

a gross misuse of taxpayer dollars allocated to specifically target states that have opted out of Medicaid expansion, it was not an isolated event.

For this reason, I joined my colleague from Missouri as the original cosponsor of H.R. 3308, the Taxpayer Transparency Act.

This bill does just what it says—provides transparency when spending tax dollars earned by hard working Americans.

My colleague's bill would require agencies in the executive branch to disclose any and all advertisements funded by taxpayers. This includes all mailers, brochures, tv and radio ads, emails, billboards, and posters.

Both the House and Senate are required to disclose this information in franked mailing—so why are executive branch agencies not held to the same standard of transparency? Our constituents deserve better.

To my colleagues, I urge you to pass this bill to hold the federal government accountable for waste and abuse of taxpayer money.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation.

For the last three years, House Republicans have repeatedly attacked critical public health, safety, and environmental protections.

This package of anti-regulatory bills is just another such attack on agency rulemakings—one that is falsely advertised as an effort to improve transparency.

Title one of this bill, which was reported by the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, would prevent a rule from taking effect until certain information is posted online for at least six months.

The only exception to this requirement would be for the agency to forgo a notice and comment period or for the President to issue an Executive Order.

This delay is completely unnecessary and is effectively a six-month moratorium on rules. It also could give agencies a perverse incentive to avoid a public comment period altogether if a statutory or court-ordered deadline could be missed.

Just one example of a rule that could be affected by this bill is the Food and Drug Administration's proposed rule on electronic prescribing information, which would ensure that doctors have the most current safety information on prescription drugs.

Under this bill, this drug safety rule could not be finalized until OMB posts information about the rule on its web site for six months.

FDA, like other agencies, already details the status of its rulemakings on its website, and extensive information about proposed rules is also available on the website Regulations.gov.

Yet under this bill, if OMB failed to post a required piece of information, FDA could not finalize the rule unless the President stepped in and issued an Executive Order. It should not be that hard for doctors to have the most up-to-date safety information about prescription drugs.

That is just title one of this Frankenstein bill. The other three titles of this bill are even worse. One title would add 60 additional requirements to the rulemaking process.

We should be making the regulatory process more efficient and effective. Adding 60 new requirements will do exactly the opposite and make it needlessly complex.

Madam Chairman, this is a package of bad bills that would do nothing to improve our rule-making process. I urge every Member to oppose it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3308, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3865, STOP TARGETING OF POLITICAL BELIEFS BY THE IRS ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2804, ALL ECONOMIC REGULATIONS ARE TRANSPARENT ACT OF 2014; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 487 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 487

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3865) to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from modifying the standard for determining whether an organization is operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare for purposes of section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill 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 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 Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after 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. 2804) to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to publish information about rules on the Internet, 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 amendments specified in this section 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. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform 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 113-38. 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 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.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of February 27, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the bill (H.R. 3370) to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend 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. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their comments.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1245

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, you have heard me say it before, it makes me so happy to be a member of the Rules Committee because our entire resolution gets read down here. The entire Rules resolution gets read, and by golly, Mr. Speaker, if you are not proud of what you are doing in your committee, you better not sign up for a committee where every word of the work that you do gets read each and every time, but I am proud of the work we are doing in the Rules Committee.

The rule that we have on the floor today, Mr. Speaker, is going to make two bills in order. Both, I would argue, are incredibly important for providing

not just transparency to what goes on here in Washington but also to ensure that the people's voice continues to be heard in Washington.

House Resolution 487, this rule, is a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 3865. That is the Stop Targeting of Political Beliefs by the IRS Act, Mr. Speaker. That is in response to what now every American understands to be the 501(c)(4) scandal, for lack of a better word; that for the first time in my lifetime, there are allegations that the IRS is targeting folks on the basis of their political beliefs for whether or not they are able to have their organization certified as a tax-exempt organization. That is not just a concern of groups on one side of the aisle or the other, Mr. Speaker, that is a concern of folks across the spectrum, and I would argue it is a concern for all Americans who believe that having their voice heard is important.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 2804, the All Economic Regulations are Transparent Act.

Mr. Speaker, in that structured rule, we made in order 11 amendments. We had two Members come by and testify on behalf of their amendments last night in the Rules Committee. We made both of those amendments in order. In addition, we made four Republican amendments and five other Democratic amendments in order; so for a total of 11 amendments, four Republican amendments and seven Democratic amendments were made in order on that underlying bill. As is customary, it provides the minority with a motion to recommit on both bills.

Mr. Speaker, I sit on the Government Reform Committee. We just had a Government Reform Committee bill pass here on the floor of the House, and we have another one here today. It aims for transparency. There is just no question in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that we have replaced taxation in this country with regulation. Rarely does someone come down and say, "I want to tax an industry." What they will come down and say is, "I want to regulate an industry." In fact, in my great State of Georgia, Mr. Speaker, we are regulating jobs right out of existence. We don't have to tax them out of existence. We don't have to outlaw an industry. We just regulate it out of existence.

Perhaps there are some industries that need to be regulated out of existence, and we should have that full and open debate on the floor of the House, but what is absolutely certain is that the American people need to be able to understand the power of the regulatory process, and the impact that it has on jobs and economic development in their community.

Today in statute, Mr. Speaker, there is a requirement that the administration twice a year publish a notice of all of those regulations that are being considered and what their impact is anticipated to be, but we have had instances,

as recently as 2012, Mr. Speaker, where the administration just ignored that statute altogether. Now understand, the requirement is that you must inform the American people twice a year, just twice a year, about the regulations that are coming through the pipeline that will impact them, their families, and their businesses, and yet, that has been ignored. There has been no ability for folks to understand the magnitude of those regulations.

So we came back in this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, and said, listen, not only should you be doing that, you should probably be doing it once a month. If you have seen the Federal Register, Mr. Speaker, it is thick. It comes out every day of the week. It captures all of the new rules and regulations that are coming out. They are coming out like water out of a spigot. They are tough to keep track of. So this bill says let's do it not twice a year, let's do it once a month. Let's make sure that the American people understand in a volume that they can see and read once a month what those new rules and regulations are, and, if an agency chooses to ignore that requirement, that proposed rule and regulation will not go into effect such that the American people will get six months of notice about what it is that is going on.

I will give a good example, Mr. Speaker. It goes to the second bill we are considering, the Stop Political Targeting bill that is on the floor here today. There is a public comment period that is on right now. I don't know if most folks in America know that. I know everybody understands the IRS targeting scandal. I don't know if they know that the administration is involved in a rulemaking right now. The investigation is still ongoing into the IRS. The extent of the abuse is not yet understood at the IRS. The committees are continuing to work through that process, as the law requires, and yet the administration has released a rule that says we think we know how to fix this, even though the investigation is not done yet; this is what we want to do, and the public comment period ends tomorrow. The public comment period ends tomorrow.

Now, folks can go to www.regulations.gov. They can still go and file their comment if they believe that the people's voice being heard is important, but think about that, Mr. Speaker. A scandal that everyone in America understands, a scandal that I believe is offensive to absolutely everyone in America because it doesn't matter which party you are in, you shouldn't target folks who disagree with you; we should absolutely have an full and open debate and let the best ideas win. Yet the administration has proposed a solution to a problem that is not yet fully understood, and the opportunity for the American people to comment on it ends tomorrow. I don't think folks know that back home, Mr. Speaker.

This transparency bill we have on the floor today intends to address that, not just for this regulation, but for all future regulations, and the Stop Political Targeting bill that we have on the floor today says this and this alone: it says since we don't fully understand what is going on, and since we know with certainty that the IRS has breached the public's trust, not the entire IRS but just this one scandal here in the 501(c)(4) operations, since we know with certainty that the public's trust has been diminished, let's not have the administration, in the absence of a full understanding by the Congress, the absence of full comment by the American people, let's not have the administration completely re-regulate that area. Rather, let's put this off, not forever, Mr. Speaker, because we all agree that work needs to be done, but for 1 year and 1 year only so that the Congress can have a full understanding and the American people can have a full accounting of what it was that led to citizens' voices being silenced by the Internal Revenue Service in their applications for 501(c)(4) status.

Those are the two bills we have on the floor today, Mr. Speaker. Again, all of the germane amendments that were offered, and candidly, there were no germane amendments that were offered to the Stop Political Targeting Act, so that is a closed rule with just the one motion to recommit, and 11 amendments made in order for the government transparency bill on the floor today, only four Republican amendments, seven Democratic amendments, so we can have a full and open debate. I am very proud of this rule, Mr. Speaker.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am forced to rise again in opposition to the rule and the two underlying bills that are counterproductive and aren't dealing with the issues that our constituents sent us here to address. Each of these bills was brought under a restrictive process, one of them a completely closed rule that blocked all efforts from both sides of the aisle to improve the legislation.

Let's talk about the IRS bill first.

The IRS bill has a title that I think would engender broad bipartisan support. If we want to run a bill that prevents the IRS from discriminating against organizations based on their political affiliations, whether they are progressive or tea party or anywhere in between, I think there would be a way to come together in support, hopefully near unanimous support, around such a bill.

Like many Americans, I was outraged that organizations had been singled out based on the name of their organization for additional scrutiny.

That is simply not the right criteria that the IRS should be using. I hope they got the message over at the IRS loud and clear, and I hope we can move to fully implement the recommendations of the inspector general to ensure that this never happens again.

However, this bill actually undoes one of the very recommendations of the inspector general from the inspector general's own report. There is even a Republican bill in the Ways and Means Committee by PETE ROSKAM that would require the IRS Commissioner to implement all of the recommendations of the inspector general, including these very regulations that this other Republican bill is seeking to prevent the implementation of. So make up our minds here, folks.

If we want to move together to prevent the IRS from discriminating against any organization because of their political affiliation, let's do so, whether it is something binding, implementing in statute the recommendations of the inspector general, whether it is a sense of Congress, I stand ready to work with my colleague from Georgia and others to speak with a strong voice that that kind of discrimination has no role in the IRS. However, that is entirely separate from what this bill does, which guts one of the very inspector general recommendations that was designed to remedy this problem going forward.

As for the other bill, the ALERRT Act, it would slow down the regulatory process and increase red tape for agencies. It has been estimated that this bill increases reporting requirements for agencies by six times. This is a Republican bureaucrat welfare bill. How many more government bureaucrats are you going to have to hire to deal with six times more paperwork that is going to come from this bill?

You know, when I talk to my constituents in Colorado about what do we need to do, they don't say, "You need to go to Washington and help bury government workers in more paperwork. I want more red tape."

Yet, that is the bill we have here today, a Republican bill that would bury the Federal Government under six times as much reporting requirements for agencies. That is not what the American people want. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and this bill.

Look, there are some issues that we could be working on here today, Mr. Speaker. Let me talk about a few of those. These are the kinds of issues that I believe if my party had the opportunity to bring bills to the floor of this Chamber, we would be bringing those bills to the floor of this Chamber. One of those is immigration reform. Rather than spending time debating bills that are counterproductive and aren't going anywhere, let's consider legislation that would replace our broken immigration system with one that works.

The Senate, Mr. Speaker, was able to come together, 68 Members, Demo-

cratic and Republican, around a commonsense solution, securing our border, ensuring that people who are here illegally get in line behind those who are here legally, implementing mandatory workplace authentication of workers, making sure the future flow of workers is in line with the needs of our economy and America can continue to compete in the 21st century. We have a nearly identical bill in the House, H.R. 15, a bipartisan bill. I think if we brought it forward under a rule, it would pass. Let's bring that bill forward, Mr. Speaker.

Nearly a year ago, the New Democratic Coalition Immigration Task Force, which I cochair, released detailed principles on comprehensive immigration reform. I applaud the Republican principles that were issued on immigration reform. There is a lot that we have in common. I believe that we can work together to pass a bill to create American jobs, ensure that we are more competitive in the global economy, reduce the deficit by hundreds of billions of dollars, and that reflects our values as Americans and reflects our values as people of faith.

Yet, the House majority has found time to shepherd dozens of bills through the Judiciary Committee to the floor of the House, including one that we are considering today, but the House hasn't dedicated a single moment of floor time to an immigration reform bill. We haven't even tried, Mr. Speaker. We haven't had a 3-hour debate, we haven't had a 1-hour debate, we haven't had a 1-minute debate on any immigration reform bill here on the floor of the House of Representatives. You don't get to "yes" without scheduling the time and the space for Democrats and Republicans of good faith to work together to solve a problem that the American people want and demand a solution for.

Across the country, business leaders, faith leaders, national and local editorial boards, and the law enforcement community are calling for real leadership on advancing immigration reform now. In fact, just yesterday, the Chamber of Commerce sent a letter to Speaker BOEHNER from more than 600 businesses urging Congress to pass immigration reform. The Chamber president, Tom Donohue, posted a blog post emphasizing the need to have a modernized E-Verify system, provisions that are included in H.R. 15.

Last week, a Wall Street Journal op-ed criticized the Republicans' failure to act on commonsense reform. Citing a recent study from the American Farm Bureau about the cost of failing to act, The Wall Street Journal wrote:

Republicans have killed immigration reform for now, but the Farm Bureau study shows that in the real economy it is still needed. The irony is that many Republicans who support handouts to farmers oppose reforms that wouldn't cost taxpayers a dime and would help the economy.

So instead of passing a bill that reduces the deficit, secures our borders,

and makes the reforms we need, Republicans say let's bury the government in red tape, increasing the paperwork for agencies by six times, and let's give government handouts to farmers. Those are the Republican policies that we are seeing in this Congress, and it is why the American people hold this institution in great disapproval. The longer we delay in passing comprehensive immigration reform, the greater the cost of inaction becomes.

□ 1300

According to the Congressional Budget Office's nonpartisan analysis, passing immigration reform would increase our gross domestic product by 3.3 percent, raise wages by \$470 billion for American citizens, and create an average of 121,000 jobs for Americans each year over the next decade.

So, rather than create jobs for Federal bureaucrats having to deal with six times as much paperwork, let's create jobs in the private sector, Mr. Speaker. Let's pass immigration reform to ensure that American companies can compete in the increasingly complex global marketplace.

If we have the ability, Mr. Speaker, to bring a bill forward to the floor, another bill we would bring forward is increasing the minimum wage to \$10.10. Just before coming up here today to manage this rule, Mr. Speaker, I signed a discharge petition to bring that bill to the floor, a bill that I proudly cosponsor, a bill authored by my colleague, Mr. MILLER of California.

Raising the minimum wage would help restore fairness for working men and women across the country. It would lift millions of Americans out of poverty. It would fuel demand and economic growth.

A letter from over 600 economists, including seven Nobel Prize winners, said:

At a time when persistent high unemployment is putting enormous downward pressure on wages, such a minimum wage increase will provide a much-needed boost.

It is no panacea, but if we are looking at helping Americans earn enough so that they don't have to be part of the social safety net or government welfare programs, we need to make sure that they can do that in the private sector because—you know what?—at current minimum wage levels, a family working full-time, 40 hours a week, earns about \$14,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, you try living on \$14,000 a year. I couldn't do it. I don't think you could do it, Mr. Speaker.

Guess what? That is why we have a social safety net that helps Americans and supplements their income. Whether it is Medicaid, whether it is food stamps, Americans earning \$14,000 a year don't live a great life, but they get a little help from us, and that is the right thing to do; it reflects our values.

Do you know what? If we can help them earn a little bit more, they will require less help from other taxpayers

in paying their rent, paying their bills, putting groceries on their table.

So we can be fiscally responsible in reducing the need for social safety net programs if we can help lift up more Americans out of poverty. One substantial step towards doing that will be to increase the minimum wage to \$10.10.

Another issue that we would love to bring forward, Mr. Speaker, would be renewing unemployment insurance. Again, when unemployment insurance ran out with employment at high levels, it sucked money out of the economy, money that could otherwise go to create jobs and private sector growth.

In the past and in prior recessions and in prior times when we had this level of unemployment, this has always been a bipartisan issue. There has always been responsible governing majorities of Republicans and Democrats, in this Chamber and the other Chamber, that have put together extensions for unemployment insurance.

And yet, once again, it has run out, and we seek to bring a simple bill to the floor that ensures that we don't endanger our recovery by sucking money out of the economy in our time of need.

I will go on and on, Mr. Speaker, about bills we could be considering, but sadly, the truth is—and the American people see this—we are not considering those bills here today. We are considering a bill that adds six times as much paperwork to already overworked Federal workers, and we are considering a bill that guts one of the recommendations of the inspector general that was designed to help prevent the IRS from discriminating based on political affiliation and ensure that we have sufficient transparency, consistent with our Tax Code around entities in the political arena.

We can do better, Mr. Speaker. I encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to do better. I am confident that, if they are not able to do better, Mr. Speaker, the American people will give my side of the aisle a chance to do better. Either way, Mr. Speaker, immigration reform doesn't solve itself. It takes the United States Congress to solve it.

While the President can move forward with his executive powers, as he has with the deferred action program, the only comprehensive solution can come from the United States Congress.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work in good faith towards addressing the flaws in our immigration system and replacing chaos with the rule of law, increasing our competitiveness, reducing our deficits, securing our borders, making America safer, and creating jobs for Americans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a freshman Member, a young Member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, in support of this legislation.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the time.

One of the things that comes when we have these debates, and we have a lot of issues that come before the floor, we speak in terms of—and my good friend from Georgia, we talked about this before—we talk in terms of bill numbers; we talk in terms of rules, the good gentleman from across the aisle from Colorado often speaks of; and we all talk in the terms that we understand.

But many times, when you look at bills and you look at the things that are coming before the floor, it is a good idea to start painting the picture of those that are impacted by it. Mr. Speaker, when we begin to do that and when we begin to look at the bills on the floor today, I want to tell you a story.

The story involves Mr. Puckett. He owns a small business that has been creating jobs for over 100 years, a family-owned brick company. Mr. Puckett attributes the success of his business to their hard work and loyal employees.

Unfortunately, when I met Mr. Puckett, the conversation was not so optimistic. He testified before the Judiciary Committee on the first bill I introduced, H.R. 1493, which is now title IV of this legislation, because his company had just lost 50 jobs as a result of two regulations crafted behind closed doors.

In a Nation of over 300 million, 50 jobs may not seem like much, but in Mr. Puckett's town, that is the difference between 50 families having food on the table or going hungry; or for small towns, like I have in northeast Georgia, it means the difference in staying in their beloved part of the State or moving somewhere else to find a job.

Every State, every congressional district, has their Mr. Pucketts. No business has been untouched by the toll of costly and overburdensome regulations. That is why I rise today in strong support of this rule and the underlying legislative package.

Now, a lot will be said and has been said about this, in saying that we need to do other things, we need to go on to this project. I just heard from my friend from across the aisle. As I have done before from here, I will simply remind him, in that nirvana state of just a few years ago, when they had the choice to do whatever they wanted to do, they chose to leave immigration on the table while they fixed other things which we are fixing today.

But today, we are going to talk about the Mr. Pucketts of the world and the business owners, but not just the business owners, the folks who work for them, the folks that so many times are missed by what we are trying to do.

By reforming our Nation's regulatory system, we jump-start the engine of our economy. When our economy gets up and going, our families flourish.

A lot can be said about this whole package. There are other speakers who will speak later today about the dif-

ferent titles. I am speaking specifically to title IV, which is commonly known as "sue and settle."

I have talked to Members of both Democrats and Republicans who go home and have townhall meetings. One of the things that happens all the time is you begin to talk about regulation in bills and what does this do. I see this sense of many who are in the audience. All of a sudden, their eyes just glaze over, and they say: Here it comes, Washington speak; we don't get it.

Well, I am just a country boy from northeast Georgia, and I just want to put it in simple terms. This makes it very simple to understand the sue-and-settle legislation.

Two people have a problem. They don't get along. Something is not right. In one group, they have maybe a business or a group that have a disagreement on something going on, and they can't seem to find their solution, so the one actually says: Whoa, I see something here. There is a regulation that I can sue on. This is a government agency that I can go sue. So we have a third party in play.

So what we do is we take two people who have an issue—and I will just use "people" as the term here—and we have their outlet as saying: I will sue a third party—being the Federal Government—and while I am suing, I will work out a deal with the bureaucrats in this agency and go to a judge and get a consent order; and then, by the way, then that consent order is binding on the other person.

I grew up in a family with a brother. I have often kidded that I thought he was adopted, but he is not. He is actually my brother. It is like any other sibling rivalry, but when we would have a disagreement, it is sort of like him going to Mom and Mom only believing him, only hearing his side of the story, and then punishing me—which, by the way, for anybody watching today, that happened quite regularly.

I have spoken many times to my mom and dad about that. But is that fair? No, it is not fair. Both sides need to be heard. You need to have the opportunity. That is what sue-and-settle legislation does.

You can hear a lot, and I am sure there will be many folks who will come to the floor today and tonight saying: No, that is not what it does; you are gumming up the works. And I will get to that in a minute.

But when we understand what these do—the abusive use of consent and decree and settlements to coerce agency action is often referred to, as I have said, to sue and settle—it is the reason Mr. Puckett was losing these jobs. He did not have the input because of one of these decrees.

Agencies are failing to uphold their statutory rulemaking discretion and are allowing lawsuits from outside the groups to determine their priorities and duties. Between 2009 and 2012, the majority of these sue-and-settle actions occurred in the environmental

realm, Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act, and Endangered Species Act.

Again, when you come forward trying to make regulatory rules, we have, like we had testified into Rules Committee last night, that anybody threatening to say something about the regulatory action is wanting dirty water, dirty air, and baby cribs that fall apart, that is just a mischaracterization and not worthy of debate to the American people.

There is no one on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, that wants to breathe dirty air; there is no one on this side of the aisle that wants dirty drinking water; and there is no one on this side of the aisle that wants malfunctioning parts that hurt people. That is not worthy of this debate.

This is simply saying that we are having an issue of fairness. Our President talks fairness. He discusses transparency. We are calling on him to say: We agree with you, Mr. President, on this issue. Let's have transparency. Let's have fairness here.

But, when someone enters an out-of-sight backroom deal with unelected employees—bureaucrats—to establish when the EPA will meet its past-due responsibilities, it is effectively deciding how EPA will use its limited resources and, thus, creating policy priorities for the Agency.

If the EPA needs assistance in prioritizing its many regulatory responsibilities, I recommend they consult the States who must implement these regulations and the communities that will be impacted by them.

Unlike what some claim, H.R. 1493 does nothing to hinder the rights of citizens to bring suit against their government. Again, another "let's throw up something against the wall to see if it sticks." This does nothing. They can still bring the suits. We are just simply asking for transparency.

Instead of buying into the mantra of special interest groups that benefit from these sweetheart deals, let's look at what it actually does. As I described before in basic terms, it allows fairness; it allows transparency; and it allows those with constitutional standing to be part of a suit so that they can have input into something that will affect them. I believe everyone can agree to that.

If you are being affected, you ought to—and especially when it comes to the United States Government—we ought to be able to tell what this bill and what these rules and regulations do to us.

This is good governance. Why should we let just a certain area and a certain group—Mr. Speaker, you know of this as well. There are areas in which they get into disagreements and only their views are put forward. Sue and settle works to eliminate that.

And then, also, the bill actually requires agencies to publish notice of a proposed decree or settlement in the Federal Register and take and respond to public comments at least 60 days

prior to filing the decree or the settlement. Again, it is simply improving public participation.

This is what we are about here. This is what this bill does. This bill takes a measured and reasonable approach to the sue-and-settle problem. It ensures that settlements are conducted out in the open and impacted stakeholders can have a seat at the table.

That is good governance. That is putting transparency out there. That is doing the things that we are supposed to do here.

I also have to respond to my friend from Colorado. We have great debates down here. I enjoy listening to your perspective and coming down, Mr. Speaker, and having this kind of conversation; but I was amazed because I believe, today, the American people—there are many times I have very frustrated people in the Ninth District of Georgia who say: Both your Houses, Republican, Democrats, you are the same. I am tired of it all.

Well, today is one of those days, in this discussion right here, that you can honestly say: Here is the difference in governing philosophy. And it came out just a minute ago.

I am here with a bill and other parts of this bill today that are actually looking for transparency, openness, and willing to get regulations that are effective in a limited form of government which our Founders thought of, so that businesses can still be businesses, employees can still have jobs, moms and dads can still have paychecks and take care of the kids at home and take care of their families.

□ 1315

What I heard just a few minutes ago was the concern about the burden on the Federal Government. We are more concerned that this may cause extra work. Frankly, from my perspective, I believe this legislation can help because we can trim the size of the Federal Government and give roles and responsibilities where they need to be with States and others, and when we do so, that gives us the proper respect.

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

Mr. WOODALL. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I think what we see here is a concern for the Federal Government. Our government employees are great folks—they do good work—but I am more concerned with the American business owner. More importantly, I am concerned with the workers who will lose their jobs, have lost their jobs, or who have had to change jobs.

This is the difference right now, Mr. Speaker. If you want to see governance philosophy that is different, I am concerned that government should do what it is supposed to do and that the burden they are putting on themselves should be removed. My concern is the business owner and the worker. My concern is Mr. Puckett. My concern

even more is for the 50 folks who don't have jobs because the government, through regulatory backroom deals, has cut out their livelihoods.

Who do they see for that, Mr. Speaker? Who do they go and complain to? What government agency takes their phone calls when their government has, in essence, helped put them out of jobs?

No one on this side wants anything except an economy that is flourishing and people who are working and jobs that are secure. It is about the everyday man and woman who gets up and goes to work, but their business owners are having to tell them "not today." We are being inundated with rules and regulations. I will stand with the American worker every day. I will acknowledge the role of our government in its limited form, but don't ever mistake there is a separate philosophy here, one that encourages Big Government and one that says, "I am for the workers who get up every morning and go to work to take care of their families."

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, before further yielding, I want to address some of the comments, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, this bill creates a backdoor increase in the Federal bureaucracy. When you are talking about increasing reporting requirements by six times and adding 60 additional procedural and analytical requirements to the rulemaking process, you know that this bill must contemplate increasing the size of the Federal bureaucracy to deal with these increased requirements.

As an entrepreneur who started a number of small businesses, I know the importance of having certainty and predictability in the regulatory process. The additional bureaucracy instituted by this ALERRT Act will simply not help businesses thrive and grow. This legislation would create headaches for businesses at a time when many small businesses are already struggling to recover from the recession.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 1010, which is legislation to raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour, in order to restore fairness for men and women across our country.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition on the motion to move the previous question so that this body may consider H.R. 1010, the Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2013.

This crucial piece of legislation will positively impact the lives of nearly 30 million American workers and their families by gradually raising the Federal minimum wage from its current

\$7.25 an hour to \$10.10 an hour by 2016. Beyond 2016, the bill ties the Federal minimum wage to annual inflation, ensuring that hardworking men and women will never again see their wages stagnate due to congressional obstruction or inaction.

Let's first discuss who benefits from this legislation. I am sure that many watching at home and some in this very room may have a skewed perception of the contemporary minimum wage worker. I will try my best to clear up a few of these fallacies so that this debate can be framed by fact and not by stereotype.

The average age of the minimum wage worker is 35 years old: 54 percent of them are full-time workers, and 55 percent of them are women. The average affected worker earns half of his or her family's total income, and more than one-fourth of the minimum wage workers have children. Of the Nation's, roughly, 75 million children, nearly one-fifth of them have at least one parent who would receive a raise if the minimum wage were increased to \$10.10 an hour. An employee working 40 hours per week for the entire 52-week calendar—no time off—at the Federal minimum wage will earn just \$15,080 in 2014.

Now, who can live on \$15,000 a year? I just heard the gentleman from Georgia speak passionately about his concern for the American worker. I would ask that gentleman and others who are concerned about the American worker: Are you concerned about all of the American workers, or are you just concerned with those who earn at higher brackets than \$15,080 a year? A worker who works full time and is still below the Federal poverty level will qualify for Medicaid, for CHIP, for SNAP, and for other public assistance programs that will cost taxpayers approximately \$7 billion this year alone.

Let's raise the minimum wage, and let's lift people out of poverty without spending a dime of additional Federal money. Let's save on those programs that the Federal Government has put in place to help those maintain a standard of living who need a helping hand.

A recent poll conducted by Quinnipiac University found that 71 percent of American workers support raising the minimum wage. That same poll found that Democrats, Republicans and Independents are all in agreement that raising the minimum wage is the right thing to do.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I refer back to the words of Speaker BOEHNER in his first speech to this Chamber upon being sworn in as Speaker on January 5, 2011.

He said:

This is the people's House. This is their Congress—it is not about us; it is about

them—and what they want is a government that is honest, accountable, and responsive to their needs.

Seventy-one percent of the American people are asking us to do this. If the Speaker's words mean more than just words on a page, I would urge him to bring this bill to the floor so that we can respond to the 71 percent of the American people who think that raising the minimum wage is good economic policy and that it is good personnel policy.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleague from Colorado if he has any speakers remaining.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we do. We have at least one speaker who is here and ready to go.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, the people whom I represent at home in Brooklyn and in Queens have been hit hard by the devastation of Superstorm Sandy, and many of these working families are still struggling to recover from this vicious storm. Homes were destroyed. Businesses were ruined. Lives have been turned upside down.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we need to deal with the issue that has been brought before the people who have suffered from this storm and who now face significant flood insurance rate increases as a result of the Biggert-Waters law passed in 2012. The people who were victimized by Superstorm Sandy are now facing the prospect of significant flood insurance premium rate increases that are heading directly at them like an out-of-control freight train, and this House should be stepping in to stop that freight train dead in its tracks. That is why I support the reform of the Biggert-Waters law. We should suspend the flood insurance increases that are heading towards these Superstorm Sandy victims. We should allow for FEMA to conduct an affordability study. We should give Congress the opportunity to get this issue correct.

The failure of this House to act on flood insurance reform is yet another example of the delay and the dysfunction in dealing with the real issues that confront the American people, and our inability to move forward as previously planned is just yet another time when a manmade disaster from this House is being imposed on the American people.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes to say, if you care about any of these issues that have been brought up today—and these are not issues that are involved in the rule, and these are not issues that are coming to the floor today—then you care about whether or not the American people are able to make their voices heard, because I am absolutely certain,

as I have learned in my 3 years of having a voting card, Mr. Speaker, that the American voters still run this show. Now, the voters have a tough time having their voices heard, but if they can have their voices heard, they can make a difference.

We are talking about issues that we wish we could change, Mr. Speaker. Today on the floor, we have an issue that we can change. The administration is proposing regulations that will silence voices on these very issues that my colleagues are raising.

Let me read from Cathy Duvall, the Sierra Club's director of public advocacy and partnerships, who says this about the proposed regulations from the Obama administration's Treasury Department:

The proposal harms efforts that have nothing to do with politics—from our ability to communicate with our members about clean air and water to our efforts to educate the public about toxic pollution.

Mr. Speaker, if you believe in this process as I do, if you believe in this Nation as I do, then you believe that it is paramount that the people's voices are able to be heard. That is the issue here today. If you believe that the priorities of this House should be changed, if you believe the priorities of this Nation should be changed, if you believe anything in this Nation should be changed, you must believe that we should preserve the power of the individual's voice.

That is why this rule moratorium is here today, Mr. Speaker. That is why the investigations must go on. That is why we must reject the administration's rush to judgment here and ensure that our priority continues to be that of the board of directors of this country—the American voters.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule because it needs an amendment. I rise today in order to ask, when the motion on the previous question to end the debate is brought up, that we vote “no” so that at that point an amendment can be introduced.

If that possibility is available, I would like to bring up the provisions of H.R. 1010, which will provide a long overdue increase in the minimum wage. The bills that we are considering today are just distractions from the issues that are most important. We need to be addressing the problems that people are having.

Mr. Speaker, today's families are struggling to pay for basic needs, such as housing, health care, groceries, transportation. Someone working full time at a minimum wage job today only earns about \$14,000 a year. At that Federal minimum wage today of \$7.25, a parent working full time, year round, doesn't earn enough to get above the poverty level. When I say a “parent,”

that is because studies have been done and have shown that the average minimum wage worker is 35 years old;

Raising the minimum wage not only increases workers' income and reduces turnover, it stimulates the economy. That is because people earning the minimum wage are spending every dime that they get, thus helping the economy. We have heard fears about possible job losses, but the effect of an increased minimum wage on jobs has been studied for decades, and these studies have proven that no job loss can be expected with a modest increase in the minimum wage.

We have a clear choice. We can choose to require a fair, living wage so that people can afford food and housing for their families, or we as taxpayers can be left picking up the tab through increased public assistance when they cannot pay their bills, and we can be left with a stagnant economy that is not as improved as it would be with an increased minimum wage.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" when the previous question is moved. I also encourage them to support legislation to increase the minimum wage so that we can improve the quality of life for millions of Americans and improve the economy in the process.

□ 1330

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I say to my friend from Virginia I think he is absolutely speaking from the heart when it comes to sharing the voice of his constituents in Virginia. My constituents take a slightly different view. They look to the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office that said, yes, you can raise the minimum wage. You called it a modest raise. I think they called it a more than 40 percent increase in the minimum wage. But you can raise the minimum wage, as some are proposing, and that is going to lift 900,000 families above the poverty line and that is going to destroy 500,000 jobs.

I don't fault my colleagues at all for being concerned about those 900,000 individuals that are going to be lifted above the poverty line. I think we all want folks lifted above the poverty line. I don't want folks working a lifetime for minimum wage.

I want people working their way up the ladder. It is a ladder of opportunity that we ought to be building in this House. But to dismiss those 500,000 individuals that the Congressional Budget Office said will lose their jobs altogether are not partisan fights we have, Mr. Speaker. These are heartfelt discussions that we have about how best to serve the American people to whom we have sworn an oath to the Constitution that rules this land.

These are very difficult issues, but they are made better each and every time, I am certain, Mr. Speaker, if we preserve the power of the American people to have their voice heard in this debate. That is what is so important

about this rule and why we must pass this rule today—to bring to the floor the Stop Targeting of Political Beliefs by the IRS Act—so that Americans' voices are not just silenced on the basis of their content, but not silenced period.

It is abhorrent that we would silence voices on the basis of their content, but I would argue, Mr. Speaker, it is abhorrent if we have an opportunity to stop voices from being silenced at all.

I believe this House will take that step today, and that is why I am proud to be here representing this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I would inquire if the gentleman from Georgia has remaining speakers.

Mr. WOODALL. I do not have any remaining speakers.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, these underlying bills are destined, if they pass this Chamber, like so many bills, for the Senate's bill graveyard. Why? Because they are counterproductive. They are not what the American people want. They don't do what they say.

If we had a bill that fully implemented the recommendations to prevent any kind of discrimination based on political affiliation at the IRS, we could pass that bill. That would be an important step forward in ensuring that the terrible embarrassment and pie on your face that the IRS had, the loss of confidence that it engendered among the American people, will not happen again.

That is a good issue to work on, but that is not what we have. Instead, we have a bill that actually guts one of the very recommendations of the inspector general designed to prevent this from happening again—the exact opposite of the title of the bill.

We also have a bill before us that creates more red tape in the Federal Government and regulatory agencies. I don't think the American people are calling out for more red tape. I don't think small businesses want regulators, whose approval they need, to be so buried with six times as many reports and 60 times more analytical requirements that they won't even be able to give routine approval for various things that small businesses and entrepreneurs need. It is a counterproductive step.

So instead of addressing the issues that the American people want us to act on, from immigration reform to raising the minimum wage to extending unemployment insurance, we are debating counterproductive, single-Chamber bills that will die in the Senate and would be harmful to the country if passed.

My colleagues Mr. SCOTT and Mr. BISHOP gave eloquent testimony for the importance of raising the minimum wage. I certainly agree with my colleague from Georgia that it is not a panacea. Would that there were a silver bullet to lift people out of poverty, it would have 435 votes.

I do believe that the American people agree that when you work full time, you shouldn't need a government hand-out. You should be able to support your family at a very basic level. You shouldn't have to live in poverty if you are working 40, 50, 60 hours a week at a backbreaking job. Raising the minimum wage to \$10.10 will help accomplish that.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 1010, legislation to raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour, to restore fairness for working men and women across the country.

Someone working full-time, year-round at minimum wage earns just over \$14,000. That is nearly \$4,000 below the poverty line. It means that other Americans will need to subsidize that person through government support, welfare, or food stamps. Because, guess what. That \$14,000 isn't enough to provide for a family, have a shot at the American Dream, or even to put a roof over your head and food on the table.

By raising the minimum wage to \$10.10, we can help Americans become self-sufficient to support themselves and their families with pride and have a job that gives them pride to put food on their table and a roof over their head without the need for government support.

Increasing the minimum wage to \$10.10 is simply a return to the level of the minimum wage in the 1960s. It would allow millions of additional American workers to support their families.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous materials, 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, as my colleague from Georgia said, this rule does not contain immigration reform and minimum wage, but I think it is important for the American people to know what it could contain, what it should contain with this Chamber under Republican leadership, what it would contain if this Chamber were under Democratic leadership.

The agriculture community, the faith-based community, the business community, the law enforcement community, and the fiscal responsibility community all speak with one voice on immigration reform. What we are doing now doesn't work.

There are over 10 million people here illegally. Companies violate the law every day. There is over close to 2 million deportations, each at cost to the taxpayers of \$10,000 to \$20,000.

It is time to replace our broken immigration system with the rule of law, reduce our deficit by hundreds of billions of dollars, create over 100,000 jobs

for Americans, finally secure our borders, and ensure that nobody works illegally in this country, potentially undermining wages for American workers. That is what we can accomplish. We recognize it would be a bipartisan solution.

H.R. 15, the Senate-passed bill, doesn't have everything that Democrats want in it; it doesn't have everything that Republicans want in it; but it would be good for our country. It would be great for our country and for the American people.

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.

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

Mr. Speaker, you have heard a lot of heartfelt sentiments from my friends here on the floor of the House today. Unfortunately, what you haven't heard is what we are going to do together to ensure that the heartfelt sentiments of every single citizen of these United States can be heard here in Washington.

I fear my friend from Colorado is right. I don't say that lightly. He has a lot of good ideas, and I hope to collaborate with him on even more. I fear he is right that this is a single-Chamber solution. I fear that only the United States House of Representatives is concerned with protecting the voice of the people—not just people who agree with me, Mr. Speaker, but people from all stripes.

I have read from the Sierra Club earlier. Let me read from the ACLU's comments to the administration on this rule. This is what they say: "Social welfare organizations praise or criticize candidates for public office on the issues and they should be able to do so freely, without fear of losing or being denied tax-exempt status."

That is "the heart of our representative democracy," the ACLU says.

"The proposed rule"—that is the administration's rule; that is the rule we are here today to stop—"threatens to discourage or sterilize an enormous amount of political discourse in America."

Mr. Speaker, I have a chart here today. It lists what tax-exempt organizations are able to do. A 501(c) is that section of the Tax Code that deals with tax-exempt organizations.

You have 501(c)(3)'s that are able to do get-out-the-vote work, voter registration work, and candidate forums. 501(c)(4)'s are where the administration is regulating, and that is the source of the scandal: the targeting of American citizens based on their political beliefs. And 501(c)(5)'s are the labor unions in the country.

Mr. Speaker, what folks need to understand is that, as we sit here today, all of these groups can do get-out-the-vote work. All can do voter registration work and candidate forums. Why? Because it advances our Republic. It advances the cause of freedom and discourse in America.

But this, Mr. Speaker, is what the administration is proposing. For 501(c)(5)'s, or labor unions, it is proposing they continue doing all of that material. Also, for 501(c)(3)'s to continue doing all of that. But the 501(c)(4)'s—the very same 501(c)(4)'s that were targeted by the IRS on the basis of their political beliefs—those groups, and those groups alone, would be silenced.

Mr. Speaker, America is not advantaged by that rule. Maybe in some shortsighted way someone believes their personal political agenda is advanced by that scheme, Mr. Speaker, but we do not. We as a Nation do not. It is a shortsighted gain. That is why we put this bill on the floor today to delay these new regulations, this change of how American political discourse occurs, for 1 year—and 1 year only—while the investigation completes itself.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to read from the report that the inspector general crafted at the Treasury Department. He says, What were the words, what triggered this additional investigation that went on?

This is what they were, Mr. Speaker.

If you use the word "Tea Party," you might get special scrutiny. If you use the word "patriot" in your name, you might get special scrutiny. If you were concerned, Mr. Speaker—and this is reading from the Treasury Department report—if you were concerned about government spending, government debt, or taxes, you could be subjected to special scrutiny. If you wanted, Mr. Speaker, to "make America a better place to live," you could be subjected to special scrutiny.

The administration has gone far beyond that, Mr. Speaker. They are not just going to subject some groups to special scrutiny, as is the source of the scandal. They are silencing all groups. If you had a statement in your case file, Mr. Speaker, that criticized how this country is being run, you were subject to special scrutiny.

Mr. Speaker, that is not just our right, that is our obligation. Our obligation as citizens is to criticize the way this country is being run when we don't agree. Because, after all, Mr. Speaker, the President doesn't run this country. The Congress doesn't run this country. We the people run this country.

This rule to bring this bill is about one thing and one thing only, and that is making sure that those people to whom the Constitution invests every bit of power that the country has to offer, the American citizens have a voice with which to express their concerns and the information on which to educate that voice.

My colleague from Georgia was absolutely right, Mr. Speaker. There are so many things that happen on the floor of this House, you can't tell the difference between who is who regionally, politically, and what it is that folks believe. But this issue is one of those defining issues.

Do you believe that the board of directors of America, the United States citizen, deserves a loud voice and full information? If you do, you vote "yes" on this rule, you vote "yes" on the underlying legislation, you reject the administration's effort to silence the American people on both sides of the aisle, and you commit yourself to believing that a full and open debate is the only way in which this country will succeed.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud cosponsor of H.R. 3865, the Stop Targeting of Political Beliefs by the IRS Act, offered by my friend and Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. Camp of Michigan.

In the wake of the IRS's admission last year that it improperly targeted conservative groups, troubling information continues to come to light detailing just how high the scandal went. In response, the President briefly feigned the appropriate indignation and did some cursory bureaucratic reshuffling.

Then, rather than actually addressing this stunning abuse of First Amendment rights, the Administration decided to double down by proposing a regulation that all but codifies the targeting. The proposed IRS regulation—which would change the way that tax exempt status is determined for social welfare organizations—is a move that would significantly impact the activities and First Amendment rights of those organizations. It adds a massive paperwork burden for organizations, and broadens the IRS's power over political activity.

The IRS issued the rule despite six ongoing investigations into the discriminatory targeting and the fact that the existing guidance has been in place and functioning for more than 50 years.

In order to combat this proposed overreach by the IRS, H.R. 3865 prohibits it from finalizing this unnecessary rule—and similar rules—for one year.

Despite President Obama's claims that there was "not even a smidgen of corruption" at the IRS, I believe the American people still deserve real answers and a true commitment to preserving their First Amendment rights. H.R. 3865 is critical to working to regain the trust of Americans and preventing the Administration from codifying the IRS's unacceptable and discriminatory targeting.

Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve more than opaque and hurried rule changes meant to crush political discourse. At the very least, the Administration should commit to having all the facts from completed investigations before drastically changing the rules to suit its election year strategy. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to join me in fighting the IRS's continued attempts to stifle free speech by supporting H.R. 3865.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3865.

For years, Congress demanded action on this issue. In an independent report, the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration (TIGTA) told the IRS and Treasury to remove the gray and give clear guidance regarding the tax treatment of social welfare organizations.

There were dramatic hearings, and the public demanded clear, fair rules. Members of this Congress from both sides of the aisle agreed that the IRS should implement all nine of the TIGTA recommendations.

This is just what the IRS and Treasury did. They are taking their time, and trying to do the right thing—once and for all. The IRS already received 23,000 comments on the proposed rulemaking—23 thousand, Mr. Speaker.

And today, not even eight months later, this body is trying to tear down long overdue progress and restart the clock at square one. So, you can see why I oppose bringing this bill to the Floor today. It makes no sense, no sense at all.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress can be constructive, supportive, and effective. Instead, this bill returns to the old tradition of no, by any means necessary.

I urge each and every one of my colleagues to oppose this unnecessary bill.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, today the House will vote on H.R. 3865 the Stop Targeting of Political Beliefs by the IRS Act, legislation to prevent the IRS from implementing newly proposed rules to restrict the First Amendment rights of certain non-profit groups. This legislation is an important step in holding the IRS accountable for its illegal targeting of conservative organizations in the run-up to the 2012 election.

Last year it was revealed by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration that the IRS used inappropriate criteria to review organizations applying for tax-exempt status based upon their names and policy positions. Now the IRS wants to rewrite the rules to justify its inappropriate and likely criminal behavior. Congress should not let the IRS take ANY regulatory action until wrong-doers within the IRS are held accountable.

In April, top IRS official Lois Lerner revealed in a public forum that the agency had been discriminating against more than 75 groups with conservative sounding names in the run-up to November 2012. Ms. Lerner actually went so far as to plant a question in the audience about the issue in order to pre-empt the release of the Inspector General's audit.

When all this became public, Members of the Administration including the President and the Attorney General expressed their outrage and called it unacceptable. The Attorney General even went so far as to declare his intent to conduct a criminal investigation.

Furthermore, it's clear from testimony given during the various Congressional hearings over the years and correspondence with the IRS that officials there were not telling Members of Congress the truth. In March of 2012—a year before this story broke—then-IRS Commissioner Douglas Shulman assured Congress: 'there is no targeting of conservative groups.' On April 23, 2012, I joined with 62 of my House colleagues in writing the IRS Commissioner inquiring further about the possible targeting and we were assured that there was no targeting or delay in processing IRS applications submitted by conservative groups.

Ms. Lerner, a longtime federal employee and senior IRS official, has since asserted her Fifth Amendment Constitutional right by refusing to testify before Congress and tell the American people exactly what the IRS was doing and who had ordered these discriminatory actions.

To make matters worse, it was further revealed that IRS employees released confidential donor information and even private taxpayer records. Disclosing confidential taxpayer information is one of the worst things an IRS employee can do—it's a felony, punishable

with a \$5,000 fine and up to 5 years in prison. In fact, the Treasury Inspector General noted at least eight instances of unauthorized access to records, with at least one willful violation.

These are serious abuses but to date, not a single IRS employee has been indicted. The FBI has refused to file criminal charges. The Washington Post has reported that the investigation into this scandal is being led by Barbara Bosserman, a partisan who 'donated a combined \$6,750 to President Obama's elections and the Democratic National Committee between 2004 and 2012.' Furthermore, she does not serve in the Public Integrity Section that typically oversees these matters, but rather the Civil Rights Division, historically the most partisan office at the Department of Justice.

This week I am joined by nearly fifty of my House colleagues in writing to the Attorney General demanding the appointment of an independent special prosecutor to investigate the IRS's illegal targeting of conservative groups. Only an independent investigator who is not aligned with either political party will have the credibility to get to the bottom of this matter and hold wrong-doers accountable—whatever they may be.

I have also introduced H.R. 3762 which would hold federal employees at the IRS personally accountable when they release private taxpayer information. Under this bill, individuals whose private information is released would have a personal right of action against the employee rather than simply hoping that the Department of Justice will take action.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 487 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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. 1010) to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage. 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 Education and the Workforce. 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. 1010.

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. WOODALL. With that, 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 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1944.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 192, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Pearce
Amash	Griffin (AR)	Perry
Amodei	Griffith (VA)	Petri
Bachmann	Grimm	Pittenger
Bachus	Guthrie	Pitts
Barletta	Hall	Poe (TX)
Barr	Hanna	Pompeo
Barton	Harper	Price (GA)
Benishek	Harris	Reed
Bentivolio	Hartzler	Reichert
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Ribble
Black	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Boustany	Holding	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Buchon	Hurt	Rokita
Burgess	Issa	Rooney
Byrne	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Campbell	Jones	Rothfus
Capito	Jordan	Royce
Carter	Joyce	Runyan
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	King (IA)	Salmon
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Sanford
Coble	Kingston	Scalise
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Schock
Cole	Kline	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Lamborn	Sessions
Cook	Lance	Shimkus
Cotton	Lankford	Shuster
Cramer	Latham	Simpson
Crawford	Latta	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Long	Smith (NJ)
Daines	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Dent	Lummis	Stewart
DeSantis	Marchant	Stivers
DesJarlais	Marino	Stockman
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Stutzman
Duffy	McAllister	Terry
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Thornberry
Ellmers	McClintock	Tipton
Farenthold	McHenry	Turner
Fincher	McKeon	Upton
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Valadao
Fleischmann	McMorris	Wagner
Fleming	Rodgers	Walberg
Flores	Meadows	Walden
Forbes	Meehan	Walorski
Fortenberry	Messer	Weber (TX)
Fox	Mica	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Gardner	Mullin	Whitfield
Garrett	Mulvaney	Williams
Gerlach	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Wittman
Gibson	Noem	Wolf
Gingrey (GA)	Nugent	Womack
Gohmert	Nunes	Woodall
Goodlatte	Nunnelee	Yoder
Gowdy	Olson	Yoho
Granger	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Graves (GA)	Paulsen	Young (IN)

NAYS—192

Barber	Bass	Becerra
Barrow (GA)	Beatty	Bera (CA)

Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Owens
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Payne
Braley (IA)	Himes	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Brownley (CA)	Holt	Peters (CA)
Bustos	Honda	Peters (MI)
Butterfield	Horsford	Peterson
Capps	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Capuano	Huffman	Pocan
Cárdenas	Israel	Polis
Carney	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Quigley
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Rahall
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Richmond
Chu	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver	Kind	T.
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Sanchez, Loretta
Cohen	Kuster	Sarbanes
Connolly	Langevin	Schakowsky
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Costa	Lee (CA)	Schrader
Courtney	Levin	Schwartz
Crowley	Lewis	Scott (VA)
Cuellar	Lipinski	Scott, David
Cummings	Loebsack	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Loftgren	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Shea-Porter
DeFazio	Lowe	Sherman
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Sinema
Delaney	(NM)	Sires
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Slaughter
DelBene	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Deutch	Lynch	Speier
Dingell	Maffei	Swalwell (CA)
Doggett	Maloney,	Takano
Doyle	Carolyn	Thompson (CA)
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
Engel	Matheson	Tierney
Enyart	Matsui	Titus
Eshoo	McDermott	Tonko
Esty	McGovern	Tsongas
Farr	McIntyre	Van Hollen
Fattah	McNerney	Vargas
Foster	Meeks	Veasey
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Vela
Fudge	Michaud	Velázquez
Gabbard	Miller, George	Visclosky
Gallego	Moore	Walz
Garamendi	Moran	Wasserman
Garcia	Murphy (FL)	Schultz
Grayson	Nader	Waters
Green, Al	Napolitano	Waxman
Green, Gene	Neal	Welch
Grijalva	Negrete McLeod	Wilson (FL)
Gutiérrez	Nolan	Yarmuth
Hahn	O'Rourke	

NOT VOTING—14

Blumenauer	Ellison	Pastor (AZ)
Brooks (IN)	Gosar	Posey
Cantor	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Davis, Rodney	McCollum	Tiberi
Duckworth	Miller, Gary	

□ 1411

Ms. KUSTER and Messrs. CICILLINE and KENNEDY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. RIGELL and BROOKS of Alabama changed their vote from “nay” to yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 65 I was meeting with a local official, Mayor Chris Koos, and missed the time to cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 185, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

AYES—231

Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Perry
Amash	Griffin (AR)	Peters (CA)
Amodei	Griffith (VA)	Peterson
Bachmann	Grimm	Petri
Bachus	Guthrie	Pittenger
Barber	Hall	Pitts
Barletta	Hanna	Poe (TX)
Barr	Harper	Pompeo
Barton	Harris	Posey
Benishek	Hartzler	Price (GA)
Bentivolio	Hastings (WA)	Reed
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Renacci
Black	Herrera Beutler	Ribble
Blackburn	Holding	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Hudson	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Roby
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Buchon	Issa	Rokita
Burgess	Jenkins	Rooney
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Camp	Jones	Ross
Campbell	Jordan	Rothfus
Capito	Joyce	Royce
Carter	Kelly (PA)	Runyan
Cassidy	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	King (NY)	Salmon
Chaffetz	Kingston	Sanford
Coble	Kinzing (IL)	Scalise
Coffman	Kline	Schock
Cole	Labrador	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Lance	Sessions
Cook	Lankford	Shimkus
Cotton	Latham	Shuster
Cramer	Latta	Simpson
Crawford	LoBiondo	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	Long	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Daines	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Denham	Lummis	Southerland
Dent	Marchant	Stewart
DeSantis	Marino	Stivers
DesJarlais	Massie	Stockman
Diaz-Balart	McAllister	Stutzman
Duffy	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Thornberry
Ellmers	McHenry	Tipton
Farenthold	McIntyre	Turner
Fincher	McKeon	Upton
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Valadao
Fleischmann	McMorris	Wagner
Fleming	Rodgers	Walberg
Flores	Meadows	Walden
Forbes	Meehan	Walorski
Fortenberry	Messer	Weber (TX)
Fox	Mica	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Gardner	Mullin	Whitfield
Garrett	Mulvaney	Williams
Gerlach	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Wittman
Gibson	Noem	Wolf
Gingrey (GA)	Nugent	Womack
Gohmert	Nunes	Woodall
Goodlatte	Nunnelee	Yoder
Gowdy	Olson	Yoho
Granger	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Graves (GA)	Paulsen	Young (IN)

NOES—185

Barrow (GA)	Bera (CA)	Brady (PA)
Bass	Bishop (GA)	Braley (IA)
Beatty	Bishop (NY)	Brown (FL)
Becerra	Bonamici	Brownley (CA)

Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes

Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell

NOT VOTING—14

Blumenauer
Cárdenas
Cooper
Ellison
Gosar

Graves (GA)
Gutiérrez
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Miller, Gary

□ 1421

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS
PROTECTION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1944) to protect private property rights, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 353, nays 65, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—353

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold

Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
McIntyre
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta

Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster

Becerra
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clever
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
DeGette
Dingell
Edwards
Engel
Farr

Blumenauer
Ellison
Gosar
Hudson

Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas

NAYS—65

Frankel (FL)
Grayson
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Holt
Huffman
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Maffei
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks

NOT VOTING—12

McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
Michaud
Miller, Gary

□ 1429

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I unintentionally missed rollcall vote No. 66 and cast an incorrect vote for rollcall vote No. 67 on Wednesday, February 26, 2014. I would like to correct my error and ask that the record reflect the following: on H. Res. 487, rollcall vote No. 66, I should have voted “no;” on H.R. 1944, rollcall vote No. 67, I should have voted “aye.”

□ 1430

STOP TARGETING OF POLITICAL
BELIEFS BY THE IRS ACT OF 2014

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 487, I call up the bill (H.R. 3865) to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from modifying the standard for determining whether an organization is operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare for purposes of section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and ask for its immediate consideration.