

TAX PLAN WILL RAISE TAXES

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, let me see if I can inject some truth into this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the deficit-exploding Republican tax plan that rewards billionaires first, and then asks hardworking Americans to pay for it.

The Trump Republican tax scam will raise taxes for millions of working families. It will kill jobs in the home construction industry. It will punish student loan borrowers. This reckless plan will repeal the deduction for State and local income and sales tax. I would remind my colleagues in the majority: If you vote "yes," you are voting for a \$900 billion tax increase on American families.

This bill is not conservative. It is not pro-family. It is not pro-worker. It will kill jobs and reward the wealthy and corporations at the expense of everyone else.

Vote "no" on the GOP tax scam, and let's pass a real tax reform bill that puts middle class families first.

□ 1230

DEMOCRATS WILL DELIVER A BETTER DEAL

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, last night all throughout our great country, hatred lost in America; fear-mongering lost in America, race-baiting lost in America, xenophobia lost in America, homophobia lost in America, Confederate monuments lost in America, the war on Medicaid lost in America, voter suppression lost in America, the Trump playbook lost in America, and the make America hate again agenda lost in America.

Democrats will continue to focus on the economic well-being of the American people, will continue to fight for better jobs, better wages, and a better future for the American people.

Democrats will continue to fight to deliver a better deal.

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, November 8, 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 message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 8, 2017, at 9:37 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1088.
That the Senate passed S. 1015.
With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2201, MICRO OFFERING SAFE HARBOR ACT

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 609 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 609

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2201) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to exempt certain micro-offerings from the registration requirements of such Act, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, 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. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. The rule provides 1 hour of debate and makes in order all amendments offered at the Rules Committee.

I want to note that not one amendment to this rule or to this bill was offered by the Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act is an important step toward helping small businesses grow across our country. Small businesses aren't just about selling a product or providing a service. Entrepreneurs take

the risk for a chance to improve their community and their family's livelihood. These individuals employ our friends and families and improve our quality of life. Congress needs to do what we can to help entrepreneurs succeed.

Young businesses need to use their limited capital, time, and resources to grow their business, not fill out bureaucratic paperwork. This problem has only grown worse since Congress passed the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act in 2010.

When Dodd-Frank passed, Congress promised it would protect consumers. But it has only hurt community banks, small businesses, and the middle class. Dodd-Frank's burdensome regulatory regime has caused community banks to disappear across America, making access to capital more difficult for many small businesses.

The House passed the Financial CHOICE Act to repeal and replace Dodd-Frank, but it currently sits untouched in the United States Senate. I hope they will quickly vote to repeal Dodd-Frank and make credit easier to access for Main Street.

But there is more we can do in the people's House to help create new jobs and opportunities. All too often the Federal Government creates regulations that disproportionately hurt small businesses. While a large corporation may have a team of lawyers to comply with these rules, this is rarely the case for a young business. That is why I support this bill.

This bill ends ambiguity in the law by clearly defining a nonpublic offering exemption under the Securities Act. Currently, companies just starting out risk unintentionally violating these laws, which might discourage them from seeking the capital they need to grow. It is common sense to ensure our country's laws are clear and to allow small businesses to operate without fear of accidentally violating the law.

Our economy depends on small businesses and those who put everything on the line to pursue the American Dream. This bill will benefit all of us by helping those individuals grow their businesses and create jobs in their communities. In order to help our small businesses grow and create jobs, we need to pass this rule and pass the underlying bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Securities Act of 1933, which, obviously, was put into effect after the Depression or while it was going on, governs current law regarding the sale and purchase of securities like stocks, bonds, or options. The intent behind this law is to require that investors receive necessary information about the securities and to prevent fraud when they are sold.

To achieve this, the Securities and Exchange Commission currently prohibits the sale or delivery of securities that have not been registered with the agency, with some limited exemptions. Today, these exceptions are usually limited to those transactions made with sophisticated investors who understand the associated risks.

H.R. 2201 would weaken the Securities Act unnecessarily by adding an entirely new exemption for certain issuers while removing important disclosure requirements.

Let me say that again: while removing important disclosure requirements, in other words, to know what you are buying.

It would leave investors vulnerable to fraud by allowing companies to sell unregistered securities without the important guardrails that apply to these transactions today. It is part of the majority's agenda that prioritizes deregulation above all else.

Through the Congressional Review Act and many other bills, the majority has been relentlessly attacking safeguards that protect consumers—risking our health, our safety, and our finances. This is all in order to make it easier for corporations to engage in questionable business practices.

Who loses in the giveaway to big corporations and bad actors? The American people do.

Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that a bad process leads to a bad product. This week has put the majority in the history books for all the wrong reasons.

Closed rules completely block Members from offering amendments on the House floor, and just yesterday, with the 49th closed rule of the year, this majority broke the record for becoming the most closed session of Congress in history. That is a long time.

Let me repeat that. This session of the 115th Congress is the most closed session ever. In fact, our present Speaker has not had an open rule.

This is not some arcane matter. More than 1,300 amendments have been blocked this year through the restrictive rules. It has prevented action on matters that touch nearly every sector of society.

This week we saw another mass shooting in a church. Families gathered together in a small Texas town, and a man with a gun came in and killed 26 of them and wounded 20 more. One family lost eight of its cherished members. Those killed in that attack equal 7 percent of the small town's entire population.

Now, this Congress could work together and actually stop these tragic murders because this is the place where we can do that, but under the majority, we can't even get a vote on any measure that would do anything about it.

If you care about whether we send troops to war in Afghanistan and Syria—if you care—then closed rules matter.

If you care about protecting whistleblowers or reducing government spending, then closed rules matter.

If you care about whether we build the President's offensive border wall with Mexico or strengthen ethics in the executive branch, then closed rules matter.

If you care about protecting the nearly 800,000 young DREAMers nationwide, then closed rules definitely matter.

The majority has used restrictive closed and structured rules to prevent debate and votes on these and many, many other important matters from ever happening here on the House floor.

Each of us has been elected to do our job representing our constituents by amending legislation on this floor, but because of the closed process, we are being prevented from doing our jobs.

Bills routinely come before the Rules Committee that haven't even been fully considered by the relevant committees. Such a bill is before us today.

When Speaker RYAN took the gavel 2 years ago, he said: "Only a fully functioning House can really, truly do the people's business." Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not doing the people's business. We are unable to do the job we were sent here to do. We are unable to take action on the things our constituents care about most.

It is no wonder that this Congress is the most unpopular Congress in recent memory. It is past time that we return to regular order and start tackling the major issues that we face.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, obtaining accessible and reliable forms of capital is one of the biggest challenges that small businesses and entrepreneurs face today. I will say that again. We are not talking about large corporations. We are talking about small businesses and entrepreneurs.

According to the 2016 Year-End Economic Report from the National Small Business Association, 41 percent of all small businesses surveyed said that "lack of capital is hindering their ability to grow their business or expand their operations, and 20 percent said they had to reduce the number of employees as a result of tight credit."

That is why I introduced the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act. This bill does not create a new securities registration exemption under the Securities Act; rather, it defines what constitutes a permissible nonpublic offering, and it provides small businesses with the clarity and confidence to know that their offering is not a violation of the Securities Act.

If enacted, this will make it easier for entrepreneurs and small businesses—again, not large corporations—to raise money from family, friends, and their personal network without running afoul of the vague and undefined private offering safe harbor provisions in the Securities Act of 1933.

More specifically, this legislation requires the following three criteria be

met simultaneously in order to trigger a safe harbor exemption for a security offering: each purchaser must have a substantive preexisting relationship with an owner; there can be no more than 35 purchasers of securities from the issuer that are sold in reliance on the exemption during the 12-month period preceding; and, lastly, the aggregate amount of all securities sold by the issuer cannot exceed \$500,000 during the 12 months preceding the offering.

The Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act helps bring clarity to existing law so that our current and future job creators can easily raise capital within the confines of an easy-to-understand provision without the help of an ever increasingly expensive expert.

□ 1245

Furthermore, the legislation preserves all Federal and State antifraud protections. Ultimately, this bill will scale existing Federal rules and regulatory compliance for small businesses, thus providing another practical option for entrepreneurs to raise the capital they need to start and grow their business.

The timing for this legislation could not be better, as the House continues to promote job creation and economic growth through this once-in-a-generation effort to reform our Tax Code.

As our small businesses and startups continue to provide for over half of all net new jobs since the 1970s, we must provide the tools they need to succeed, and this legislation does just that.

I thank Chairman HENSARLING, Chairman SESSIONS, and Chairman HUIZENGA for working to bring this important bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the previous question, adopt the rule for H.R. 2201, and vote in favor of the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act when it comes to the floor for consideration.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation would help thousands of young people who are Americans in every way, except on paper.

Democrats have tried numerous times to protect DREAMers. We voted over and over to try and bring the Dream Act, and we have offered amendments, only to be blocked by this record-breaking closed Congress. There is bipartisan agreement that something must be done to help these young people. Let's do it today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I must ask a question of this Chamber: What makes America great?

Do we measure greatness by the strength of our economy or by the size of our military?

Is greatness defined by export prices and profits of corporations?

You see, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is the case. I believe that we are a nation built upon a set of unshakable values. It is our ability to uphold these values, not the rise and fall of the stock market, that will ultimately define our greatness.

One of our values is this: if you work hard, set goals, and refuse to give up, you can fulfill your dreams. As Americans, this value is engrained into all of us. We repeat it each and every day, and we tell our kids to follow their dreams, or tell them that they can be anything that they want when they grow up.

We say these things, Mr. Speaker, because we believe them. We believe that hard work pays off. We believe that dreams can come true.

Yet, on September 5 of this year, President Trump ignored these American beliefs when he ended the DACA program. That decision told nearly 800,000 young people in this country that their hard work didn't matter and that their dreams of pursuing success might not pay off in the end.

These young DREAMers, who are as American as any of us, go to school here, they have jobs here, they raise families in our communities, and they serve in our military.

This is why each and every day we fail to pass the Dream Act, we call the values that make our country great into question. If we fail to pass this bipartisan legislation, then we are no longer a nation where hard work pays off.

I will be forced to explain that to DREAMers in my district. I will have to tell Minerva, who paid her way through college, that she will have to give up her dream of medical school. I will have to explain to Leticia that, despite becoming the first in her family to attend college, she will not be able to fulfill her dream of serving others as a social worker.

You see, Mr. Speaker, these are real young people with real dreams. They deserve a real answer. They put in the work, they have done everything they can to build lives in this country, and we need to come together to make sure that we uphold our values and allow them to continue those lives here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can bring the Dream Act to the floor for a vote immediately. This country is great because we uphold our

values. Mr. Speaker, it is time that we prove that.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), chairman of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Colorado allowing me an opportunity to speak on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, currently, the Securities and Exchange Commission prohibits the sale or delivery of securities that have not been registered with the agency.

A large portion of startups—and, really, these are ideas—rely on small, nonprofit offerings also known as private placements, such as with friends and family. They do a round of offerings in order to raise initial, early-stage seed capital; however, the Securities Act of 1933 does not define what constitutes a public offering or, conversely, a nonpublic offering. As a result, startups may unintentionally violate the act when it seeks to offer securities to potential investors in a private placement.

Let's put that in real English. Let's make this actually approachable in a way that I think true American entrepreneurs can understand.

The reality is, these are people with an idea, a drive to move forward and to improve something. They go and offer to their family, or maybe ask of their family, to be a part of that dream, to help with some seed capital, to give them a little bit of their hard-earned money to help them achieve their dream.

And, guess what?

They get to take part in the success of that. There is some risk, but there is also reward.

How this really translates is that there might be the doctor who has got a great idea for a new health drink or a new implement to use while he is in surgery. This might be a mom who left the workforce and was taking care of her kids and said: There has got to be a better way of making sure my kids are getting a healthy meal transported to school; or something like that.

These are people who are looking around and saying: I can go make life better not for me, not just for my family, but for others. They are then trying to pursue that.

To address this uncertainty that we have, H.R. 2201, the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act, would implement a simple amendment to the Securities Act of 1933, by making clear what constitutes a nonpublic offering.

It is going to provide small businesses with needed clarity and confidence to know that their offering is not a Securities Act violation. Think of that. Again, it might be that doctor or that stay-at-home mom who is out there just trying to fund an idea, unintentionally and with no malice or no understanding that they are violating Federal law.

A micro-offering authorized under this bill would allow small businesses or small entrepreneurs to operate with confidence, and the commonsense requirements to be a part of this are such:

Each investor has a substantive pre-existing relationship with an owner. This is no fly-by friendship. This is somebody who you actually know;

There are fewer than 35 purchasers or investors; and

Also, the amount cannot exceed \$500,000.

If you just divide out \$500,000, which is a lot of money, by 35 people, that is less than \$15,000 a person. That is \$14,285, to be exact. This is not about helping Wall Street somehow, for crying out loud. This is about Main Street.

I believe it is important to note, as the sponsor, Mr. EMMER, had noted earlier, that nothing in this bill would remove or inhibit the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Department of Justice from prosecuting securities fraud.

With antifraud protections still in place, the legislation appropriately scales Federal rules and regulatory compliance costs for these small businesses and entrepreneurs.

H.R. 2201 is a commonsense bill designed to help Main Street and not Wall Street. Simply put, it will allow these small businesses and entrepreneurs, these DREAMers, to access capital necessary for their growth.

As I said, Representative EMMER has done a phenomenal job in shepherding this through. In a 2016 Capital Markets, Securities, and Investments Subcommittee hearing where we dealt with the bill, he had a great quote that said:

"The problem with the ability of small businesses to effectively use this exemption is—the term 'private offering' is not defined in law. Not only does this prevent small business from using the exemption, it leaves businesses who try to use the exemption and can't afford a team of expensive lawyers—which, again, most small businesses cannot—exposed to potential lawsuits and future liability. . . . This legislation will create a bright line safe harbor for small private offerings. It will help entrepreneurs open new businesses and expand existing ones."

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the hard work of my colleague, Mr. EMMER, on this bill, and I encourage all my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2201.

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

Mr. Speaker, unnecessary, partisan bills like this one take up valuable floor time when we could be considering important legislation to extend expired programs like Perkins loans, which help low-income students finance their education, or to address gun violence. The American people are frightened of an agenda that prioritizes deregulation and corporations above all else.

Democrats have been pushing for votes on the House floor on amendments that would actually address the

major problems we are facing today. That includes everything from climate change and our military's role abroad to protecting the DACA recipients and addressing the gun violence epidemic that is tearing communities apart. But we have been blocked at every turn.

The majority has gone to unprecedented lengths to prevent any kind of real debate from happening. We have proof of that because they have used closed and structured rules to block more than 1,300 amendments so far this year. So far, this session is the most closed session of Congress since Congress began.

It is no wonder that just 13 percent of the public approves of Congress under this leadership. That is according to the latest figures from Gallup. The bill before us just continues that dangerous and unpopular agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, the rule, and the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an important step to improve the American economy. We need to support small businesses and their ability to grow. This will happen if we give the free market the opportunity to work.

We should get bureaucrats out of the way of small-business owners who only want to serve their families and communities. This bill moves us in that direction.

I thank Congressman TOM EMMER for introducing this important bill and for taking the time to come to the floor today. I also thank Chairman HENSARLING for his work on these bills as well as the House Financial Services Committee.

Chairman HENSARLING recently announced that he will not be seeking reelection to Congress, but we will all remember the great work he has done during his time in D.C. and the important contribution he made to the legislation we are looking at today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, and I ask them to vote "yes" on the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 609 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

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

SEC. 2 Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on

the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule

[a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

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

Mr. 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 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adopting the resolution, if ordered; and

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 4173.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 190, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 616]

YEAS—224

Abraham	Curbelo (FL)	Herrera Beutler
Allen	Davidson	Hice, Jody B.
Amash	Davis, Rodney	Higgins (LA)
Amodei	Denham	Hill
Arrington	Dent	Holding
Bacon	DeSantis	Hollingsworth
Banks (IN)	DesJarlais	Hudson
Barletta	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga
Barr	Donovan	Hultgren
Barton	Duffy	Hunter
Bergman	Duncan (SC)	Issa
Biggs	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins (KS)
Bilirakis	Dunn	Jenkins (WV)
Bishop (MI)	Emmer	Johnson (LA)
Bishop (UT)	Estes (KS)	Johnson (OH)
Black	Farenthold	Johnson, Sam
Blackburn	Faso	Jones
Blum	Ferguson	Jordan
Bost	Fitzpatrick	Joyce (OH)
Brady (TX)	Fleischmann	Katko
Brat	Flores	Kelly (MS)
Brooks (AL)	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (IN)	Fox	King (IA)
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Buck	Frelinghuysen	Kinzing
Bucshon	Gaetz	Knight
Budd	Gallagher	Kustoff (TN)
Burgess	Garrett	Labrador
Byrne	Gianforte	LaHood
Calvert	Gibbs	Lamborn
Carter (GA)	Gohmert	Lance
Carter (TX)	Goodlatte	Latta
Chabot	Gowdy	Lewis (MN)
Cole	Granger	LoBiondo
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	Long
Collins (NY)	Graves (LA)	Loudermilk
Comer	Graves (MO)	Love
Comstock	Griffith	Lucas
Conaway	Guthrie	Luetkemeyer
Cook	Handel	MacArthur
Costello (PA)	Harper	Marchant
Cramer	Harris	Marino
Crawford	Hartzler	Marshall
Culberson	Hensarling	Massie

Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
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
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik

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

NAYS—190

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
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halloran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
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
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Aderholt
Babin
Bridenstine
Cheney
Coffman
Cuellar
Gosar

Grothman
Hurd
Johnson, E. B.
LaMalfa
Mitchell
Norman
Pocan

Rooney, Thomas
J.
Roybal-Allard
Sanford
Walker

□ 1326

Messrs. KHANNA, RYAN of Ohio, and HOYER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. CALVERT, KATKO, SMITH of New Jersey, and GOODLATTE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 616.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in a meeting with the Secretary of the Navy. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 616.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 616.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 190, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 617]

YEAS—233

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Baretta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer

Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
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
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar

Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
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
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
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
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)

NAYS—190

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
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel

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

Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halloran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier

Suoizzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres

Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

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

NOT VOTING—9

Aderholt
Bridenstine
Cuellar

Hurd
Johnson, E. B.
Mitchell

Pocan
Roybal-Allard
Sanford

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1334

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.

VETERANS CRISIS LINE STUDY ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4173) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on the Veterans Crisis Line, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 618]

YEAS—420

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguiar
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)

Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa

Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo

Españolat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farethold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (CA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa

Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebssack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeke
Meng
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascarell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Kuster (NH)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)

Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suoizzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Allen
Bridenstine
Cuellar
Franks (AZ)

Hurd
Johnson, E. B.
Messer
Mitchell

Pocan
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Sanford

□ 1340

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 618.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I was detained this afternoon at Georgetown University Hospital as my youngest son Blake broke his nose last evening and I was attending to him. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 616, "yea" on rollcall No. 617, and "yea" on rollcall No. 618.

HYDROPOWER POLICY MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include in the RECORD extraneous material on H.R. 3043.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 607 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. 3043.

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

□ 1343

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. 3043) to modernize hydropower policy, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

□ 1345

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3043, the Hydropower