

Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaever  
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  
Foxo  
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)  
Cleaever  
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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLINS of Georgia). Pursuant to House Resolution 487, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3865

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stop Targeting of Political Beliefs by the IRS Act of 2014”.

#### SEC. 2. APPLICABLE STANDARD FOR DETERMINATIONS OF WHETHER AN ORGANIZATION IS OPERATED EXCLUSIVELY FOR THE PROMOTION OF SOCIAL WELFARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The standard and definitions as in effect on January 1, 2010, which are used to determine 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 shall apply for purposes of determining the status of organizations under section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) PROHIBITION ON MODIFICATION OF STANDARD.—The Secretary of the Treasury may not issue, revise, or finalize any regulation (including the proposed regulations published at 78 Fed. Reg. 71535 (November 29, 2013)), revenue ruling, or other guidance not limited to a particular taxpayer relating to the standard and definitions specified in subsection (a).

(c) APPLICATION TO ORGANIZATIONS.—Except as provided in subsection (d), this section shall apply with respect to any organization claiming tax exempt status under section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which was created on, before, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) SUNSET.—This section shall not apply after the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stop Targeting of Political Beliefs by the IRS Act of 2014”.

#### SEC. 2. APPLICABLE STANDARD FOR DETERMINATIONS OF WHETHER AN ORGANIZATION IS OPERATED EXCLUSIVELY FOR THE PROMOTION OF SOCIAL WELFARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The standard and definitions as in effect on January 1, 2010, which are used to determine 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 shall apply for purposes of determining the status of organizations under section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) PROHIBITION ON MODIFICATION OF STANDARD.—The Secretary of the Treasury may not (nor may any delegate of such Secretary) issue, revise, or finalize any regulation (including the proposed regulations published at 78 Fed. Reg. 71535 (November 29, 2013)), revenue ruling, or other guidance not limited to a particular taxpayer relating to the standard and definitions specified in subsection (a).

(c) APPLICATION TO ORGANIZATIONS.—Except as provided in subsection (d), this section shall apply with respect to any organization claiming tax exempt status under section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of

1986 which was created on, before, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) SUNSET.—This section shall not apply after the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3865.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3865, the Stop Targeting of Political Beliefs by the IRS Act of 2014, to stop the IRS and Treasury from restricting free speech activities of social welfare organizations that have been in place for over 50 years.

Last May, we learned that the IRS targeted conservative groups seeking tax-exempt status. For over 9 months, committee investigators have reviewed hundreds of thousands of internal IRS documents and interviewed IRS officials regarding the targeting. Our investigation is not yet over, and the Ways and Means Committee continues to wait for the IRS to turn over Lois Lerner's emails. Despite the ongoing investigations both in Congress and by the inspector general, last November Treasury rushed forward with proposed new regulations to stifle 501(c)(4) groups, upending rules that have been in place for over half a century.

Under the proposed rule, social welfare organizations would face additional, unprecedented scrutiny for engaging in the most basic nonpartisan political activity, such as organizing nonpartisan get-out-the-vote drives, registering voters, or hosting candidate forums in their neighborhood. If the Treasury Department and the IRS have their way, these sorts of activities would jeopardize the tax-exempt status of social welfare organizations.

Making matters worse, the administration is pushing the proposed rule based on a false premise. Treasury issued these rules under the premise of “considerable confusion” in the tax-exempt application process. They use the term considerable confusion to justify their actions. However, the committee's investigation has found no evidence that confusion caused the IRS to systematically target conservative groups. In fact, we found evidence to the contrary, that IRS workers in Cincinnati flagged Tea Party cases for Washington, D.C., because of “media attention.” Before Washington got involved, front-line IRS employees were already processing and approving Tea Party applications with no intrusive questionnaires or signs of confusion.

In addition to being based on a false premise, the proposed rule was drafted in secrecy and long before the administration's proclaimed need for clarity. Our investigation has discovered that Treasury and the IRS were working on these new rules behind closed doors for years—well before the targeting came to light.

While the administration claims that the proposed rule is a response to the inspector general's audit report, IRS employees told committee staff in transcribed interviews that discussions about the rule started much earlier, in the spring of 2011. Further, a June 2012 email between Treasury officials and then-IRS director of tax exempt organizations, Lois Lerner, shows that these potential regulations were being discussed off plan—meaning that the plans for the regulations were to be discussed behind closed doors. This type of behavior raises serious questions about the integrity of the rule-making process and counsels for putting a hold on the draft rules.

The intent of the rules proposed by the Obama administration is clear: to legalize the IRS' inappropriate targeting of conservative groups. These proposed rules severely limit groups' rights to engage in public debate by labeling activities such as candidate forums, get-out-the-vote efforts, and voter registration as “political activity” for 501(c)(4) groups. However, 501(c)(3)'s—which are not allowed to engage in my political activity—and labor unions are free to continue to engage in these activities without limitation.

It is clear that the American people are also concerned that these proposed rules would squash their First Amendment rights. Treasury has received over 94,000 comments on the rule so far, which is the most they have ever received on any rule ever. Given the American public's significant interest in the proposed rules, it is imperative that Treasury put a hold on them until the investigations into the targeting are complete so that all the facts are known and the public has ample opportunity to be heard.

This legislation will ensure that Treasury does not rush this rule into effect this year, allows the ongoing investigations to issue findings on the targeting, helps us to stop the IRS' targeting of taxpayers based on their personal beliefs, and is a commonsense step to preserve these groups' ability to engage in public debate.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting “yes” to this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) control the remainder of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

On a day when the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. CAMP, is unveiling a tax measure that requires serious bipartisanship to be successful, we are here on the floor considering a totally political bill in an attempt to resurrect an alleged scandal that never existed.

Was there incompetence at the IRS in the processing of 501(c)(4) applications?

Yes—and I was among the very first who said that those in supervision should be held accountable.

Was there corruption, political interference, White House involvement, an enemies list, as the Republicans have claimed since day one?

Absolutely not; no evidence whatsoever.

Yesterday, the IRS Commissioner confirmed that \$8 million has been spent directly on those investigations as over 255 people have spent over 79,000 hours doing nothing but responding to congressional investigations. An additional \$6 million to \$8 million has been spent to add capacity to information technology systems to process securely the 500,000 pages of documents Congress has received.

What have they learned? That both progressive and conservative groups were inappropriately screened out by name and not activity, and that no one was involved in this outside of the IRS, and that there was no political motivation involved.

When the inspector general asked his chief investigator to look into the possibility of political motivation by the IRS, that investigator concluded:

There was no indication that pulling these selected applications was politically motivated. The email traffic indicated there were unclear processing directions and the group wanted to make sure they had guidance on processing the applications so they pulled them. This is a very important nuance.

Indeed, it is, and it is precisely that lack of clarity that the IRS was responding to in proposing new regulations for 501(c)(4) organizations. New regulations that are designed to bring certainty in determining whether an organization's primary activities are political.

The regulations are among several steps the IG himself recommended in his audit report that the IRS undertake, each of which the Republicans repeatedly called for action on.

In a June 3, 2013, hearing before the House Appropriations Committee, Chairman CRENSHAW told Acting IRS Commissioner Danny Werfel:

We're going to insist that the IRS implement all nine of the recommendations in the inspector general's report.

A Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. ROSKAM, has a bill to implement all of the inspector general's recommendations, including implementing new 501(c)(4) regulations.

Why is this important? Because applications for 501(c)(4) status have nearly doubled between 2010 and 2012—to 3,357, and spending has skyrocketed.

In 2006, \$1 million was spent by (c)(4) organizations. In 2010, \$92 million was spent. In 2012, \$256 million has been spent by (c)(4) organizations.

The (c)(4) designation presently allows organizations to keep their donors secret, hidden as to which individuals contributed, and that is exactly the secrecy that the Republicans are trying to preserve.

Why? Because the three largest spenders, representing fully 51 percent of the total, are a Who's Who list of Republican political operatives.

□ 1445

It is indicated here: Crossroads GPS, Karl Rove, \$71 million; Americans for Prosperity, the Koch brothers, \$36 million; and the American Future Fund, the Koch brothers again, \$25 million. That is \$132 million of the skyrocketing \$256 million that the Federal Election Commission had reported to it, according to the Center for Responsive Politics.

If you live in a targeted State and you turn on your television, you have probably seen these groups at work distorting the Affordable Care Act.

That is why we are here today, purely and simply, not because Republicans want to stand up for the rights of social welfare organizations—and they often talk about small ones—but to preserve the secrecy around the Republicans' big campaign efforts.

These are draft regulations that the Republicans themselves called for. Over 76,000 comments—and I think now more—have been received, and the comment period does not close until Friday.

These regulations aren't likely to come out this year anyway with all these comments, so why this bill? Why this bill? It is very, very clear, and it is very simple. There is a problem with 501(c)(4)'s. The three organizations that I mentioned that are involved as political operatives, in one form or another, these are people who have donors nobody knows. This is secret money.

Why are we standing here and saying to the IRS: Don't look at 502(c)(4)'s; don't look at the possible massive abuse; don't look at what has happened in the last few years where political operatives, under the guise of 501(c)(4), have moved from \$1 million in many cases to \$256 million reported to the FEC?

Our constituents, Democrats and Republicans, are offering their comments. Some of them I agree with and they deserve to be read, but not to be shredded at the hands of a November campaign strategy by the Republican Party of this country and by the Republican Conference of this House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) control the balance of the time.

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

There was no objection.

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

I want to take a moment just to respond to some of the comments that my friend on the other side made.

First of all, there are three ongoing investigations that are incomplete. There is the congressional investigation being conducted by multiple committees, incomplete; there is the inspector general investigation, still incomplete and ongoing; and there is a third, a criminal investigation.

I ask, first off, the question: Why start regulating now when we don't have all the information? Let's let all this go to conclusion and then institute the proper reforms.

I want to point out that in its report on targeting, the inspector general recommended the Treasury and the IRS provide guidance on how to measure political activity—not what constitutes political activity, how to measure it.

The proposed rule has been in development since 2011. Internal IRS emails between Treasury and IRS show that they were developing the rule off plan—off plan. That means beyond the sunshine of disclosure and out in the open—off plan. What do they have to hide? Why are they doing this? And this is actually before all the allegations came out.

Then, when asked at the markup of H.R. 3865—this legislation—whether the proposed rule answers the inspector general's recommendation for the IRS and Treasury to provide guidance on measuring political activity, Tom Barthold, the chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation, nonpartisan, said: The proposed rule does not address the measurement issue.

All we are seeking to do is to delay the implementation of this rule until we complete the investigation and we have all the facts, and then we can talk about what necessary reforms should be implemented.

But I think it is a bit premature to start putting forth regulations that will infringe on First Amendment rights. It is a very blunt instrument and a very dangerous path to embark upon at this point in time.

With that, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), my friend, a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the piece of legislation we are talking about.

I think it is rather chilling that 223 years ago, our First Amendment rights were enshrined in our Bill of Rights. We have all taken the same oath. We said, to the best of our ability, we preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. I am hearing now dollar signs or dollar numbers being there saying, well, we can't afford to spend this kind of money.

Never before in America were we ever worried about the cost of money when

it comes to defending our freedoms and liberties under our Constitution and our Bill of Rights. It has no dollar attached to it. It is basically fundamentally American.

When we talk about American citizens not being able to talk that way—the First Amendment, by the way, protects us and enshrines us, 45 words in the First Amendment that protect and enshrine our rights.

This is not a political issue. This is not about an “R” or a “D.” This is about a “we.” This is about the entire country. If we are going to sit here and say: Oh, no, this just has to do with an election—an election—really, an election?—we cannot allow the voice of the people not to be heard in our town squares. When they need to speak out, they need to know that they can speak out without being threatened or without being worried about what is going to happen to them.

This is so basically who we are as Americans. It has nothing to do with Republicans and Democrats, Independents and Libertarians. It has to do with who we are. If we cannot see that and we turn this into a political agenda and talking points, then, my gosh, how far we have fallen from what the Founders intended at the very beginning.

We cannot have this debate in seriousness and say we are spending too much money to protect the rights of our American citizens. That is absolutely foolish.

I am very, very strong on the protection of what we are talking about. H.R. 3865 reconfirms what the American people need to know. They can speak out on anything, anytime, anywhere they want, without having to be worried about anybody interfering with it, especially a government.

This is a government that serves the people; this is not a people that serve our government. And to think that we have to have a piece of legislation in addition to our First Amendment rights on the floor is absolutely so different than what we think.

Again, the voice of the American people has got to be heard. I don't care—conservative, liberal, I don't care where you are coming from. You have the right to speak out anytime you want.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on both sides, for housekeeping purposes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 22 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Louisiana has 21½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CROWLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the outrage and the innuendos from my Republican colleagues and their chief mouthpiece, FOX News. The facts should show this is phony, a phony investigation against President Obama launched for political purposes: facts

like the person who began these investigations was a self-described conservative Republican; facts like more than 500,000 pages of documents have been provided to Congress, and there is no smoking gun; facts like, of the five dozen interviews of IRS employees at 15 congressional hearings, that nothing was found.

These are the facts, but I realize some will choose to not believe the facts versus fiction. Let me provide some basic commonsense information.

The inspector general who oversees the IRS, someone who was appointed by then-President George W. Bush—someone who has admitted that he covered up political targeting of progressive groups in his report to Congress; someone who had a number of private meetings with the Republican chair of the Oversight Committee, DARRELL ISSA, and then came out to issue public statements as facts—this someone, J. Russell George, has testified under oath that he notified Congressman DARRELL ISSA of his investigation into the IRS in the summer of 2012.

Do you know what else was happening in the summer of 2012? A very close Presidential election.

Does anyone honestly think, if there was an actual scandal or an actual targeting of just Tea Party groups by the administration in the months and the weeks leading up to the 2012 elections when Barack Obama was going to the ballot, that Congressman DARRELL ISSA wouldn't blow the whistle and expose it when he was notified that an investigation was ongoing and occurring?

It just doesn't pass the laugh test. This is another phony scam in the realm of phony scams my Republican colleagues make up to go after Democratic Presidents.

But what is also interesting is that, just as the Republicans continue their crusade to discredit the IRS, the Republicans have rallied around their version of tax reform—I have a copy of the summation right here; this is just the summation—a radical version that will empower—empower—the IRS. This legislation that they are offering today will empower the IRS and raise taxes on families while cutting them for multinational corporations.

For the past several years, the public has been told that the Republicans would try to rip the Tax Code out from its roots and that it would be rewritten by Democrats and Republicans together.

Well, guess what. Democrats were never once invited to help draft, draft this bill. Speaker BOEHNER even dismissed Democratic criticism of the process by saying, “Blah, blah, blah.”

So what is the result? A radical Republican tax plan that will, if enacted, end the tax break for families to deduct their State and local income taxes that they already paid in taxes to the States and local governments. It will slash the mortgage interest deduction for homeowners. It will create a new tax on Social Security. It will tax

workers for the health care offered by their employer. It will increase taxes on hundreds of thousands of our military families. It will institute the chained CPI to raise taxes, and it is also known to reduce veterans' and Social Security benefit checks.

This really does beg the question: Whose side are our Republican colleagues on? They try to look populist by creating false and fake scandals and bashing the IRS, but in reality, their words and actions mask their bill to empower the IRS and radically redesign the Tax Code, making families pay more so international corporations can pay less.

That is the real scandal here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I welcome the opportunity to debate tax reform, but it is obvious to me that the gentleman hasn't read the bill yet, and I think you should read the bill before you debate tax reform. That will come on another day.

But I want to get back to why we are here today. I want to point out that this is a bipartisan IRS investigation by Congress. I want to also point out, in that regard, that the Ways and Means Committee document requests are bipartisan joint requests from Chairman CAMP and Ranking Member LEVIN. Ranking Member LEVIN also admits that the investigation is incomplete.

So we have to get down to the bottom of this and let this investigation be done. The American people deserve to know what the truth is before we start issuing new law or having new regulations issued by the executive branch which will have the chilling effect of infringing on First Amendment rights.

One of the previous speakers on the other side mentioned the IRS spending money and manpower on this investigation. Yes, the IRS also spent \$40 million on conferences over the period of the targeting.

□ 1500

One conference alone cost \$4.1 million—waste. In 2012, the IRS spent \$21.6 million on union activity—taxpayer dollars on union activity. Explain that to the taxpayer. The IRS also spends about \$5 million annually on its full-service production studio in New Carrollton, Maryland.

The fact of the matter is that the American people are tired of the waste. They are tired, and they are also very concerned about the infringement on their First Amendment rights.

With that, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI).

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3865, the Stop Targeting of Political Beliefs by the IRS Act.

Last year, northeast Ohioans and Americans across the country were

deeply troubled to learn the IRS abused its power by targeting conservative groups. Many in Ohio's 16th District, my district, contacted my office to express grave concerns about the lack of accountability and transparency within the IRS. Not only did the Federal agency violate the public trust, but it infringed on our First Amendment rights.

The Ways and Means Committee began investigating allegations of potential political discrimination within the IRS nearly 3 years ago. What was discovered is disturbing. The committee found evidence that conservative groups were targeted to an extent far beyond what was initially reported. As part of its ongoing investigation, the committee requested and reviewed hundreds of thousands of internal IRS documents, and it interviewed dozens of its employees.

Recently, the IRS published draft rules that would essentially authorize the continued targeting of political groups. These rules represent a disregard for liberties outlined in our Constitution, and they demonstrate the dangers of a growing Federal Government. The IRS' actions bring to light just how rampant abuse is within this administration. The American people will not tolerate it, and neither will Congress.

This legislation is commonsense. It would require the IRS to halt this rule-making process until the committee completes its investigation. It is critical that the committee gathers all the facts before the IRS implements these rules, which were created behind closed doors. That is not political. That is just common sense. There should be no controversy at all.

This legislation builds upon a bill I introduced last year which would specifically spell out that any IRS employee, regardless of political affiliation, who targeted a taxpayer for political purposes could be immediately relieved of his duties. It passed the House with broad bipartisan support.

This is not a partisan issue. Whether you are a Republican, a Democrat or an Independent, above all, we are Americans. Targeting anyone based on any affiliation goes against the very principles this country was founded upon. Americans of all political beliefs deserve to know that they will not be targeted by their government for political purposes.

I thank Chairman CAMP for his hard work on this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind the gentleman from Ohio that this tax bill, known as the Tax Reform Act of 2014, which was made public today, will be a sucker punch to the guts of families who live in higher tax States, like Illinois, Wisconsin, Nebraska, New York, and Ohio. All of these States have representation from the Republican Party on the Ways and Means Committee. They helped to draft this legislation. The question is: Whose side are they on?

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. McDERMOTT).

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, here we are back in the theater of the absurd. The Republicans are wasting valuable time and resources on political theater, crafted to make the producers at FOX television happy while they should be moving forward with the country's business.

There have been six separate investigations. Not a single shred of evidence has been found demonstrating political motivation or White House involvement in the IRS grouping of the tea party applications by name. Now, one of my colleagues is a physician. He is from Louisiana. He has operated many times. You do not begin surgery until you know what is going on with the patient. We have six investigations which found no reason to operate, no reason to pass this legislation. Yet here it is. Ironically, the real trickery of this is this bill. It is designed to protect Karl Rove's Crossroads GPS and the Koch Brothers of Houston from exposing where the money that they put into the political process is being used.

Everyone knows what a 501(c)(4) is about. You give the money to the organizations. They don't have to report your name to anyone, and then the organizations can use it any way they want. Now, if an organization goes to the IRS and says, "we want a 501(c)(4)," the IRS should ask a few questions, don't you think, if they are going to give an exemption from the American people, from those people paying the taxes who put it in there? Karl Rove and all of his cohorts ought to pay taxes if they are going to use it for the political process, and it is the IRS' job to find that out. It is the same with liberal groups. Any group that comes in has to explain what it is going to do with the money.

We have had six investigations, but now we have a bill without any conclusion from any committee or any investigation that there is a problem. The floor of the House should not be the stage for the Republicans to work out their November election strategy and funding. If Republicans really want to work on behalf of the American people, they should get serious and roll up their sleeves. The production tax credit ought to pass out of here as a unanimous consent. There are a thousand things that ought to be happening here today instead of this silly bill, which will have no effect. It is not going through the Senate. The President isn't going to sign it. It is simply political theater to give the directors at FOX TV things to put on television.

If you intend to do something real, you can, but this bill is not real. It is simply to reignite the baseless allegations against the White House.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gen-

tleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the majority leader of the House.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Stop Targeting of Political Beliefs by the IRS Act.

Political speech was considered by our Founders to be deserving of the utmost protection. The First Amendment they wrote is no less crucial to our democracy today than it was in those initial days. Since those days, Americans have come up with all sorts of ways to exercise their fundamental free speech rights, including assembling together in organizations to express their thoughts about what their government is doing.

These groups, including those known as 501(c)(4) organizations, are an important part of our democracy. Many of these groups are formed to specifically engage and educate our citizenry through candidate forums, debates, grassroots lobbying, voter registration, and other activities to promote the common good so America has an informed public.

For over 50 years, these organizations have been eligible to apply for tax-exempt status, but now, Mr. Speaker, that status is under threat from new regulations being proposed by the IRS. The goal here is clear. These regulations were reverse engineered in order to directly silence political opponents of this administration's.

That is the worst kind of government abuse. Silencing your critics is commonplace in authoritarian countries, not in the United States of America. Frankly, it is a cowardly act to silence people via backroom regulations. Those who disagree with any administration's policies, whether conservative or liberal, still deserve the constitutional protections afforded to them. This kind of government abuse must stop, and it must stop now.

Today, we have an opportunity to act in a bipartisan manner because this bill prevents these costly regulations from taking effect on groups that promote issues both sides of the aisle deeply care about. Nearly 70,000 comments have been submitted about this proposed regulation from both sides or all sides of the ideological spectrum. The majority of those submissions are negative.

Recently, the American Civil Liberties Union submitted a 26-page comment to IRS Commissioner John Koskinen, stating:

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, even if doing so could influence a citizen's vote.

The ACLU continued, stating that the advocacy work done by these groups is "the heart of our representative democracy."

The ACLU and so many others who have also spoken out in opposition to this proposed regulation are absolutely

right. Political speech represents the best part of America, the ability for Americans to be able to reach out to their elected representatives and let them know when they agree or disagree with them.

No matter which side of the aisle we are on, Mr. Speaker, we must protect that fundamental freedom. So let us stand together today and pass this bill so that Americans, whether individually or collectively, can continue to strengthen our political process without fear of retribution.

I would like to thank Chairman CAMP as well as subcommittee Chairman BOUSTANY on the Ways and Means Committee and all of those across our country who have spoken out on this issue, and I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CROWLEY. The only threat, Mr. Speaker, to the freedoms of Americans is not the bill we are discussing on the floor today but the bill that was announced this afternoon, the Tax Reform Act of 2014—the freedom of Americans to purchase their first homes, the freedom of Americans not to have attacks placed on their health care. Those are the types of freedoms that are being threatened today.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the chair of the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think the best way to describe this bill is to call it the “prevent secret money from disclosure act,” because that is what we are really talking about.

What matters today to most Americans? If you talk to folks back home or on the street, they will tell you: Are you working on making sure the private sector is creating jobs? Does this bill help create jobs? No. They will say: Then at least make sure, if I am paying taxes, you are using them the right way. Does this bill help taxpayers save money? No.

So why are we doing this?

You are hearing folks talk about the Constitution. The Constitution doesn’t guarantee campaign donors get special tax treatment or protections. The First Amendment protects speech, not secret contributions.

So what is the problem?

The problem is that the IRS has finally figured out that a whole bunch of folks are funneling a lot of dark, secret money into organizations that under the Tax Code are permitted and that they are using this to influence our American campaigns.

We have no idea who is making these contributions of millions of dollars—secret dollars—to influence campaigns here in America. Is it foreign governments giving these millions of dollars? We don’t know. Is it money launderers trying to influence elections? We don’t know. We have no idea who is giving this money because, under the Tax

Code under which these organizations are filing, they have no obligation to disclose who has given them one red cent.

That Tax Code section, 501(c)(4), is very similar to the 501(c)(3), the charitable organization we are very familiar with. 501(c)(4)s are classified as “social welfare organizations.” Guess what? Do you know how much those social welfare organizations spent doing campaign and political work in our elections? How much do you think the political campaigns spent, the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee combined? \$255 billion in the 2012 election. That is what the two political parties spent together. How much did social welfare organizations spend on campaign and political activity? More than the two political parties combined—\$256 billion. Can you tell me where one penny came from? No, you can’t, because it is all secret money.

What are the proponents of this bill trying to do? They are trying to hide the names of those who gave the money. Why? We don’t know.

□ 1515

But it sure would be nice to know who is getting all this money, when just 8 years ago, those same social welfare organizations gave a total of \$1 million for political purposes. It was \$256 billion in 2012. Eight years ago, it was \$1 million.

Something is going on in America. Someone is trying to buy elections. And we can’t figure it out because those donors don’t have to be disclosed. It is time to make sure that those donations are disclosed. That is all the IRS is trying to do.

It is cloaked as something different by proponents of this bill. Let’s not hide the money. It is time to disclose those contractors.

Vote down this bill.

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

There is no denying that we may need reforms in this. There has been a lot of debate about this. The gentleman from California and I have had those kinds of conversations. But I would point out that the investigations are not complete, and they need to be complete.

The ranking member mentioned earlier in his comments money and donors as reasons for this rule, but neither the word “donor,” “money,” or “contributions” appears in the regulation.

It has been cited by the former Commissioner of the IRS that there was confusion. A confusion narrative emerged, but it was on the basis of no internal investigation at the IRS. There has been no interview of the employees, no facts established. We are still doing this investigation, from our standpoint, as is the inspector general.

We know from our investigation so far, having interviews with the Cincinnati employees, that they were not confused by the rules. They were proc-

essing the applications until interference came down from Washington, from higher up in the Exempt Organizations Division of the IRS. Employees then flagged Tea Party applications and others because of what they said were “media interest,” not confusion. Within 24 hours of the flagging for media interest, these Washington, D.C., officials at the IRS requested Tea Party applications.

Unlike the IRS, the Committee on Ways and Means has been investigating this matter, and we have not completed this investigation. But committee investigators have interviewed nearly three dozen IRS officials, from frontline screeners to the former commissioner. We have reviewed hundreds of thousands of documents. It is nearing completion, but this investigation is being held up.

A central figure in this investigation is Lois Lerner. We have not gotten the information that we have requested from Lois Lerner. We have put the newly confirmed Commissioner on notice that if he wants to move forward with reforms and do all the things he wants to do during his tenure at IRS, we have got to get this investigation done. We have to get the facts on the table, and this IRS has to come clean before the American people.

This agency occupies a central part of every single American’s life. It affects every one of us. This agency has the power to destroy each and every one of us. And that is why the trust and the integrity needs to be restored.

All this rule does is shuts down speech. It does nothing that these gentlemen, our friends on the other side of the aisle, have mentioned in terms of reforms and cleaning up the election system and all that. No, it does none of that. It just simply stifles speech. I don’t think that is appropriate.

We owe it to the American people and we owe it to the integrity of this institution to complete this investigation, put the facts on the table, and follow these facts wherever they may lead. This is not political. This is simply looking at the facts.

Rather than a recently drafted cure for confusion, this proposed rule, like I said, simply focuses to silence some of these small groups, silence conservatives.

As early as 2011, long before the inspector general audit, IRS officials in Washington, D.C., began talking about the proposed rule. We have email from Treasury to IRS, off plan—off plan. Now we are trying to get more of those emails because we want to know what they mean by “off plan.” What was really discussed and why was all this talked about before the allegations even came forward from these various groups?

This is not right. We need to get to the bottom of it. And rather than curing confusion, the proposed rule would simply silence these social welfare organizations and have a disproportionate effect on some of these right-



leaning conservative groups that were subject, in the first place, to the targeting.

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

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

My good friend from Louisiana would continue to have you believe that only right-wing and conservative groups were being investigated when in fact he knows and we know that it went well beyond that. There were progressive groups who were also subject to this investigation.

Mr. Speaker, let me also point out to my friend from Louisiana, he mentioned that maybe members of the Democratic Caucus had not yet perused the Republican Tax Reform Act of 2014. I would just point out for the record that I am assuming he read the proposed regulations. He mentioned that money was not mentioned, when in fact on the first page, in the fourth standpoint:

Contributions of money or anything of value to, or solicitation of contributions on behalf of, a candidate, political organization, or any other section 501(c) organization engaged in candidate-related political activity.

So money is mentioned on the first page, just to set the record straight, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican radical tax plan will, for the first time, tax workers for their health insurance benefits that they are provided through their job and tax previously untaxed Social Security income. The question, again, is: Whose side are they on?

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. BILL PASCRELL, my friend.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely have the greatest respect for the good doctor. I think he is a reasonable man and a good person, but when you are explaining, you are losing.

I rise in strong opposition to this legislation.

After we learned last year about the inexcusable way the IRS evaluated applications for tax-exempt status—because that is what is at the heart of this issue—I was hopeful that we could have a bipartisan response. After all, it was not only conservative groups, as you have heard, that had their applications singled out solely because of words like “Tea Party.” No one is denying that. Progressive groups were inappropriately filtered as well. My Democratic colleagues and I were equally outraged by this behavior. We put it on the record. But those hopes faded quickly when it became apparent that my colleagues on the other side weren’t actually interested in investigating this wrongdoing and fixing the problems.

This bill is just the latest example of how, instead, they are only concerned with scoring cheap political points. Where I am from in Paterson, New Jersey, we would call this Pyrrhic sophistry. That is what we would call it. Empty arguments, deceitful. That is what that means.

The examples the Republican leader pointed out could be under section 527. But if you are under 527, you need to disclose where the money came from. So you choose not to be under section 527 of the Tax Code. You would rather be in another section. And what is that other section? You are not tax liable and you don’t have to disclose who gave you the money.

What is this? Russia? China?

You heard the numbers. We are talking about billions of dollars. The difference? They would have to disclose where the money came from.

No evidence of any retribution has been found yet within either political party. So this is really a witch hunt. For the American people, unfortunately, it is the integrity of our electoral process here that is on trial.

The fact is that the Supreme Court’s rulings have legalized a torrent of hundreds of millions of dollars in corporate spending that has infected our elections.

We ask again today, join us in correcting that decision by the Supreme Court. It has infected our legal process.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. One of the most egregious newly legal big spenders are organizations operating as 501(c)(4) tax-exempt groups. They could easily be under section 527. We created a special section of the Tax Code precisely for tax-exempt political groups. No, they don’t want to go under those groups, because if they go under those groups, they have got to tell us who is contributing to them.

This is absolutely chicanery. These regulations aren’t some wild-eyed, down-the-rabbit-hole conspiracy theory to prosecute the President’s political enemies.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PASCRELL. They are simply about preserving congressional intent and providing clear rules of the road, both for tax-exempt groups and the IRS, about what exactly is political activity so they know what is permissible under the law.

This isn’t about free speech. This isn’t about being a Tea Party or a Progressive. Spend all the money you want to say whatever you want about any election. Just don’t expect to be able to do so while calling yourself a tax-exempt social welfare group.

We are paying more taxes because these people are getting away with it. That is the bottom line. And you, I know, Doctor, are totally against that, because you would not really, in the final analysis, prefer that some groups are better than others—those particularly who don’t tell us who donated to the group.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time is left on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Louisiana has 11½ minutes remaining.

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

In the Nation Magazine, Nan Aron of the liberal judicial lobby, the Alliance for Justice, writes:

501(c)(4)’s are made up of over 86,000 mostly small organizations nationwide that are active participants in civic life.

They were not invented in the last election cycle. They have been around for generations. Their purpose isn’t to hide donors. It is to advance policies.

Ms. Aron also adds:

These groups were involved in elections because it is often impossible to advance a policy cause without being involved in the political process.

This is from the liberal side of the political spectrum.

I am now pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana, TODD YOUNG, a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because this is an essential issue that affects groups in my home State of Indiana, as well as groups throughout the country.

As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I have been present during hearings where we have learned that the IRS targeted conservative and Tea Party groups. During those same hearings, I have shared letters and documents that showed some of the targeted conservative groups were my fellow Hoosiers.

Regretfully, it appears that the IRS, rather than holding those responsible for this targeted sort of activity, is seeking to make political targeting part of their standard operating procedure. The recently proposed IRS regulation that pertains to these 501(c)(4) groups is designed to do so in a way that clearly inhibits their First Amendment activities.

501(c)(4) is the section of our Tax Code that many of the conservative groups tried to file under. They can’t file as a 501(c)(3) because that would limit their ability to engage in grassroots lobbying. They can’t file as a 501(c)(5) because they aren’t a labor union. They can’t file as a 501(c)(6) because they aren’t a chamber of commerce. They can’t file as a 527 because that would limit them only to political activity.

None of these other organizations are affected by the new regulations—only 501(c)(4)’s.

Now, this seems curious to me, and the regulation seems aimed at preventing such groups from engaging in civil discourse. This is why I strongly support H.R. 3865, the Stop Targeting of Political Beliefs, or STOP, Act.

This bill doesn’t say that the IRS cannot regulate this issue, or even that they should not regulate this issue.

□ 1530

Instead, it just tells them to wait until the investigation into this targeting concludes before discussing whether any changes to the rules are necessary.

It is eminently reasonable. It would help protect the political speech and the civil rights of my constituents and those around the country. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), our friend on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing worse than gridlock, according to my predecessor, Congressman Henry Hyde. The worst thing than gridlock is the greased chute of government.

It is ironic that the very administration that jammed through the Affordable Care Act, also known in the vernacular as ObamaCare, the very group that foisted that on the American public in the middle of the night, without much oversight, without much discussion, just jammed it all through, now has a new remedy as it relates to this newest problem, and that is, do it again. Do it again on another issue.

We heard our friend from New Jersey posing a question, and he is misinformed. The nature of his question was somehow that the American public is paying for this, and yet, we had testimony that Mr. CAMP, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, asked this question of Mr. Barthold, who is the chief of staff for the Joint Committee on Taxation.

He asked this question—this is DAVE CAMP, chairman of the committee:

Do these proposed regulations respond to some kind of revenue loss or some kind of tax avoidance scheme?

Answer: Not that I am aware of, sir. These organizations are generally exempt, and a revenue loss has not been identified as the basis of these proposed regulations.

So let's not kid ourselves. Here is the reality. The reality is that this stifles speech. This is from an administration that has been complicit in overseeing an Internal Revenue Service that has picked winners and losers, Mr. Speaker, has been able to say you get to participate in the public debate and you don't.

We ought not do this. There have been over 100,000 comments on this proposed regulation. For those that want to participate and offer their own comment, Mr. Speaker, they can go to [roskam.house.gov/dontbesilenced](http://roskam.house.gov/dontbesilenced) to make sure that their voice is heard as well offering an official comment on this.

One thing we do know: we know that an administration which has a tendency to over-respond, we know that an administration that has not much credibility, frankly, on being thoughtful and nimble as it comes to legislation, is not the administration that we

should trust at this point in time with a rule of such incredible consequence when they have demonstrated no capacity to do right things in the past.

I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, Federal law states that social welfare groups must exclusively promote social welfare. Social welfare includes activities like early childhood education, environmental protection, or veterans' assistance, not partisan political campaign activity.

Now, there is an important book on the House floor, and it is a dictionary. We have that book here because this is a lawmaking institution, and the precise definition of words is incredibly important.

Now, last time I looked up the word "exclusively," it meant everything, excluding everything else, solely, or only.

However, the IRS must have found an alternative definition for exclusively when it issued a regulation allowing social welfare organizations to only primarily promote social welfare. This contradiction between Federal law and IRS regulation has allowed these groups to spend over a quarter-billion dollars on political campaign activity, not their social welfare mission, while keeping their donors secret.

I urge my colleagues simply to vote against the bill and let the IRS move forward with this proposed regulation to correct this. "Exclusively" should mean exclusively.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Louisiana for yielding and for his leadership on holding the IRS accountable.

Mr. Speaker, we should not stand by and let the IRS target American citizens based on their political beliefs, and yet, that is what has been going on. It has been uncovered.

The President tries to act like it is some isolated incident, and yet, of course, we have got all kind of testimony that shows this goes way beyond some local office. This is widespread abuse of power by the Internal Revenue Service, and what we are seeing now, with this latest proposed rule, is literally something that would try to shut down an entire segment of American people who want to participate in the democratic process, Mr. Speaker.

The IRS should not be able to go and target people based on their political views, and yet that is what is happening, and President Obama is encouraging this kind of activity where you,

literally, have the White House using enemy lists to go after people with groups like the IRS.

We have seen it with the EPA. We have seen it with the NLRB and the entire alphabet soup of Federal agencies that seems to want to go after people that might say something, exercising their First Amendment rights, that the White House disagrees with.

That is not how America works. That is not what this great country is built upon, Mr. Speaker.

If the President doesn't like the political views of somebody, that is what the great discourse of this country is all about. That is what makes our country so great, that we can disagree. We can exercise those great rights that the Founding Fathers put in place and that was later established in the Bill of Rights, the first of those Bill of Rights being the First Amendment, encouraging free speech. It is what makes us strong as a Nation.

Yet here comes the IRS trying to shut down, use the heavy hammer of their power to try to shut down political speech of people who disagree with them.

It is not going to work, Mr. Speaker. We are not going to stand for it here in this House. I commend my colleague for bringing the legislation, which I am proud to cosponsor. Over 94,000 Americans have already weighed in on this as well, signing letters and inputting public comment, including 70 members of the Republican Study Committee who have chimed in.

We are not going to stand for this. This will be a bipartisan vote in support of this legislation to stop the abuse of the IRS.

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

Obviously my Republican colleagues don't want to talk about their radical Republican tax bill. I understand. I know why, because it is an actual bill on the American taxpaying public, a bill that would tax Social Security and would eliminate tax deductions on State and local taxes that taxpayers have already paid. It will implement chainsaw CPI.

Instead, they want to focus on a phony scandal—I understand it—and not this extreme scandal Republican tax bill, a bill they will force upon the American public.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague. I have listened all afternoon as my Republican colleagues have held forth about the importance of the First Amendment. No one is debating that. That is not what this bill is about, despite your best efforts to suggest it is.

What this bill is about is letting organizations spend millions of dollars of secret money, secret money, to try to buy elections to serve their special interests. That is what this bill is about.

Now, our Republican colleagues have talked repeatedly about the Treasury



inspector general's report. I don't know if they have read the report, but one of the recommendations was for the IRS to revise its regulations and guidelines to clarify this particular area.

I would have hoped that all of us would want the IRS out of the business of determining whether or not a 501(c)(4) is primarily involved in political activity or primarily involved in social welfare activity.

I don't want them under the nose of every organization trying to figure it out, and that is why the IRS is trying to reform this area of the law.

So why isn't that what our Republican colleagues want?

Because this isn't about allowing those groups to exercise free speech. It is allowing those organizations to be used to channel secret money without disclosing those expenditures to the voters. That is what this is all about, because you can spend as much money as you want on political advocacy and campaigns. All you have to do is organize as a 527, which is another organization under the Tax Code which, by the way, is also tax exempt.

So why isn't that good enough?

You can say as much as you want, spend millions of dollars. I will tell you why. Because under 527's, people are spending all that money to influence elections, they have to disclose. They have to tell voters who they are spending millions of dollars to try and influence those votes.

That is not good enough for our Republican colleagues. They want to preserve this messy situation because it allows all that secret money to flow into these campaigns.

We believe voters have a right to know who is trying to spend millions of dollars to influence these votes, and by the way, eight of the nine Justices on the Supreme Court in *Citizens United*, a case which I had lots of problems with lots of parts of it, but eight of the nine Justices agree with us that transparency is important.

Here is what Justice Kennedy said. These transparency laws "impose no ceiling on campaign-related activities" and "do not prevent anyone from speaking," but they have "a governmental interest in providing the electorate with information about the sources of election-related spending."

Eight out of nine Supreme Court Justices agree with what every poll shows, that the American people overwhelmingly want transparency in our elections. Because why? Transparency brings accountability.

I think every American has an interest in knowing who is spending millions of dollars to try and get them elected to Congress, to serve particular special interests.

So, Mr. Speaker, for goodness sakes, this isn't about the First Amendment. Everyone is in favor of the First Amendment. This is about allowing secret money in campaigns, and we should not allow that. It is against the public interest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

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

I would, first off, mention that the regulation does not mention donors.

Secondly, I would like to point out that the ACLU itself said these requirements "will pose insurmountable compliance issues that go beyond practicality and raise First Amendment concerns of the highest order."

The gentleman mentioned the Treasury inspector general report, but he didn't quite precisely characterize what the inspector general said. The inspector general said in his report that the IRS, one of the recommendations is the IRS provide guidance on how to measure political activity, not what constitutes political activity.

So with those clarifications, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and DAVE CAMP for leading this effort to protect our free speech.

Whenever someone in Washington tells you don't worry, it is not really about free speech, trust me, it is.

A lot of Americans are frightened by the thought that their government would target them based on their political beliefs, and I am convinced the darkest days in America's history have been when the government has tried to silence the voices of those who disagree with it.

We suffered under this intimidation during the civil rights era, under the antiwar era, and now today, because conservative organizations, constitutional organizations, some who simply want to make the country better and have that voice, are now being targeted.

Make no mistake. This is not about clearing up confusion. This is about intimidation. This is about the government using one of the most powerful agencies it has, the IRS, the only agency that can destroy your life, your family, your business' life with their immense power, targeting people because of their political beliefs.

If you talk about what is free speech, I would point to this: look at organizations back home in your community. Those who want to do get out to vote, so go vote and have your voices heard. Voter registration, candidate forms, let's find out what elected officials and candidates feel about the issues.

Then just grassroots lobbying, letting their neighbors, their communities, their members understand the issues and weigh in. That is free speech. That is the First Amendment, and when this government targets Americans based on it, we have got to stop it.

Make no mistake, Republican, Democrat, Tea Party, Progressive, I don't care where you are at on there, we cannot let the government have this power. It must be stopped now.

□ 1545

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply close this debate by saying that, throughout all of this vigorous discussion, we want to make clear that this bill just simply asks for a 1-year delay in the implementation of this rule to allow ample time for Congress to complete its investigation and for the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration to complete its investigation, so that we have the facts on the table.

We shouldn't be jumping ahead of the gun and possibly, and likely, infringe on the First Amendment rights of so many people unless we have the facts.

The ranking member of the committee, Mr. LEVIN, has admitted that the investigation is incomplete. Let's just give this time. We owe it to the American people to do that. We owe it to the integrity of this institution to do our work prior to having these premature judgments come forward, especially when the rule does not address all the issues that have been discussed today.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I ask that we all vote in favor of this bill, support it, and move it forward. Let's hit that pause button. Let's complete the investigation and do our due diligence.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 487, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Van Hollen moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3865, to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new sections:

#### SEC. 3. PRESERVING DEMOCRACY FROM THE CORRUPTING INFLUENCE OF SECRET DONORS.

Nothing in this Act shall limit, restrict, or prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from issuing regulations requiring the disclosure of secret political donors.

#### SEC. 4. RESTORING UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FOR AMERICA'S JOB SEEKERS.

This Act shall not take effect until the Secretary of the Treasury has certified that the most recent percentage of the insured unemployed (those for whom unemployment taxes were paid during prior employment) who are receiving Federal or State unemployment insurance (UI) benefits when they are actively seeking work is at least equal to the percentage receiving such benefits for the last quarter of 2013, as determined by the

Department of Labor's quarterly UI data summary measurement of the Unemployment Insurance reciprocity rate for all UI programs.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee.

If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended, and as the motion indicated, it addresses secret money in elections. I am trying to make sure we end that secret money. It also deals with the issue of extending unemployment insurance, which my colleague from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) will discuss in a minute.

But I want to focus on this issue of secret money because this resolution, what we are asking our Republican colleagues to join us on, is to vote on a very simple statement: to say that nothing in this act shall limit, restrict, or prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from issuing regulations requiring the disclosure of secret political donors.

Our Republican colleagues all afternoon have said this is about the First Amendment. This is about protecting the right of people to express their views.

That is not what their bill is about. Everyone is in favor of people being able to express their views. As I indicated earlier, you can form what is known as a 527 organization; and whether you are an individual or an organization in that form, you can spend millions of dollars to try to influence the outcome of elections.

What we are saying is the voters have a right to know who is bankrolling these campaign efforts. What we have seen over the last couple of years is a huge increase, an explosion of money being spent by outside groups to try to influence the outcome of elections to try to elect Members of Congress to support whatever interests those groups may support.

This motion, what we are proposing, would still allow all this money to be spent. But—and here is the key—most of that money is now flowing through 501(c)(4) organizations because some groups have been abusing those organizations to allow them to use them as secret conduits, conduits to allow them to secretly fund campaigns.

All we are saying is let's not take away the right and ability of the Treasury Department to adopt regulations to make sure we don't allow that secret money because I thought most of us agreed in transparency, and I thought most of us agreed in accountability.

And I know that eight of the nine Supreme Court Justices, even in a con-

troversial case, support transparency and disclosure. They say that is good for democracy. And you know what? Every poll shows that the American people overwhelmingly agree. So let's vote for disclosure and vote for this motion.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Let's look at the facts. Only those who won't look don't see them.

There have been 1.9 million long-term unemployed Americans who have lost their unemployment insurance since December 28 and another 72,000 every week. Unemployment insurance lifted 2.5 million from poverty in 2012, and now hundreds of thousands are sinking into poverty because this institution and the House majority will not act.

The long-term unemployment rate in this country: 36 percent of jobless workers over 6 months; the lowest percentage of jobless receiving unemployment insurance in over 50 years. It is mindless not to act in terms of the national economy. It is heartless not to act in terms of the individual lives of hundreds and hundreds and hundreds and hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of Americans and their families.

Vote for this motion to recommit. I don't see how anybody can go home and vote "no."

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order, and I seek the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit actually allows and perpetuates the targeting of Americans by the Internal Revenue Service. This motion to recommit permits the government to restrict the free speech of Americans.

I can't stand for this. The American people can't stand for this and should not stand for this. Vote "no" on this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 191, nays 230, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

YEAS—191

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

NAYS—230

Aderholt	Capito	Farenthold
Amash	Carter	Fincher
Amodei	Cassidy	Fitzpatrick
Bachmann	Chabot	Fleischmann
Bachus	Chaffetz	Fleming
Barletta	Coble	Flores
Barr	Coffman	Forbes
Barton	Cole	Fortenberry
Benishek	Collins (GA)	Fox
Bentivolio	Collins (NY)	Franks (AZ)
Bilirakis	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (UT)	Cook	Gardner
Black	Cotton	Garrett
Blackburn	Cramer	Gerlach
Boustany	Crawford	Gibbs
Brady (TX)	Crenshaw	Gibson
Bridenstine	Culberson	Gingrey (GA)
Brooks (AL)	Daines	Gohmert
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Goodlatte
Broun (GA)	Denham	Gowdy
Buchanan	Dent	Granger
Bucshon	DeSantis	Graves (GA)
Burgess	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)
Byrne	Diaz-Balart	Griffin (AR)
Calvert	Duffy	Griffith (VA)
Camp	Duncan (SC)	Grimm
Campbell	Duncan (TN)	Guthrie
Cantor	Ellmers	Hall

Hanna	McKinley	Royce	Bridenstine	Heck (NV)	Pitts	Grijalva	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Harper	McMorris	Runyan	Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Poe (TX)	Gutiérrez	Maffei	Sarbanes
Harris	Rodgers	Ryan (WI)	Brooks (IN)	Herrera Beutler	Pompeo	Hahn	Maloney,	Schakowsky
Hartzler	Meadows	Salmon	Broun (GA)	Holding	Posey	Hanabusa	Carolyn	Schiff
Hastings (WA)	Meehan	Sanford	Buchanan	Hudson	Price (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Maloney, Sean	Schneider
Heck (NV)	Messer	Scalise	Bucshon	Huelskamp	Rahall	Heck (WA)	Matsui	Schrader
Hensarling	Mica	Schock	Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Reed	Higgins	McDermott	Schwartz
Herrera Beutler	Miller (FL)	Schweikert	Byrne	Hultgren	Reichert	Himes	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Holding	Miller (MI)	Scott, Austin	Calvert	Hunter	Renacci	Hinojosa	McNerney	Serrano
Hudson	Miller, Gary	Sensenbrenner	Camp	Hurt	Ribble	Holt	Meeks	Sewell (AL)
Huelskamp	Mullin	Sessions	Campbell	Issa	Rice (SC)	Honda	Meng	Shea-Porter
Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney	Shimkus	Cantor	Jenkins	Rigell	Horsford	Michaud	Sherman
Hultgren	Murphy (PA)	Shuster	Capito	Johnson (OH)	Roby	Hoyer	Miller, George	Sires
Hunter	Neugebauer	Simpson	Carter	Johnson, Sam	Roe (TN)	Huffman	Moore	Slaughter
Hurt	Noem	Smith (MO)	Cassidy	Jones	Rogers (AL)	Israel	Moran	Smith (WA)
Issa	Nugent	Smith (NE)	Chabot	Jordan	Rogers (KY)	Jackson Lee	Nadler	Speier
Jenkins	Nunes	Smith (NJ)	Chaffetz	Joyce	Rogers (MI)	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Swalwell (CA)
Johnson (OH)	Nunnelee	Smith (TX)	Coble	Kelly (PA)	Rohrabacher	Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Takano
Johnson, Sam	Olson	Southerland	Coffman	King (IA)	Rokita	Kaptur	Negrete McLeod	Thompson (CA)
Jones	Owens	Stewart	Cole	King (NY)	Rooney	Keating	Nolan	Thompson (MS)
Jordan	Palazzo	Stivers	Collins (GA)	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen	Kelly (IL)	O'Rourke	Tierney
Joyce	Paulsen	Stockman	Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Roskam	Kennedy	Pallone	Titus
Kelly (PA)	Pearce	Stutzman	Conaway	Kirkpatrick	Ross	Kildee	Pascrell	Tonko
King (IA)	Perry	Terry	Cook	Kline	Rothfus	Kilmer	Payne	Tsongas
King (NY)	Petri	Thompson (PA)	Costa	Labrador	Royce	Kind	Pelosi	Van Hollen
Kingston	Pittenger	Thornberry	Cotton	LaMalfa	Runyan	Kuster	Perlmutter	Vargas
Kinzinger (IL)	Pitts	Tiberi	Cramer	LaBarn	Ryan (WI)	Langevin	Peters (CA)	Veasey
Kline	Poe (TX)	Tipton	Crawford	Lance	Salmon	Larson (CT)	Peters (MI)	Vela
Labrador	Pompeo	Turner	Crenshaw	Lankford	Sanford	Lee (CA)	Pingree (ME)	Velázquez
LaMalfa	Posey	Upton	Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Scalise	Levin	Pocan	Visclosky
Lamborn	Price (GA)	Valadao	Culberson	Latham	Schock	Lewis	Polis	Walz
Lance	Reed	Wagner	Daines	Latta	Schweikert	Lipinski	Price (NC)	Wasserman
Lankford	Reichert	Walberg	Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Scott, Austin	Loeb sack	Quigley	Schultz
Latham	Renacci	Walden	Denham	Lucas	Sensenbrenner	Lofgren	Richmond	Waters
Latta	Ribble	Walorski	Dent	Luetkemeyer	Sessions	Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Welch
LoBiondo	Rice (SC)	Weber (TX)	DeSantis	Lummis	Shimkus	Lowe	Ruiz	Waxman
Long	Rigell	Webster (FL)	DesJarlais	Marchant	Shuster	Lujan Grisham	Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)
Lucas	Roby	Wenstrup	Diaz-Balart	Duffy	Simpson	(NM)	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth
Luetkemeyer	Roe (TN)	Whitfield	Duncan (SC)	Massie	Sinema	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sánchez, Linda	
Lummis	Rogers (AL)	Williams	Duncan (TN)	Matheson	Smith (MO)	(NM)	T.	
Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)	Ellmers	McAllister	Smith (NE)			
Marino	Rogers (MI)	Wittman	Farenthold	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NJ)			
Massie	Rohrabacher	Wolf	Fincher	McCaul	Smith (TX)			
McAllister	Rokita	Womack	Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Southerland			
McCarthy (CA)	Rooney	Woodall	Fleischmann	McHenry	Stewart			
McCaul	Ros-Lehtinen	Yoder	Fleming	McIntyre	Stivers			
McClintock	Roskam	Yoho	Flores	McKeon	Stockman			
McHenry	Ross	Young (AK)	Forbes	McKinley	Stutzman			
McKeon	Rothfus	Young (IN)	Fortenberry	McMorris	Terry			
			Fox	Rodgers	Thompson (PA)			
			Franks (AZ)	Meadows	Thornberry			
			Frelinghuysen	Meehan	Tiberi			
			Gallego	Messer	Tipton			
			Gardner	Mica	Turner			
			Garrett	Miller (FL)	Upton			
			Gerlach	Miller (MI)	Valadao			
			Gibbs	Miller, Gary	Wagner			
			Gibson	Mullin	Walberg			
			Gingrey (GA)	Mulvaney	Walden			
			Gohmert	Murphy (FL)	Walorski			
			Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)	Weber (TX)			
			Gowdy	Neugebauer	Webster (FL)			
			Granger	Noem	Wenstrup			
			Graves (GA)	Nugent	Whitfield			
			Graves (MO)	Nunes	Williams			
			Griffin (AR)	Nunnelee	Wilson (SC)			
			Griffith (VA)	Olson	Wittman			
			Grimm	Owens	Wolf			
			Guthrie	Palazzo	Womack			
			Hall	Paulsen	Woodall			
			Hanna	Pearce	Yoder			
			Harper	Perry	Yoho			
			Harris	Peterson	Young (AK)			
			Hartzler	Petri	Young (IN)			
			Hastings (WA)	Pittenger				

## NOT VOTING—9

Blumenauer	Jeffries	Pastor (AZ)
Ellison	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Gosar	McCollum	Westmoreland

## □ 1620

Messrs. PITTENGER, COBLE, POSEY, RICE of South Carolina, BILIRAKIS, AMODEI, ADERHOLT, SCHOCK, and Ms. GRANGER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. SERRANO and COHEN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. 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 243, noes 176, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

AYES—243

Aderholt	Barletta	Bilirakis
Amash	Barr	Bishop (UT)
Amodei	Barrow (GA)	Black
Bachmann	Barton	Blackburn
Bachus	Benishek	Boustany
Barber	Bentivolio	Brady (TX)

Bass	Chu	Deutch
Beatty	Cicilline	Dingell
Becerra	Clark (MA)	Doggett
Bera (CA)	Clarke (NY)	Doyle
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Duckworth
Bishop (NY)	Cleaver	Edwards
Bonamici	Clyburn	Engel
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Enyart
Braley (IA)	Connolly	Eshoo
Brown (FL)	Conyers	Esty
Brownley (CA)	Cooper	Farr
Bustos	Courtney	Fattah
Butterfield	Crowley	Foster
Capps	Cummings	Frankel (FL)
Capuano	Davis (CA)	Fudge
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny	Gabbard
Carney	DeFazio	Garamendi
Carson (IN)	DeGette	Garcia
Cartwright	Delaney	Grayson
Castor (FL)	DeLauro	Green, Al
Castro (TX)	DelBene	Green, Gene

## NOES—176

Blumenauer	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Ellison	McCollum	Scott, David
Gosar	Pastor (AZ)	Westmoreland
Jeffries	Rangel	

## NOT VOTING—11

Blumenauer	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Ellison	McCollum	Scott, David
Gosar	Pastor (AZ)	Westmoreland
Jeffries	Rangel	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

## □ 1627

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk to correct the name of the bill to the Protect Anonymous Special Interests Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Polis of Colorado moves to amend the title of H.R. 3865 to read as follows:

To protect anonymous special interests by prohibiting 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 6 of rule XVI, the amendment is not debatable.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

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

## RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 241, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

AYES—177

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

NOES—241

Aderholt	Cantor	Farenthold
Amash	Capito	Fincher
Amodei	Carter	Fitzpatrick
Bachmann	Cassidy	Fleischmann
Bachus	Chabot	Fleming
Barber	Chaffetz	Flores
Barletta	Coble	Forbes
Barr	Coffman	Fortenberry
Barrow (GA)	Cole	Fox
Barton	Collins (GA)	Franks (AZ)
Benish	Collins (NY)	Frelinghuysen
Bentivolio	Conaway	Gallego
Bilirakis	Cook	Gardner
Bishop (UT)	Cotton	Garrett
Black	Cramer	Gerlach
Blackburn	Crawford	Gibbs
Boustany	Crenshaw	Gibson
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Gingrey (GA)
Bridenstine	Daines	Gohmert
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Goodlatte
Brooks (IN)	Denham	Gowdy
Brown (GA)	Dent	Granger
Buchanan	DeSantis	Graves (GA)
Bucshon	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)
Burgess	Diaz-Balart	Griffin (AR)
Byrne	Duffy	Griffith (VA)
Calvert	Duncan (SC)	Grimm
Camp	Duncan (TN)	Guthrie
Campbell	Ellmers	Hall

Hanna	McKeon	Rothfus
Harper	McKinley	Royce
Harris	McMorris	Runyan
Hartzler	Rodgers	Ryan (WI)
Hastings (WA)	Meadows	Salmon
Heck (NV)	Meehan	Sanford
Hensarling	Messer	Scalise
Herrera Beutler	Mica	Schock
Holding	Michaud	Schrader
Hudson	Miller (FL)	Schweikert
Huelskamp	Miller (MI)	Scott, Austin
Huizenga (MI)	Miller, Gary	Sensenbrenner
Hultgren	Mullin	Sessions
Hunter	Mulvaney	Shimkus
Hurt	Murphy (FL)	Shuster
Issa	Murphy (PA)	Simpson
Jenkins	Neugebauer	Sinema
Johnson (OH)	Noem	Smith (MO)
Johnson, Sam	Nugent	Smith (NE)
Jones	Nunes	Smith (NJ)
Jordan	Nunnelee	Smith (TX)
Joyce	Olson	Southerland
Kelly (PA)	Owens	Stewart
King (IA)	Palazzo	Stivers
King (NY)	Paulsen	Stockman
Kingston	Pearce	Stutzman
Kinzinger (IL)	Perry	Terry
Kline	Petri	Thompson (PA)
Labrador	Pittenger	Thornberry
LaMalfa	Pitts	Tiberi
Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Tipton
Lance	Pompeo	Turner
Lankford	Posey	Upton
Larsen (WA)	Price (GA)	Valadao
Latham	Rahall	Wagner
Latta	Reed	Walden
LoBiondo	Reichert	Walorski
Long	Renacci	Weber (TX)
Lucas	Ribble	Webster (FL)
Luetkemeyer	Rice (SC)	Wenstrup
Lummis	Rigell	Whitfield
Maffei	Roby	Williams
Marchant	Roe (TN)	Wilson (SC)
Marino	Rogers (AL)	Wittman
Massie	Rogers (KY)	Wolf
Matheson	Rogers (MI)	Womack
McAllister	Rohrabacher	Woodall
McCarthy (CA)	Rokita	Yoder
McCaul	Rooney	Yoho
McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
McHenry	Roskam	Young (IN)
McIntyre	Ross	

NOT VOTING—12

Blumenauer	Jeffries	Rangel
Ellison	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Gosar	McCollum	Waxman
Grijalva	Pastor (AZ)	Westmoreland

□ 1645

Mr. CALVERT changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2431. An act to reauthorize the National Integrated Drought Information System.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 899, UNFUNDED MANDATES INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2013

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-362) on the resolution (H. Res. 492) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 899) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to im-

posing Federal mandates, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### ALL ECONOMIC REGULATIONS ARE TRANSPARENT ACT OF 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 2804.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 487 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2804.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1648

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 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, with Ms. FOXX in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Just over 6 months ago, President Obama announced that he would once again pivot to the economy. The bottom line of his speech: after 4½ years of the Obama administration, "We're not there yet."

The President was right. We were not there yet nor are we there today. Job creation and economic growth continue to fall short of what is needed to produce a real and durable recovery in our country. The nominal unemployment rate is down, but that is not because enough workers have found jobs; it is because so many unemployed workers have despaired of ever finding new full-time work. They have either left the workforce or have settled for part-time jobs.

As long as this situation continues, Congress must stay focused on enacting reforms that will stop the losses, return America to prosperity, and return discouraged workers to the dignity of a good, full-time job. The legislation we consider today is just that