

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, it is clear after The Indianapolis Star uncovered the widespread abuse scandal that Congress must act to implement consistent, stricter laws governing the reporting of abuses to our Nation's athletes and to all our children. Once again, The Indianapolis Star has shown us the importance of investigative journalism and a free press.

Many of these athletes are too young and are not empowered to speak out against authority figures when they are hurt or abused by them. But each of us as Members of Congress is in a position to do something about it, and we must.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to listen to the voices of the American people before hurling our Nation further toward disaster with this dangerous healthcare bill.

The majority hasn't held any hearings or gotten input from experts, advocates, or patients. They are ignoring the opposition from groups like AARP, American Medical Association, March of Dimes, and American Hospital Association.

The score later today from the Congressional Budget Office won't change the underlying facts of this bill. It will gut protections for people with pre-existing conditions. It will gut essential health benefits, kick millions of people off of health insurance, and place a crushing age tax on those aged 50 to 64 whose premiums will go up. It will also cut billions from Medicaid to pay for a major tax cut for the wealthy. That is \$880 billion that they want to take away from Medicaid to give to the rich and corporations. This is so unAmerican, I stumbled over saying it.

Mr. Speaker, a bad process has led to a bad bill. We should be doing what the American people want and improving the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today for the children.

In voting for the bill and the underlying bills, we are sending a message to the abuser of children: If you harm one of these little ones, you will be met with the full fury of the American justice system. You will be discovered and reported by your peers. You will face the threat of appropriately harsh demands. You will face the full force of the law if you visually depict child exploitation.

We are sending a message to the bystanders: You have a solemn duty to protect these children. You have a duty to be their hope and happiness and their future when you step in and stop abuse. You have a duty to report the heinous acts committed by monsters.

Lately, we don't have many moments in Washington where both political parties can come together and reach a consensus, but the legislation we are

considering today provides the perfect opportunity.

These bills should not be controversial. They should draw the support of both sides, because protecting our children is a moral necessity for every American. That is, after all, the message these bills send.

I thank Representative BROOKS and Representative JOHNSON for the hard work they have done on these bills, and I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for shepherding these bills through the Judiciary Committee and spending so much time in committee working on legislation to protect our children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members to vote "yes" on the resolution, vote "yes" on the underlying bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 352 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

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

SEC. 5. 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. 1516) to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families. 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 Education and the Workforce. 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. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1516.

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 de-

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer a resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately release his tax return information to Congress and the American people.

Whereas, in the United States' system of checks and balances, Congress has a responsibility to hold the Executive Branch of government to a fair and equal standard of transparency ensuring the public interest is placed first;

Whereas, according to the Tax History Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed their tax return information to the public;

Whereas, tax returns provide an important baseline of reasonable information including whether the President paid taxes, ownership interests, charitable donations made, and whether tax deductions have been exploited;

Whereas, disclosure of the President's tax returns could help those investigating Russian influence in the 2016 election understand the President's financial ties to the Russian Federation and Russian citizens, including debts owed and whether he shares any partnership interests, equity interests, joint ventures or licensing agreements with Russia or Russians;

Whereas, the President recently fired Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, under whose leadership the FBI was investigating whether the Trump campaign colluded with Russia to influence the 2016 election;

Whereas, President Trump reportedly stated to Russian officials during a White House meeting that he fired Director Comey to ease pressure on the ongoing investigation of Russia's influence in the 2016 election;

Whereas, Senate Russia investigators have requested information from the Treasury Department's criminal investigation division, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, or FinCEN, which handles cases of money laundering, for information related to President Trump, his top officials and campaign aides. FinCEN has been investigating allegations of foreign money-laundering through purchases of U.S. real estate;

Whereas, the President's tax returns would show us whether he has foreign bank accounts and how much profit he receives from his ownership in myriad partnerships;

Whereas, Donald Trump Jr. said the Trump Organization saw money "pouring in from Russia" and that "Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets."

Whereas, the White House will not confirm whether the President has filed a 2016 tax return;

Whereas, Congress gave itself the authority to review an individual's tax returns to investigate and reveal possible conflicts of interest of executive branch officials involved dating back to the Teapot Dome scandal.

Whereas, it has been reported that federal prosecutors have issued grand jury subpoenas to associates of former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn seeking business records as part of the ongoing probe into Russian involvement in the 2016 election;

Whereas, according to his 2016 candidate filing with the Federal Election Commission, the President has 564 financial positions in companies located in the United States and around the world;

Whereas, against the advice of ethics attorneys and the Office of Government Ethics, the President has refused to divest his ownership stake in his businesses; and can still withdraw funds at any time from the trust of which he is the sole beneficiary;

Whereas, the Emoluments Clause was included in the U.S. Constitution for the express purpose of preventing federal officials from accepting any "present, Emolument, Office, or Title . . . from any King, Prince, or foreign state";

Whereas, the Chairmen of the Ways and Means Committee, Joint Committee on Taxation, and Senate Finance Committee have the authority to request the President's tax returns under Section 6103 of the tax code;

Whereas, the Joint Committee on Taxation reviewed the tax returns of President Richard Nixon in 1974 and made the information public;

Whereas, the Ways and Means Committee used IRC 6103 authority in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas Director Comey has testified that tax returns are a common tool in investigations because they can show income and motives;

Whereas, the American people have the right to know whether or not their President is operating under conflicts of interest related to international affairs, tax reform, government contracts, or otherwise: Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives shall—

1. Immediately request the tax return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2006 through 2015 for review in closed executive session by the Committee on Ways and Means, as provided under Section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code, and vote to report the information therein to the full House of Representatives.

2. Support transparency in government and the longstanding tradition of Presidents and Presidential candidates disclosing their tax returns.

□ 1300

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from California wish to present argument on the parliamentary question of whether the resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House?

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized.

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, under clause 1 of rule IX, questions of the privileges of the House are those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings. I believe that the dignity of this institution is at risk each day that passes without this body exercising its statutory authority and constitutional duty to operate as a coequal branch of government.

The legislative branch of government has the responsibility and authority to keep a proper check on the executive branch under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code. Specifically, three committees have jurisdiction to request tax returns: the Committee on Ways and Means, the Senate Finance Committee, and the Joint Committee on Taxation. This provision has been part of our Federal Tax Code since 1924 to facilitate full and complete investigations into scandals that rise to the level of national importance.

Nothing could rise to the level of national importance like the possible fi-

nancial entanglements our President may have with Russian entities and individuals. This situation is truly unprecedented. It is our sworn duty to uphold the integrity of this institution and examine all the relevant details related to this issue.

Each week we see yet another fact in the growing case of entanglements between our President, his campaign and closest advisers, and Russian officials. The most recent troubling report occurred just last week when we learned that the President himself reportedly made statements directly to Russian officials during an Oval Office meeting regarding the FBI investigation into his campaign ties with Russia. This is the same meeting where the President took it upon himself to reveal highly classified information to Russian officials.

How long can this body allow these types of actions to go unchecked?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is reminded the remarks must be confined to the question of order.

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. I understand, Mr. Speaker. I promise that they relate to the question at issue.

Mr. Speaker, further, the American people deserve to know if President Trump has exploited the Federal Tax Code for improper personal gain.

The personal business endeavors of the leader of the free world should be exercised to the highest possible standard. Specifically, the President's business dealings around the world make him more prone to potential conflicts of interest than any President in history. However, the President did not take adequate steps to mitigate any potential issues. He was advised by the Office of Government Ethics to divest himself of his business entanglements. The President chose to ignore this sound advice.

It is now the duty of this body to restore integrity to the oversight process. Our democracy should be an example to the world. Today we have the opportunity to ensure that it is achieved through taking up this overdue investigation. It is only then we can restore the dignity and integrity of the House through exercise of our constitutional duty.

For these reasons, this resolution raises a question of the privileges of the House and should be allowed a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California seeks to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

As the Chair most recently ruled on May 17, 2017, the resolution directs the Committee on Ways and Means to meet and consider an item of business under the procedures set forth in 26 U.S.C. 6103 and, therefore, does not qualify as a question of the privileges of the House.

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Buck moves that the appeal be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. 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, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 352;

Adopting House Resolution 352, if ordered;

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2052; and

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 467.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 187, answered “present” 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

YEAS—225

Abraham	Davis, Rodney	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiberi	NOT VOTING—17
Aderholt	Denham	Hunter	Noem	Roskam	Tipton	Graves (LA)
Allen	Dent	Hurd	Nunes	Ross	Trott	Black
Amash	DeSantis	Issa	Olson	Rothfus	Turner	Johnson (OH)
Amodei	DesJarlais	Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo	Rouzer	Upton	Brooks (IN)
Arrington	Diaz-Balart	Jenkins (WV)	Palmer	Royce (CA)	Valadao	Burgess
Babin	Donovan	Johnson (LA)	Paulsen	Russell	Wagner	Cummings
Bacon	Duffy	Jordan	Pearce	Rutherford	Walberg	Ellison
Banks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Joyce (OH)	Pittenger	Scalise	Walden	□ 1331
Barletta	Duncan (TN)	Katko	Poe (TX)	Schweikert	Walker	Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of
Barr	Dunn	Kelly (MS)	Poliquin	Scott, Austin	Walorski	New York changed his vote from “yea”
Barton	Emmer	Kelly (PA)	Posey	Sensenbrenner	Walters, Mimi	to “nay.”
Bergman	Estes (KS)	King (IA)	Ratcliffe	Sessions	Weber (TX)	Mr. SHUSTER changed his vote from
Biggs	Farenthold	King (NY)	Reichert	Shimkus	Webster (FL)	“nay” to “yea.”
Bilirakis	Faso	Kinzinger	Renacci	Shuster	Wenstrup	So the motion to table was agreed to.
Bishop (MI)	Ferguson	Knight	Rice (SC)	Simpson	Westerman	The result of the vote was announced
Bishop (UT)	Fitzpatrick	Kustoff (TN)	Roby	Smith (MO)	Williams	as above recorded.
Blackburn	Fleischmann	Labrador	Roe (TN)	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)	A motion to reconsider was laid on
Blum	Flores	LaHood	Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Wittman	the table.
Bost	Fortenberry	LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)	Womack	Stated for:
Brady (TX)	Foxx	Lamborn	Rohrabacher	Smucker	Woodall	Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I
Brat	Franks (AZ)	Lance	Rokita	Stefanik	Yoder	was unavoidably detained. Had I been
Bridenstine	Frelinghuysen	Latta	Rooney, Francis	Stewart	Yoho	present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall
Brooks (AL)	Gaetz	Lewis (MN)	Rooney, Thomas	Stivers	Young (AK)	No. 274.
Buchanan	Gallagher	LoBiondo	J.	Taylor	Young (IA)	Stated against:
Buck	Garrett	Long	Adams	Tenney	Zeldin	Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 274.
Bucshon	Gibbs	Love	Aguilar	Thornberry		—
Budd	Gohmert	Lucas	Barragán			PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
Byrne	Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer	Bass			OF H.R. 1973, PROTECTING YOUNG
Calvert	Gosar	MacArthur	Beatty			VICTIMS FROM SEXUAL ABUSE
Carter (GA)	Gowdy	Marchant	Bera			ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR
Carter (TX)	Granger	Marino	Beyer			CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1761,
Chabot	Graves (GA)	Marshall	Blumenauer			PROTECTING AGAINST CHILD EX-
Chaffetz	Graves (MO)	Massie	Blunt Rochester			PLOITATION ACT OF 2017; AND
Cheney	Griffith	Mast	Bonamici			PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS
Coffman	Grothman	McCarthy	Boyle, Brendan			DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY
Cole	Guthrie	McCaull	F.			26, 2017, THROUGH JUNE 5, 2017
Collins (GA)	Harper	McClintock	Brady (PA)			The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr.
Collins (NY)	Harris	McHenry	Brown (MD)			HULTGREN). The unfinished business is
Comer	Hartzler	McKinley	Brownley (CA)			the vote on ordering the previous ques-
Comstock	Hensarling	McMorris	Bustos			tion on the resolution (H. Res. 352) pro-
Conaway	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers	Butterfield			viding for consideration of the bill
Cook	Hice, Jody B.	Meadows	Capuano			(H.R. 1973) to prevent the sexual abuse
Costello (PA)	Higgins (LA)	Meehan	Carbajal			of minors and amateur athletes by re-
Cramer	Hill	Messer	Cárdenas			quiring the prompt reporting of sexual
Crawford	Holding	Mitchell	Castro (TX)			abuse to law enforcement authorities,
Culberson	Hollingsworth	Moolenaar	Castor (FL)			and for other purposes; providing for
Curbelo (FL)	Hudson	Mooney (WV)	Chu, Judy			consideration of the bill (H.R. 1761) to
Davidson	Huizenga	Mullin	Cicilline			amend title 18, United States Code, to

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Sanford

Bishop (GA)	Bishop (GA)	Graves (LA)	McSally
Black	Black	Johnson (OH)	Newhouse
Brooks (IN)	Brooks (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Sinema
Burgess	Burgess	Loudermilk	Swalwell (CA)
Cummings	Cummings	Maloney,	Thompson (PA)
Ellison	Ellison	Carolyn B.	Velazquez

□ 1331

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SHUSTER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 274.

Stated against:

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 274.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1973, PROTECTING YOUNG VICTIMS FROM SEXUAL ABUSE ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1761, PROTECTING AGAINST CHILD EXPLOITATION ACT OF 2017; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY 26, 2017, THROUGH JUNE 5, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 352) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1973) to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1761) to amend title 18, United States Code, to criminalize the knowing consent of the visual depiction, or live transmission, of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from May 26, 2017, through June 5, 2017, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 188, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

YEAS—231

Abraham	Barletta	Blum
Aderholt	Barr	Bost
Allen	Barton	Brady (TX)
Amash	Bergman	Brat
Amodei	Biggs	Bridenstine
Arrington	Bilirakis	Brooks (AL)
Babin	Bishop (MI)	Brooks (IN)
Bacon	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan
Budd	Blackburn	Buck