the urgency. Now is the time to pass the Dream Act, to allow these DACA recipients to continue to live and work and serve in the only Nation that many of them have ever known their whole lives.

All the while, congressional Republicans still refuse to work with Democrats on a long-term government funding solution. Here we are less than 10 days from another government shutdown. The Federal Government continues to move from quick spending patch to quick spending patch, costing taxpayers more in the long run by preventing our agencies from doing the planning necessary to improve efficiency.

Today we are only 5 legislative days away—9 actual days—from a government shutdown and the huge negative repercussions that would follow. As a former businessowner, I know, firsthand, the value of long-term budgeting and stability. Millions of Americans know how to plan their family budget and their home budget. Why can’t Congress do it for the country?

Instead of working on a long-term budget solution, the House is spending its time on other legislation. Here we have a bill that undermines workers’ rights and their protections under the National Labor Relations Act.

In addition to this controversial bill, there are two attached pieces of legislation that were originally separate

bills that easily could have gone on the suspension calendar and would have largely been noncontroversial. They passed on unanimous consent in the Senate and in the House Natural Resources Committee, but their fate is put in jeopardy by putting them onto a controversial bill.

The first bill amends the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010. To clarify, that is a separate economic development fund known as the WMAT settlement fund that can be accessed to cover potential cost overruns for this rural water project.

The Interior Department has said it is unsure if the settlement fund could be used for additional costs, and so this clarifies that water-related economic development projects would specifically include the planning, design, and construction of the rural water system. This legislation could have passed and, likely, could have become law but, instead, has been put into jeopardy by affixing it to a bill that is unlikely to go anywhere.

The second uncontroversial bill that is wrapped up is regarding the authority of pueblos. It concerns two New Mexican pueblos and simply clarifies that they could lease their lands that are held in trust by the Federal Government for 99 years. This legislation ensures Native Americans have the right to their lands that they deserve. It respects their sovereignty and nations in a noncontroversial way.

I am fully supportive of these two technical and simple pieces of legislation, but, unfortunately, because they are attached to a bill that isn't going anywhere, are very unlikely to become law.

These are the types of bills that could go straight to the suspension calendar and straight through the Senate and should be signed by the President, but, instead, they are being put in jeopardy by lumping them in with a bill that is unlikely to become law.

There are so many of these types of Natural Resources Committee bills from both Democrats and Republicans that should be making their way forward as stand-alone items.

I am glad, for instance, that one that I authored, my Bolt's Ditch and the WEDGE Act—actually, two that I authored—were put forward and passed by this House and not attached to other controversial legislation.

I am also reintroducing, soon, a bicameral bill that I also consider noncontroversial, the Continental Divide Wilderness, Recreation and Camp Hale Legacy Act bill. It would preserve over 90,000 acres of wilderness and recreation lands in Summit and eastern Eagle Counties, and is endorsed by local businesses, commissioners, and towns across the area.

It was crafted with input from dozens of stakeholder groups, including the Wilderness Society, Vail Resorts, the Outdoor Industry Association, the International Mountain Bicycling As-

sociation, Conservation Colorado, and many municipalities and local businesses. It will help sustain our recreational economy in Eagle and Summit Counties, protect watersheds, and preserve important wildlife corridors and tourism opportunities.

These are the kinds of bills that we should be moving forward from the Natural Resources Committee, not controversial bills that actually take away the rights of American citizens, including Native American citizens.

And, while we are not today, we should never be moving forward on Natural Resources Committee bills that actually whittle away at the public lands we all own and the Antiquities Act by shrinking monuments like Bears Ears or making it easier to destroy lands we cherish and value.

All I ask is that we separate out these two Natural Resources bills, send them to the suspension calendar, and not let them be put in jeopardy by affixing them to the fundamental underlying legislation which is controversial, namely, the Tribal labor bill. That is the bill that is the main controversial bill in this package.

And, of course, I stand here as a supporter of the rights of every American to organize. I am a supporter of workers' rights, and I am also a strong supporter of Tribal sovereignty, not only principles under American law, but the right thing to do.

I, like many of my colleagues, place a great deal of importance in Tribal self-determination, autonomy, local control, and independent governance for our nations. In fact, I have been the champion of sovereignty, and I have long voted in favor of legislation that allows Tribal discretion in the judicial processes and in education.

But, of course, the right to organize is an inalienable right of every American, protecting our workers, including Native American workers, to fight for a safe working environment regardless of what entity owns the company they work for. Legislation balancing these two competing principles is possible.

Reconciling these two priorities can be difficult, but I think that there is a way to do it. Instead, this bill drives a wedge between issues or groups that have a history of working strongly together, such as Native Americans and labor unions.

We can balance critical rights to sovereignty with the protections that are due to every American citizen regardless of their race, ethnicity, cultural practices, membership in an Indian nation, or governing structures. This legislation does not find the right balance. It hurts workers of all stripes and colors, including many Native American workers.

Workers have the right to collectively bargain; otherwise, workplaces become unsafe, sexual harassment can go unchecked, and the income gap continues to widen. This legislation would strip Native Americans and non-Native Americans, many of whom work for

Native American enterprises, of the right to collectively bargain.

Without the right to self-governance, we would not have the strong communities present across the country today. Without the right to collective bargaining, we would not have the strong and growing economy that supports our middle class. This legislation simply does not succeed in balancing both of these values.

I also want to point out that President Trump agrees with me, or at least he did last time he commented on this 25 years ago. In 1993, at a hearing before the House Committee on Natural Resources regarding the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, then private citizen Trump testified regarding the legal barriers facing labor unions at that time to organize workers employed at Tribal casinos. His testimony said, in part: "At present, even union workers in States like New Jersey would have no federally or State protected rights or the ability to organize in casinos on Tribal lands. The unions hope to do something about this. They hope to gain the right to recognition, the right to organize if they so choose. Quite frankly, I hope they have better luck than we have had so far."

Mr. Speaker, the last time the President commented on this, it is clear that he also believed that workers on Tribal land should have the right to collectively bargain. I hope that his administration would not be supportive of this legislation if it were to move through Congress, which it is unlikely to do.

Instead of policies that benefit those at the top, I have a number of ideas that I will be talking about later that we can move forward to empower workers and help make sure that the 21st century economy works for everyone.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Colorado covered a lot of ground, so let me try to respond to some of that area because a lot of it doesn't have a whole lot to do with the legislation until the final phase of his remarks.

In terms of CHIP, we actually agree. I think that's something—and, frankly, this House should be proud it passed a CHIP bill on a bipartisan basis months ago. Our real problem is the United States Senate simply hasn't produced legislation. It doesn't have to accept our legislation. It just needs to pass a CHIP bill so we can go to conference and bargain.

I am pleased that both sides, frankly, have worked to make sure that, when we have done extensions of government spending as we work through some of these knotty issues, we continue to fund CHIP. I think the leadership on both sides of the aisle have been clear about that, and I think we will. But, again, it will be great when the Senate finally passes a bill or we make this part of a larger spending bill.

In terms of my friend's points about the Dream Act, I am honestly heartened at the discussion that took place at the White House yesterday. I think there is a genuine desire to come to an agreement on DACA. But the real issue there is border security in addition to legal status.

These folks, obviously, I think, deserve legal status; but you also have to fix the problem, and the problem is on the border. So the outline of the deal is there if people approach it in good faith on both sides of the aisle. I take the fact that we had leadership in both parties meeting with the President yesterday as a good sign in that regard.

In terms of the budget, we probably have at least some areas of agreement. My friend didn't vote for it, but it is worth noting, the House passed every single appropriations bill before the September 30 deadline. We have been waiting now for over 120 days for the United States Senate to just pass a single appropriations bill.

We are in discussions with them now, and I think at some point, when there is an agreement as to what the top line number is—and I think we might not be too far away from that—then we will be able to proceed. But again, this House has done its work. Just as it did on CHIP, it produced legislation on time, and it is prepared to sit down and negotiate with the Senate whenever the Senate decides it can get around to getting its job done.

In terms of the National Labor Relations Act, the Tribal sovereignty portion of this bill, let me point out a couple of things.

My friend does have an excellent record, honestly, in terms of support on Native American issues. This is just an issue where we disagree. There will be Republicans and Democrats who oppose this legislation. There will be Republicans and Democrats who support this legislation.

It is not really purely a partisan question at all, but it is worth noting, the Indian community is united on this issue. The National Congress of American Indians, over 150 Tribal organizations and individual Tribes have come and asked the Congress to correct this oversight.

The fact that this happened in the way it did, that is, the National Labor Relations Board acted on its own to extend its jurisdiction, had no instructions from Congress to do that, had no request from the administration to do that, they just decided they would do it all, that is my definition of a regulatory body run amuck.

For almost 70 years, the NLRB recognized that it did not have jurisdiction in this area and did not try and do it. This is a very new thing. It aroused opposition in Indian Country immediately.

Again, we don't apply these standards to any State government or any local government. We have lots of State governments and lots of local governments involved in activities that

are not strictly governmental. They run municipal golf courses. They do water parks. None of these things are necessarily inherently government. They are not forced to comply with this. So we should extend to Tribal government, which we historically have done, the exact same status and rights in this regard as we do to State and local governments.

We would all be pretty upset if the Federal Government decided it would interject itself in this way into the affairs of any individual State or any of the individual localities that we represent.

□ 1415

Working for a public entity is different. You certainly have rights, but there are restrictions. You have certain rights, like the right to strike, that in most States and most localities do not exist. Tribes should have the same right to make those sorts of decisions for themselves. Again, they resent and have resented historically the violation of their sovereignty. In this case, a regulatory agency without the authority of this body and without the authority of the administration that existed at that time acted on its own.

What the Indian nations and Indian Country have come and asked is: Restore us the sovereignty that you historically accorded us.

That is all this legislation does.

The last point, my friend says this is unlikely to become law. I beg to disagree. Not only did this pass the House on a bipartisan vote in the last Congress, but this Congress it has been reported out of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs on a bipartisan vote. There is every reason to believe this. We will see what the administration does. But I suspect views change over 25 years, and I would hope the administration is supportive of this. As a matter of fact, as I recall, I think they issued a statement to that effect.

So, regardless, let's do our job. Let's continue to do the job we did in the last Congress when, on a bipartisan basis, Republicans and Democrats alike decided Tribal sovereignty was an important issue. We should work together to defend it and to expand it. In this case, we are working to reclaim something that a Federal agency took away, acting on its own, over a decade ago. So the solution to this is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly urge my friends to support the rule and, more importantly, the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, when we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule—not just any amendment, but an amendment to bring up the bipartisan, bicameral bill, H.R. 3440, the Dream Act.

It is far past time that we consider this urgent piece of legislation, the lack of which is tearing apart the lives

of over 100 aspiring Americans every day who are unable to do what you and I take for granted, Mr. Speaker, which is simply go to work the next day. Every day that we fail to act, approximately 122 DREAMers lose their legal ability to work.

Mr. Speaker, even Republicans have called for a vote on this critical issue. At the end of last year, 34 Republican colleagues sent a letter to Speaker RYAN urging a vote before the year's end, a vote that never happened, a vote my colleague, Mr. CORREA, is giving us a chance to take now.

How much longer will this body be complicit in the Trump administration's assault on DREAMers?

It is time we listen to the vast majority of Americans and the majority of this body and act to protect courageous, aspiring Americans like the group from Colorado I met with yesterday.

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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, recently, my daughter came home from high school accompanied by two of her good friends. These young ladies are about 16 years of age. They wanted to sit down and talk to me a little bit, so we sat down and we spoke. After a while, I learned these young ladies were very nervous and very scared. They were DREAMers.

They had a basic question for me, which was: What can we do? What can you do for us?

Very, very tough questions. After a moment I answered them: Continue to study hard. Continue to follow the law. Be good students and don't give up hope.

At the same time I told them: Don't worry about Washington, D.C. I am going to Washington to fight for you.

That is what we are doing here today, myself and my colleagues, fighting for DREAMers, fighting to make sure that they have a shot at the American Dream.

Now, I am happy to say today that DREAMers enjoy support of not only Democrats, but Republicans as well on this floor.

Why?

Because all of us know who DREAMers are. DREAMers are hardworking individuals. They serve in our military. They are soldiers, police officers, firefighters, nurses, teachers, and, of course, they are also our neighbors. DREAMers also are very good immigrants. They pay their taxes and follow the law.

Do you know what?

They provide value to our country.

Recently, I also had the opportunity to visit my son's high school, the Air Force Naval ROTC program. I went to be part of what is called a pass in review. Some very nice, honorable young cadets passing in review, all saluting the flag of the United States, all taking the Pledge of Allegiance to our country and to our flag.

Do you know something?

A lot of those cadets were DREAM-ers.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the chance to do what is right. We have a chance to do our job. Let the Dreamer legislation come before us for a vote and let's give the DREAMers the opportunity to earn the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, let's not live with regrets. Let's not look back 5, 10, 15 years from now and say what we could have, should have, would have. Now is the time to act. Now is the time to vote for our DREAMers.

I ask my colleagues to please vote against the previous question so that we can immediately bring up the Dream Act to vote for justice and equity.

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

Again, Mr. Speaker, I certainly respect my friend's right to bring up a subject that they think is important and is important, and it is appropriate that they use their time to do that.

I would remind them that there is a negotiation underway. I think the issue here is less about DACA probably and more about border security. The issues are naturally paired together. These young people came here through no fault of their own. They are not responsible for any sort of criminal act. But they were transported across a very porous border.

So to ensure that we are not here again doing the same thing again, strengthening that border at the same time that we provide legal status seems the appropriate thing to do. I suspect neither is achievable without the other linked together.

So I take it that the two sides are negotiating. I am not involved in those negotiations. I am not a member of the relevant committees, but I think the two sides are involved in that negotiation. My hope is that they come to an agreement and that we can have a large, bipartisan victory and a piece of legislation that we are all proud of. But I suspect it is going to take some give-and-take on each side to achieve that.

I do want to go back, though, to the principal underlying legislation here and ask my friends—many of whom, by the way, will support this legislation. There will be considerable Democratic support for this. But I would hope—and, again, I understand this is an issue of competing goods, but sovereignty is not something we should grant to States and localities and deny Indian Tribes.

We should not have a double standard here. If we need to make changes

across the entire Labor Relations Act, fair enough. I guess we should consider that. But we should not single out Tribes and make them subject to capricious, arbitrary, bureaucratic activity deciding on what their legal status is, what their rights are, and interfere with their ability to operate their own businesses, which are absolutely indispensable to supporting their governmental activities.

We do not give Tribes the power to tax. They can't tax their own land. They can't tax their own citizens. If they are not successful economically, they have to rely on the limited resources given by the Federal Government to do everything from protecting their citizens to providing healthcare for their citizens and to making sure that there is appropriate education for their citizens. They ought to be able to do what other governments do and earn money and run their own affairs.

We allow States to do that. We allow localities to do that. For almost 70 years, we allowed Indian Tribes to do that. Then we took it away from them. They are not even asking for something new. They are just asking for something that was taken from them, in terms of their authority and sovereignty, to be restored to them.

Mr. Speaker, again, I go back to urging the passage of the underlying legislation. I hope that we continue to work on these other issues that my friends have brought up. We are working on them in areas like CHIP, like the DACA question, and like the border security question.

But let's also take our time and pass this very important piece of legislation and restore to Indian Tribes what the National Labor Relations Board took away from them over a decade ago.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to address some of the things that my colleague, Mr. COLE, said. The big difference here between Tribal-owned and -run businesses and State and local governments is that State and local governments are not generally in the business of owning/operating companies. With very few exceptions, we don't have a socialist form of government in this country where cities or States are actually operating businesses in competition with the private sector.

Tribes, in addition to their Tribal workers, which are more analogous to State or local workers—and it is an appropriate discussion—also happen to own businesses, which is fine, and they produce revenue for the Tribes, which is great. However, they should play by the same economic rules as other businesses, which in no way impede businesses from succeeding in our country.

Of course, many of these Tribal-owned businesses are the main source of support and income for Tribes. If our labor laws work for any other business, they should also work for them.

American citizens, including Native American citizens of our country, don't lose their rights as workers because of the ownership of the organization and company that they happen to be employed by. That is a key tenet that needs to be balanced with, of course, Tribal sovereignty, which I am a strong supporter of.

If the discussion were simply about Tribal employees, it would be a different discussion. To be clear, it is about businesses that are owned by Tribes, and we simply don't have an analogy on the State and local side with very few exceptions. I am sure there is one somewhere. But, in general, municipalities and counties are not the owners of operating businesses that compete in the private sector.

Now, I want to talk about what is possible with regard to enhancing the rights of workers and labor. Instead of these kinds of policies that take away the rights of workers, including Native American workers, we should be moving forward on policies that put workers first.

My bill, the Giving Workers a Fair Shot Act, would do that. The bill would provide reasonable solutions to address the growing inequality in the United States by helping workers and ensuring that companies follow the law, emphasizing the need for corporate accountability.

It would remove unfair obstacles to forming a union, enhance transparency from employers, and increase penalties for violating our labor laws, which are strong but often not enforced.

First, all too often, employers frequently drag their feet on a newly formed union's first contract for months, sometimes for years, often with the goal of avoiding an agreement. Sometimes that means a newly certified union that the voters have voted in fails to receive a first contract.

My bill would set up a first-contract arbitration system where the union or the employer has the option of seeking mediation if they feel one party is not responding adequately to a negotiation request.

It would also ensure that no taxpayer funds are used for union busting or persuaders, activities like planning and implementing activities that deter employees from joining or forming a union. Again, it simply makes sure that no taxpayer funds are used for that explicit purpose.

Third, the bill updates the National Labor Relations Act's definition of "supervisor." Too often, workers are reclassified as supervisors for effectively gerrymandering bargaining units. This updated definition helps prevent that sort of manipulation and would make it easier for employees to be able to form a union if they so choose.

Fourth, the bill reaffirms the importance for the government to protect workers from having their rights violated by increasing criminal and civil

penalties for individuals and executives who violate critical labor laws.

Injured workers and worker deaths should never be simply a cost of doing business. These robust protections help make sure that this is truly a criminal issue for the few bad actors that exist on the employer side.

Finally, the legislation empowers shareholders and creates new accountability for CEOs and executives by preventing the CEO and chairman at a publicly traded company from being the same person. We would all love to work for ourselves, but that is not in the long-term economic interest of the shareholders, the customers, or the workers.

The bill also expands insider trading restrictions for executives to 1 year after they leave a company.

In my district and across Colorado, people are clamoring for proactive policies that actually help address the income gap and put the needs of middle class families and workers first. Policies like the Giving Workers a Fair Shot Act would do that.

Now, this legislation that we are seeing here today is not the only controversial legislation we are seeing this week. Unfortunately, the next rule up will be one that takes away our constitutional rights as Americans.

The FISA reauthorization legislation has been described as a compromise, but that is not the case.

□ 1430

This legislation is not the necessary FISA reform bill that many in Congress, including myself, have called for, which is why I and so many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are opposed to it in its form and support the Amash-Polis amendment, cosponsored by many others.

It is also why the current FISA reauthorization bill is opposed not only by privacy and civil liberties groups and consumers but also technology companies and job creators across the political spectrum. Businesses are, rightfully, afraid that, if this bill passes, it will make it even harder for American companies to engage in international commerce.

Many countries in Europe, for example, will simply refuse to do business with a technology company that is housed in the U.S. because they are afraid of what will happen to their citizens' data, perhaps even in contravention of their own stronger privacy laws.

This bill does not make any steps in the direction of reform that are necessary. It falls short on several grounds. In fact, in some ways, it makes the FISA program worse by codifying the "abouts" collections term that refers to the NSA searching through the internet traffic to collect not only communications to or from an intelligence target but also those that simply mention an identifier used by a target, even though that has been declared unconstitutional twice. It could

be the name of a city or State or even a country that can be used as an identifier; in theory, subjecting close to 100 percent of tax and emails and internet traffic to warrantless searches.

This bill fails to consider the core concern that I have and that many Members on both sides of the aisle share; namely, the government's use of section 702 information against American citizens in investigations that have nothing to do with national security and does not require a warrant or the due process of our Constitution.

Instead, the bill codifies the ability of the government to access the content of our emails and telephone calls without a warrant. It creates an unprecedented and unworkable "optional" warrant, which is merely window dressing but does nothing to address the legitimate concerns.

These massive flaws could have been addressed, had we proceeded under regular order, but this version was reported only from the Intelligence Committee and bypassed the Judiciary Committee, which was cut out of negotiations when they agreed to go along with the Intelligence Committee railroading their committee. That is why I signed a bipartisan letter with dozens of our Members demanding FISA be handled under regular order.

I am proud to have offered the amendment that will be considered later with Representatives LOFGREN and AMASH and others that would provide a better path to keep American citizens safe and protect our privacy and ensure that American companies can remain competitive abroad. It will protect our constitutional rights and keep us safe.

My amendment, which is based off the USA RIGHTS Act, ends backdoor searches, ends reverse targeting, bans "abouts" collections, and strengthens FISA court oversight and transparency. I think these are all common-sense and necessary changes that Americans have been demanding for years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to oppose the FISA reauthorization and support the Amash-Loftgren amendment when they are brought forth shortly.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to a couple of my friend's points.

Let me begin by disagreeing respectfully with my friend's assertion that people are having their rights stripped away.

The only people losing their rights here are Indian Tribes. That is what happened when the NLRB did what it did. Without the direction of Congress or the administration, it decided on its own it would treat Indian Tribal governments different than it treated other governments. So it is those rights to the Tribal governments that we are busy trying to restore.

My friend, who, again, is very good on Indian issues, as a rule, and I under-

stand the competing claims here. So I recognize the tension that is involved in that. But it is not as if Tribal governments don't have their own labor codes and their own standards. Frankly, those have to comply with American law.

Under the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1965, there is absolutely nothing that a Tribal government can do that would contravene the guaranteed rights in the United States Constitution for all Americans.

So to suggest that they are somehow violating the rights of American workers, I think, is to mischaracterize who they are and how they have acted. What they have said is, if we are sovereign, if the Federal Government says that State governments and local governments are allowed to regulate their own workforces, then Tribal governments are allowed to do the same.

I want to disagree also with my friend. There are lots of municipal golf courses in the United States. There are lots of municipal water slides. There are park systems. You can go to the State of Virginia and it happens to own the liquor business in the State. It has decided it is going to make that a State function. We don't regulate those employees.

So the idea that just because it is a money-making activity, that we then somehow treat it differently, we don't do that to any locality or any State in the country.

We just had an unelected Federal agency decide on its own it was going to do that to Indian Tribes. It is not doing it to anybody else, just to Tribes. I would submit that that is fundamentally unfair. Again, nobody's rights are taken away. Every American citizen has exactly the same right.

But if you were to go to work for the Federal Government, you don't have precisely the same rights you do in the private sector. The same thing is true here. If you choose to go to work for a Tribal government, you live within that regime. That regime has to comport with the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and you have not lost your action rights in Federal court if you think there is a violation.

So I think, frankly, this is a case that is crystal clear. You treat everybody the same way, every governmental unit the same way. That is all the Tribes are asking for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a distinguished member of both the Rules Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his work as the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that deals with funding public health as well as medical research.

I heard some comments about extension of the funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program at the beginning of the debate, and I wanted to



come to the floor and remind people that the Energy and Commerce Committee did do its work as far as continuing the funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program. It completed its work. We delayed a little bit at the request of committee Democrats, we delayed a little bit at the request of the ranking member of the full committee, but we did deliver a product the first part of October.

That product passed the floor of this House late October, early November. It passed with, of course, almost every Republican vote and over two dozen Democratic votes. It was, indeed, a bipartisan effort.

It funded the Children's Health Insurance Program for 5 years, which was the Democratic request; the funding levels were requested by the Democrats; and it was offset in a responsible way.

That bill is pending over in the United States Senate, and I, frankly, do not understand why the Senate minority leader will not release that bill for a vote by his Senators because it is, after all, Democratic Senators who represent States around this country that are going to suffer as a consequence of not passing this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I also want to address something my friend, Mr. COLE, said.

Again, I am sure you can find a few instances in municipal and State government, but I am sure the gentleman would agree that, relative to size, they are very few and far between. Even most municipal golf courses are run by private operators under contract to municipalities. I am sure the gentleman can find a couple that aren't.

I have interacted with businesses in my district that are owned by Tribal nations, and I worked with them. There are a number of provisions in law that help them. I support those.

But I do believe that workers don't give up their rights simply because they work for a company that happens to be owned by a Tribal nation, as opposed to an American or even a Native American citizen of our country who, in their personal capacity, is the owner of a company and would not have the same ability to deprive workers of their rights as a company that was owned by his or her Tribe.

So, again, we want to make sure we support Tribal autonomy. And I do. Perhaps there is a bill to be had here, but it is simply not this bill.

I want to share a story of one of my constituents from Fort Collins, Colorado, that I think will bring this back to what our body should be doing.

I understand there are arguments on both sides of this. I understand there are people on both sides of the aisle who have concerns and also who support this bill. But it is not the urgency that we face with regard to deferred action or child health insurance.

In July of 2017, Carla and her husband from Fort Collins found out they were

expecting another child. Both Carla and her husband work full time. Carla works at a local childcare center. Her husband works at a local retail store.

Even with their two full-time incomes, like many Americans, they felt the Children's Health Insurance Program was the only medical coverage for them, and Carla enrolled in CHIP.

Carla is due to deliver her baby in March of this year, but she worries that, when the baby comes, she won't have medical coverage anymore. Unfortunately, Carla is right to worry. Right now, Colorado is expected to run out of CHIP funding at the end of February, just a few weeks before Carla is due.

That is why this issue is so urgent, Mr. Speaker. For the tens of thousands of children and pregnant women, like Carla, we can't wait another minute to provide a permanent extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

But instead of finding a bipartisan fix for the Children's Health Insurance Program or for deferred action or to keep the government open, instead, here we have yet another bill that people will have different opinions on, and I feel that it undermines workers' rights and is not supportive in the way that I would be of the rights of our nations. It is, unfortunately, another example of misguided priorities.

We have precious little time—I believe 4 days—until the funding of the government expires. We should have acted on the Children's Health Insurance Program last year. We should have acted on deferred action last year. We need to act now.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I oppose the underlying bill, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, and I want to stress that, while we disagree on this, I appreciate his efforts in Native American issues. He has a record that, I think, is an excellent record overall. We just disagree very profoundly in this case.

I will say this: if you happened to just casually turn on the coverage of the debate at any point, you might wonder what we were debating about. In the course of the debate, we have talked about CHIP, we have talked about the DREAMers, we have talked about the budget, we have talked about FISA. We have spent a lot of time talking about a lot of different things other than the information at hand. I don't begrudge my friend. He feels very passionately about those areas.

It is interesting to me that, on the FISA issue, for instance, we will actually have a debate tomorrow. The amendment my friend supports will be in order tomorrow. We will have an opportunity to do that.

I think there are good faith efforts underway on both sides on the DACA issue and on the issue of FISA, particularly on the issue of the budget as well. Again, I wish this place worked a little

differently. Sometimes deadlines are like alarm clocks here, but those things are underway.

What we are talking about today is also an effort that has been waged by Indian nations for over a dozen years to try and reclaim part of their sovereignty that was unjustly taken away from them.

I am going to disagree with my friend very profoundly. Nobody's rights have been taken away. Every American's rights are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. The Indian Civil Rights Act of 1965 makes it abundantly clear no Tribe can do anything in contravention and restrict the rights of Americans.

The only people who have lost rights in this whole discussion and episode have been Tribal governments who had their right to regulate their labor affairs, the same way we allow States and localities to do it, taken away from them.

It wasn't taken away from them by an act of this Congress. We never passed legislation. It wasn't taken away from this because the administration ordered some agency of the executive branch to do something. It was taken away because, acting in a rogue manner, the National Labor Relations Board, on its own, decided it would expand its legal authority.

Well, that is great. They may have a case to make. But that is not what they are supposed to do. They are supposed to operate within the authority Congress gives them. If they think they need a grant of additional authority, they come to Congress and ask for that grant of additional authority. They don't simply, on their own, decide they will willy-nilly violate the rights of a sovereign Native American nation. That is exactly what happened in this case. Frankly, the Tribes have been extraordinarily patient in pursuing the remedy to this.

I think we ought to, today, take the opportunity to rectify a wrong that an agency of the executive branch did without the consent of Congress or even without the consent of the President of the United States at the time and allow Tribes to reclaim the authority that they exercised for over 70 years.

If we think we need to do something different in that regard, that is a fair point to make. If we do, it needs to be the same for State governments and local governments. You don't single Tribes out of sovereign entities and impose something on them that doesn't apply to everybody else that is a sovereign of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I encourage all Members to support the rule, but I recognize my friends probably will not, and that is fair enough. That is normal partisan debate.

But with S. 140, the House is taking steps to strengthen Tribal sovereignty. This body actually has a pretty good record. I worked with my friends across the aisle when we passed the Violence

Against Women Act, which had a very important component giving Tribes back some of the jurisdiction that they needed to regulate domestic abuse and sexual assault on their own territory.

□ 1445

My friends were overwhelmingly supportive and helpful in that measure. It would not have happened without them, so I know in many cases we do agree. But in this case, under this bill, Tribal governments will be able to be excluded from the requirements for employers under the NLRA, just like State and local governments.

This legislation will reverse the bureaucratic overreach of the NLRB and clarify the law once and for all. This bill is a commonsense solution that will clarify the original intent of Congress that the NLRA does not have jurisdiction over Tribal governments.

I applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for this work. We will actually have a split decision over this. There will certainly be some Republicans supporting my friend's position, but by and large, I think this House will do what it did the last time it considered this legislation, and that is, on a bipartisan basis, pass the law.

This time, given the action of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, we have every reason to believe the legislation will be picked up and sent to the President's desk, where I am confident it will be signed.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 681 OFFERED BY  
MR. POLIS

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 139, RAPID DNA ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 682 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 682

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 139) to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, 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 115-53 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, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; (2) the further amendment printed in 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 division of the question; and (3) one motion to commit with or without instructions.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 682, currently under consideration.