Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
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
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
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
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—189

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—26

Bass
Black
Bridenstine
Cárdenas
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cummings
DeLauro
Gabbard
Gaetz
Garamendi
Hudson
Lieu, Ted
Lucas
Messer
Nolan
Pearce
Poe (TX)
Polis
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Shea-Porter
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Walz

□ 1044

Mr. LOEBSACK changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to establish the bases by which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall issue, implement, and enforce certain emission limitations for existing electric utility steam generating units that convert coal refuse into energy.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 101 on H.R. 1119, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "yea" when I should have voted "nay."

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 101 regarding the "Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment Act" (H.R. 1119). Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was at a medical appointment with my son and was unable to vote, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 100 and "yea" on rollcall No. 101.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), my friend, for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

One worth highlighting is H.R. 4909, the Student, Teachers, and Officers Preventing School Violence Act, sponsored by former sheriff, Representative JOHN RUTHERFORD.

Mr. Speaker, all Members of this House were saddened and horrified by the tragic events in Parkland, Florida. Sheriff Rutherford's bill will provide local communities with critical resources to upgrade our schools and keep our children safe. I look forward to the House speaking with one bipartisan voice next week and passing this important bill without delay.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider several bills from the Financial Services Committee. This includes two bills sponsored by Representative SCOTT TIPTON: H.R. 1116, the TAILOR Act; and H.R. 4545, the Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act; as well as H.R. 4263, the Regulation A+ Improvement Act, sponsored by Representative TOM MACARTHUR.

Taken together, these bills will consider House Republican's work to create an economic environment that is both pro-competition and smart and balanced in its regulatory approach.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, additional legislative items are possible, including potential legislation making further appropriations for FY 2018. I will be sure to inform all Members as soon as any additional items are added to our schedule.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for that information.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the last year, we have continually run up against deadlines on how we were going to keep the government of the United States operating properly.

The omnibus is currently being discussed. The negotiations for the omnibus were made possible by the fact that a significant number of Democrats voted for it, while a significant number of Republicans voted against it. It was a bipartisan statement proceeding.

That omnibus needs to be passed by March 23. We are not scheduled to be here, Mr. Speaker, on March 23. That does not mean that we might not go over, but it means that it needs to pass the House and the Senate and be sent to the President prior to or on March 22.

Negotiations are, unfortunately, not proceeding as effectively as I would hope they would. I am hopeful that there will be a clean bill from either

side without any riders that would lead either side to oppose that bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk about an issue. First of all, let me say that the leader has announced a number of bills for consideration next week. I venture to say that an extraordinarily infinitesimal amount of the American people have any ideas what those bills do or are urging those bills to be passed. I do not mean that they are without substance. I mean that they are not the issues on the mind of the American people. This is the people's House.

Mr. Speaker, the Speaker appeared on television at a townhall on CNN some 14 months ago. He made a promise at a CNN townhall to a Dreamer that asked him a question.

House Speaker PAUL RYAN strongly suggested to that young woman that ''revocation on protection for the Dreamers brought here as children will not be carried out.''

Notwithstanding that, the President of the United States put that Dreamer and hundreds of thousands of other Dreamers—indeed, close to 2 million Dreamers—at risk by withdrawing their protections, which Speaker RYAN indicated would not happen: ''Will not be carried out.''

That was some 6 months ago, Mr. Speaker. Not the CNN; that was 14 months ago.

I have talked to the Speaker, I have brought it up continuously on this floor, and I have been told by the Republican leadership: Don't worry, we have got until March 5 to do something.

I was told that in October, I was told that in November, I was told that in December, I was told that in January, and I was told that in February: Don't worry, we have got until March 5.

March 5 came and went. No action. None.

That Dreamer to whom the Speaker spoke is still at risk, still worried, and still twisting in the wind. Eighty-six percent of the American public, Mr. Speaker, say that that young woman should not be kicked out of the country that she knows: brought here as a child, went to elementary school, middle school, high school; some to college, some practicing medicine, some practicing law, some being social workers, many being teachers.

I was told: Don't worry. They were told: Don't worry, March 5 is a long way away.

It has come and gone.

And we are told this week that we will consider H.R. 1116, the TAILOR Act. I am not sure that any of my constituents have talked to me about the TAILOR Act.

H.R. 4263, the Regulation A+ Improvement Act, I doubt that a single one of my constituents has talked to me about that act.

They are fillers, Mr. Speaker. They are fillers while we fiddle, while Rome burns.

I have asked, Leader PELOSI has asked, frankly, and leaders of the Catholic Church and other denominations have asked to put the Dreamer bill on the floor in the people's House.

The Speaker of this House, when he became the Speaker, said: We will not duck the tough issues. We will take them head-on. Don't worry, we have got until March 5.

March 5 is behind us, and we consider these bills, which I think are filler bills, and controversial bills at that.

We have asked, Mr. Speaker, that the majority party put on the floor three bills on an issue of vital importance to the American people, that every American knows about, that the people's House ought to have the right to speak on, and express the views of the American people and establish policy they support—86 percent of them.

So I will, again, ask the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, to put the Dream Act on the floor; to put Mr. GOODLATTE's bill on the floor; to put the bipartisan bill, sponsored by Mr. HURD from Texas and Mr. AGUILAR from California; put them on the floor.

□ 1100

Take the issues. I know they are tough. The Speaker said he wants to take the issues head-on, Mr. Speaker, not duck. Show some political courage. And not only that, respect this institution and every Member in it who wants to express their opinion on this legislation of critical importance to at least 1.8 million Americans, vital to their future, to their life.

And 86 percent of Americans believe they ought to be protected, just as Speaker RYAN pledged they would be 14 months ago when he said revocation of protection for the Dreamers brought here as children will not be carried out. Mr. Speaker, that bill ought to be brought to the floor to carry out that representation and that assurance.

I have been patient. I have talked. I have worked. I have come to meetings. I met with the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, with my colleague and friend, the majority leader, and Mr. DURBIN and others, 25 of us sitting around the Cabinet table, Mr. Speaker, when the President said we will take care of DACA, and he said: You send me a bill; I will sign it, and I will take the heat.

He was not telling the truth, Mr. Speaker, because we had a bill, called the commonsense crowd, about 25 United States Senators brought a bill to the floor. It took care of a couple of the things the President wanted to take care of, but it wasn't good enough for him, notwithstanding the fact he said: You send me a bill. You decide, i.e., the Congress, the coequal branch of government that now stands suppliant in the face of saying we will pass something only if the President will sign it.

That is not what the framers meant, Mr. Speaker. We are a coequal branch, not a subservient branch of the government of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if we brought those three bills to the floor that I just referred to—the Dream Act, cosponsored by ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, a Republican, and LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, a Democrat; and the Goodlatte bill, sponsored by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee; and a bipartisan bill sponsored by many Republicans and many Democrats, Mr. HURD, a Republican from Texas, and Mr. AGUILAR, a Democrat from California—if we brought those bills to the floor, the problem is they know the Hurd-Aguilar bill would pass, which would reflect the views of 86 percent of the American people.

No, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that the American people are overwhelmingly for that, we are going to be considering H.R. 1116, H.R. 4545, H.R. 4263, ignoring that 1.8 million people, ignoring that promise that the Speaker made to that young woman that she would be protected.

The Speaker has told me over and over again: Oh, I want to do this. I want to do that. I am going to have some task force. I am going to do this, that, and the other.

March 5 has come and gone. Nothing has happened.

I used to be the majority leader. I could bring a bill to the floor. If I said something was going to happen, I tried to make sure it happened.

If I sound angry, it is because I am angry. If I sound frustrated, it is because I am frustrated. The people's House ought to be given the opportunity to express the will of the American people on this issue.

There is another issue, and we do have a bill, the so-called Rutherford bill that we are bringing to the floor on suspension. We are probably all going to vote for the Rutherford bill.

But we are going to ignore a bill, as we have been ignoring for years under Republican leadership, a bill that is supported even more than the DACA, Dreamer bills, and that is comprehensive background checks, which clearly will save lives, which will close the loopholes, which will make sure that those with criminal records don't get guns, will make sure that those with mental health issues don't get guns, will make sure that terrorists who can't fly on airplanes can't get guns.

Mr. Speaker, we have been urging and pleading for that bill to be brought to the floor over and over again. The National Rifle Association is not for that bill. I can't understand why. Rather, we bring a bill to the floor that will help schools—I think that is positive—do what they can do right now.

Should we help them? Of course. But we ought not to pretend that we are doing something to make our children safer in their schools, to make concertgoers safer at their concerts, to make churchgoers safer in their church, to make people who go to a nightclub safer in that nightclub, to make people who go to shopping centers safer in those shopping centers. We ought not to pretend the Rutherford bill is going to do that.

Will comprehensive background checks do it all? It will not. There are other things I think ought to be done. But at a minimum, the American people think that we ought to make sure that everybody who purchases a weapon has a background check to make sure that they are not a criminal, somebody with a substantial mental health problem that makes them unsafe to own a gun, spousal abusers.

Mr. Speaker, the bills we are going to consider next week I am sure have some merit from some perception, from somebody's perception, but the two bills that I have just discussed are on the minds of the American people, and millions are at risk if we do not pass legislation dealing with that issue.

I do not criticize the Rutherford bill, but it will not solve the problem, and everybody knows it will not solve the problem; nor, frankly, will universal background checks in and of itself solve the problem, but experts say it will save thousands of lives over time. It would have saved lives in Charleston, South Carolina, the nine people killed in Mother Emanuel Church in Charleston, South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I like to work in a bipartisan way, but that requires respecting one another. My Republican friends wrote a book in which they were very critical of the way we ran the House because it wasn't open and transparent. I would ask them to reread that book. I have read it.

My friend is smiling.

In that book, they really wanted to change the way this House runs, make it open and transparent, take the tough issues head-on. That is what the Speaker said.

Mr. Speaker, they are not taking the tough issues head-on. They are hiding from the NRA. They are hiding from some of their hardline people who want to kick people out of America, who want to take that lamp that the Statue of Liberty holds high and bring it down.

Yes, I am disappointed. Yes, I am angry. Yes, I am frustrated. I came to this body to express my opinion on the important issues confronting my country and to try to make it better.

Mr. Speaker, I would plead with the majority leader to perhaps delay those four bills. Rutherford's could be on suspension. It won't take much time. Delay those three bills that a miniscule amount of Americans, there may be 100, there may be 200 Americans who would be concerned those bills aren't brought forward, and put on the floor the three bills I referred to—the Dream Act, the Goodlatte bill, and the Hurd-Aguilar bill—and let the people's House express its opinion. That is not an unfair request.

And let the background check, universal background check bill come to the floor, and let the House vote. I know that there are some Republicans who don't want to vote on that bill because the public is so overwhelmingly for it and they may upset the NRA. That is what this business is about, Mr. Speaker, expressing openly and clearly what we think the policies of our country ought to be to make our public better, to make our country safer.

Mr. Speaker, I would end on those two issues, and I yield to my friend, the majority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BIGGS). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

I have great respect for the gentleman, and there were a lot of questions inside there, I believe.

Out of my respect for the gentleman, I am quite concerned that if he is fact-checked, he is going to get quite a few Pinocchios, so let me walk through, first, how he started the debate.

The gentleman started and the first question was concerning government funding to March 23. He then felt that work was not being done, and he used the phrase—and I may get it a little incorrect, but he said we only were able to pass a budget agreement because of the majority of the Democrats, and not the majority on the Republican side, passing it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time to just make a correction.

I said a significant number of Democrats voted for it and a significant number of Republicans voted against it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

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

So I think it would just be helpful on the record to actually state what the vote was.

There were 167 Republicans who voted for that budget agreement, 67 who did not. There were 73 Democrats who voted for it, but the majority of Democrats, 119, voted against it, which Mr. HOYER was in that group, as well, voting against it. So I would make one point, and that is 71 percent of Republicans voted for this budget agreement.

And just to make the facts correct, Mr. HOYER's concern about the appropriations process, this House passed all 12 appropriations bills, and we did it on time and we sent it over to the Senate. In the meantime, the Democrats shut the government down before we could ever get there. So I think history should actually play to facts.

Yes, I am concerned about the March 23 deadline, but I am pushing hard. I would actually like to take those bills up next week. And as Mr. HOYER knows, being a member of the Appropriations Committee as he was in the past, when you get to this point where we already have the numbers set, it is really what is called a four corners, the four leaders.

Now, the committees are all working through it. They are actually making great progress. There are a few things left to actually close out. I would like to get it done a week ahead of time, and I hope Mr. HOYER's side would as well.

So let's walk through some others.

First of all, I was a small-business owner. The idea is having a bill on this floor that creates more jobs, that brings more access to capital. Mr. Speaker, I heard from the other side, the leader, she thought crumbs was the idea of Americans getting $1,000 in a bonus. That is about equal to what I am hearing, and I am offended by it. It is not insignificant that someone wants to create a job and have access to capital. The gentleman is wrong about that.

Then the gentleman talks about our Speaker. Our Speaker has worked a great deal, and, yes, he has kept his word.

Mr. HOYER was in that meeting with me when we were in the White House. Before we left that bipartisan, bicameral meeting with the administration, we agreed to work on this issue in four areas, and we have had numerous meetings in my office about that as well.

□ 1115

I don't know, maybe you forget to state that we are a rule of law Nation. In doing so, that is why we are in this position we are today, because there was a past executive branch that thought they were a legislative branch and they did something that everyone would agree they do not have the power to do. So the current President said to move it to the legislative branch like it should be because there are court cases coming. In doing so, that is what we are working on.

The courts have now come back, giving further time. The Supreme Court has now given a timeline that wants to make sure the Ninth Circuit before there—so this gives us time to solve the problem.

I am more concerned about solving a problem than just passing a bill for some political favor. I do not want to be back at this place in another 2 years and having kids sitting here who are questioning where they are going to go.

I know you raised some issue about individuals. Not one person is in jeopardy that is registered within DACA. You have been in meetings where you heard that from the Secretary of Homeland Security, where you heard that from the Chief of Staff to the President as well.

The President even went further than talking about DACA to even making the point solving, but he also had three other pillars. As you know, we need a secure border. You also know the current law does not treat everybody equally who comes here illegally, so you are going to perpetuate the problem if you maintain the current law.

Thirdly, the idea that we want to make sure the nuclear family is closer together sooner—you have got a 30-year wait when someone wants to come in and petition a brother and sister.

Why don't we help them be able to bring their children and their spouses in together?

That is one of the proposals as well.

Then the whole concept of merit. Those are all common sense. I think they could be bipartisan. And the sooner we solve that problem, we will solve it for a long term.

So on this side of the aisle we want to get this job done long before the courts even have to act. I think that would be the proper thing to do. So, yes, that is what we have been working upon.

Now, another issue you brought up was about guns, and you talked about this Congress. I first want to give you a few little facts. I appreciate that you always mention my book. That is why I smile. We don't get any royalties from it, but the veterans do, so please mention it as much as you like.

If I take—and let me just give you the numbers. Quorum does this. Some bright kids out of Harvard created a company and it is all about data.

There are more bills out of committee, 643 in this Congress; and there are more bills out of this House, 558, than any Congress in the last 25 years. And in that meantime, we also passed tax reform that hasn't been done in three decades.

I know some people on your side of the aisle refer to it as crumbs or Armageddon, but I will tell you, to those families out there that got extra money, that are actually fixing their car or actually paying their hospital bills, or those 1.2 million people who just work at one company that now have a longer maternity leave, they don't think it is crumbs, and they don't think having a bill on the floor that let more people take a risk and create a small business is insignificant.

Now let me talk to you about what we did because we believe background checks are important as well. Let me give you a little background. The background check is only as good as the database of what you have.

The National Instant Criminal Background Check System, referred to as the NICS database, is currently administered by the FBI. If the NICS check indicates a person as being in a prohibited category, the FBI will signal a deny on the firearm transfer. However, the NICS database is incomplete and outdated.

For example, on November 5, 2017, a mass shooting occurred at the First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs, Texas. Devin Patrick Kelley murdered 26 and injured 20 others. Kelly was prohibited by law from purchasing or processing firearms or ammunition due to a domestic violence conviction in a court martial while in the United States Air Force. However, the Air Force failed to record the conviction in the FBI NICS database.

That is why this House, this Congress, this majority acted. We put the Fix NICS bill in December—it is sitting in the Senate—which would strengthen our background check system and make it more accurate. It would require Federal agencies to certify twice per year that they are uploading criminal record information to NICS, requiring agencies to establish an implementation plan to ensure maximum coordination and reporting of records. Now you are on record to voting against that.

We have another bill on the floor from a former sheriff from Jacksonville, Florida. He is looking at school violence. Let me walk you through that one.

As I mentioned, Congress will vote next week on the STOP School Violence Act. This bill is proudly supported by Sandy Hook Promise, who note that it will ensure that millions more schools will be trained in prevention and lives will be saved.

Now, this isn't the only thing we are doing. Just this week, we are having oversight. We took the Oversight and Government Reform Committee in this Congress and the Judiciary Committee in this Congress this week, and brought the FBI in, and they will come back again; because there is not one person in America who wants to see what happened in Florida to happen again.

But let's walk through this situation, because I think it is important that we examine it because we want to solve these problems. There were multiple red flags that were raised to the FBI about the behavior of Nikolas Cruz.

The very first red flag: On September 25, 2017, a YouTube channel host took a snapshot of a comment under his video that said: ''I am going to be a professional school shooter.'' He sent that comment to the West Virginia FBI tip center, where all tips are supposed to go, which deemed it a credible threat and opened an investigation.

FBI agents searched for files on Nikolas Cruz, but they were unable to identify the individual and did not even reach out to YouTube in an attempt to recover records on Cruz, so on October 11, 2017, the FBI formally closed the inquiry. That was one red flag, but that is not where it ended.

A second red flag: On January 5, 2018, a second tip came via a phone call to the FBI from a concerned family member. They described in detail problems with Cruz he was showing with regard to social media, cruelty to animals, school trouble, and dealing with a recent death in the family.

When the FBI searched the database again for Nikolas Cruz, the previous tip popped up. However, despite the call from a family member, from a previous red flag, from a YouTube comment from the individual himself that he wanted to be a professional school shooter, they closed the investigation. The shooting happened on February 14, 5 months after the first tip.

This House has not stopped to act. This House acted in December. The background checks have to be fixed. That is why we passed it and put it into the Senate. That is why we are taking up more action now for the schools and adding that to what we already took up in this House. Those aren't insignificant.

I believe there is a path forward. Just as we did all appropriations bills, just as we have been through numerous meetings when it comes to DACA, there is not one child in jeopardy today. The only jeopardy that we will have is if we don't get together and solve the problem.

We have narrowed it to four areas. You and I know what has been said in those meetings. You and I know where it is. We can find compromise. We can solve this problem. But let's make a pledge to the American public that we don't do a bill for the sake of something politically. We create law that solves something so we are not back here in a future Congress taking up the exact same issue putting other people in jeopardy. That is my promise, and that is what I will continue to work for.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader talked about a lot of issues, one of which was NICS. What he didn't say was they put a poison pill in the Fix NICS bill, which is why so many of us voted against it on concealed carry. There is a disagreement in this House on that. We disagree, for the most part, on that provision. We don't think that makes America safer. There are differences of opinion on that.

My suggestion to the majority leader is, the Rutherford bill is on the floor. By unanimous consent, let's put the Fix NICS bill in the Rutherford bill without the poison pill in it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman to see if he will be agreeable to doing that.

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

That would be the same outcome that is already sitting in the Senate. The Senate has the Fix NICS bill now. We will add more to it.

I hope you are just as frustrated with the Senate as I am.

Why can they not pass something?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, my question was, will you agree—you talked a lot about NICS and where it is failing, and we can fix it. We agree with that.

So what I am asking you—you put the Rutherford bill on. I think most of us are going to vote for the Rutherford bill. Maybe all of us will vote for the Rutherford bill, which says let's help schools make themselves more safe.

Why should anybody be opposed to that?

What I say to you is: you just spent a significant amount of time talking about how we could make the NICS process work better, but that many of us voted against it and it hasn't moved in the Senate.

I guarantee you—I don't know that I can guarantee you, but my thinking is: if you do the Rutherford bill, and if you add in the Fix NICS bill—not with concealed carry, but the Fix NICS bill that you talk about in the Rutherford bill—

I will work with you to get that passed in the United States Senate, and I think we will be successful.

My question to the majority leader: Will you agree to a unanimous consent request to add the Fix NICS bill into the Rutherford bill on the suspension calendar?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Let me give the gentleman a few facts. There are 426 bills that have passed this House that sit over in the Senate. Of those 426, there is less than 10 that are partisan. The rest of them all have bipartisan votes.

There are more than 200 votes on bills that sit over in that Senate that were passed here by voice unanimously. So I am not one to do something politically just so somebody else feels better that now they can vote for something because they voted against it before. I am for making law and saving children.

So from this point, we are going to pass the STOP School Violence Act. We are going to send it to the Senate, just the way they already have our Fix NICS bill over there. And let's have the Senate—and I will take you up on this. Let's work together right now to get that bill back over here.

Mr. HOYER. The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. The answer is no, because we want to continue to have that on which we agree defeated by that on which we do not agree. That is the pattern. And when the gentleman says all those bipartisan bills, there were some, obviously, Democrat votes on many of those bills, I am sure.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear a word about a bill that has the majority's support on the floor of the House of Representatives that I spoke about, and that is Hurd-Aguilar. Mr. GOODLATTE, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee said if Goodlatte was put on the floor, it will lose 50, 60, 70 Republicans. Mr. GOODLATTE said that, and that was passed out of the Judiciary Committee. It hasn't been brought to the floor because it would fail.

Hurd-Aguilar, which has not been considered by the committee, but which has the majority of votes on this floor, that bill has not been brought up; just as the bill that passed the United States Senate 5 years ago, to deal with so many of the problems that immigration confronts us with, including security at the border, 5 years, has not been brought up. March 5, nothing happened. Come and gone.

The majority leader spent a lot of time, Mr. Speaker, talking about things that are important but were not on the subject because he doesn't want to deal with the subject. Apparently the Republicans don't want to deal with the subject and they won't put it on the floor. They are obstructing the will of the American people and they are putting thousands and thousands and thousands of people at risk.

The majority leader, with all due respect, is wrong. All of the DACA recipients are not protected, and many of them are not signing up again because they are afraid their government will come after them. They feel they were flim-flammed.

I disagree with the majority leader, Mr. Speaker. Many of us believe what the President did is absolutely legal. It is consistent with what Ronald Reagan did, with what George H.W. Bush did, with what Bill Clinton did, and what George W. Bush did.

□ 1130

Every President, since I have been serving here, has modified immigration consistent with their executive authority. There was nothing mentioned about the quote of the Speaker that was clearly directed at this young woman to say that revocation of protections for the Dreamers brought here as children will not be carried out.

Nobody can sign up for DACA protection now under the court order—nobody. You can re-up, but you can't sign up—1.8 million. The President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, sent a message down here, or maybe he tweeted it, they would agree to 1.8 million and a pathway to citizenship, parenthesis, if you agree with this, if you agree with that, if you agree with the other.

That is not what was said at the White House, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the majority leader. He brought up some other points, said we need to agree to discuss those. I agreed to discuss them. I didn't agree to agree to them, nor did anybody else in that room. And the President of the United States, 25 Members of the House and Senate sitting around the Cabinet table, said: Are we agreed that we are going to solve the DACA issue first?

Not a single Member demurred. Not a single Member said no—not a single one, Mr. Speaker, yet we can't get that bill to the floor. And the majority leader says: Oh, well, we are bringing up a bill that will create jobs.

I am for doing that. And, frankly, if we do that the week after or the week after that—frankly, I don't know the bills well enough to be speaking about them with much depth of information as to how they were voted on in committee, but my inkling is that the majority Democrats—I don't know what is in there, in these bills—may well have voted against them. Most of those bills coming out of committee are pretty partisan.

We didn't discuss the three bills that I brought up. The majority leader didn't mention them. They have bipartisan support on two; and one, the chairman of the committee admits, does not have the votes on this floor. He would get no Democratic votes, and he would lose a substantial number of Republican votes, and the majority leader knows that, Mr. Speaker.

And we talk about NICS. I want to fix NICS. I don't want concealed carry to be part of that. And I regret that the majority leader would not agree to let's fix NICS and put the Rutherford bill through. That would pass the Senate, but he has got a bill over there he knows won't pass the Senate but maybe it makes a good talking point.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what we have to do. We have been waiting a long time, not just the 6 months since September, waiting for March 5 to come and go. We have been waiting for a long time to have bills on the floor with an open amendment process so we can, in fact, do the people's will on immigration and on protecting our students and our families and our citizens from the irresponsible use of guns.

We are not against the responsible use of guns. We believe the Second Amendment protects people on owning handguns and hunting guns; but the Supreme Court, in the Heller decision, said there are things that the community could do. There are things that the government can do to protect its people and to make sure that gun use, within the framework of the Second Amendment, is responsible.

I don't know what we have to do, Mr. Speaker. I don't think anybody doubts that the Hurd-Aguilar bill has the majority votes in this House. I would urge people to, if they believe in this issue, sign a discharge petition. They refused to bring the Export-Import Bank bill to the floor for 1½ or 2 years. Some of the leadership weren't for it. As a matter of fact, the two highest weren't for it. But 127 Republicans to 117 Republicans, they were for it, and over 300 votes were for it, and they would not bring it to the floor short of a discharge petition.

That is not transparency; that is not openness; that is not taking the tough issues head on. That is obfuscating. That is undermining democracy in the people's House. If the gentleman wants to respond, I will yield to him. If not, I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I actually have the same question. I don't know what we have to do.

You know, we come here quite often to have these colloquies. They are supposed to just be for what is happening the next week, but we talk about more issues. For a long time, I heard: What about the Children's Health Insurance Program? You know what, this House brought it up early. We tried to work through committee. The Speaker knows how many times I went on the other side.

They wouldn't even let their committee work on it. So what did we do? We took the ideas that the Democrats had, we put it in the bill; we passed it bipartisan; they still said no. They didn't say no once, they said it numerous times to the Children's Health Insurance Program. And I sat here wondering: What more do we have to do?

Disaster relief. I know, Mr. Speaker, the heart of the minority whip. We went together to Puerto Rico. We went together to the Virgin Islands. We went to Florida. What more do we have to do? Then we brought it to the floor, and he still said no. But you know what? We still got it done.

Government funding. He started this whole discussion about government funding. He misspoke and said it was because of the Democrats that we were able to make this plan. He said a majority of them; and it was not a majority, it was a minority.

Mr. HOYER. I did not.

Mr. MCCARTHY. It was a majority of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time. With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the leader what I said, and I knew what I said, and I know what the facts are. The Republicans could not pass that bill on their own. There were over 60 Republicans who voted ''no'' on that bill, and they got 167. You may have given me—or 170.

That is, Mr. Speaker, almost 50 short of passage. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, when I was majority leader, we didn't get much help from the other side, and we always had 218 to pass what we wanted to pass on our side. Seventy-three of our Democrats voted for it, which is why it passed. Not the majority, because the majority of us were so frustrated.

Again, the majority leader has not spoken to the bills. He has spoken about what we have passed. And the CHIP bill, by the way, was brought up weeks after its authority expired. Weeks after it expired.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Legitimately, may I respond?

Mr. HOYER. He says it was because of our committee. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, we can't stop anything in committee. They have a majority on every committee and can bring a bill up tomorrow—the next hour if they decide to do so.

Mr. MCCARTHY. May I ask the gentleman: Are you stating that we brought CHIP up just weeks before it expired?

Mr. HOYER. No, after.

Mr. MCCARTHY. After?

Mr. HOYER. It expired on September 30. You didn't bring it up until weeks after that.

Mr. MCCARTHY. With all due respect, I think you might want to ask your staff before you put that on record, with all due respect. Well, I am not sure you are correct because we brought it, and it passed this House.

Mr. HOYER. I have consulted with the staff person for whom you have great respect and affection, and she says that I am right. Now, she is my staffer, so maybe she is somewhat biased, but I will tell you that we believe we are right on that.

But that is not the point, Mr. Speaker. The point is not what we have done in the past—particularly what we have done. And we all are for CHIP. That is not the point. The point is we have two critical pieces of legislation this House must address and that the overwhelming majority of the American people think we ought to address and think we ought to pass and are for. And I don't mean 51 percent or 52 percent of them. I mean 86 percent of the people or more. It is not a close question.

And rather than talking about, well, we did this, we passed 5,950 bills, I am not talking about those bills. I am talking about bills we haven't brought to the floor, Mr. Speaker, that we haven't allowed the House to consider; that we have hundreds of thousands of kids, young people who we respect and who are teachers, are doctors, are workers in our factories making a difference, working in restaurants and hotels.

I was with the Chamber of Commerce in Maryland just the other day, and three different CEOs came up to me and said: We have got DACA people working for us and doing an excellent job, and they are worried that they are going to be kicked out of the only country they know.

But we talk about NICS, and we talk about this, that, and the other. Bring those bills to the floor. That is what we are asking for. We want that respect. We want that respect for this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield to the majority leader again. It is those two bills that we believe would pass with significant majorities in this House—the three bills, and we can choose between them. We have offered the queen of the hill, with the explanation for those who may be watching and not bored stiff. One of those three bills that I have mentioned, one a Republican bill, the other two bipartisan bills, Ros-Lehtinen-Roybal-Allard bill and the Hurd-Aguilar bill, both of those bills are bipartisan. Certainly one of those will get a significant majority of this House, and I am not denigrating the bills.

I may or may not be for them that are on the schedule, but there are no issues that the country feels are more important right now than background checks, and there is no issue more timely than fixing—as the Speaker pledged to do 14 months ago, putting at risk that young woman and hundreds of thousands of other individuals in our country similarly situated. That is what we ought to be doing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I know you reclaimed your time the time before, but let me finish what I was saying.

With all due respect, what do we have to do? Yes, we have Fix NICS sitting over in the Senate. And, yes, we are going to add to it for school violence. We know that it does not have to be partisan, but the background check system is broken. Let's not make it partisan. Let's get it done.

When it comes to the challenge for DACA, we are just down to four items. Border security. Not one person in here would probably argue against that. And I know my friend across the aisle, Mr. Speaker, I know his heart. He is a good man. He was, as he stated earlier, majority leader. They had the majority here. They had 60 votes over in the Senate. They had a lot of Members in the Senate, and they had the Presidency. Same problem at that time, too. They did not fix it.

I don't want to be in that same place in the future. My commitment is to fixing this problem. So let's sit down. Let's talk about border security, but let's make sure our borders are actually secure.

When I look back—and people talk about that Gang of Eight bill—you put more money in there for border security than was even being requested today. But people still, on the other side, say no, Mr. Speaker.

But the other point, too, is, if somebody comes from Mexico or Canada and illegally comes across the border, why are they sent back to their country but everybody else is not? Let's secure the border correctly. Then, when it comes to really protecting the nuclear family, why don't we make it a little faster that you could have your children and your spouse with you? And do you know what that would do? I think that would make everybody a little stronger.

When it comes to the idea of coming to America, should it just be the luck of a lottery, or should it be merit? I think merit is a fairer process for everybody's opportunity.

Now, I don't think anybody out there that is listening or can hear this later would say those are partisan ideas. But when we sat in the White House and we discussed it and we said let's narrow it to those four items, I know the way our government is designed.

□ 1145

It is not designed that one person gets all their way. It is based upon compromise.

This city, our capital, was because of a compromise. The creator of the banking system, Alexander Hamilton, made this our capital. George Washington, our first President, never served here. He was sworn in on Wall Street and served his second term in Philadelphia.

As my good friend knows, Mr. Speaker, when a bill comes out of committee, it gets worked on, then it is brought to the floor. That is exactly what is happening with Mr. GOODLATTE today, so we can bring something to the floor and pass it, that everybody, hopefully, can vote for.

This Congress has acted on so many items, but so many times this year it has felt like the election has never ended. I know the heart of many of the Members on the other side. They wanted to vote for disaster relief. They were so frustrated that they shut the government down.

Do you know what? We have all learned from that lesson before. It is not productive.

I also watched people when they talked about health facilities. They wanted that funding, but they couldn't vote for it.

Then they said the whole problem was, when we brought all 12 appropriation bills to the floor, that they couldn't vote for them because they needed a budget agreement. They needed more money. So, yes, it took a long time to work that out because you want to hold that with other issues as well.

Finally, after the shutdown, that was able to be broken apart. But when we finally got that budget agreement that really is negotiated by both sides, even the individual on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, came to the floor and said she was going to vote ''no,'' but she negotiated and wanted to tell how she got victories inside the bill.

That is not compromise. You can't sit in a room and say, ''Okay, I will give here and you give there,'' and based upon the formation of our government, with the Senate as well, we come to an agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what goes on in people's minds and why they wanted to be there. I will make this promise to the American public: I will stay in the room, I will take the ups and downs, but at the end of the day, I want to solve a problem. I don't want a political bill.

I will tell you this, Mr. Speaker. I have been in the room many times with this President. He said on this very floor, he went beyond DACA. For those in the American public must understand. It is a much higher number. And for him to find that compromise, he just asked for three other things. That doesn't mean we are going to get them all, but that does mean we could find compromise in those three.

Mr. Speaker, the one sad part, if we had this debate with the American public, they would find compromise with those three items. They would probably find it very fast. They would want their borders secure; they would want the nuclear family closer together sooner; and they would probably want to see some merit.

So I know there are times here that we get heated, but the majority of bills that pass this floor are bipartisan.

As I stated earlier, more than 200 of those more than 400 bills that are sitting in the Senate passed by voice, all the Democrats and all the Republicans.

We are going to differ on some items, and that is right. I want you to keep your principles. But there is a window, and there is an opportunity. And I know, as the days get closer, the election will be sooner, but let us make a promise to one another. Let's keep that election on the outside, and let's find solutions on this side, in this House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the leader spoke in a very calm and reasoned way. I will do the same.

As an aside, I will tell you the CHIP bill passed on November 3, over a month after its authorization expired.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader talks about coming to compromise. I went down to the White House. Mr. DURBIN and I talked about whether we would go to the White House. We went to the White House out of respect for the Presidency, out of a hope that the discussions that we had at the White House would lead to resolution of a serious issue threatening hundreds of thousands, indeed, close to 2 million individuals who know America as their country and who 86 percent of Americans think ought to stay here in America.

In that meeting, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States said—and he said it on television. You don't have to take my word. There is a video record of what the President said. What he said is we would take care of the DACA issue, consistent, Mr. Speaker, with what Speaker RYAN said to that young woman when he said that the revocation of protections for Dreamers brought here as children will not be carried out.

There was no parenthetical addition, if we do X, Y, Z, A, B, C, D, W. There was no parenthetical phrase. He said: We will not put you at risk, young woman, and those similarly situated.

We have a bipartisan coalition on this floor, but the leader speaks about going into a room—if you want to have a pejorative, a back room, privately—to try to resolve issues not directly related to the DACA protectees.

They are here. The President said they ought to stay here. And the President made a representation, Mr. Speaker, that if we passed a bill, he would sign it. But as the Senate considered a compromise piece of legislation, agreed to by Republican Senators and Democratic Senators, just a few hours before it was brought to the floor, the President said he would veto it. That was not what he said on television in the White House. He said that he would take the heat, if heat there is, and sign the bill that we sent down.

Now we have a Speaker of the House and a majority leader of the Senate who say we won't send something down to the President unless he agrees to sign it, meaning that the House and Senate will not act independently of the President's imprimatur. How sad a position it is that the people's House and the United States Senate have subjugated themselves to the President of the United States.

I presume, Mr. Speaker, that prolonging this discussion apparently will make no difference. But, Mr. Speaker, our side of the aisle represents just short of 50 percent, maybe 48 percent, of the American people. Mr. Speaker, we are saying let us consider. Let us have on this floor—not in a back room, not in somebody's office, not somewhere privately—on the House floor, the people's floor, let us vote.

Let the American people see who raises their hand ''aye'' and ''nay'' on propositions that have been worked on in committee, the Goodlatte bill, and for months between Republicans and Democrats, bipartisan bills. Let the people speak through their Representatives. Don't bottle it up in somebody's office. Let the people's House work its will. Have the courage to pursue that which you said you would do and take the tough issues head-on, not duck them.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope, on behalf of that 86 percent of the American people who support the Dreamers, and even more who support comprehensive background checks, that we have the ability to consider those bills and consider them next week.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 2018, TO TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 2018

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, March 13, 2018, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO BOONE COUNTY DEPUTY JACOB PICKETT

(Mr. ROKITA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a Hoosier hero who paid the ultimate sacrifice. Deputy Jacob Pickett of the Boone County Sheriff's Office was killed in the line of duty on March 2, 2018.

Jacob was a 5-year veteran in law enforcement and served as the leader in the department's K–9 unit. He held the ranking of sheriff deputy in Boone County.

One of Indiana's finest, Jacob is a hero and acted selflessly on the day that took an unexpected and fatal turn. But he died doing what he was trained to do: protecting the thin blue line and keeping the community he loved safe from harm's grasp, and he did that that day.

Boone County citizens and all Hoosiers mourn over the loss of Jacob, who was known as a man of integrity and compassion.

Jacob leaves behind his wife, Jennifer, two young children, and his K–9 partner, Brik, to carry on his legacy of service to fellow Hoosiers. His sacrifice will never be forgotten.

As the Gospel of Matthew says:

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God.