

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution that was previously noticed, asking that it be read in full concerning President Trump's tax returns.

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 disclose his tax return information to the House of Representatives and the American people.

Whereas, President Nixon explained that "People have got to know whether or not their President is a crook" when he invited the Joint Committee on Taxation to audit his returns after the Internal Revenue Service gave him an unwarranted tax discount;

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

Whereas, the Chairmen of the Committee on Ways and Means, Joint Committee on Taxation, and the Committee on Finance have the authority to request the President's tax returns under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

Whereas, pursuant to Article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, often referred to as the Origination Clause, the House of Representatives has the sole authority to initiate legislation that raises revenue for the national government, and the Committee on Ways and Means is considering a comprehensive reform of the Tax Code;

Whereas, according to media reports analyzing President Trump's leaked 2005 tax return, we know that had his own tax plan been in place, he would have paid an estimated mere 3.48 percent rate instead of a 24 percent rate, saving him \$31.3 million;

Whereas, according to The New York Times, the President used a legally dubious tax maneuver in 1995 that could have allowed him to avoid paying any Federal taxes for 18 years;

Whereas, President Trump holds "interests as the sole or principal owner in approximately 500 separate entities," according to his attorneys, and the President's tax plan proposes to cut the tax rate on such "pass-through" entities from 39.6 percent to 15 percent;

Whereas, one analysis estimated that President Trump would personally save \$6.7 million from two tax breaks included in the Republicans' first tax cut, which they misleadingly call the American Health Care Act;

Whereas, without the President's tax returns, the American people cannot determine how much he will personally benefit from proposed changes to the Tax Code;

Whereas, an ABCNews/Washington Post poll found that 74 percent of Americans would like President Trump to disclose his tax returns and the most-signed petition on the White House website calls for the release of the President's tax return information to verify compliance with the Emoluments Clause, with more than 1,097,000 signatures as of date of this resolution;

Whereas, disclosure of the President's tax returns could help those investigating Rus-

sian influence in the 2016 election better understand the President's financial ties to the Russian Federation, Russian businesses, and Russian individuals;

Whereas, after breaking his pledge to make his tax returns available, President Trump instead presented a one-page letter from a law firm giving him a clean bill of health on any business dealings with Russians, but failed to note that the very same law firm boasted of the "prestigious honor" of being named "Russia Law Firm of the Year" for 2016;

Whereas, former Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, before he was fired by President Trump, publicly confirmed that the Bureau has been investigating potential ties between President Trump's campaign and Russia since July and that the Russian President Vladimir Putin favored a Trump electoral victory;

Whereas, President Trump's son-in-law and senior advisor, Jared Kushner, met during the Presidential transition at the behest of the Russian Ambassador with Sergey N. Gorkov, a graduate of a school run by the successor to the KGB and who was appointed by Vladimir Putin to head a Russian state-owned bank that is on the U.S. sanctions list;

Whereas, Mr. Kushner proposed establishing a secret back channel of communications directly to Vladimir Putin, even considering the use of Russian embassy facilities to do so;

Whereas, Attorney General Jeff Sessions falsely stated during his Senate confirmation hearing that he "did not have communications with the Russians," when in fact he met at least twice during the campaign with Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak;

Whereas, former Director Comey testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee that President Trump had asked him in the Oval Office about "letting Flynn go," referring to the investigation into former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn's business ties to Russia;

Whereas, President Trump stated on May 11, 2017, that he had decided that he was going to fire Comey because of "this Russia thing";

Whereas, former Director Comey, on June 8, 2017, testified that Special Counsel Robert Mueller could investigate whether President Trump's actions with regard to Director Comey and the Flynn investigation constituted obstruction of justice;

Whereas, in 2013, President Trump said, "Well, I've done a lot of business with the Russians. They're smart and they're tough," and President Trump's son, Donald Trump, Jr., told a news outlet in 2008 that "Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets";

Whereas, against the advice of ethics attorneys and the nonpartisan Office of Government Ethics, the President has refused to divest his ownership stake in his businesses;

Whereas, the Director of the nonpartisan Office of Government Ethics said that the President's plan to transfer his business holdings to a trust managed by family members is "meaningless" and "does not meet the standards that . . . every President in the past four decades has met";

Whereas, the Emoluments Clause was included in the 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 Trump International Hotel in Washington, D.C., has hired a "director of diplomatic sales" to generate high-priced business among foreign leaders and diplomatic delegations;

Whereas, the Joint Committee on Taxation reviewed the tax returns of President Rich-

ard Nixon in 1974 and made the information public;

Whereas, the Committee on Ways and Means used the authority under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas, the Committee on Ways and Means has now voted three times along party lines to continue to cover-up President Trump's tax returns;

Whereas, the House of Representatives has now refused nine times to act on President Trump's tax returns;

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;

Whereas, the House of Representatives undermines its dignity and the integrity of its proceedings by continuing the cover-up of President Trump's tax returns: Now, therefore, be it;

Resolved, That the House of Representatives shall—

1. Immediately request the tax return and return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2006 through 2015, as provided under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as well as the tax return and return information with respect to the President's businesses of each business entity disclosed by Donald J. Trump on his Office of Government Ethics Form 278e, specifically each corporation and each partnership within the meaning of subchapter K of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 where he is listed as an officer, director, or equivalent, or exercises working control; and

2. Postpone consideration of tax reform legislation until the elected Representatives of the American people in this House have obtained President Trump's tax returns and return information to ascertain how any changes to the Tax Code might financially benefit the President.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I do wish to address the parliamentary question and would appreciate the opportunity to speak at this time about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized on the question of order.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, you can certainly observe, as all the Members can, the many troubling events that are reflected in the resolution we just had read and why they do arise to the privileges of the House.

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."

This resolution seeks to protect the integrity of the proceedings of the House, and I believe that it is therefore privileged. There is just not an issue that is more fundamental to the integrity of this House, the people's House, than the faith the American people have in our democracy.

That sacred faith is being undermined. It is under assault right now by President Trump. This House must act to protect the integrity of its proceedings.

Now, I know that there are many Members here who are eager to avoid a direct up-and-down vote on the specific question of covering up the Trump tax returns, and that there have been nine previous times when Members have come to the floor and presented resolutions that were focused on trying to get those returns and to end the cover-up.

Recognizing the Speaker's prior rulings nine times against considering this measure, I have, today, offered a different resolution, taking a new approach that I bring to the Speaker's attention. Unlike the last nine resolutions, my resolution does not direct the Committee on Ways and Means to meet and consider action on these secreted tax returns.

I believe it should not be ruled out of order on the grounds that were used the previous nine times that this type of resolution was blocked. This coverup of the Trump returns must end, and that is why I have taken a different approach.

Pursuant to Article I, section 7, clause 1 of the United States Constitution, what we know as the Origination Clause, the House of Representatives has the sole authority to initiate legislation that raises revenue for the national government.

As the Speaker knows, that means the House Ways and Means Committee, on which I serve, on which Mr. PASCRELL, who I know wants to comment on this point of order, is concerned, for this House to exercise with integrity its authority to originate tax legislation. This is authority that it solely possesses. The American people should know how the President and his family might personally benefit from the tax legislation, either in their direct personal income or through the many business intermediaries with which they work. I believe some 500-plus entities reported on their financial disclosure statement.

President Trump, we know, has bragged publicly about his ability to bend the Tax Code to his whim in the past. He has said only he can "fix it."

And the question is: Will he fix it for himself, or fix it for working families? Will he enrich the middle class with jobs, or simply enrich himself and other billionaires like him?

While recently Mr. Trump has provided us a single page of clues concerning the contents of his tax plan that they now say will be provided fully in September, he has not given us much detail. But he does give us a few clues off that one page. One is his proposal to repeal the alternative minimum tax. We know if that had been the law, if that Trump proposal had been in effect for the one year, 2005, that we have his return, he would have paid about the amount that an employee does on their Social Security. It would have saved him \$30 million.

I understand that there are many here that simply don't want to look under the rock to see what is contained

in those returns. And there are many who believe that Mr. Trump is the golden ticket to more prized tax breaks, to more ending of consumer protection, and they have been rather quiet about the tax return issue, about the conflicts of interest, and about the potential foreign collusion.

But after all the resolutions presented here on the floor, nine, plus the amendments that I have offered in the Ways and Means Committee that have been rejected, I can say that, while there has not been progress yet on the House floor, there has been progress.

Mr. Trump has responded. He provided a one-page letter from a lawyer that reviewed his tax returns, and that lawyer gave a Good Housekeeping "seal of approval" to assure us—"to assure America he had no business dealings with the Russians as a result of reviewing the returns."

What he did not say was that the same law firm had boasted of what they call the prestigious honor of being named the "Russia Law Firm of the Year." I would just say today, in response specifically to the point of order, that it is not sufficient to preserve the integrity of this House to rely on the "Russia Law Firm of the Year" to be the only entity that reviews these returns.

□ 1345

I believe that we can do better; that we must protect the dignity of the House.

According to Mr. Trump himself, he is already being investigated for obstruction of justice. It is important for us to have the tax returns on tax reform. It is important to have it on the Russia investigation.

And, you know, there is hardly an hour that goes by, certainly a day that goes by, that there is not some additional information. When I opened The Washington Post this morning, right there on the front page—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the question of privilege.

Mr. DOGGETT. Certainly.

And one of those aspects of the question of privilege is how conflicts of interest interface with what we are doing here in the House. I mentioned the tax returns and the Russia investigation, but there is a new one out today, and that is in the budget. I assume eventually we are going to have a budget resolution presented here, though it is very late this year. But when we take up that budget resolution and we take up the appropriation bills, The Washington Post reports that, while there have been significant cuts in the Housing and Urban Development budget, as many people cannot afford housing—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman must confine his remarks to the question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. DOGGETT. I would do nothing else, Mr. Speaker.

And this particular example shows how the proceedings of the House

would be impaired if the only aspect of the budget that increases HUD is one from which Mr. Trump personally benefits, which is what the Post is reporting, and so we need the returns in order to see that.

Like so many other broken promises, we will not get these returns voluntarily. I believe that the House needs to act. Unlike Sally Yates, unlike the U.S. attorney in New York, and unlike James Comey, he can't fire us, and we don't have to be accessories to a cover-up.

I call on this House to protect the integrity of its proceedings, including the integrity of our unique constitutional authority over tax legislation, by declaring that this resolution is in order. This resolution simply calls on the House to secure the tax return and return information on Mr. Trump and his businesses. It further declares that, in order to preserve the integrity of the House, we will not be taking up tax reform legislation, which we certainly need to take up, and we have ideas to offer and to cooperate in trying to see reform of our taxes, but not do it until we have had an opportunity to review thoroughly Mr. Trump's tax returns and return information to ascertain how he may personally benefit.

I would hope that the Speaker, considering my comments, as well as those that I know Mr. PASCRELL wants to offer, would be ruling that we can have that straight up-and-down vote, no hiding behind a rock, let us look under the rock.

I appreciate the Speaker giving me this opportunity to emphasize the very significant importance of this question to the integrity of the House and to the future of the American people and our democracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the question of order?

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, how are you today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New Jersey wish to be heard on the question of order?

Mr. PASCRELL. Yes, I do, thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I think we need to define a few terms here what we are talking about. We are talking about tax returns. What does that mean? It doesn't mean the 1040. It doesn't mean the 278.

In this particular case, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about close to 12,000 pages of tax returns; that is what we are talking about, the integrity of the House, the integrity of myself and you. I know you are a person of integrity. And I say it like it is, so I am not blowing smoke. That is why this is important.

So a 2-page, 3-page 1040 doesn't mean anything to what we are doing; 12,000 pages, just on this President's tax returns.

The stunning potential conflicts of interest are piling up. Every day, we

all read about it. The President was told by the Ethics Commission, divest yourself of your holdings. That doesn't mean you give your money away, your assets away. It means what it says, you divest.

But I think that there is nothing more of a threat to the integrity of our House than ignoring our duties, to provide a check and a balance to the executive branch. To restore the dignity of the House, we must use our authority to request the President's tax returns. Give the American people the transparency that they deserve.

In addition, it is reported that the President's hotel in Washington received \$270,000 from Saudi Arabia when they were here to lobby against the bill allowing families of 9/11 victims to sue the Saudi Government.

Now, last week, the District of Columbia and Maryland filed a lawsuit against the President, arguing that he is violating the anticorruption clauses in the Constitution by allowing his businesses to accept payments from foreign governments and other government entities. We have no way of knowing whether the President or his firms have received Russian income or loans or entered into Russian-linked partnerships. In fact, you are going to read a lot about that this week. There are hearings going on as we speak. A certified letter from paid attorneys does nothing to assuage these concerns.

Two weeks ago, we heard from the former Director of the FBI, James Comey, who confirmed that the President tried to influence him to stop the Russian investigation.

Isn't it great that we live in a body where they can't stop us? The President can't stop us. We can only stop ourselves.

The legislative branch has the responsibility and authority to check the executive branch, and section 6103, you have heard me say that number many times, section 6103 of the Tax Code, which allows for the examination of tax returns—that authority, put in place specifically so Congress could examine conflicts of interest following that scandal which we all know about in 1923.

Nothing could be more of a threat, to me, to the integrity of the House and our Members, than ignoring our duty to fully examine the personal financial entanglements of this President or any President, and particularly those, at this time, which we are reading about, that he may have with the Russian entities and individuals or whether he abused the tax laws of this country.

We have a right to know who our public officials are and what investments they have made, and every member of the executive branch of government—and this was made clear in the decision in 1924, particularly Interior Secretary Fall at that time, to examine his tax records, and that is how people were brought to justice in 1924.

It also protects the privacy of the very taxpayer. And we are having ex-

ceptions. We have exceptions to that. Three years ago, we had an exception in the Ways and Means Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman have any further argument on whether this resolution constitutes a question of the privileges of the House?

Mr. PASCRELL. Yes, it does constitute a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Then the gentleman will confine his remarks to the question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. PASCRELL. Yes, I can, Mr. Speaker. May I continue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As long as the gentleman confines his remarks to the question of privilege.

Mr. PASCRELL. Very good. Thank you.

Just let me say this in conclusion: if and when, if and when such conflicts are revealed, I don't want to say to you, my constituents, that we had the power to review the conflicts, but we chose not to. I, for one, do not want my integrity or the integrity of my brothers and sisters on this floor to be demeaned by a shameful failure. To restore the dignity of the House is what this privilege is all about.

I have a question of the Speaker at this particular time, if I may.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may inquire.

Mr. PASCRELL. I think that I would like to present today what Congress should do immediately about the question of privilege before us. May I proceed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As long as it pertains to the question of privilege.

Mr. PASCRELL. The Chair is good on that answer, Mr. Speaker.

I think that we should do this. I think we should require the President and the Vice President, whomever that will be in the future, for now, and their families, to resolve their conflicts of interest by selling their assets, using a truly independent asset manager.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's remarks are wandering from the question of privilege.

Mr. PASCRELL. I don't believe so, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. You might not believe so, but the Chair does.

Mr. PASCRELL. But I am compelled to follow your direction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman has no further argument on the question of privilege, the Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. PASCRELL. Well, my final comment is this: I know you don't take the question of integrity lightly. That is not a joking matter at all. Nor do I take the integrity of the President of the United States lightly. I have an obligation and a responsibility.

As I said on February 1, I will not yield. This is important to all of us, and it is not partisan. Read my letter of February 1.

I thank the Chair for his indulgence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Texas seeks to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

In evaluating the resolution under rule IX, the Chair must determine whether the resolution affects "the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings."

The first resolving clause of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas seeks tax returns and tax return information of the President and certain of his business entities.

Section 702 of the House Rules and Manual states that "rule IX is concerned not with the privileges of the Congress, as a legislative branch, but only with the privileges of the House, as a House."

As the Chair ruled on March 28, 2017, a resolution offered under rule IX seeking information from actors entirely extramural to the House, such as the President and certain business entities in which the President may be involved, is not uniquely concerned with the privileges of the House, as a House. Accordingly, the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas does not constitute a question of privilege under rule IX.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I most reluctantly, after the Speaker's careful consideration of this, must 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. NEWHOUSE. 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. Newhouse 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.

Mr. DOGGETT. 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 392; and on adoption of House Resolution 392, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 188, answered "present" 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

YEAS—227

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington

Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr

Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)

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

Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce

Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stivers
Taylor
Tennet
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowe
Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin

McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky

Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

ATTEST:

STEVE BULLOCK, *Governor*.

COREY STAPLETON,
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE GREG GIANFORTE, OF MONTANA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect GIANFORTE present himself in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. GIANFORTE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 115th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE GREG GIANFORTE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, GREG GIANFORTE is a family man and a businessman. He has been a husband for 29 years, and he is a father of four. He is a founder with his wife, Susan, of RightNow Technologies, which employs over 500 fellow Montanans.

It is good to have another businessowner in this House, somebody who knows the way the economy works, who has created jobs, and who cares about his local community.

Now, Montana may only send one Member to this body, but out West, it is not about how many of you there are, it is about how much you do.

GREG is a doer, and we are happy to have him here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE), who is the dean of Montana.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and Majority Leader MCCARTHY.

I am humbled and honored to have been elected by the people of Montana to represent them here in this House.

I am joined today by my wife, Susan, who is in the gallery. We have been married 29 years. We have four grown children. Two of them are with us today, along with our daughter-in-law. We raised them hunting, fishing, and hiking on the great public lands in Montana.

I am a business guy and an electrical engineer. I am trained to solve hard problems, not to argue about them, just to get things done.

Susan and I did start a computer software company in our home over 20 years ago in Bozeman, Montana, and it grew to over 500 employees there and became one of the State's largest employers.

I am Montana's lone voice here in this House, sent by the people to do the work of the people. The MT comes before the R or the D after my name. I promised the people of Montana that I

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Sanford
NOT VOTING—14

Aderholt
Chaffetz
Comstock
Cummings
Gabbard

□ 1419

Mr. ESPAILLAT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2017.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the Certificate of Election received from the Honorable Corey Stapleton, Secretary of State of Montana, indicating that, at the Special Election held on May 25, 2017, the Honorable Greg Gianforte was duly elected Representative in Congress for the At-Large Congressional District, State of Montana.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,
KAREN L. HAAS, *Clerk*.

Enclosure.

THE STATE OF MONTANA CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

I, Steve Bullock, Governor of the State of Montana, hereby certify that at the Special Election held on the 25th day of May 2017, Greg Gianforte was elected to the office of United States Representative, to serve for the balance of an unexpired term that commenced on January 3, 2017. Said candidate received the highest number of votes cast, as appears from the official canvass of returns of the Special Election.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the Great Seal of the State of Montana this 15th day of June 2017.

Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Español
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal

NAYS—188

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
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett