

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS OF CERTAIN PERSONS TO UNDERMINE THE SOVEREIGNTY OF LEBANON OR ITS DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES OR INSTITUTIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 112-127)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared with respect to the actions of certain persons to undermine the sovereignty of Lebanon or its democratic processes and institutions is to continue in effect beyond August 1, 2012.

Certain ongoing activities, such as continuing arms transfers to Hizballah that include increasingly sophisticated weapons systems, undermine Lebanese sovereignty, contribute to political and economic instability in the region, and continue to constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared on August 1, 2007, to deal with that threat and the related measures adopted on that date to respond to the emergency.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 24, 2012.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4078, RED TAPE REDUCTION AND SMALL BUSINESS JOB CREATION ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6082, CONGRESSIONAL REPLACEMENT OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S ENERGY-RESTRICTING AND JOB-LIMITING OFFSHORE DRILLING PLAN

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 738 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 738

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 4078) to provide that no agency may take any significant regulatory action until the unemployment rate is equal to or less than 6.0 percent. 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 two hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committees on the Judiciary and Oversight and Government Reform now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112-28, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 6082) to officially replace, within the 60-day Congressional review period under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, President Obama's Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil; Gas Leasing Program (2012-2017) with a congressional plan that will conduct additional oil and natural gas lease sales to promote offshore energy development, job creation, and increased domestic energy production to ensure a more secure energy future in the United States, 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 Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in

the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112-29. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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.

□ 1320

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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

Ms. FOXX. 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. House Resolution 738 is a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 6082, the Congressional Replacement of President Obama's Energy-Restricting and Job-Limiting Offshore Drilling Plan, from the Natural Resources Committee and Chairman HASTINGS, and seven other bills that will be considered as a single package, including mine, H.R. 373, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act; H.R. 4078, the Regulatory Freeze for Jobs Act by Mr. GRIFFIN; H.R. 4607, the Midnight Rule Relief Act by Mr. RIBBLE; H.R. 3862, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act by Mr. QUAYLE; H.R. 4377, the RAPID ACT by Mr. ROSS of Florida; H.R. 2308, the SEC Regulatory Accountability Act by Mr. GARRETT; and H.R. 1840, which is a bill by Mr. CONAWAY to improve consideration by the

Commodity Futures Trading Commission of the cost and benefits of its regulations and orders.

H.R. 6082 is a bill to replace the Obama administration's final offshore drilling plan announced on June 28, which keeps 85 percent of America's offshore areas off limits to energy production, with one that would establish a timeline for 29 specific leases, some of which are not open for drilling under the Obama plan.

The legislation would also require the Interior Department to prepare a multilease environmental impact statement for any leases required under the bill not in the June 2012 plan.

The remaining bills are rolled into one package; and while each has its own unique virtues, they're all intended to provide for Federal regulatory relief.

H.R. 373 is the culmination of nearly 5 years of work to build on the success of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, or UMRA, which is a bipartisan initiative that has not been modernized since its inception in 1995.

Given his express support for regulatory reform, my hope is that President Obama will support my bill, which incorporates many of his ideas, including those embodied in Executive Order 13563.

Mr. Speaker, so often we thank people for working on our legislation and for working in the Congress only at the time that they retire, but I want to give some thanks today for the hard work that's been done, particularly on H.R. 373. There's an enormous amount of work that has gone into bringing this bill to the floor.

I'd first like to thank Brandon Renz, my legislative director, who has worked with this for over 5 years. I thank Kristin Nelson and Peter Warren with the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee for providing the diligence and creative thinking needed to shape the product we're considering today.

I also thank Ryan Little, Austin Smythe, Daniel Flores, and Hugh Halpern for their help shepherding this bill through the various committees of jurisdiction. It's this kind of cooperation that's necessary to ensure the proper functioning of this legislative body.

I thank Chairman DARRELL ISSA for bringing this bill to the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. He is providing extraordinary leadership for that committee and our country. But it's my colleague and good friend, Congressman JAMES LANKFORD, the chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee's Subcommittee on Technology, Information Policy, Intergovernmental Relations and Procurement Reform, who is deserving of my most sincere appreciation and praise.

Mr. LANKFORD's dogged work and determination to build upon and improve on my initiative is only one demonstration of his keen intellect and ex-

ceptional legislative acumen. For a freshman with no prior legislative experience to have received such immense respect by peers of both parties further underscores his professionalism and amiable personality. Undoubtedly, this House would be better off if it were filled with legislators as serious about seeking tangible solutions to problems as Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. ISSA.

Mr. Speaker, it's on that note that I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I'd like to address process just very briefly, and that is that, when we began this session of Congress, we were advised by our Republican colleagues that we were going to bring up each measure individually and discuss them. This is a structured rule that does contemplate the opportunity for many Members to participate, but it isn't an open rule. What it is is it's a measure as the base bill that has cobbled to it six distinctly different measures—evidenced by the number of thank-yous that had to come from Dr. FOXX to the various committees.

I do agree with the one, Dr. FOXX, where you thank the young man for creative thinking. This is out of the box when it comes to us as far as process is concerned being creative. Cobbling six pieces of legislation—with another to make seven—is a bit much.

This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 4078, the Red Tape Reduction and Small Business Act of 2012, and H.R. 6082, which has such a long and convoluted name that the cost to the government to simply print the bill may require the Republican majority to raise the debt ceiling.

What the red tape bill should be called, Mr. Speaker, is the "Eliminate the Government's Ability to Protect Its Own Citizens Act of 2012," because that is what the radical legislation—creative, though one may think it is—aims to do.

Under this legislation, Federal agencies would be prohibited from issuing new regulations until the unemployment rate falls below 6 percent.

□ 1330

And I defy any economist or anybody else in the world to tell me when that's going to be in an economy such as the one that we have. So too, would new regulations be prohibited between Election Day in early November and Inauguration Day in late January.

For the past 2 years, the Republican majority has been spending its time doing everything, it seems to me, to crash the economy by defaulting on our debt, eliminating the greatest health care protections made in decades, and turning sensible decisions about women's health care into a fantasy of religious persecution.

But now it appears that perhaps struggling Americans have finally managed to capture the Republicans' attention, except that the majority's response is not to make the kind of investments that will actually create jobs, but, instead, to gut the Federal Government's efforts to protect the health and safety of American citizens.

I realize that in the fantasy world inhabited by some far-right ideologues allowing polluters to run amok is tantamount to creating jobs, allowing corporations to pursue fantastic profits at the expense of public health and safety is somehow good governance, and enabling the middle class to fall farther and farther behind the ultra-wealthy is somehow a shining example of the American spirit.

But I have to ask, under this legislation, where will these new jobs come from?

I suppose we'll need more doctors to care for sick children, since the FDA will be prohibited from monitoring the safety of baby formula. We will need caregivers, I'm sure, willing to provide free care for older Americans, as Medicare will be unable to change its payments to providers. And we'll need new water treatment plant workers, as corporate polluters will have increased freedom to dump harmful chemicals into our drinking water, as they have for years.

If I sound extreme, Mr. Speaker, it's because this bill is extreme. A blanket prohibition on new regulations is not any kind of solution to grow our economy. The FDA, the EPA, and the Veterans Administration, these agencies are not responsible for the failure of our jobless recovery.

What is irresponsible is the failure to address the real needs of the American people. Rather than preventing the Federal Government from ensuring clean drinking water, we ought to be investing in the infrastructure that makes clean drinking water possible and that desalinates salt water.

We ought to be investing in economic development projects, in the national infrastructure, in clean energy technology, in education, and in the kinds of programs that support those Americans who are struggling the hardest. Rich CEOs of big polluters aren't one of those that are in need.

But speaking of rich CEOs out of touch with everyday Americans, it was Mitt Romney who said in 2009 that, "You have to have regulation." He said that regulations need to be modernized, reviewed, and effective, and that Republicans "misspeak" when they say they don't like regulation.

I guess what Mitt Romney calls "misspeak" other people might call "outright ridiculous" because that is what the ideology behind this bill is. It is as ridiculous a notion that yet more drilling for oil will somehow—drilling in these places where companies like BP can cause the kind of incidents that we saw in the gulf—that somehow this is going to benefit the country. It won't.

The other bill to be considered under this rule is just the latest manifestation of the Republican energy doctrine: "Only drilling, all the time, and everywhere." This legislation does exactly two things. It tears up environmental protections, and it further enriches oil company executives.

The House, under the Republican majority, has taken 142 pro-oil-and-gas drilling votes this Congress. Using the hourly cost of voting in the House, as calculated by the Congressional Research Service, the more than 90 hours we have spent debating these measures that everybody in this House knew were going nowhere when they left this House, we've spent \$54 million of the taxpayers' money debating, and these are the people that would tell me they want to cut costs.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that there's always a chance that the Republicans will achieve success the 143rd time and additional hours that they try something. But once again, the majority's efforts reflect a dogged determination to rely on an outdated ideology that seeks only to reward the wealthiest corporations.

We are already drilling at historic levels in this country. The United States is home to more offshore drilling rigs than the entire rest of the world combined. Seventy percent of offshore areas currently leased are not even active yet.

This legislation isn't going to change the price of fuel for the average American. It does not mandate that oil drilled in the United States—Mr. MARKEY brought an amendment that allowed that if it's going to be drilled here, it ought to stay here. But this legislation doesn't allow for it to even be sold in the United States.

In fact, oil will simply be shipped out to the highest bidder, similar to what's going to happen with Keystone when it's completed, on the world market, generating enormous profits for the oil companies while sticking the American public with the bill.

I recently saw an editorial cartoon by Joel Pett. And in the cartoon, a man stands up at a climate change summit and asks, what happens if climate change is, indeed, a hoax, but we achieve energy independence anyway, that we preserve the environment anyway, that we create green jobs anyway, and livable cities, and have cleaner air and water. The answer, of course, is that we will all be better off.

Republicans can stick their heads in the tar sands all they want, but pumping more fossil fuels out of the ground and into the atmosphere will not sustain the American economy, nor provide the kind of economic prosperity that will benefit all Americans. And as I've said before, and I repeat again, I'll be the last person standing against drilling offshore of Florida.

At the same time, preventing the Federal Government from acting on behalf of public health and safety will not create new jobs. It won't return the un-

employment rate to 6 percent, and it won't send a signal to the American public that their elected Representatives are ably minding public resources.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I just would like to point out to my colleague from Florida that we certainly agree on our side of the aisle with Governor Romney that we need regulations. These bills don't do away with all regulations. Republicans know you need government. We just want some common sense brought into our government. We want a cost-benefit analysis done to rules and regulations.

After all, we're here, we're breathing the air, we're drinking the water, we're eating the food. Our children, our grandchildren are, too. It doesn't make any sense these tired old accusations against Republicans that we don't care anything about our environment or our food because we're here living with them, also.

□ 1340

I don't think the American people are going to buy the arguments that my colleague made.

I would now like to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank Ms. FOXX, my colleague, for her kind introduction on that.

All aspects of this bill, each part of it, has gone through the committee process. Multiple of them have had multiple hearings related to them. There has been plenty of opportunity to be able to allow for input and for votes through the traditional committee process on this.

The reality is that red tape is strangling our businesses. Each day, they wake up, and they are worried about what the Federal Government is going to do to them rather than what the Federal Government is going to do for them. There is an appropriate role for the Federal Government for regulations, but it seems like there is a never-ending acceleration of regulations—and not just small—they get larger and larger and larger and more and more expensive and more and more nonsensical at times.

Let me just give you one quick example of this: community bankers that are facing hundreds of new regulations.

When the problem seemed to be the largest investment banks, the one who got hit the hardest with the regulations were the community banks. Now community banks have to step aside. A bank that may have 14 to 20 employees and \$50 million or less in total assets, which is a very small rural bank, has to go and prove that these rules don't apply to them. That involves their hiring outside attorneys. That involves setting aside staff that should be doing loans. That involves setting aside additional time to prove these hundreds of rules don't apply to them and that they're not a big bank. Regulations

passed on to them—death by a thousand paper cuts is how they explain it to me.

Simplicity and common sense need to be applied to how we do regulations. When there is no check and balance in the regulatory environment, it needs to have that.

Now, the other side seems to assume that, occasionally, Americans are in need of daily oversight by the Federal Government, that unless some Federal bureaucrat or some Federal regulator is not standing next to their beds when they get up that they won't know how to get to work and that, when they get to work, they're going to cheat a neighbor and that, on the way home, they're going to cheat another neighbor, so we'd better have a Federal regulator standing right next to them because American citizens can't be trusted to do the right thing without Federal control.

I would say the neighbors that I live around, in the cities that I visit all over America, have great citizens who want to do the right thing and are doing the right thing and are serving their neighbors. We have great city and State governments. They're doing very good regulatory schemes. We should trust them more to engage in what they're doing in the communities that they live in, where they eat the food, where they drink the water. They are the first line of defense on that, rather than taking all those things to Washington, D.C., and assuming all Americans can't function without someone from Washington, D.C., checking on them each and every day. Let me just give you a couple things on that.

During the first hearing that I participated in here in this Congress, someone from the other side extolled the benefits of adding more regulations because companies were sitting on money and were not spending it. This was a way to force companies to hire additional people by hiring compliance officers—people to oversee regulations—and that, if we couldn't increase employment in America through producing more goods and services, we would increase employment in America by creating more bureaucrats just in the private business.

That's not how I see that you should grow an economy. Let me just highlight one area, one title of this great bill.

Title IV of this is the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2011. This was a bill that started in the previous Congress with Ms. VIRGINIA FOXX as the author. That bill went through multiple processes in the previous Congress. We picked it up in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, and we did three hearings on it at the beginning of last year. We had city leaders, we had State and county leaders, we had private business leaders, and we had administration individuals from this administration and from the previous administration come and testify.

In 1995, the House and the Senate and the President signed a bill called the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. It was a wide bipartisan act—394 votes in the House and 91 votes in the Senate—to give information to the House and to the Senate before decisions were made about what is an unfunded mandate, and what effect will that have.

There are large loopholes that have been exploited in the last 17 years. This bill aims to fix those loopholes:

It takes in all the independent agencies, and it also puts them under those same requirements;

It puts in the language that President Clinton put in in Executive Order 12866 in order to clarify this, that the administration's functioned under. It puts that language and codifies it from President Clinton into this bill. It also takes a clarification of President Obama's that he has for this bill and also adds it into the language;

It redefines "direct costs" with how the CBO already defines "direct costs," and it actually codifies that language and provides ability;

It allows for a ranking member or a chairman of a committee to do an analysis of a rule to make sure that it is not exceeding our unfunded mandates requirements. It is very bipartisan. It's not just the chairman. A chairman or a ranking member can get in on that.

It is the intent of this, in this modern regulatory environment, to clean this up and to make sure Congress has the information to make their decisions.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my good friend from Florida on the Rules Committee for yielding time.

I rise to oppose the rule and the underlying bills, particularly H.R. 6082, because that bill unreasonably expands offshore drilling without the corresponding and necessary safety standards.

The Republicans are ignoring the lessons that we learned after the BP Deepwater Horizon blowout. Again, they are putting the profits of the oil companies ahead of the safety and larger economic concerns of families and businesses all across our great country.

Certainly, memories cannot be so short that we don't remember the devastation caused by the BP Deepwater Horizon blowout and disaster. That oil spewed for months and months, and they could not cap the well. In the meantime, it caused serious economic damage, not just to my home State of Florida and to the tourism industry and fishing and to the hotels and motels and restaurants, but all across the gulf coast and all across the country.

I recall very well, prior to the blowout, they said it was safe. They said drilling in deep water and offshore was safe and that there hadn't been very many accidents. But they were wrong.

I remember Tony Hayward came in front of our committee, and he said, We were wrong. We didn't anticipate this would happen.

You've got to anticipate that it will happen.

Unfortunately, in the aftermath, we appointed a blue ribbon commission, the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon blowout. They issued their report in January of 2011. They had many recommendations from experts in how you make offshore drilling safe. The Congress has not acted on any of those recommendations to make it safe. Yet, in this bill, they press ahead to open even more areas for oil drilling. That's not right. You're putting our economy and our environment at risk when you do so.

This was a great commission, by the way, because they didn't just stop there. They've issued progress reports along the way. I know people often-times don't like report cards, and the Congress is not going to like this report card. They've broken it down into safety and environmental protection, spill response and containment, and ensuring adequate resources.

Under safety and environmental protection, they say Congress has done nothing to make permanent the improvements that have been made by industry and the Obama administration. We've got to enact these into law before we go forward with more offshore drilling in new and pristine areas.

They say Congress has provided little support for spill response and containment. If we're going to expand drilling—and it certainly has to be part of our energy portfolio—we have to be able to respond to a disaster, and yet Congress has done nothing there.

It says, although the administration has provided increases in funding to oversight, Congress has taken little action to adjust the unrealistic limits on liability. Who is going to pay? It shouldn't be the taxpayers who pay for these disasters. Right now, they have not adjusted the outrageous liability limits that these oil companies have when there are accidents.

What you're doing is really thumbing your nose at—you're turning a blind eye to—the hard work done by the commission, the commission that proposed to protect us if we were going to rely on offshore oil. I think it's going to be part of our portfolio, so why not adopt reasonable safety standards?

I know some of my colleagues say, Well, we don't like red tape. I don't like red tape either, but this isn't red tape. These are vital environmental and economic safety standards to ensure that the \$60 billion tourism industry in Florida is maintained. Those are hardworking folks and good jobs back home. For the hotels and motels, even though the oil was coming out of the ocean 350 miles away, their businesses fell off. All we ask is that simple safety standards be adopted.

Mr. MARKEY and Mr. HOLT have proposed some of those as amendments.

The Republicans rejected other ones. We need to adopt these. Otherwise, it is irresponsible to press ahead with expansive, new deepwater drilling in deeper areas, in pristine areas.

□ 1350

These recommendations are reasonable. And if the Republican Congress cannot take up reasonable safety standards in the wake of one of the worst economic and environmental disasters in our history, then I'd hate to say what's at risk for this great country.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, recent economic indicators show that another recession is a real danger. Consumer confidence is plummeting, businesses aren't hiring, and recovery continues to slow. Real unemployment is at 14.9 percent, and millions of Americans have given up hope. The World Bank reports that the U.S. is now 13th in the world when measuring the ease of starting a new business. In 2007, we were ranked third. Last month, American manufacturing shrank for the first time in nearly 2 years. Economists are revising their growth projections downward. Inflation looms on the horizon, and Europe's sovereign debt crisis continues unabated.

Some of the circumstances that led to this crisis are out of anybody's control, but many of these circumstances are not. Policymakers in Washington have an obligation to our constituents and to this country to work together to create an environment where the American people prosper. We have such an opportunity today. The Red Tape Reduction and Small Business Job Creation Act takes a balanced approach towards regulatory reforms that are desperately needed in today's market.

For 25 years, before I was elected, I was a small businessman. I started a business not because of a government program or because of government lending; in fact, I couldn't even get a bank to loan me money. I borrowed money from a friend and grew that business over 20-some years to 27 employees. I didn't do it because there were good bridges and roads next door to me. I saw a need, I took a risk, and worked harder than the next guy. I also knew the rules and understood that government was the referee, not the player.

Today, the regulatory climate and litigious nature of many government agencies create uncertainty. Some falsely claim that certainty has nothing to do with our current economic crisis. Mr. Speaker, economics is as much a behavioral science as anything. When businesses don't know what the next regulatory hurdle will be, they won't invest.

The Florida Chamber of Commerce has recently done a study of small

businesses in Florida. The results were clear: uncertainty is the number one issue facing job creators and entrepreneurs. Right now there are projects waiting on the sidelines that have the potential to create 1.9 million jobs annually in this country. Talk about a shot in the arm to the economy.

The only thing certain about this President has been the uncertainty that he has provided and the regulatory reform and tax reform for small business. Take my home State of Florida for example. According to research by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, there is potential for 121,000 jobs there if we have regulatory certainty. In the first year of operations, businesses could generate over \$2 billion in employment earnings. This bill is not about generating profits for fat cats and Big Oil. How do I know? Because I have seen firsthand a project in my area come to a halt because of a litigious activist group that affected 200 blue color jobs: secretaries, machinists, and more. There were 14 Federal agencies, State and local agencies, 7 years of permits and review, only to have a lawsuit 1 month later kill the dreams of a better life for my neighbors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROSS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one thing I know about government is that before it gives to someone, it must take from someone else. This legislation presents solutions that are sensible and immediately effective. My neighbors are tired of the regulatory burden. I'm tired of the regulatory burden.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my good friend and colleague from Florida that when he speaks about 120,000 jobs that may have been created, Governor Rick Scott categorically rejected money for light rail between the I-4 corridor of Orlando and Tampa that would definitely have produced 18,000 jobs.

You can't have it both ways. You can't one minute say that you don't want something, and then the next minute say that some fictional number is going to take place that's a magic bullet. We worked hard to get that money appropriated. The last statement that he made was that you can't give something unless you get something. Well, they got from Florida, and that money went to the east coast corridor, to California, to Illinois. I'm not certain about whether any of it went to Kentucky, but I'm sure that the next speaker would be prepared to address that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my friend from Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in op-

position to the rule which, if enacted, will block United States servicemembers and veterans from getting the best care and services we can offer.

In the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment to exempt from the proposed moratorium any regulation that is related to the health and safety of United States servicemembers and veterans. I did so because I believe, as I'm certain all my colleagues do, that servicemembers and veterans are best served when the agencies that serve them can provide critical treatment and assistance in a timely and responsive manner. Doing so often requires writing new rules and regulations. We should not, for example, block a new regulation that allows the VA to provide medical or other benefits to caregivers of veterans and servicemembers in exchange for a new talking point about the economy.

My colleagues on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee agreed. My amendment was unanimously approved in a bipartisan fashion. Yet, inexplicably, Republicans are now blocking it from a full vote. Suddenly, they're ready to let our commitments to our heroes lapse. And for what, a new talking point? Over the next 5 years, more than 1 million veterans will return home from war. Part of our commitment to them must be to ensure that they have the best services available, whether that's in health care, job training, or educational benefits.

Mr. Speaker, most legislation has unanticipated consequences. This legislation has a consequence that is easily anticipated, and that is that we will be tying the hands of the agencies that serve our brave men and women in the armed services. I ask any one of my Republican colleagues from the Rules Committee to explain why this amendment wasn't made in order and why this rule is sending a message to our military and veterans that they aren't entitled to the best we have.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule and the bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, as I often do when I'm handling a rule, I have to make sure that the public understands the facts.

It's my understanding that the amendment that the gentleman spoke of that was adopted in the committee and then presented in the way that it was presented for this bill was not germane. I need to point out to the public that it was not the majority, it wasn't the Republicans, who decided the amendment wasn't germane. It is our Parliamentarians, who are non-partisan.

I would now like to yield 3½ minutes to my colleague from Texas, Representative CANSECO.

Mr. CANSECO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina, and I rise today in strong support of the rule for H.R. 4078.

The Regulatory Freeze for Jobs Act is an important piece of legislation

that will ensure the government does not stand in the way of America's job creators.

I have the honor of representing a district that reaches from San Antonio, Texas, to El Paso, Texas, including nearly 800 miles of U.S.-Mexico border. When I head home for a work period, my days are spent on the road meeting with diverse groups of small businessmen, entrepreneurs, community bankers, farmers, energy producers, teachers, and law enforcement agents.

The most common theme that I hear from my constituents, whether they're Democrat or Republican, conservatives or liberals, to the left or to the right, is that the Federal Government is intrusive and standing in the way of job creation by issuing job-killing regulations. One constituent even sent a letter to my office on how regulations and high energy costs are impacting his family. He writes:

Our family is on a fixed income. It has become a hardship to buy gasoline. Now, with the coal mines being shut down, our electric bills are going to go through the roof. I guess the wife and I will have to get a block of ice and a box fan to stay cool this summer.

□ 1400

Since President Obama took office, we have seen a 52 percent increase in regulations deemed economically significant, which means a regulation costs the economy at least \$100 million annually. And according to a September 2010 report from the Small Business Administration, total regulatory costs amount to \$1.75 trillion annually, enough money for business to provide 35 million private sector jobs with an average salary of \$50,000. In the midst of an economic downturn in which the unemployment rate has been above 8 percent for 41 consecutive months, 35 million private sector jobs is a very significant amount of jobs.

The legislation we begin to consider today is an important step in the right direction to provide certainty to our Nation's job creators so they can start hiring again and get our economy back on track.

It is amazing that this year alone, the Federal Register, where rules and regulations are published for the public to view, has seen more than 41,000 pages alone devoted to this regulatory explosion. These regulations would cost \$56 billion and result in paperwork burdens that would take 114 million hours to complete. That is 13,000 years working 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Imagine how many jobs we could create in America if those 114 million paperwork hours were spent on building roads, issuing loans, expanding small businesses, and selling products instead of pushing paperwork across a desk to please a government regulator.

From regulating farm dust, stock tanks, and streams on private property, keeping young people off the farm, and imposing the most expensive rule ever on the energy sector, nothing is off limits for the out-of-control regulators in this administration. Even

though the House of Representatives has had some success in reining in job-killing regulations, right now it is still a good time to go to work for the Federal Government as a regulator in Washington, DC, because they are hiring.

If we want more jobs on Main Street, we need less red tape from bureaucrats and other regulators in Washington, DC.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to tell both sides how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The gentleman from Florida has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from North Carolina has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to my good friend from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), whose State did benefit from that money that was to go to Florida, as appropriated.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule on the so-called regulatory freeze bill which will act as a chain saw, going through parts of the government that have absolutely nothing to do with small business or small business job creation. And I say that as a former small employer.

One of the regulations which will be butchered under this law is the income-based repayment program which the Department of Education is now in the middle of fashioning, which will provide loan payment relief for people paying title IV student loans. For a teacher making \$25,000 a year with maybe about \$20,000 in student loan debt, that program will reduce monthly payments by \$100 a month. That is real help for people who are contributing to the U.S. economy. Allowing that regulation to go forward will not hurt the U.S. economy. In fact, it will provide more basis for that teacher to go out and survive and spend money on housing, car loans, et cetera.

Yet this bill, in the name of job creation, will knock down the income-based repayment program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COURTNEY. The income-based repayment program is trying to provide student loan relief at a time when student loan debt in this country now exceeds \$1 trillion—higher than credit card debt, higher than car loan debt. It is a commonsense program, fully paid for.

The Student Aid and Fiscal Responsibility Act, signed into law in 2010, offset every nickel of cost in the income-based repayment program; and yet here we are, debating a bill at a time of crisis for middle class families because of student loan debt, denying them the needed relief which will help the U.S. economy.

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

The rule before us today provides for consideration of my bill, H.R. 373, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, as I mentioned before. While working on this legislation over the years, I have come to appreciate that the subject matter is not one of the most thrilling ever to be considered by this House. In fact, I'm confident that reading a summary of my bill would provide an effective remedy for even the most stubborn case of insomnia.

Some have compared observing the legislative process with that of making sausage. Admittedly, in the case of my bill, it more closely resembles watching paint dry. Nor do I expect many in the media will sell many advertisements dissecting legislation entitled the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act. However, this certainly does not diminish the meaning or value of this important work.

By collaborating with the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, we've worked to create a comprehensive legislative package that promotes the principles of good government, accountability, and transparency that my constituents sent me to Congress to represent. These principles have been a top priority of mine throughout my legislative career, starting in the North Carolina State Senate.

Very simply, H.R. 373 advances these priorities by drawing upon bipartisan initiatives to expand access to information. The legislative text, itself, identifies the stated purpose of H.R. 373 as improving:

the quality of the deliberations of Congress with respect to proposed Federal mandates by providing Congress and the public with more complete information about the effects of such mandates, ensuring that Congress acts on such mandates only after focused deliberation on their effects while enhancing the ability of Congress and the public to identify Federal mandates that may impose undue harm on consumers, workers, employers, small businesses, and State, local, and tribal governments.

But it does so much more than that. The strength of the bill is that it serves to inform more fully decision-makers engaged in the policymaking process while letting affected State and local governments and those in the private sector who must put Washington dictates into practice know what's coming and better participate in the process.

Many provisions of the bill simply codify, clarify, and streamline existing practice. Others enhance the purpose of UMRA by applying its disclosure requirements to more circumstances while initiating more complete, detailed, useful, and accurate cost estimates to expose otherwise hidden costs. Yet others still protect legislative intent by closing loopholes in current law, allowing enterprising rule-makers to circumvent disclosure requirements while imposing costly mandates.

All of these provisions are harmonized in a way that provides some-

thing for everyone—which, unfortunately, is a rare legislative virtue—yet underscores the unique opportunity Members of both parties have to vote for a modest, yet effective legislative solution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentlelady that I'm going to be the last speaker, and I am prepared to close.

Ms. FOXX. That would be fine with me, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is prepared to close. I will have some more comments to make, and then I will close.

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

We could go back to the days when government was helpless against the robber barons who abused our public resources. We could go back to the days when citizens had no recourse against corporations who valued profit above individual health and safety. And we could go back to the days when unelected oligarchs drove this Nation's destiny, rather than democratically elected governments representing the interests of the American public.

Prohibiting Federal agencies from carrying out necessary and essential public protections will not create new jobs. It will not boost our economy. It will not protect the most vulnerable and disadvantaged Americans in a time of extraordinary uncertainty.

Drilling for oil everywhere and anywhere is not a solution. It won't even provide much benefit, unless you consider further enriching oil executives to be a benefit for millions of struggling Americans.

□ 1410

What Americans need is government that is willing to invest in its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to this rule to make in order an amendment which proposes that Congress will not adjourn until the President signs middle class tax cuts into law.

We have an opportunity to extend the middle class tax cuts for 98 percent of Americans who make less than \$250,000. This should not be a partisan fight; this is what we were elected to do. We should not adjourn into August recess while American families across this country are trying to make ends meet. It is imperative that Congress act on behalf of families across this Nation and bring them the certainty and security that their taxes will not go up in 6 months.

I don't know about all of my colleagues here, but I have had the misfortune of having been involved in lame duck sessions; and the one that is coming up where we are about to go off the cliff is going to be brutal for some of the newcomers in this institution who do not understand that it seems to be a methodology to wait until the last

minute before we do something. We can do it in August. We can give 98 percent of the American people certainty about their taxes and be assured that if they make less than \$250,000 their taxes will not go up in December, or that their taxes will not be leveraged so we can avoid seeping to it that the Bush tax cuts on the 2 percent of Americans that are even concerned about the little bit of money that each one of them would have to provide in order for us to ensure safety for children, education for children, safety for old people, and understanding that the middle class has this great need.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the various elements of the comprehensive reform contained in title IV of the underlying bill can be overwhelming, which is why it may be helpful to elaborate on the purpose of some of the most prominent individual provisions within the package.

In that light, it is important for the American people to understand the oppressive nature and full scope of the costs associated with complying with Federal mandates.

As a former small business owner, I experienced a myriad of costly, overly burdensome Federal mandates, and I hear from my constituents every day about the challenges that they face in dealing with them.

In my position as chairwoman of the House Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training, I have become familiar with an example of a ridiculous rule that will unnecessarily complicate student access to higher education. As we all know, in recent months, students and families have urged Congress to act to stem the ever-increasing cost of higher education. In response, the Obama administration has offered several proposals claiming to reduce student loan debt and rein in tuition. However, these initiatives only further entrench the Federal Government in the affairs of States and institutions.

In response, higher education officials are crying foul over a 2010 Department of Education rule establishing a Federal definition of a credit hour. Higher education personnel believe this regulation will restrict innovation, limit flexibility, and pave the way for additional Federal overreach into higher education. As we've seen many times before, onerous Federal regulation always come with a price, which in this case is paid by students or their families.

It's time to take a comprehensive view of the problems facing our Nation's higher education system and eliminate burdensome Federal regulations that pile unnecessary costs on institutions and students. Rather than getting the Federal Government further entrenched in higher education, we should be working together to remove costly mandates that pile unnecessary financial burdens on colleges and universities.

Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD a statement from the 2012 edition of "Ten Thousand Commandments" issued by the Competitive Enterprise Institute relative to the explosive growth of regulations by Federal agencies in the past 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to say that Republicans, contrary to what our colleagues have said across the aisle, are not opposed to all regulations and rules. We are not opposed to government. We understand that we have to have government in order to have a civil society. We understand that we have to have regulations to protect us in some cases from each other and to make sure that we have an orderly society.

We live in the greatest country in the world, Mr. Speaker; and we got here not because of the government, but we got here because of the hardworking Americans who have good values, who love this country and want to see it continue to thrive. We can count on those hardworking Americans to do the right things in almost every case. What Republicans want are commonsense regulations, and we want to stop the flood of regulations that have come particularly from this administration. And the materials that I have submitted to the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, will document the unnecessary rules and regulations that have come, particularly in this administration.

We have heard today many reasons for Congress and President Obama to pursue Federal regulatory reform as a cost-free way in which the Federal Government can promote economic growth. We have the worst deficit, the worst debt we've ever had in this country. We have an unemployment rate that is stifling economic growth. What we're proposing here today will help our economy, will help revive our economy, and will bring jobs to this country.

This legislative package, with the passage of this rule, represents a variety of ways we can move towards these ends. As Americans look to Congress for innovative solutions to spur private sector job growth, I call on my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

The 2011 Federal Register stands at 81,247 pages. That number is just shy of 2010's all-time record-high 81,405 pages. These years are the only two in which the number of Federal Register pages topped 81,000.

In 2011, agencies issued 3,807 final rules, compared with 3,573 in 2010, a 6.5-percent increase.

Proposed rules appearing in the Federal Register increased even more than the num-

ber of final rules, from 2,439 to 2,898, an 18.8-percent increase that signals a likely future rise in final rules.

Although regulatory agencies issued 3,807 final rules in 2011, Congress passed and the president signed into law a comparatively few 81 bills. Substantial lawmaking power is delegated to unelected bureaucrats at agencies.

Of the 4,128 regulations now in the pipeline, 822 affect small businesses and 212 are 'economically significant' rules wielding at least \$100 million in economic impact. That number represents a 32.5-percent jump over the 160 rules five years ago, in 2006, and a higher level than any year of the past decade except for the 224 rules in 2010.

The number of final 'major rule' reports issued by agencies and reviewed by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has grown. The 99 rules of 2010 represented the highest number since this tabulation began. Five years ago, there were 56 such reports.

The five most active rule-producing agencies—the departments of the Treasury, Commerce, the Interior, and Agriculture, along with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)—account for 1,733 rules, or 42 percent of all rules in the Unified Agenda pipeline.

The government's reach extends well beyond the taxes Washington collects and its deficit spending and borrowing. Federal environmental, safety and health, and economic regulations cost hundreds of billions—perhaps trillions—of dollars every year over and above the costs of the official federal outlays that dominate the policy debate.

Economics 101 on tax incidence explains how and why firms generally pass along to consumers the costs of some taxes. Likewise, some regulatory compliance costs that businesses face will find their way into the prices consumers pay and into wages earned.

Taxation and regulation can substitute for each other because regulation can advance government initiatives without using tax dollars. Rather than pay directly and book expenses for new programs, the government can require the private sector—as well as state and local governments—to pay for federal initiatives through compliance costs.

Because such regulatory costs are not budgeted and lack the formal public disclosure of federal spending, they may generate comparatively little public outcry. Regulation thus becomes a form of off-budget or hidden taxation.

As the mounting federal debt causes concern, the impulse to regulate instead can also mount. Deficit spending, in a manner of speaking, can manifest itself as regulatory compliance costs that go largely unacknowledged by the federal government. Worse, if regulatory compliance costs prove burdensome, Congress can escape accountability by blaming the agencies that issue the unpopular rules.

Openness about regulatory facts and figures is critical, just as disclosure of program costs is critical in the federal budget . . .

[But] Disclosure of and accountability for regulatory costs are spotty. This allows policy makers to be reckless about imposing regulatory costs relative to undertaking ordinary—but more publicly visible—government spending.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 738 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 3

It shall not be in order to consider a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment or adjournment sine die unless the

House has been notified that the President has signed a bill to extend for one year certain expired or expiring tax provisions that apply to middle-income taxpayers with income below \$250,000 for married couples filing jointly, and below \$200,000 for single filers, including, but not limited to, marginal rate reductions, capital gains and dividend rate preferences, alternative minimum tax relief, marriage penalty relief, and expanded tax relief for working families with children and college students.

(The information contained herein was provided by the Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

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 opposition, at least for the moment, 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."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will 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 Mem-

ber 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.

Ms. FOXX. 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 on the resolution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 738, and adopting House Resolution 738, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 738) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4078) to provide that no agency may take any significant regulatory action until the unemployment rate is equal to or less than 6.0 percent; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6082) to officially replace, within the 60-day Congressional review period under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, President Obama's Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program (2012-2017) with a congressional plan that will conduct additional oil and natural gas lease sales to promote offshore energy development, job creation, and increased domestic energy production to ensure a more secure energy future in the United States, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 177, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 502]

YEAS—238

Adams	Goodlatte	Nunnelee
Aderholt	Gosar	Olson
Alexander	Gowdy	Owens
Amash	Granger	Palazzo
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Paul
Austria	Graves (MO)	Paulsen
Bachmann	Griffin (AR)	Pearce
Bachus	Griffith (VA)	Pence
Barletta	Grimm	Petri
Bartlett	Guinta	Pitts
Barton (TX)	Guthrie	Platts
Bass (NH)	Hall	Poe (TX)
Benishek	Hanna	Pompeo
Berg	Harper	Posey
Biggert	Harris	Price (GA)
Bilbray	Hartzler	Quayle
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Reed
Black	Hayworth	Rehberg
Blackburn	Heck	Reichert
Bonner	Hensarling	Renacci
Bono Mack	Herger	Ribble
Boren	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Boustany	Huelskamp	Rivera
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Brooks	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Brown (GA)	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Buerkle	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Rokita
Burton (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Jones	Roskam
Campbell	Jordan	Ross (FL)
Canseco	Kelly	Royce
Cantor	King (IA)	Runyan
Capito	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Carter	Kingston	Scalise
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Schilling
Chaffetz	Kline	Schmidt
Coble	Labrador	Schock
Coffman (CO)	Lamborn	Schweikert
Cole	Lance	Scott (SC)
Conaway	Landry	Scott, Austin
Cravaack	Lankford	Sensenbrenner
Crawford	Latham	Sessions
Crenshaw	LaTourette	Shimkus
Culberson	Latta	Shuler
Davis (KY)	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Denham	LoBiondo	Simpson
Dent	Long	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Dold	Lummis	Southerland
Dreier	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Duffy	E.	Stutzman
Duncan (SC)	Mack	Sullivan
Duncan (TN)	Manzullo	Terry
Ellmers	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Emerson	Marino	Thornberry
Farenthold	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Fincher	McCaul	Tipton
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Turner (NY)
Flake	McHenry	Turner (OH)
Fleischmann	McKeon	Upton
Fleming	McKinley	Walberg
Flores	McMorris	Walden
Forbes	Rodgers	Walsh (IL)
Fortenberry	Meehan	Webster
Fox	Mica	West
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Gallely	Miller, Gary	Wilson (SC)
Gardner	Mulvaney	Wittman
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Wolf
Gerlach	Myrick	Womack
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Woodall
Gibson	Noem	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Nugent	Young (FL)
Gohmert	Nunes	Young (IN)

NAYS—177

Ackerman	Baldwin	Berkley
Altmiere	Barber	Berman
Andrews	Barrow	Bishop (GA)
Baca	Becerra	Bishop (NY)