

The proposals will steal \$1 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid in exchange for giveaways to the very wealthy and corporations.

The President and Republicans are turning their backs both on their own rhetoric and the real needs and lives of American families.

□ 1230

BIG TALK AND BROKEN PROMISES

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

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, big talk and broken promises, that is what we have seen.

As Trump's first 100 days come to a close, we see desperate times are leading to desperate measures. First, there is a push to revive TrumpCare. Really? Twenty-four million Americans would be kicked off health insurance in the first year, and there would be 15 to 20 percent increases in premiums according to the Congressional Budget Office. The big change to get a compromise is taking away essential benefits and pre-existing conditions, the foundation of making sure Americans have health care.

Second, we see Trump's threats to defund the subsidies. This is a blatant violation of law. Seven million Americans would lose health care immediately if that happened.

Third, we see Trump's threats to cut Medicaid and Medicare by \$1 trillion. Block grants will mean cuts to senior's health care, cuts to children's health care.

With these 100 days coming to a close, we see Trump as the least popular, least productive President in modern history.

While Trump is breaking his promises, our constituents are depending on us to keep ours.

REJECT ATTEMPTS TO FEARMONGER

(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, every day, we wake up and we have a choice of how we can look at the world: through the murkiness of fear or through the clarity of truth. I challenge you to choose clarity, choose a perspective that is grounded in truth and in love.

Today, President Trump announced the opening of the Victims of Immigration Crime Engagement Office, or VOICE, an office that will spew propaganda highlighting crimes committed by immigrants as opposed to equally harmful crimes committed by non-immigrants. It is a waste of taxpayer money that will manipulate law enforcement data in an attempt to play on fears and anxieties.

I am countering the opening of VOICE with the Saved By American

Immigrants National Task Force, SAINT. The SAINT task force will collect and share stories of the countless immigrants who have saved Americans lives through heroic acts.

I am calling for stories like the story of Maytham Alshadood, a Coloradan who grew up in Baghdad. He aspired to be veterinarian and began his studies, worked with the American Army as a translator, and had to leave because of the increase in violence. He came under a special immigrant visa. He started school in America. He is now a registered nurse, saving and transforming lives in America every day, including those of veterans.

Let us reject attempts to fearmonger and tear apart American families, families that are just like ours, families that are ours.

FIX THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, 53 percent of Americans disapprove of President Trump's service to this Nation in this first 100 days. I didn't say Members of Congress. I didn't say party. I said 53 percent of Americans disagree, and I understand why: a healthcare promise that did not come to fruition; families are now looking, with his potential bill, to higher healthcare costs for our working families; 24 million more Americans are off of insurance.

What about the age tax for hard-working Americans? Americans 50 to 64 years old will be paying upwards of \$12,000 to \$14,000 for their premium.

The last insult is to those hard-working Americans who now receive Medicare by deleting, depleting, taking away, and destroying \$100 million from the Medicare trust fund.

There is no other answer. There is no other answer than disapproval, because why would anyone who leads this Nation destroy the very health care, the very arm of opportunity and rest that Americans have when they become sick?

I think the disapproval is probably too low. Let us fix the healthcare system. Let us not destroy it.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following mes-

sage from the Secretary of the Senate on April 26, 2017, at 9:16 a.m.:

Appointments:
Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff
Commission on Native Children.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1695, REGISTER OF COPY- RIGHTS SELECTION AND AC- COUNTABILITY ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 275 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 275

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1695) to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide additional responsibilities for the Register of Copyrights, 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. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-13. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 254 is laid on the table.

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 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. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Resolution 275, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1695, the Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act of 2017.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. The rule also provides for a motion to recommit and makes in order amendments by Representatives DEUTCH and CHU.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee had the opportunity to hear from Judiciary Committee Chairman BOB GOODLATTE and Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS. Their testimony reflected the strong bipartisan support for this legislation and the work both Members have invested in moving it forward.

I personally thank Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member CONYERS, and the Judiciary Committee staff on both the majority and minority side for their work on this legislation.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I had the opportunity to participate in the committee markup where we debated numerous amendments and enjoyed a thorough discussion of this bill. The Judiciary Committee ultimately adopted an amendment by my colleague from Texas, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, to strengthen the bill. H.R. 1695 passed the Judiciary Committee in a show of overwhelming bipartisan support by a vote of 27-1.

The Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act is supported by numerous outside groups, including the American Conservative Union, SAG-AFTRA, the AFL-CIO, the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, CreativeFuture, the Motion Picture Association of America, the Gospel Music Association, the American Chemical Society, the Church Music Publishers Association, Oracle, and many, many others. These groups represent only a sampling of the broad support behind this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as you can tell, H.R. 1695 has brought together many groups of people who don't traditionally have similar interests. From creators to

labor organizations to conservative groups, the diversity of support behind this legislation speaks to its significance in the copyright industry and to our economy as a whole.

H.R. 1695 also enjoys the public support of our two former Registers of Copyright, individuals who filled the very position this bill seeks to address. Former Registers Marybeth Peters and Ralph Oman have both made clear their belief in the importance of an "independent copyright advice straight and true from the expert agency" to Congress.

These former Registers correctly point out that this bill addresses a "structural, not personal or political" issue between the Library of Congress and the Copyright Office. Despite what some may say, this is what the bill simply does.

H.R. 1695 is a necessary first step toward any larger efforts toward modernizing the Copyright Office. It helps ensure that the Register can implement policy and advise Congress effectively, and this legislation will ultimately help strengthen our copyright system. This is particularly relevant today, as today is World Intellectual Property Day.

As I discussed earlier today in this Chamber, the importance of strong IP protections, including a strong copyright system, is clearer than ever. In fact, the copyright system in our country is so critical that our Nation's Founders sought to recognize it in the Constitution. Article I, section 8, clause 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the power "to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries."

While robust intellectual property protections have always been a foundational principle of our Nation, today such protections are also a major economic driver creating and fueling the American Dream. In fact, core copyright industries in the United States are now responsible for \$1.2 trillion in GDP, representing nearly 7 percent of our economy and employing more than 5.5 million people. In my home State of Georgia alone, more than 19,000 copyrights are registered annually to State residents.

Yet the head of the Copyright Office, which oversees such a massive sector of our economy, is unilaterally selected by the Librarian of Congress. This is the case, despite the fact that the Copyright Office is statutorily designed as Congress' adviser and the massive role that copyright plays in our economy and our society.

I want to be clear. I think the role of the Library is a critical one, and the Librarian performs many important duties. Historically, however, the Librarian has not been an expert in copyright and isn't expected to be, Mr. Speaker.

Does it make sense, then, to make the Librarian—any Librarian—to be

solely responsible for the selection of the person responsible for overseeing the Nation's copyright policy? I don't think it does. In fact, the current selection is more an accident of history than an example of carefully conceived policy.

By way of historical background, in 1870, the Library of Congress believed it would make sense for copyrighted works to be placed in the Library as a means to grow the collection. While this made sense at that point in history and while the collections are still an important function of the Library, this provision neither requires nor justifies the role of the Register of Copyrights to be subordinate to the Librarian.

Today, with the major role that the Copyright Office plays in our culture and our economy, we can no longer justify the head of the Copyright Office—and Congress' designated expert adviser—being hired under the umbrella of the Library of Congress. Currently, the Register is hired according to the same unilateral process as much more junior positions are filled. Under today's system, the Register can serve for an unlimited duration without review or removal, despite the importance of this position.

And finally, the Register is not Presidentially appointed, and there have been questions in the courts regarding the authority of the Copyright Office to conduct rulemaking.

We need a copyright system for the 21st century. We need a system that will take us into the future by protecting and promoting innovation. Copyright is the foundation of innovation, and innovation is the force that drives our economy. A strong copyright system allows the millions of kids and young adults throughout our 50 States to make their dreams a reality, to build a career out of what they produce in their minds and imaginations. Today's rule provides for an underlying bill that will help ensure that our copyright system is equipped to rise to the challenges of the future and to support Americans as they strive to make their hopes, dreams, and ambitions into reality.

The underlying bill promotes American innovation by recognizing the importance of the Register of Copyrights position. This bill would create a selection committee composed by bipartisan, bicameral congressional leadership and the Librarian of Congress to recommend candidates to the President for nomination. The bill would establish a Senate confirmation process for the position and establish a 10-year term for the Register of Copyrights position.

This legislation represents the product of more than 4 years of bipartisan collaboration. It reflects the consensus view that the Copyright Office is better positioned to serve the public if the Register is no longer treated like a subordinate official within the Library, but as the seat of expertise and property protection that it is, regardless of

who the Librarian or who the President may be.

To reiterate, this issue has been under discussion since before anyone knew the former Librarian would be leaving or a new Librarian would be taking over.

□ 1245

When these discussions began, there was a Democrat in the White House, and it was clear that our next President would be, possibly, a Democrat as well. Yet both Republicans and Democrats have supported the reality that undergirds this bill, and we have supported what is good for American innovation and our creators and our dreamers, rather than worry about what specific President may make the next appointment to this Office.

The legislation is the first step in the Judiciary Committee's work to modernize the Copyright Office, which is now needed more than ever. As the vice-chair of the Intellectual Property Subcommittee, I will continue to push that effort forward, to look at ways to promote better infrastructure and technology at the Copyright Office, and to work to update our music licensing laws.

H.R. 1695 is the beginning, rather than the end, and our commitment to copyright modernization and the support of these ideas underpinning it continue to receive broad support.

The rule provides for a bill that is, simply put, good policy. The opportunity before us is not about one individual but establishing the right process for selecting the Copyright Register and future Registers. The bill would increase accountability within the Copyright Office and take the first steps toward making sure our Copyright Office works for this century.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that I thank the chairman of the full Judiciary Committee, BOB GOODLATTE, and the ranking member, JOHN CONYERS, for their hard work on this; and also a special commendation to Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE of Texas, who sponsored an amendment that actually strengthened this bill and provided a process moving forward that will help and, I think, bring all parties some semblance of structure and form as we move forward in this process, a beginning, as I said, the first step in a modernization of our Copyright Office.

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

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

I want to begin by wishing my colleague from Georgia a happy International Copyright Day, right up there with Thanksgiving and Christmas as great American holidays.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. Look, first of all, 60 hours; we have less than 60 hours before the Federal Government of the United States will shut down, and here we are filling time with a bill. Of course, the concept deserves

to be debated and fleshed out, but is it really what we should be talking about when we are 60 hours away from the shutdown of our Federal Government?

Now, it feels like we have been here before. Now, sometimes it is because, unfortunately, we have been brought to the brink of economic disaster, just as Republicans seem to do every time government funding or the debt ceiling is about to expire. We know it has happened before. We know it will happen again.

Maybe it is time for a short-term CR; maybe it is an omnibus, but, look, that is what we should be doing right now. There will be plenty of time, plenty of time to figure out the intricacies of copyright and the oversight of the Office after we make sure that the basic functions of government are able to continue after 60 hours.

And even if we do keep the government open, all we are doing is kicking the can down the road and not allowing American businesses or individuals to plan for the future.

Can you imagine if your family didn't know if you would have a job or what salary it would be at every few months?

Now, look, congressional salaries, they are exempt from government shutdowns, of course. If they weren't, perhaps we would be discussing the government shutdown with 60 hours to go until other Federal workers are prevented from coming to work.

Even at this moment, we don't have a full-year appropriations bill. We have a continuing resolution that expires midnight on Friday. Those are the priority issues that the American people want us to focus on. When we deal with what is urgent, that will allow us the time and the space for thoughtful consideration of Copyright Office oversight.

We need to get past this bitter partisanship and this brinksmanship. Even the rule we are considering today is problematic and partisan, which is why I am in staunch opposition. It doesn't allow all the amendments to come to the floor, including one from my colleague, Ms. LOFGREN, that I tried to amend the rule to allow, and it was turned down in Rules Committee by a partisan vote.

We don't have an open rule, as Speaker RYAN promised to provide as we got back to what was called regular order, allowing our Democratic and Republican colleagues to improve and enhance bills, offer their ideas up for consideration. If a majority adopt them, they can be included in the overall bill.

Instead, we are considering a rule that effectively stops debate on important amendments that were omitted and brings forward a politically motivated bill about the head of the Copyright Office.

Simply put, this bill would take the authority of hiring and firing the Copyright Register, who is the head of the Copyright Office, from the Librarian of Congress, and give it to the President,

with Senate approval. It effectively politicizes the Office of the head of the Copyright Office.

Now, it sounds innocuous, but what it means is that special interests will be involved with picking the person to make decisions over who receives a copyright. Yet, again, through this bill, Congress is choosing the big, powerful interests over the consumers, over innovation, and over the little guy.

As the Electronic Frontier Foundation said: this bill is "designed to . . . allow powerful incumbent interests to use their lobbying power to control this increasingly politicized Office. And while the Librarian of Congress still oversees the Copyright Office, the Librarian of Congress would not be able to remove the Register no matter how poorly they perform their job."

Under this bill, the position of Register of Copyrights will be yet another political position and will, frankly, stall one of the great projects they are embarking on, the modernization effort that is desperately needed at the Copyright Office. The last thing we need is political cronyism in the Copyright Office.

Let's talk a little bit about the history of the position of the head of the Copyright Office. Most of the first century of America, U.S. District Court clerks processed copyright applications themselves. Now, that was obviously inefficient to foist on the judicial branch, and, in 1870, Congress centralized the power of copyrights at the Library of Congress. Seven years later, the Copyright Office was created as a separate department within the Library, and the Register of Copyrights was established as the head of that Office.

Why depart from history so radically now? Why give in to increasing executive authority in a time when many of us are concerned about the growing powers of the Presidency? Frankly, some of this seems to be about the personal dislike of the Librarian, Dr. Carla Hayden, or the general situation with the most recent Register who departed last October, Maria Pallante.

It appears that some believe that Dr. Hayden should not have reassigned Ms. Pallante, so there is a micromanaging of particular personnel issues, but an inspector general's report stated that Ms. Pallante was clearly deficient in her duties, especially around those of modernization of the Office.

As just one example, the inspector general discovered that the Copyright Office wasted 6 years and nearly \$12 million attempting to implement an Electronic Licensing System. Based on the IG report, it would seem that the Librarian had a valid reason to reassign the Copyright Register last October, and she definitely had every right to do so, as the head of the Library. The last thing we want is politically motivated decisionmaking in a personnel process around performance at the Library of Congress.

Since the Librarian of Congress, Dr. Carla Hayden, was appointed in 2015, she has been pulling the Library of Congress and the Copyright Office into the 21st century. And if we move the appointment into the hands of the President, we are taking away the ability for the Librarian to supervise the Office of Copyright and continue to do this work. We are going to stop progress dead in its tracks.

With hundreds of Presidential appointees who haven't even been nominated, no less approved, and the glacial pace of Congress, it could be years before a Librarian is confirmed under this new scheme.

Look, we all understand and agree that there are problems that we need to work on together with regard to the copyright process to bring it into the 21st century. Again, with 60 hours away from a government shutdown, now might be a time to focus on keeping government open and perhaps having a more thoughtful debate, removing the passions around the personnel involved after we continue to keep government open.

This bill, unfortunately, does not solve the problems with copyrights. It makes the situation worse because it slows down a desperately needed modernization indefinitely and would hurt the public and consumers.

The last thing we need is a more autonomous Copyright Office. After the obscene wasting of taxpayer dollars, do we really want to provide for more politically motivated decisionmaking within the Office of the Copyright? I think the answer is no; that is why I oppose the rule. I oppose the bill.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will have more time to discuss especially the IG report and what it may say here in just a moment. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), another strong advocate in our protections of copyright and others in this intellectual property debate.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1695, the Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act.

I am an original cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation. It was introduced by Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS, making this Register of Copyrights a position nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. It was passed out of the House Judiciary Committee by a vote of 27-1. It is completely appropriate that we bring this provision to the floor.

As a co-chair of the Congressional Songwriters Caucus, and a Representative of middle Tennessee, which is the Nashville area, it is home to many content producers and creators, in particular, to songwriters. Creators deserve to know that they will have a Register who will do a couple of things really well: is accountable to the peo-

ple through their elected Representatives, and will provide independent and expert advice to Congress.

According to a report prepared by the International Intellectual Property Alliance: the total copyright industries employed nearly 11.4 million workers in 2015, accounting for 7.95 percent of all U.S. employment, 9.39 percent of all private employment in the U.S. The average annual compensation paid to employees of the total copyright industries in 2015, per employee, \$82,117, exceeds the average annual wage by about 21 percent.

Intellectual property must be protected. Copyrights must be protected. Congress has a role in making certain that these constitutional provisions are held and, also, making certain that the Office is responsible to Congress. I urge the House to move forward on this commonsense measure.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the distinguished ranking member on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that should be opposed, and I agree with Mr. POLIS that it is unfortunate it is being rushed because this may be one of the more significant votes we will take about our economy in this Congress.

I have heard a lot of rhetoric that this isn't about the Librarian. I am sorry, it is about the Librarian. Dr. Carla Hayden is probably the most qualified Librarian of Congress who has ever served. She has done more in the last 6 months to advance modernization in the Library and the Copyright Office than her predecessor did in the prior 2 decades. If we prevent her from appointing a new Register, that effort will be stalled, and I think that would be tragic.

It has been mentioned that somehow, by making this a political position, it would be more accountable. I beg to differ. Mr. POLIS has mentioned the view of the Electronic Frontier Foundation that this would enhance special interests. What they have actually said, and I think it is very pertinent, is that the bill would allow powerful incumbent interests to use their lobbying power to control this increasingly politicized Office.

No President is going to select an appointee who will be shot down by the special interests. That is quite different than the Librarian who removed the prior Register because of, I believe, the inspector general's scathing report about the failure to computerize that office, essentially wasting \$12 million, while misrepresenting that fact to the Librarian and to Congress.

The national library groups, including the national Copyright Alliance, the American Library Association, and the like, say this:

It's difficult to understand how the public or Congress itself would benefit from politicization of the Register of Copyrights'

position by making it subject to Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation as this legislation proposes. Such politicization of the position necessarily would result in a Register more actively engaged in policy development than in competent management and modernization.

That is what we want out of a Register. We don't want a partisan for one side of the issue. We want somebody who can run, in an efficient way, the Copyright Office.

Now, a word about the amendment that has been bandied about as somehow giving Congress a greater say. I value the friendship of my colleague, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who I have served with for so long, but I fear her amendment does not accomplish what she said because the President's power to appoint is limited only by Senate confirmation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LOFGREN. It is limited only by Senate confirmation. It cannot be limited by a list prepared by Congress.

□ 1300

I would just say, finally, that if there is a conflict of interest, as has been suggested, the Librarian cares only about the public interests. It is Donald Trump who has the 30 copyrights, and I don't think we should ask President Trump to take this position with that conflict of interest, something that all of us have been concerned about.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, this is about policy. This is about moving forward in the modernization process. I believe that Ms. Hayden is fully qualified to be Librarian of Congress. I think the issue comes in the Copyright Register's Office, not the Librarian herself.

There are some issues also. It has been interesting because I have been involved in this now my whole time in Congress, and this issue of copyright protection and intellectual property, I have to say Electronic Frontier Foundation are good folks, but we disagree, many of us in the content community and also the intellectual property, with the views of a more open or less inhibited copyright protection, which we believe is the very heartbeat of the innovative system. It is protecting the copyright as we go forward.

So just simply to have somebody saying that they are looking out for the big guy, I am looking out for the single songwriter. I'm looking out for the person right now in their home pecking out their first novel, working on their first articles. These are the kinds of things that need protecting. This is the little guy we are talking about. This is making this modernization happen, and we are going to continue to move forward.

We have differences of opinion. That is fine. But I think in looking at this

big picture, we are talking about a Register's Office that has so much work in our economy as a whole, we are just simply looking toward the first step of modernization.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE.)

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation, and I urge my colleagues to take a step back and consider the unintended consequences of this legislation.

As a former member of the Judiciary Committee, I had the opportunity to hear firsthand from a very diverse range of stakeholders on their experiences in dealing with the Copyright Office, and one of the most common refrains I heard was the dire need for modernizing the Office and updating their IT systems to be more user-friendly. So I was very disturbed to learn recently that 6 years and nearly \$12 million were wasted on yet another failed government IT project, this time at the Copyright Office. This waste of taxpayer dollars is unacceptable, and any legislation to reform the Office ought to have successful modernization as its primary goal. This legislation fails that test.

H.R. 1695 sets back the clock on considerable progress that has been made already under the leadership of the new Librarian of Congress, Dr. Carla Hayden. The bill puts the power to appoint the head of the Copyright Office in the hands of a President who, as of February, still had around 2,000 appointments sitting empty. This kind of delay will set back the Office when it is finally on the right track.

And to what end?

It seems that this bill is just another solution in search of a problem.

A vote for this bill is a vote to stop progress, a vote to continue to waste tax dollars, and a vote to add one more person to the list of positions that President Trump seems to have no interest in filling. I am very concerned that this is a misguided experiment without a clear purpose and that taxpayers will be the ones who foot the bill when it doesn't succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee of Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet on the Judiciary Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the underlying legislation, which I view as a great step forward.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard about the misdeeds alleged of the prior Register of Copyrights, and we have heard

what a wonderful Librarian Carla Hayden is; and I agree, she is a wonderful Librarian. But this bill is not about individuals. It is not about whether the last Register was a good or bad Register. It is not about whether she knew what she was doing on modernization or not. This bill is an institutional bill. This bill is against politicizing. This bill is for strengthening and enhancing the stature of the Office of Register of Copyrights.

The committee held 4 years of hearings on the Copyright Act. There are many contentious issues that we will be bringing to the floor over the next couple of years on that. This was not one of them. This issue had broad support.

Everybody agrees that the Office of Copyright must be modernized. What this bill does is to take it and give it a little more independence from the Library of Congress. The Librarian of Congress is an interested stakeholder. There are many stakeholders in Copyright. Librarians are stakeholders, tech people are stakeholders, content creators, movie studios, authors, and editors—there are lots of different stakeholders. No stakeholder should be in a controlling position.

The Librarian of Congress is in a controlling position, and there is a consensus that that ought to be reduced. I, personally, and a lot of other people think the Register's Office should be taken out of the Library entirely. But this bill is a compromise. It doesn't do that. It simply enhances the stature of the Copyright Office by making this a Presidentially appointed office for a 10-year term.

You talk about politicizing? Right now, President Trump could, if he wished, fire the Librarian tomorrow. The Librarian serves at his pleasure, and the Register of Copyrights serves at her pleasure. So the President totally controls the Librarian of Congress and the Register at any time.

This bill would say that the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, would appoint the Register who would have a 10-year term. That gives her or him more independence, obviously, and it enables them to undertake the proper modernization.

One of the problems we saw was that the modernization requirements of the Library of Congress are very different from the modernization requirements of the Copyright Office, and one seemed to take precedence over the other, which is not surprising when one is subject to the other and part of it.

So this bill would increase the stature of the Copyright Office. It would make it less political by giving the incumbent a 10-year tenure during good behavior. There are powerful interests who have an interest, and they would be one step further removed because of the 10-year tenure.

This is a bill that has broad bipartisan support. Almost every interest group that deals with the Copyright Office is in favor of this, from the authors

to the directors, to the songwriters, to the motion picture people, you name it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, but I am opposed to the rule.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, thank goodness, hopefully, we will get this rule passed and we will get to this bill so the gentleman can be in support of it, that is as we move forward.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today President Trump plans to unveil a tax cut proposal that would vastly reduce the business tax rate for international corporations and even for his own real estate empire. We have no way of knowing how many millions he personally might save through this so-called Trump loophole—no idea—unless he releases his tax returns. Democrats have been calling on the President to release his tax returns for this reason and so many others. We cannot allow the White House to be used as a tool to enrich the President and his family.

Up until now, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed his tax return information. These returns have provided a basic level of transparency to help to ensure the public's interest is placed first. The American people deserve the same level of disclosure from this administration. If they continue to refuse to provide it, then we, as the people's elected Representatives, should hold the executive branch accountable.

If not us, who?

Mr. Speaker, when we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative ESHOO's bill, which would require Presidents and major party nominees for the Presidency to simply release their tax returns.

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, to discuss our excellent proposal, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado for his leadership and for yielding me time.

Here I am again. I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that my bipartisan—this is both Republicans and Democrats—this bipartisan legislation, the Presidential Tax Transparency Act, can be made in order for debate and a vote.

The Presidential Tax Transparency Act is very simple. It would require this President, all future Presidents,

and Presidential nominees from both major parties to publicly disclose their tax returns. Until recently, most Americans thought this disclosure was required by law, but it actually has been a tradition. It has been a voluntary disclosure by every President of both parties since Watergate.

This long disclosure tradition exists because, A, the American people demand a baseline level of transparency from the highest officeholder in the land, and each one of the Presidents wanted the American people to know that their first and top priority was the American people's interest and not their own financial interests. This last Saturday, April 15, thousands of Americans in 125 cities across the country participated in tax marches calling for the President to release his tax returns.

Now, why did they do this on holy Saturday?

Because they care and they are deeply concerned about the President's conflicts of interests and his foreign business entanglements.

The President's refusal to release his tax returns is just one example of his administration's historic lack of transparency as we near the 100-day mark of the administration. As questions about his associates' ties to Russia continue to swirl, yesterday, the White House refused to provide information about General Flynn's Russia contacts to the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. Just before the Easter holiday, the White House also announced that it will break with precedent and will not make its visitor logs public. This is added to the fact that the President's meetings and golf outings at his properties in Florida, New Jersey, and elsewhere—where he has so far spent one-third of his Presidency, according to *The Washington Post*—are also off the books.

Who is the President meeting with? Who does he listen to? Do his personal financial interests come first, or do the interests of the country come first?

The President's business empire makes him more susceptible to conflicts of interest than any President in our history, yet he has done less to address these conflicts than any President in modern history. Since 1978, every President has placed their assets in a real blind trust. Instead of following this tradition, the President has turned his business over to his sons in an arrangement that the nonpartisan Office of Government Ethics called "meaningless from a conflict of interest perspective." It was later revealed that the President can draw profits from this trust at any time, and his son acknowledged that he will provide his father with periodic reports about the state of his family's businesses.

This is not right. This simply does not pass muster for anyone in the country. This is not Republican or Democratic. This is not partisan. The President should release his tax returns.

Now, as the gentleman said previously, this is, again, critically important because it is reported that the President is going to come out with a tax plan today and reportedly cut the tax rate on pass-through entities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. ESHOO. For all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and all of these conflicts of interest, it is why the President needs to reveal his tax returns, it is why we have bipartisan legislation.

We should defeat the previous question and sign on to the discharge petition so that this bipartisan legislation can come before the full House to ensure that the President provides transparency to the American people now and in the future.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

What I really think this bill is about is President Trump wanting to put a Big Business friend in charge of an office that can do personal favors for him and his family. We know that the President and his family have, or are seeking, dozens of copyrights. Here is a great one—here is a copyright on his book, "Trump: The Best Golf Advice I Ever Received." Now, don't get me wrong, he probably deserved a copyright. I am sure a ghostwriter wrote it for him and he had a strong contract with that ghostwriter. Since it seems that all the President spends his weekends and our taxpayer dollars doing is golf, the last thing we want is want him to put one of his golfing buddies in charge of the Copyright Office.

Who is to say the next copyright application from Donald Trump won't be disputed?

Placing his friends, business associates, and, yes, golfing partners in high places could help tip the scales in his favor, providing profits for him and his family at the expense of the American people.

I would like to take a moment to speak to a few of the defenses I have heard about the need for this bill. There is the one stating the President would pick the Register from a list of experts provided by a group, including the Librarian.

But guess what?

That list is nonbinding, so the President can easily ignore the recommendations and do whatever he wants, which is what this President usually does anyway.

□ 1315

I have also heard the argument that the Register will be more accountable and somehow transparent as a Presidential appointee. Hogwash. That is the opposite of the truth. There is as much transparency for a non-Presidential appointee once in their posi-

tion; and it is much less likely that a President is going to demand the resignation of the Register than the Librarian is going to reassign them, as the Librarian did last year when the Register was failing, as confirmed by the inspector general report.

Finally, there seems to be the argument that there were a large number of hearings in the committee on this issue and that somehow this is the work product of those hearings. Well, if you look at the record, there was not one hearing on this bill. There were hearings about general copyright reform. There was no hearing on how this bill might have a devastating impact on the need to modernize the Copyright Office, creating huge delays for important efforts. There was no hearing on whether this bill could profit the President and his family at the expense of the American people.

This is a problematic bill under a problematic rule that doesn't allow good ideas to come forward and be debated. We aren't even able to debate helpful amendments.

I know of at least one important amendment that isn't being allowed to be debated on the floor, which is Representative LOFGREN's amendment that would allow the current Librarian to fill the existing vacancy at the Copyright Office, and when that Register leaves, the new process would then apply. It seems like a commonsense transition process. Why can't we get a simple vote on that amendment?

I say again, this bill is a solution in search of a problem. Frankly, this bill makes the problem worse by giving the President the chance to put his business associate and golf buddies in charge of his own copyrights.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the President's personality is perfectly charming. I certainly wouldn't disparage his personality. What I am talking about is him putting a golf buddy or a business associate in charge of an office that he receives a direct profit from. That is called conflict of interest. That is what we are debating here today. It is not about the President's personality. Obviously, he is perfectly charming in person. I would be happy to have dinner with him. I am still waiting for the invitation.

The Copyright Office has an important function. In order to fulfill that function of registering copyrights, it needs to be a neutral arbiter. By making the head of the Copyright Office a political advocate, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, it will increasingly politicize copyrights, the basic protection Americans

rely on regarding the tradeoff between payoffs for innovation and the right of consumers for dissemination. There is no chance a political appointee will be neutral, by nature of them being a political appointee.

A political appointee will likely be the puppet of big corporations and the administration in their decisions around registration of copyrights. That doesn't help the budding author; it doesn't help the budding musician in a dispute, and it certainly doesn't help anyone trying to navigate an outdated and archaic system that needs to be modernized. This bill will indefinitely delay the modernization process.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and "no" on the bill. The last thing we need is President Trump's golf buddies to be in charge of his own copyrights to further profit the President and the First Family, who have pleasant personalities.

Do we really want to give more power to the administration so they can do favors for themselves and their own business interests? I hope not. Let's vote "no."

We should be considering a funding bill to keep the government open instead of waiting until the absolute last second, hurting businesses and Americans with the huge amount of uncertainty created.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule, "no" on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Again, regardless of the last discussion, there are things about this bill that I have talked about when we first started, and doing this actually brings us into a position of modernizing the Copyright Office, which has been discussed a long time.

I do want to address, just briefly, that there has been some discussion about an IG report. There has been discussion about, especially, the former Register of Copyrights.

As I made clear in the conference, this has nothing to do with that being brought up. Implying things that were out of this IG report was basically attempting a character assassination of the former Register of Copyrights.

I think in doing so, it has to be understood that, even in that IG report that is discussed, one of the Library's own responses back to the concerns of the IG report was that, in 2015, the inspector general found that the Copyright Office was compliant with all library methodology. With respect to its primary software applications, the Electronic Copyright Office and Copyright Imaging System, which support registration and recordation functions and are managed by the CTO, were all in compliance. I think that is really interesting as we look at this.

But also what this IG report actually did say was that there were a lot of other problems. In fact, the GAO report

in 2015 said the Library does not have the leadership to address IT management. That is why the Copyright Office was having to look at this because, also, in August 2015, of the Library's poor response and modernization, which are things that we are looking toward and how much this affects our economy. Because of the Library's problems, the electronic licensing system went down; and for 10 days, no one could register a copyright.

In fairness, you may not like this bill, you may not like the current structure, and that is fine; but when we discuss the Library, there are a lot of issues that I am sure will be addressed in the relevant committees in their oversight on this IG report. That is what they are designed to do.

What we are designed to do here is also not take and pick and choose and cherry-pick what parts of the report we want to talk about because we are trying to justify the current Librarian's decision last fall. When we understand this, we will begin to move forward on the Copyright Modernization Act.

Let's get back to the real functionality of what this is, not who we appoint or how they are appointed, but the fact that this matters to millions of people and also accounts for trillions of dollars in our industries across the world.

The Register of Copyrights Selection and Accountability Act is an important and bipartisan step. I repeat again, it came out with a vote of 27-1 in the Judiciary Committee. Mr. Speaker, I serve on that committee. That is not a usual vote on legislation that is making a positive, large, lasting impact that we are seeing on this. It is the first step rather than the last step in modernization.

As we look forward to this, I will simply say this is a good bill. It has been perfected by both Republicans and Democrats. As I have said before, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, the Congresswoman from Texas, was very helpful putting this package together, along with the chairman and ranking member on both sides of the aisle, as we come forward with this.

It is sort of a shame that, when we come to this bill, we diverge into rabbit trails away from the real issue. The real issue is let's help those folks who depend on the Copyright Office. Let's make modernize it. Let's make it the tool it is supposed to be, and that is the adviser of the expert in these issues for Congress. When we do so, at that point in time our economy continues to flourish, we get aside from the theatrics, and we get back to the real importance of the bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 275 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House

resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 305) to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain candidates for the office of the President, and for other purposes. 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 among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Ways and Means and Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 305.

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. COLLINS of Georgia. 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 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 191, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—234

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

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

NAYS—191

Adams	DelBene	Krishnamoorthi
Aguilar	Demings	Kuster (NH)
Barragán	DeSaulnier	Langevin
Bass	Deutch	Larsen (WA)
Beatty	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Bera	Doggett	Lawrence
Beyer	Doyle, Michael	Lawson (FL)
Bishop (GA)	F.	Lee
Blumenauer	Ellison	Levin
Blunt Rochester	Engel	Lewis (GA)
Bonamici	Eshoo	Lieu, Ted
Boyle, Brendan	Espallat	Lipinski
F.	Esty (CT)	Loeb
Brady (PA)	Evans	Lofgren
Brown (MD)	Foster	Lowenthal
Brownley (CA)	Frankel (FL)	Lowe
Bustos	Fudge	Lujan Grisham,
Butterfield	Gabbard	M.
Capuano	Gallego	Luján, Ben Ray
Cárdenas	Garamendi	Lynch
Carson (IN)	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney,
Cartwright	Gottheimer	Carolyn B.
Green, Al	Green, Al	Maloney, Sean
Green, Gene	Green, Gene	Matsui
Grijalva	Gutiérrez	McCollum
Hanabusa	Hanabusa	McEachin
Hastings	Hastings	McGovern
Heck	Heck	McNerney
Higgins (NY)	Hicks	Meeks
Himes	Higgins (NY)	Meng
Hoyer	Himes	Moore
Huffman	Hoyer	Moulton
Jackson Lee	Huffman	Murphy (FL)
Jayapal	Nadler	Napoli
Jeffries	Napolitano	Neal
Johnson (GA)	Neal	Nolan
Johnson, E. B.	Nolan	Norcross
Jones	Norcross	O'Halleran
Kaptur	O'Halleran	O'Rourke
Keating	Pallone	Panetta
Kelly (IL)	Panetta	Pascarella
Kennedy	Pascarella	Payne
Khanna	Payne	Pelosi
Kihuen	Pelosi	Perlmutter
Kildee	Perlmutter	Peters
Kilmer	Peters	Peterson
Kind	Peterson	

Pingree	Schneider	Titus
Pocan	Schrader	Torres
Polis	Scott (VA)	Tsongas
Price (NC)	Scott, David	Vargas
Quigley	Serrano	Veasey
Raskin	Sewell (AL)	Vela
Rice (NY)	Shea-Porter	Velázquez
Richmond	Sherman	Visclosky
Rosen	Sinema	Walz
Roybal-Allard	Sires	Wasserman
Ruiz	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Ruppersberger	Soto	Waters, Maxine
Rush	Speier	Watson Coleman
Ryan (OH)	Suozy	Welch
Sánchez	Swalwell (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Sarbanes	Takano	Yarmuth
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	
Schiff	Thompson (MS)	

NOT VOTING—5

Cleaver	Newhouse	Tonko
Marino	Slaughter	

□ 1345

Mses. JACKSON LEE, BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Messrs. GOTTHEIMER, and COURTNEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 225.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 186, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

AYES—237

Abraham	Collins (GA)	Gohmert
Aderholt	Collins (NY)	Goodlatte
Allen	Comer	Gosar
Amash	Comstock	Gottlieb
Amodei	Conaway	Gowdy
Arrington	Cook	Granger
Babin	Costello (PA)	Graves (GA)
Bacon	Cramer	Graves (LA)
Banks (IN)	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Barletta	Crist	Griffith
Barr	Culberson	Grothman
Barton	Curbelo (FL)	Guthrie
Bergman	Davidson	Harper
Biggs	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Bilirakis	Denham	Hartzler
Bishop (MI)	Dent	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Herrera Beutler
Black	DesJarlais	Hice, Jody B.
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Higgins (LA)
Blum	Donovan	Hill
Bost	Duffy	Holding
Brady (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Hollingsworth
Brat	Dunn	Hudson
Bridenstine	Emmer	Huizenga
Brooks (AL)	Estes (KS)	Hultgren
Brooks (IN)	Farenthold	Hunter
Buchanan	Faso	Hurd
Buck	Ferguson	Issa
Bucshon	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (KS)
Budd	Fleischmann	Jenkins (WV)
Burgess	Flores	Johnson (LA)
Byrne	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Calvert	Foxx	Johnson, Sam
Carter (GA)	Franks (AZ)	Jones
Carter (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Jordan
Chabot	Gaetz	Joyce (OH)
Chaffetz	Gallagher	Katko
Cheney	Garrett	Kelly (MS)
Coffman	Gibbs	Kelly (PA)

King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzingier
Knight
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Noem
Nunes

NOES—186

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

Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray

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

Smith (WA)
Soto
Speler
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus

Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Cole
Duncan (TN)
Marchant

Marino
Newhouse
Slaughter

Tonko

□ 1353

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

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.

REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS SELECTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 1695.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 275 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1695.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1356

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1695) to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide additional responsibilities for the Register of Copyrights, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Intellectual property is a critical and growing part of our Nation's economy, and the Register of Copyrights has a crucial role in the numerous copyright policy issues that impact it.

Four years ago, the Judiciary Committee began considering how to modernize our Nation's copyright laws, including how the Copyright Office is structured. Making the Register posi-

tion subject to the nomination and consent process with potential candidates identified by a congressional selection panel was among the many issues considered by the House Judiciary Committee.

Because the Director of the Patent and Trademark Office, who has an equally important voice on patent and trademark issues, is already subject to the nomination and consent process, it provided a precedent for this approach.

However, unlike the Patent and Trademark Office, the Copyright Office is part of the legislative branch. Thus, it is appropriate to also follow the precedent set for other legislative branch agencies, which gives Congress a greater say in selecting candidates for the heads of legislative branch entities to ensure those agencies are more accountable to Congress.

Because the Register position is now vacant, filled on an acting capacity by a well-regarded Acting Register, Ranking Member CONYERS and I introduced this bipartisan legislation to update the Register selection process. To mirror a recent change to the Librarian of Congress position that is now subject to a 10-year term limit, the legislation also makes the Register of Copyrights position subject to a 10-year term limit.

The selection panel would be bipartisan and would consist of leaders of the majorities and minorities of the House and Senate, and would also include the Librarian of Congress.

In the past, the authority of the Register of Copyrights to issue rulemakings has not been challenged in the courts because the Register is not subject to the nomination and consent process.

□ 1400

This legislation would remedy that question, once and for all. H.R. 1695 was reported by the House Judiciary Committee by a bipartisan vote of 27–1. In addition to strong support from traditional copyright groups, such as the Copyright Alliance, and the publishing, movie, music, and software industries, the bill has been supported by a wide range of diverse groups, such as the American Conservative Union; the AFL–CIO; Heritage Foundation scholars; the Directors Guild of America; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; MANA, A National Latina Organization; Americans for Tax Reform; and the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste.

With such strong support from a wide range of over 70 groups and a vacancy at the Register of Copyrights that needs to be quickly filled under the new process created by this legislation, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1695.

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