

RECOGNIZING MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS AWARENESS WEEK

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week, which is March 11 through 17.

Each year, activists, physicians, and policymakers come together to spread awareness about this disease and to salute the healthcare professionals and researchers who are dedicated to finding treatments and a cure for this debilitating disease.

Since 2008, I have introduced a bipartisan resolution recognizing the goals and ideals of MS Awareness Week. That is H. Res. 176.

MS is an unpredictable and incurable disease that my family and hundreds of thousands of families across our Nation experience every day.

My sister, Mildred, has lived with MS for more than 40 years. Her courage and the courage of 2 million people living with MS around the world inspire my efforts to bring more research for treatment and a cure.

As a member of the House Health and Human Services Appropriations Subcommittee, I promise to continue fighting for increased funding to find a cure, and I hope all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, help us in this effort.

HONORING HEROISM DURING WORLD WAR II

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Granville Crane of Gulfport, Mississippi, and the rest of the crew onboard the USS *Indianapolis* for their acts of heroism during World War II.

The USS *Indianapolis* received secret orders in July of 1945 to proceed to Tinian Island, transiting the Pacific unaccompanied, carrying components of the Little Boy atomic bomb.

Leaving Tinian, a Japanese submarine spotted the *Indianapolis* steaming towards Guam and fired two torpedos, striking and sinking the *Indianapolis* within 12 minutes. Approximately 300 crewmen went down with the ship, and the rest spent the next 3½ days in the water. Of the 1,200 crewmen, there were only 317 survivors.

On behalf of Mr. Granville Crane and the rest of the USS *Indianapolis* crew, I encourage my fellow Members to support H.R. 4107, the USS *Indianapolis* Congressional Gold Medal Act, which honors the crew of the USS *Indianapolis* with Congressional Gold Medals for their important role and dedicated service to our country during World War II.

CALLING FOR ACTION ON GUN SAFETY

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I just returned from outside these doors where there are thousands of young people who are calling for action on gun safety.

I marched out with my Democratic colleagues, and I really wish that my Republican friends across the aisle had joined us in this, but I will describe what I saw.

I saw a lot of very, very upset young people who are begging this House and the Senate to make change to protect them. They no longer want to live under this threat.

There was one sign in particular that caught my eye. A young girl was standing there with a sign, quietly, and it said, "Am I next?"

So, Mr. Speaker, we have to ask ourselves that question: Are we next?

They don't want another moment of silence. They want action. They want it now.

I congratulate them for their efforts.

When 18-year-olds are leading the country with moral courage, I think it is time for us to respond in kind.

□ 1215

ACTIVIST JUDGES ABUSE THEIR AUTHORITY

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, activist judges have joined liberal Democrats to stop President Trump's policies. Federal trial judges have abused their authority by issuing almost two dozen nationwide injunctions to block the Trump administration's actions. According to Attorney General Jeff Sessions, these injunctions have far exceeded their historic use. In fact, the number of injunctions surpasses all those approved in the past 200 years.

Nationwide injunctions encourage forum shopping by opponents of the President's policies who file claims in courts with liberal judges. These judges place their personal views and politics above the rule of law. They do a real disservice to the justice system.

It is time to rein in these activist judges. The people's respect for the law is at stake.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BALASAR CORRADA DEL RIO

(Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and honor the life of Baltasar Corrada del Rio, Puerto Rico's 13th

Resident Commissioner in Congress who passed away this Sunday at 82 years old.

Mr. Corrada del Rio was born and raised in Puerto Rico and was a founding member of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. He served in this body from 1977 to 1985. He also served as mayor of San Juan, secretary of State, and associate justice for the Puerto Rico Supreme Court.

Baltasar Corrada del Rio was a true statesman. His career exemplifies the qualities we all seek in our public servants: dedication, honesty, and love of our country. His life will be remembered for his unwavering support for American citizens of Puerto Rico and our quest for equality.

Mr. Speaker, I pledge to continue Baltasar Corrada del Rio's work during my time in Congress and ask the House to join me in expressing condolences to his family and our profound gratitude for his years of service to Puerto Rico and in this Congress.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4545, FINANCIAL INSTITU- TIONS EXAMINATION FAIRNESS AND REFORM ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1116, TAKING ACCOUNT OF INSTI- TUTIONS WITH LOW OPERATION RISK ACT OF 2017; AND PRO- VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4263, REGULATION AT IM- PROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 773 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 773

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4545) to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further 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 further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, 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.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the

bill (H.R. 1116) to require the Federal financial institutions regulatory agencies to take risk profiles and business models of institutions into account when taking regulatory actions, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further 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; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4263) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to small company capital formation, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further 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; and (2) 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 gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. 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 yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. The rule makes in order three bills reported favorably by the Committee on Financial Services. All three bills were the subject of multiple hearings before the Committee on Financial Services. All three bills were reported favorably by a bipartisan majority without amendment. The rule ensures that each of these provisions are fully paid for and makes in order an amendment offered by the Democrat ranking member on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of working with Chairman HENSARLING to bring many Financial Services Committee bills to the floor for debate. I

will be here again tomorrow doing the same thing. I am always amazed at how bipartisan these votes are in the Financial Services Committee.

Once again, we have before us today components of the Financial CHOICE Act. As I have already noted, each of these bills received bipartisan support in the committee. I anticipate that these bills will receive a bipartisan vote on the House floor as well.

Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to hear that the Senate is working hard toward their own bill overhauling Dodd-Frank. It is about time. The House has already done its work under the leadership of Chairman HENSARLING. We passed the Financial CHOICE Act nearly a year ago. But I certainly understand that the Senate has its own ideas about financial reform.

I would encourage the Senate to look at the roster of bills that we have passed unpacking the CHOICE Act, as they demonstrate a clear bipartisan roadmap to overhauling our financial regulatory reform effort. We continue to provide that roadmap today.

The first bill made in order by this rule is sponsored by my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. TIPPON. H.R. 1116, the TAILOR Act, is commonsense legislation that I am pleased to cosponsor.

One of the biggest complaints I hear as I travel the Fourth Congressional District of Colorado is how the Federal Government stamps out cookie-cutter regulations without a thought as to how much variation occurs in industries from State to State. For example, how do Washington regulators take into consideration the unique business model of AMG National Trust headquartered in Colorado? Do they know better than my good friend Earl Wright, who cofounded the bank in 1972, about the banking needs of his customers? Are they able to differentiate between AMG's needs and the needs of a bank in another State or on Wall Street? Typically, the answer is no.

They do not model banking regulations to the particular differences from State to State. But even inside a State there is diversity within industries. The needs of AMG National Trust's customers vary from the needs of other community banks in my district; such as, the Bank of Burlington or Community State Bank, both of which are on the Eastern Plains.

The TAILOR Act solves this problem. It requires regulatory actions to take into account each particular institution's business model and risk profile. Mr. Speaker, this change would be an innovative regulatory reform. It would ensure that overarching goals of accountability to investors and depositors are maintained while providing flexibility in the application of the regulations to each institution.

Independent community banks and credit unions have been hit hard by Dodd-Frank's wrong-headed approach

to financial services regulation. In 2016, former Federal Reserve Chair Janet Yellen said: "... when it comes to bank regulation and supervision, one size does not fit all"—and—"rules and supervisory approaches should be tailored to different types of institutions such as community banks."

The TAILOR Act will do just that. It will reorient our regulatory structure and free up our community lending institutions to increase their investments in our communities, creating jobs and opportunities for Americans.

This rule also makes in order H.R. 4263, the Regulation A+ Improvement Act. This regulation was the result of the JOBS Act passed by Congress in 2012. While Regulation A had been around for many years, it caused startups to enter into a cumbersome process for raising money from certain types of investors. The process is so inefficient that most startups avoided it altogether.

Regulation A+ revamped the regulation and raised the amount of money that entrepreneurs could raise in their startup fundraising round. Crucially, it also changed the type of investor who could invest in a startup. Prior to the JOBS Act, essentially only accredited investors could participate in the first fundraising round.

The problem is that, according to research done by Forbes magazine, accredited investors only made up 1 percent of the population, thereby excluding 99 percent of Americans. The JOBS Act changed the regulation to allow nonaccredited investors to participate in a startup's initial fundraising round. Expanding the pool of investors has proven to be a success, and the Regulation A+ Improvement Act continues reforming this area of investment regulation by further increasing the threshold investment amount. This bill will ensure greater access to capital for entrepreneurs seeking investors in their startup.

Finally, this rule makes in order H.R. 4545, the Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act. This bill establishes deadlines by which certain regulatory decisions must be made and provides for a more transparent appeals process. Under current law, financial institutions may appeal regulatory determinations to an intra-agency appellate process. The Financial Services Committee found during hearings that the appeals process was not as impartial as it was intended to be.

This bill removes the appeals process from the original examining agency and creates an independent examination review director who is able to review regulatory determinations. To ensure timeliness of regulatory reviews, the bill requires the final reports from agencies are completed within 60 days.

The combination of a better appeals process and deadline for agency action gives community financial institutions certainty as a regulator evaluates their practices.

□ 1230

Certainty in the regulatory arena will ensure that lending institutions do not needlessly restrict capital investments due to the unpredictability of a regulatory agency's decisionmaking process.

These three bills continue to advance smart financial regulatory reforms that the Committee on Financial Services has been known for under Chairman HENSARLING. Washington's cookie-cutter approach to regulation hinders investments in Colorado and across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I support these measures, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. This rule provides for the consideration of three bills out of the Financial Services Committee. Before I turn to the bills, I want to talk about the urgent issues that are not scheduled for floor time this week.

Why aren't we debating appropriations bills to keep the government funded through the end of this fiscal year?

Just 2 weeks away from another government shutdown, yet, instead of discussing how we can keep government open through the end of the year, we are debating unrelated bills.

We are halfway through the current fiscal year and we are forcing a month-after-month crisis of government funding. This is no way to run a government or a business. Agencies need certainty. Our constituents need to know that they can rely on government services and the security of our Nation. We should be discussing appropriation bills now.

In addition, there are over 800,000 DACA recipients, or Dreamers, that don't have any certainty, whose ability to work legally hinges upon a court decision that is on appeal.

In my home State of Colorado, there are over 15,000 Dreamers from countries far and wide, young, aspiring Americans who grew up in our country and know no other country, who are able to work legally today, but who risk the expiration at any moment by the whim of a court.

Every day, over 100 DACA recipients lose their protected status or it expires. We need to take up, in this body, a permanent solution for Dreamers, a pathway to citizenship so that they don't have to rely on the whims of the court system to protect them.

Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have demanded that Speaker RYAN bring an immigration bill to the floor. In fact, in the past, he said he would do so—last week, the week before. Yet we still haven't brought forward the Dream Act, or the Hope Act, or any of the bills that I am proud to cosponsor, that are bipartisan, that would address the urgent issue of how

we can ensure that Dreamers are able to work legally.

Even as we speak now, there are students on the Capitol lawn participating in an organized walkout in support of ending school gun violence. Students in Colorado are joining as well. I sent a letter to be read to the students who are doing that because I hope that we agree that no young person should have to fear going to school, nor should any parent have to fear sending their child to school.

I strongly support sending more resources to schools that create supportive environments, that foster emotional and mental health. And, yes, we need to do more on gun violence, including universal background checks.

So why aren't we discussing those bills here today?

In addition, the administration's budget eliminated title IV-A of the Every Student Succeeds Act, which is the very kind of support and enrichment grant that helps schools support health and mental health services and counseling. So in the administration's own budget, it would undermine our ability to keep schools safe.

School safety funding is not a replacement for gun safety measures, but it can help reduce violence by supporting our children in school and creating a safe learning environment.

Those are some of the pressing issues that we could be considering; I dare say that our constituents are demanding that we consider. I dare say our continued ignoring of these issues is one of the reasons that the congressional approval rating is so low. Nobody is calling my office asking for these obscure bills today on regulations of big banks.

I am getting calls from constituents about reducing gun violence in schools; finding a permanent solution for DACA recipients; keeping government open, and protecting the integrity of our elections from foreign interference.

My colleagues must have short memories because we just forget how hard the financial meltdown of 2008 was on the country's middle class. While Wall Street banks were getting taxpayer bailouts, nearly 7 million Americans lost their homes, workers lost thousands of dollars in retirement accounts, and our unemployment rate spiked to 10 percent.

Since Dodd-Frank was signed into law, we have avoided another major meltdown. The banking system is strong again because of the Dodd-Frank reforms, yet my Republican colleagues continue to bring bills to the floor that are aimed at crippling financial regulators to put banks ahead of the safety of the financial system, consumers, and the economy.

H.R. 1116, the TAILOR Act, would require that Federal regulators tailor any action to limit the burdens on financial institutions. What this bill does is force Federal regulators, those in charge of protecting consumers and our system from risk, to conduct a time-consuming re-analysis limiting

what they look at to the burdens on financial institutions, the very protections that were put in place in Dodd-Frank and, instead, change those to financial institutions, not to ensure consumer protection, to reduce costs rather than ensure protection.

It is almost like you are giving such authority to the tailors that they cut up your whole suit, and that is not what we want. If there are adjustments that need to be made, we should make them through statute, not give broad authority to government regulators to shred consumer protections.

H.R. 4545, the Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act, would establish a new Office of Independent Examination Review, yet more bureaucracy and paperwork, and have financial institutions appeal and postpone supervisory determinations, creating yet more Republican red tape, more big government committees that the Republicans seem so fond of at the cost to taxpayers.

This is, again, one of those bills that could have been easily tailored to provide targeted improvements to the exam process, but, instead, the Republicans want to set up more government committees and more red tape.

H.R. 4545 takes away the financial regulators' ability to supervise financial institutions, instead, creating new government panels that risk putting consumers at additional risk.

The last bill being considered under this rule is H.R. 4263, the Regulation A+ Improvement Act. This bill would increase the annual exemption threshold under the SEC's Regulation A+ for companies to sell initial public offerings while being exempt from registration and disclosure requirements.

The purpose of the JOBS Act, as my colleague from Colorado mentioned, is to help startups and small businesses access capital by easing some security regulations. Regulation A+, unlike these other two proposals, actually reduces regulations, so it is a good bill. I plan on supporting it. It would make it easier for smaller, nonpublic companies to access capital by allowing them to offer shares to the general public.

So two bills setting up new bureaucracies and new Republican red tape commissions that tie up government, and one that actually reduces regulation, which I think will have more Democratic support.

Currently, a company offering up to \$50 million in securities is exempt from SEC registration requirements. This bill is very simple. It just raises the threshold from \$50 million to \$75 million. Compliance costs are very expensive. So for a company in that range, they are often prohibited from accessing capital markets.

The SEC has the authority to raise the offering limit, something that Congress gave the SEC the authority to do. The JOBS Act requires the SEC to review the limit every 2 years, and if they decide not to increase it, the SEC has to report to Congress.

According to the Kauffman Foundation, startup activity has increased steadily over the past 3 years. Startups are a major job creator in our communities. Reducing red tape and bureaucracy is a good idea. Startups create 3 million jobs annually, and we need to continue to find ways to support startups and entrepreneurs.

So, again, the biggest problem with all of these bills is that they have nothing to do with what the American people are demanding Congress act on. Two of them create more Republican red tape, bureaucracy, give more power to the Federal Government. One of them helps small businesses raise capital by reducing regulation.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have two other speakers. Neither of them are here at this point in time. I would be glad to listen to more of the things that the House should be doing, if Mr. POLIS would like to engage in that discussion. But at this point, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

President Trump's March 5 deadline ending DACA has come and gone, and all we got out of the White House was tweet after tweet, a stifling of bipartisan proposals in the Senate, and a continued failure to lead.

President Trump tweeted: "Total inaction of DACA by Dems. Where are you? A deal can be made."

Mr. Speaker, has the President forgotten that it was his decision to suddenly end the DACA program that has thrown the system into chaos?

Well, to answer his question, the Democrats are right here. My colleague is right here with a motion to solve DACA right now. Let's do it. Let's rumble. This is actually the 25th time that we have attempted to bring the bipartisan bill, the Dream Act, for a vote on the floor of the House, while it is Republican colleagues who have stood by ignoring the will of this House and the Nation and refusing to let us vote on a bill that would fix DACA.

The Democrats have been and are making our position clear. We want immigration policies that make America safer and that reflect the fact that we are a nation of laws and a nation of immigrants. It is time that President Trump and my colleagues on the other side work with us to ensure that.

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 hundreds of thousands of young people who are American in every way except for on paper.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I stand on this floor to speak about our Dreamers.

Again, I must ask very simply: What happened?

For months, Washington refused to pass a budget. We had many continuing resolutions. Again, one of the issues was Dreamers.

After spending caps were raised for both military and nonmilitary expenditures, we got a budget and both Democrats and Republicans voted for that budget. Yet, still, no action for the Dreamers.

Eighty percent of the public wants a fix. We recognize that Dreamers are soldiers, teachers, police officers. They are our friends. They are our neighbors. The President has said he wants also a fix to the Dreamer issue, yet here we are again, one more time, and, again, the Dreamers face a very uncertain future.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop using Dreamers as pawns in a bigger political chess game. At the State of the Union Address here on this floor, my guest was a Dreamer, a young lady studying chemistry at one of my local universities. She wants to be a scientist, and I know she is going to be a very good scientist. That is what chemistry majors do.

You know, America is the land of immigrants, and we have many, many hardworking immigrants. That is what Dreamers are. They work hard. They study hard. They pay taxes. They follow the law. They have been fully vetted. Yet, today, again, we ask: What happened to the Dreamers?

I ask my colleagues, let's give Dreamers the opportunity to earn the American Dream. Let's give them the opportunity to earn citizenship. And let's not live with regrets. Let's not look back 20, 30 years from now and say what we could have, should have, would have. Now is the time to act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can immediately bring up the Dream Act to the floor and give relief to almost a million young people who want nothing but to earn the American Dream.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR), the sponsor of H.R. 4263.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I thought we were here to debate a rule on the Regulation A+ Improvement Act. As much as I also want to do things regarding the Dreamers, the issue at hand is a bill that is meant to help those who are creating jobs.

I want to thank my cosponsors, Representatives Sinema and Gottheimer, for cosponsoring the bill. Any time we can do a bill together on a bipartisan basis, I think it is a better bill.

□ 1245

The purpose of this bill is pretty simple. Seven out of ten jobs in this country, new jobs, come from the 28 million small businesses. I used to run one of those businesses and grew it to be a larger national business, and I know from experience that you have to have capital to grow businesses.

If we help companies raise capital, then we help them create jobs. Biopharmaceutical companies in my State of New Jersey are perfect examples. These are growing companies. They are capital intensive. They need help. The government can't do everything, but the Federal Government can play a role in helping these companies access capital, and that is what this bill is about.

Regulation A+ of the 1933 Securities Act, the very first securities law in this country, Federal law, allowed companies to offer shares on public exchanges. It required that any company that engaged in interstate commerce had to register with the SEC.

They made two exceptions: Regulation A+, which was for Main Street investors, but it put a cap on the amount that could be offered; and Regulation D, which allowed an unlimited offering to companies that were only selling to accredited investors. It has been really helpful in creating jobs and giving companies access to capital.

This bill is a modest improvement. Over time, Regulation A+ has gone from a small limit to, most recently, a \$50 million limit under the JOBS Act of a few years ago, and it is time to raise that limit again.

There is good precedent for this. The JOBS Act actually required that the SEC raise it within 2 years of 2015, when the JOBS Act took effect, or they had to explain to Congress why they didn't. Well, they haven't. They haven't raised it.

We have an interest in making sure that we help our companies in this country create new jobs, and so this bill would raise that limit from \$50 million to \$75 million and allow companies to make offerings to Main Street investors, everyday people trying to find good companies so they can build a future for their families.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been through committee markup. It was open to amendments. It is a bipartisan bill. It has gone through the Rules Committee. It is in order for this bill to move to the floor, and I urge that the rule be passed.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have any remaining speakers?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have one remaining speaker.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time for our all-Colo-
rado lineup.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), the sponsor of H.R. 1116 and H.R. 4545.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) for the time, and I appreciate consideration of the rule here today.

Mr. Speaker, both of the bills being considered under this rule amount to real relief for our Nation's community banks and credit unions.

H.R. 1116, the TAILOR Act, which passed out of committee with bipartisan support, will direct Federal financial regulators to tailor their regulations to the risk profile and business model of our institutions, meaning that regulation intended for the largest financial institutions will no longer burden the smallest of our institutions.

Our community banks and credit unions have long suffered the consequences and costs of complying with extensive heavyhanded and onerous regulations. They were created after the 2008 financial crisis. While many of these regulations are necessary for financial institutions of all sizes, many are not.

Complying with manifold regulations has significantly hampered the ability of our community institutions to offer credit to small businesses, help families get a mortgage, and extend loans to retirees and the recently employed. As one community banker wrote to me: "We have seen time and again the impact of this regulatory environment consume many hours and resources of our compliance, credit, and audit teams despite the relatively simple business model we follow."

By requiring financial regulators to consider the cost of compliance on smaller institutions as well as whether or not a regulation is necessary for an institution based on the size and risk profile of that institution, the TAILOR Act will go a long way to alleviate the burden of heavy regulation on our community banks. In turn, this will lead to renewed economic growth for our local communities that rely heavily on the presence of community banks and credit unions in their own hometowns.

The other bill being considered under this rule, H.R. 4545, which also came out of committee with bipartisan support, the Financial Institutions Examination Fairness and Reform Act, will provide certainty for community banks and credit unions that they will have independent recourse should a bank examination result in a determination that they disagree with.

If a bank or a credit union receives an examination decision that it finds unfavorable, the only recourse it has under the current structure is to appeal that decision directly to the same regulator that arrived at that decision in the first place. The Exam Fairness bill included in this rule will change that reality by creating a new Office of Independent Examination Review that will serve as an independent appeals office, providing banks and credit unions with uniform and predictable avenues to appeal examination determinations of significant consequence.

At this independent office, sober review of the agency's determination, transparency, and timeliness will be paramount, meaning that financial institutions will no longer have to wade through long delays in their appeals process and will no longer have to fear retaliation from a financial regulator because they appealed the examination results. Mr. Speaker, this amounts to new assurances to community banks and credit unions that they will have fair recourse in the examination process should they disagree with an examiner's findings.

I would like to thank the Speaker for advancing this rule.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that our community banks and credit unions can realize real relief.

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

Once again, Congress is spending our limited time here on the floor debating issues that are not being asked for by our constituents, creating new government commissions and Washington red tape that gets in the way of our economic growth and success.

We have spent countless hours debating bills that the Senate probably won't even take up instead of the items we need to do like appropriations bills, where we are 2 weeks from the expiration of government funding.

Apparently, these bills are rushed to the floor to score political points for special interests instead of dealing with the over 800,000 Dreamers whose ability to work legally hangs in the balance of a court decision.

We are considering legislation that creates new commissions and red tape instead of focusing on how to put more money in the pockets of the middle class.

I strongly urge my colleague to vote "no" on the rule and the previous question so we can bring the bipartisan Dream Act forward and finally show that, yes, the House of Representatives can do its job.

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

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

It really is fairly simple. Washington's regulations tend to strangle economic growth. What usually starts as a do-good effort quickly devolves into a "Washington knows best" regulatory regime. Instead of recognizing the unique needs of businesses around this country, the Federal Government usually stamps out a cookie-cutter regulation that purports to be the solution to a problem but, in reality, almost always has unintended consequences that reduce the freedom of Americans and reduces economic activity in our communities.

The bills before us today take a balanced approach to regulation, maintaining overarching safeguards while making commonsense reforms that free our community banks and credit unions to increase investment in our communities.

I promised Coloradans that I would work to reduce the role of Federal Government in their lives. These three bills today do just that.

I thank my fellow Coloradan, Mr. TIPTON, for introducing two of these measures. I thank Chairman HENSARLING for bringing these bills to the floor.

I urge passage for the rule and the underlying rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 773 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

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

SEC. 4. 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. 5. 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

□ 1300

STUDENT, TEACHERS, AND OFFICERS PREVENTING SCHOOL VIOLENCE ACT OF 2018

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4909) to reauthorize the grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4909

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Student, Teachers, and Officers Preventing School Violence Act of 2018" or the "STOP School Violence Act of 2018".

SEC. 2. GRANT PROGRAM FOR SCHOOL SECURITY.

Part AA of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10551 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2701 (34 U.S.C. 10551)—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking "Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services" and inserting "Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance"; and

(ii) by striking "including the placement and use of metal detectors and other deterrent measures" and inserting "through evidence-based strategies and programs to prevent violence, which may include the use of appropriate technologies, including the placement and use of metal detectors and other deterrent measure and emergency notification and response technologies";

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting after "through" the following: "evidence-based school safety programs that may include"; and

(ii) by striking paragraphs (1) through (6) and inserting the following:

"(1) Training to prevent student violence against others and self, including training for local law enforcement officers, school personnel, and students.

"(2) The development and operation of anonymous reporting systems for threats of school violence, including mobile telephone applications, hotlines, and internet websites.

"(3) The development and operation of—

"(A) school threat assessment and intervention teams that may include coordination with law enforcement agencies and school personnel; and

"(B) specialized training for school officials in responding to mental health crises.

"(4) Coordination with local law enforcement.

"(5) Placement and use of metal detectors, locks, lighting, and other deterrent measures.

"(6) Security assessments.

"(7) Security training of personnel and students.

"(8) Subgrants to State or local law enforcement agencies, schools, school districts, nonprofit organizations, or Indian tribal organizations to implement grants awarded under this section.

"(9) Acquisition and installation of technology for expedited notification of local law enforcement during an emergency.

"(10) Any other measure that, in the determination of the Director, may provide a significant improvement in security.";

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking "and has" and inserting "has"; and

(ii) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", and will use evidence-based strategies and programs, such as those identified by the Comprehensive School Safety Initiative of the Department of Justice"; and

(D) in subsection (d)(1), by striking "50 percent" and inserting "75 percent";

(2) in section 2702 (34 U.S.C. 10552)—

(A) in subsection (a)(2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "child psychologists" and inserting "mental health professionals"; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking "this part" and inserting "the STOP School Violence Act of 2018";

(3) in section 2704(1) (34 U.S.C. 10554(1)), by striking "a public" and inserting "an";

(4) in section 2705, by striking "\$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009" and inserting "\$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2028, of which not less than \$50,000,000 shall be available in each such fiscal year for grants for the activities described in paragraphs (1) and (4) of section 2701(b)"; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 2706. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

"(a) NO FUNDS TO PROVIDE FIREARMS OR TRAINING.—No amounts provided as a grant under this part may be used for the provision to any person of a firearm or training in the use of a firearm.

"(b) NO EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this part may be construed to preclude or contradict any other provision of law authorizing the provision of firearms or training in the use of firearms."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4909, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 4909, the STOP School Violence Act of 2018. Violence at our schools makes students feel vulnerable in a place where they should feel comfortable to learn, grow, and be happy.

To curb violence at our Nation's schools, the STOP School Violence Act provides a multilayered approach to identify threats and prevent violence from taking place on school grounds.

It provides much-needed resources to train students, teachers, and law enforcement officers on how to recognize and quickly respond to warning signs, and provides funding for technology to keep schools safe.

Eighty percent of school shooters told someone of their violent plans or exhibited warning signs. The bill before us today will ensure that students,