

to devastate the economy of Latin America's largest oil exporter to the point where, now, the Venezuelan people are facing shortages of basic goods, like cooking oil and even toilet paper.

Maduro has intensified his intimidation tactics by increasing political arrests and violence, labeling the opposition as terrorists and enemies of the State, and actually even expelling independent media, such as CNN.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the international community to aggressively express their commitment to the basic freedoms that are under assault in Venezuela; and I also, Mr. Speaker, urge our administration to—at the very least—demand that the OAS immediately convene its Permanent Council to invoke the democratic charter, since it has clearly been violated.

Now is the time to stand with the Venezuelan people.

ANNIVERSARY OF SUPREME COURT UPHOLDING 19TH AMENDMENT

(Ms. HANABUSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 92nd anniversary of *Leser v. Garnett*, where the Supreme Court upheld the 19th Amendment, which protects a woman's right to vote.

Our Nation's suffragettes stood up to the injustice. They fought for their rights. Without their perseverance and fearlessness, I and many of my colleagues would not be standing here today.

These suffragettes represent a long line of women who said no to the status quo, inspiring future leaders, like our very own former Congresswoman Patsy Mink from Hawaii, who authored title IX, a historic milestone for equality in women's sports.

Today, we honor the sacrifices of these suffragettes, and we commit ourselves to further equality, whether it means breaking the glass ceiling or lifting the floor beneath their feet.

Note that women make up two-thirds of the minimum wage workers. Increasing the minimum wage to \$10.10 is critical for our Nation's hardworking women struggling to pull their families out of poverty.

It is time for my colleagues to recognize this. In the legacy of the suffragettes, we will continue to fight for what women deserve: equality.

AMERICA'S RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

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

Mr. COTTON. Yesterday, I introduced the LOCAL Act, a bill allowing the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to restore joint management programs with local nonprofit organizations to

construct, operate, and maintain recreational facilities at lakes and reservoirs across the country.

Despite years of successful operation, the Corps recently determined they lacked the authority to continue these joint management programs and are in the process of suspending all local partnerships.

Arkansans know better than anyone how to manage our lands, and cuts to the Corps' budget shouldn't dictate our ability to enjoy these facilities. For years, these partnerships have allowed local groups, like the Friends of Lake Ouachita, to successfully maintain recreational facilities across our State.

Arkansas is known as the Natural State. One of our greatest points of pride is access to public lands and water. The LOCAL Act will ensure that facilities like Lake Ouachita and Beaver Lake remain easily accessible to future generations.

□ 1230

SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, we adults ask students to be model citizens, to devote themselves to their studies, and to become tomorrow's leaders. But what is our message when their leaders can't even ensure a school building that passes code inspection? Every day, the students at Trenton Central High School attempt to learn in a building that suffers from electrical fires due to poor wiring and leaking water; dripping bathroom sewage; and an absence of science labs and general inadequacy and indignities.

To fix these problems and provide Trenton students with a facility worthy of students and teachers for the 21st century, it is projected to cost \$130 million. To bring all of New Jersey's schools up to code will cost several billions of dollars. Many States cannot manage that cost alone. We need to invest in our children by devoting Federal funds to school construction and renovation. With a modern school infrastructure, we can ask our students to become the community and world leaders we want them to be.

NATIONAL LATINO ENROLLMENT WEEK

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, the administration has declared this week to be National Latino Enrollment Week in the hopes of mounting a special push—a big rush—of Latinos rushing to sign up for the Affordable Care Act because it is supposedly going to help their lives in so many ways. Yet

Latinos nationwide, like millions of other Americans, are discovering that they just can't afford the Affordable Care Act. Not only is it causing them to lose coverage, but they also see their premiums rise and have their health care plans canceled.

The Spanish site that the administration promised would help people enroll reads as if it were written by a first-year Spanish student, and it has proven to have more problems than the actual English version of healthcare.gov.

Where we live in the Central Valley, Latinos already struggle to access doctors. We have got a huge shortage of doctors, doctors that are willing to take Medicare and Medicaid, because of the reimbursement rates. So now, with the Affordable Care Act, we are going to have even fewer doctors and less access. Health care reform that doesn't increase their access is meaningless. The Affordable Care Act has also heightened their struggles.

Mr. Speaker, we must repeal and replace this damaging law with one that benefits the Latino community and millions of others across the country.

ALL ECONOMIC REGULATIONS ARE TRANSPARENT ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). 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 further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2804.

Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1232

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 further 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 Mr. YODER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, February 26, 2014, amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 113-361 offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 113-361.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In the table of contents of the bill, insert after item pertaining to section 405 the following:

TITLE V—EXCEPTION
Sec. 501. Exception.

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

SEC. 501. EXCEPTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply in the case of a rule pertaining to air quality or water quality, or a consent decree or settlement agreement pertaining to such a rule. In the case of such a rule, consent decree, or settlement agreement, the provisions of law amended by this Act shall apply as though such amendments had not been made.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 487, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

I am pleased to offer this simple amendment that would exempt rules that further protect our Nation's air and water quality from these new proposed hurdles. It is no surprise that a 2012 American Lung Association report found that Americans support the Clean Air Act by a 2 to 1 margin. Why? Because it is working. Harmful emissions are dropping, and air quality is better than it was a decade ago. But we still have 131 million fellow Americans—42 percent of the Nation—living in communities where pollution levels are deemed harmful for at-risk populations: young people and senior citizens. In fact, the national capital region is one of those areas. It is a non-attainment area for ground-level ozone.

It is pretty clear what my friends on the other side of the aisle think of government regulation, but I am curious if they have actually asked their own constituents what they think. For example, I wonder if the residents living downstream from the West Virginia chemical spill where a toxic substance has now been carried into neighboring Ohio and other points south and west share the same disdain for water quality regulation as some of my friends on the other side of the aisle. Or what about the residents near the North Carolina coal ash spill which is affecting drinking water there and in some parts of my own home State, Virginia?

Maybe we should ask the millions of parents who own one of the child car safety seats that are now the subject of a massive nationwide recall if they would feel more comfortable with less rigorous standards for safety for their children. I introduced another amendment to this bill to exempt those rules for child car safety seats so we can continue to have rigorous standards. Unfortunately, my friends on the other side of the aisle who control the Rules Committee refused to allow a vote on that amendment.

A poll conducted by the American Lung Association found nearly three of four respondents believe we shouldn't have to choose between this health and

safety standard and promoting the economy on the other hand. They understand that is a false choice and that we can and must do both. But my friends on the other side of the aisle continue to perpetuate this canard that government regulation is a heavy boot on the neck of business in America.

Another poll conducted by the American Sustainable Business Council found 78 percent of employers believe responsible regulation is important for protecting small businesses from unfair competition and leveling the playing field. In fact, the most recent Wells Fargo/Gallup index of small businesses found just 11 percent cited regulations as a significant challenge when rated against other challenges they face in the economic marketplace.

Employers and the American people get it, Mr. Chairman. They recognize there is a role for fair, reasonable, and responsible regulation in protecting public safety and health and in promoting the economy. Again, the American Lung Association poll found a 2-to-1 majority believes environmental safeguards will spur innovation and investment and create jobs.

Now, I understand the frustration expressed by some of my colleagues that the current regulatory process can sometimes be too long, and sometimes it is, averaging 4 to 8 years in some cases. But the bill before us today will do nothing to reduce that timeline. Instead, it prolongs that process by requiring even more redundant analysis. How ironic is that?

This bill would strengthen the hand of special interests by allowing them to challenge Federal agencies on whether they assessed every possible alternative and chose the one least costly to it. Their bill would erect new hurdles for citizens to petition their government to finally act on long overdue or congressionally mandated safeguards and protections.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to beat back these tired and hackneyed efforts by my friends on the other side who, on behalf of corporate polluters, have proposed this legislation. Our constituents expect safe drinking water, reliable child car safety seats, clean air, and countless other protections. Let's work together to improve the regulatory process rather than gut it and return our communities to the law of the jungle.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, air and water quality regulations, done properly, serve important goals, and I agree with my friend from across the aisle. He said the bill, however, his interpretation and ours are just different. The bill does nothing to frustrate the achievement of these goals.

But Federal air and water regulations have been the source of many of the most abusive, unnecessarily expensive, and job- and wage-destroying regulations in American history. Air regulations, for example, were precisely the regulations that inflicted the harm on Rob James, Avon Lake, Bob Sells and his workers, and Allen Puckett and his workers that I mentioned in, frankly, my opening statement in discussion yesterday. To remove these areas of regulation from the bill would severely weaken the bill's important reforms to lower the crushing costs of Federal regulation.

In looking at this amendment and looking at the discussion that was just had, Mr. Chairman, by the gentleman offering, it goes back to a tired argument that is not worthy of debate on this floor. For the opposite to present an amendment is fine. To present an amendment to say that you don't like the way we are wanting to do that is fine. But to retread and rework the idea that I or my children or anybody else's children want to breathe dirty air or drink dirty water or have child seats fall apart or child restraints be broken or anything else is just not worthy of debate here on this floor.

Let's take the bill. I will take your amendment, and it is offered in good faith. But when we look at this bill, we are looking at jobs. Again, the argument that was made to protect the government bureaucracy from more work is not also an accurate statement, especially when it does protect the men and women—the workers.

I said it yesterday. I will say it again. Do you want a clear determination on what party is looking out for whom? Do you look out for government workers and more regulations, or do you look out for the moms and dads who go to work to earn their living to take care of their families, to breathe clean air, to have clean water, and to have safety environments in a limited regulatory reform, which is what our Founders intended? That is what we do here.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Gosh, if there is a tired debate on this floor, my good friend from Georgia has just identified it. It is that hackneyed phrase, "crushing burden of regulation." Well, that would come as news to most Americans who have benefited from clean air regulation, which, by the way, has net created jobs, not destroyed them.

The Republican narrative here couldn't be more false except that they are protecting their base—their corporate base, in my view—at the expense of the average American citizen who wants to breathe clean air, who wants to drink clean water, and who wants to protect their children.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have learned here through many

times here in Congress that we do come from different areas, but I am just amazed at my friend across the aisle because I am not sure which business, which one is working out when you look at the workers that I just named and you look at the businessowners that come to my office and discuss the fact that jobs are being lost and that things are being taken here because of regulatory burden. The tired argument here is not the fact.

The honest argument here is: What is the role that we are supposed to be doing? Where is the government role that should be there that should provide good regulatory reform? And I think what was actually said was that providing hurdles to keeping regulatory reform open. What we are saying is we want it transparent. We want businesses to be a part. And to have anything said less and to say, again, to rehash an argument that implies that others want to breathe dirty air, to drink dirty water, and to in any way harm the American people by simply bringing sense to our regulatory process is just simply a straw man. When you have got nothing else to talk about, let's throw the kitchen sink at it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time and urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 113-361.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In the table of contents of the bill, insert after item pertaining to section 405 the following:

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

Sec. 501. Exception.

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

SEC. 501. EXCEPTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply in the case of a rule made by the Secretary of Homeland Security, or a consent decree or settlement agreement pertaining to such a rule. In the case of such a rule, consent decree, or settlement agreement, the provisions of law amended by this Act shall apply as though such amendments had not been made.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 487, the gentlewoman

from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1245

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak to the Jackson Lee amendment with great enthusiasm for its seriousness, and I say to my colleagues, there are no smoke and mirrors here.

This amendment exempts rules made by the Secretary of Homeland Security or any consent decree or settlement made as a result of this rule.

I don't think that we need to further educate our very diligent Members, whether they are on the Homeland Security or Judiciary or Intelligence or Armed Services Committees, or many other committees, about the new climate in which we live in this world after 9/11. We simply have to look at the landscape that we are around as we speak: Central African Republic, South Sudan, Ukraine, Venezuela, Nigeria, and Syria. Just a few days ago, I was on the Israeli side of the Syrian border, and I could look into a city very close and see constant mortar fire.

Everybody understands that with the new climate of franchise terrorism, al Qaeda travels from one conflict area to another, each time posing a threat to the United States of America or the West. Yet, we have legislation that does not exempt the actions of the Secretary of Homeland Security, who may be required to make emergency decisions.

This particular legislation has 60 new barriers, procedural requirements, before an important rulemaking can go forward. It requires a 6-month online presence before you can move forward.

I would offer to say that the conflicts in the Central African Republic and South Sudan, the crisis in the Ukraine, on which America is standing on the sides of those who believe in democracy, the fighting in Nigeria between Christians and Muslims, and the conflict in Syria that has a terrible impact as we move forward on the Palestinian and Israeli peace process—how can we not exempt the Secretary of Homeland Security?

Mr. Chairman, not only do we deal with issues of terrorism, but it is also the stand-up agency when America faces natural disasters. For example, Hurricane Rita was the fourth-most-powerful Atlantic storm in history, and made landfall with 120-mile-per-hour winds, which had devastating consequences for many of my Texas constituents. That occurred just a few years ago. Hurricane Rita came out of the gulf, but Hurricane Sandy came out of the east coast and the Atlantic waters. It brought havoc that no one ever expected. FEMA was vital in the restoration of the lives of Americans. In that instance, I would think we would want any rulemaking process to move quickly, to be able to bring aid to those in need.

As indicated, this is a question of national security and the protection of our people. We need swift responses to imminent threats to national security. We need to have flexibility for the Secretary of Homeland Security to make those decisions. H.R. 2804 was created under the guise of increasing transparency. I would offer to say that there are instances when all of us know that our security is crucial.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that my colleagues support this exemption for Homeland Security to protect America's homeland and national security.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of my amendment to H.R. 2804 that provides a common-sense exception to the "All Economic Regulations are Transparent Act of 2014."

H.R. 2804 makes numerous changes to the federal rule-making process, including:

1. requiring agencies to consider numerous new criteria when issuing rules, such as alternatives to rules proposals;
2. requiring agencies to review the "indirect" costs of proposed and existing rules;
3. giving the Small Business Administration expanded authority to intervene in the rule-making of other agencies; and
4. requiring federal agencies to file monthly reports on the status of their rule-making activities.

My amendment provides an exception to the "All Economic Regulations are Transparent Act of 2014" for rules made by the Secretary of Homeland Security or any consent decree or settlement made as a result of the rule. My amendment is simple in that it provides an exception for critical agency rules that the general safety and well-being of individuals in the United States.

Mr. Chair, Hurricane Rita, which was the fourth most powerful Atlantic storm in history made landfall with 120 mile per hour winds and had devastating consequences to Texans, many of whom were my constituents. Without Homeland Security how do Americans get through hurricanes and tornadoes?

The ALERRT Act packages four measures, all of which are designed to stop, delay, or weaken new protections. The Regulatory Accountability Act (RAA) is the most far-reaching of these measures. It amends the Administrative Procedure Act, but goes far beyond establishing procedures for rulemaking. The RAA acts as a "super mandate" overriding requirements of landmark legislation such as the Occupational Safety and Health Act and Mine Safety and Health Act.

Homeland Security is one of the most pre-eminent concerns of the federal government. The increased need for national security following the attacks of September 11th has increased the demand for Homeland Security to find more effective means to preempt attacks against our nation. And that is why my colleagues should vote to exempt the Department of Homeland Security from this legislation today.

And Mr. Chair, I was pleased to meet with, Jeh Johnson the new Secretary, on Tuesday and he appeared before the Homeland Security Committee yesterday, and I am encouraged to see that he understands just how critical his mission is and the utter importance of being able to respond swiftly to address problems as they arise. Swift responses to imminent threats to national security allow the Department of Homeland Security to protect the

rights and interests of individuals in the United States. Unnecessary delays to rules set forth by the Department of Homeland Security can waste scarce resources that keep our nation safe as well as impede the regular operations of the agency.

What we have before us in H.R. 2804 is an unnecessary reporting burden for the Department of Homeland Security. The Regulatory Flexibility Act and Executive Order 12866 already requires agency status updates twice a year. H.R. 2804 requires monthly reporting, which would create additional difficulties for agency to produce requisite reports. H.R. 2804 requires the OIRA to issue an annual cumulative report even though this reporting is already part of existing laws, thus creating duplicative reporting mechanisms and wasting limited federal resources.

The additional reporting requirements create a delay on agency activity and waste valuable resources in creating extraneous and duplicative records. The bill also prematurely calls for agencies to provide cost estimates for proposed rules that are to be finalized in the following year. Executive Order 12866 does not require agencies to report full cost estimates, but rather makes cost-benefit information discretionary. Even though the rule requires the estimation of costs, it prohibits benefit calculations of agency rules.

Further, H.R. 2804 precludes rules from taking effect until the information required by the act is available on the Internet for at least six months. This provision of the bill severely limits agencies' abilities to respond to imminent threats of national security. The amendment would preclude such a delay in relation to Homeland Security rules, consent decrees, or settlements.

H.R. 2804 was created under the guise of increasing agency transparency and regulation, but in actuality, the bill serves as an impediment to the government's ability to implement national security protections with expedience. My amendment to H.R. 2804 is necessary to curb unnecessary delay, waste, and duplication and ensuring that the Department of Homeland Security is able to make haste—not waste.

I ask my colleagues to please support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment seeks to shield the Department of Homeland Security, a department in need of good government reform, from all of the government rule-making reforms in this bill. We should not do that. The bill does not threaten needed regulation in the Department of Homeland Security's jurisdiction but simply ensures that DHS will avoid unnecessary regulation, issue smarter, less costly regulation when necessary, and not enter into sweetheart backroom deals for more regulation under the cloak of judicial orders. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much, and we obviously have a great deal of mutual respect, I hope, but a great deal of

disagreement on the intent and the impact of this legislation.

Let me say that Homeland Security has vast jurisdiction. Congress created it. In the course of that, it has a great deal of jurisdiction dealing with humanity and the necessity to help humanity. So in the crisis of dealing with issues of individuals who have been unfairly put in front of a deportation order who need to have the response of this agency, or the agency needs to correct some aspect of the many responsibilities that it has, from natural disaster to terrorism to ensuring the security of the border, the needs of Customs and Border Protection, the needs of ICE officers for regulatory schemes that will give them better tools to ensure the security of this Nation, I would argue that a 6-month delay, that 60 barriers being put in place of that regulatory scheme, does not give comfort to the American people that their homeland is secure. Give the Secretary of Homeland Security and his fellow Secretaries or Assistant Secretaries or Directors the responsibility and the leadership that they need to have to protect the homeland.

I would just offer to say that my amendment is common sense. It deals with consent orders and settlements that the Homeland Security Secretary is making in the course of making America safe. Please support the Jackson Lee amendment, commonsense security, protecting the homeland, and having us do the job we should be doing on behalf of the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I do respect the concerns raised by the gentlewoman from Texas. The Department of Homeland Security has vast jurisdiction, however, and it is an agency cobbled together, a department cobbled together with authorities from a whole host of other areas, and they have not always made things work very effectively there. One of the things that they need is more discipline and guidance in terms of how regulations are written, and that is exactly what this legislation does.

The gentlewoman raises a legitimate concern with regard to the speed with which regulations can be issued in certain emergency circumstances. I would call her attention to section 653 of the legislation, which covers just those circumstances in which the President can take action swiftly because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency. As a result of that, this amendment is not needed because it takes the Department completely out of the reforms provided in this bill. Therefore, I must continue my opposition to the amendment. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for his explanation. We have noted 653, and you are absolutely right.

It thrusts that in the hands of the President of the United States, but I would argue that the Congress created the Department of Homeland Security with a Secretary to be able to be the first line of defense, and I would argue that it is important that we exempt the Secretary of the Department from that because of their number one responsibility, which is securing the homeland, and we live in a different climate.

I think the gentleman accepts the fact that terrorism has become franchised at this moment. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I ask individuals, again, to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentlewoman. I am not persuaded that the Department of Homeland Security, especially with a provision that provides for emergency relief from any of the provisions of the bill, cannot be greatly benefited, and all those who have to deal with the Department of Homeland Security will not be greatly benefited, if the Department is operating more effectively and if the regulations they promulgate are more efficient and more effective and more addressed toward what really needs to be done to address problems and not simply adding to the regulatory burden that businesses and American citizens face. So I continue my opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 113-361.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk as the designee of Mr. JOHNSON.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In the table of contents of the bill, insert after item pertaining to section 405 the following:

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

Sec. 501. Exception.

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

SEC. 501. EXCEPTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply in the case of a rule that the Director of the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job creation and

whose benefits exceeds its cost, or a consent decree or settlement agreement pertaining to such a rule. In the case of such a rule, consent decree, or settlement agreement, the provisions of law amended by this Act shall apply as though such amendments had not been made.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 487, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, as I indicated, I am moving this on behalf of Mr. JOHNSON. The amendment is simple. It would exclude from this bill any rule that would result in net job growth.

I ask that my colleagues support this commonsense amendment to promote job growth and strengthen the middle class. After all, the stated purpose of the ALERRT Act is to grow the economy and create jobs. Although this bill purports to grow the economy and create jobs, we cannot pretend that this bill's myopic focus on regulations will accomplish any of these goals.

I have profound concerns with the ALERRT Act. The bill would undermine the ability of agencies to protect the public interest. It is a continuation of the majority's obstructionist approach that led to the sequester and the shutdown of the Federal Government. The majority continues to rely on debunked and partisan studies that presuppose that regulations have harmful effects. Far from it. There is ample, bipartisan evidence that have found that regulations have a negligible effect on the economy and create jobs.

No one would argue that there is not a positive impact from the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act, and all of the regulatory scheme that has provided for a safe workplace for our workers under OSHA, and those who protect the quality of life of Americans from sea to shining sea.

Leading scholars such as Wake Forest law professor Sidney Shapiro has testified that all of the available evidence contradicts the claim that regulatory uncertainty is deterring business investment. Bruce Bartlett, a senior policy analyst in the Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations, has observed that regulatory uncertainty is the canard invented by Republicans that allows them to use current economic problems to pursue an agenda supported by the business community year in and year out. In other words, it is a simple case of political opportunism, not a serious effort to deal with high unemployment.

Nevertheless, the House Republican leadership continues to bulldoze its deregulatory agenda through Congress. This deregulatory train wreck threatens to send us back to the days before the Wall Street collapse, a financial catastrophe that could have been avoided by responsible policies. Instead of working together to come to a bipar-

tisan solution and end sequestration, this Congress has continued an agenda to make life worse for American families. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Johnson amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I share and welcome the gentlewoman's concerns about the impacts of regulations on jobs, but I submit that the right way to address that concern is to join me in supporting the Rothfus-Barr amendment that would make sure that agencies do a much better job of identifying adverse job impacts before they impose them.

The gentlewoman's amendment, offered on behalf of the gentleman from Georgia, unfortunately would have the opposite effect; that is because it would give the executive branch a strong incentive to manipulate its jobs impact and cost-benefit analyses to avoid the requirements of the bill.

The amendment also puts the cart before the horse, offering carve-outs from the bill based on factors that cannot be determined adequately unless the important analytical requirements in the bill are applied in the first place.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago I stood to the floor of the House and showed a picture that has been made by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) of a long line of suit-wearing Americans looking for jobs. Yet this Congress, my friends on the other side of the aisle, have refused to pass extended unemployment insurance, emergency unemployment insurance. Yet they put legislation on the floor pretending to create opportunities for American workers. I can tell you what will create opportunities for American workers, and that is to extend the unemployment insurance, or in actuality, pass my legislation, H.R. 3888, that provides training for individuals for newly created job skills. Or, in fact, as so many of us have done, sign a discharge petition to raise the minimum wage. That is a story for creating jobs or lifting up the opportunities for the American people.

This amendment says simply, if you join us and you believe in job growth, if there is a regulatory scheme that in fact deals with job growth, then this is the amendment that you should support. And I would argue you should support an increase in the minimum wage, and today we should put on the floor of the House the extension of the unemployment insurance, emergency insurance for my constituents and Americans across America. The number is 1.3 million in 2013, rising to 2 million now, with no relief. There is no excuse. The other body had a bill that was paid for, and yet it was refused by Republican Senators in the other body.

I would simply ask that we work together to create job growth. This amendment will say to my good friends that if it creates jobs, then we should in fact support it, that particular regulatory regulation, and we should not subject it to this legislation.

With that, I ask for the support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1300

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I would reiterate that the right way to address the concern about the impact of regulations on jobs is to join me in supporting the Rothfus-Barr amendment that would make sure that agencies do a much better job identifying adverse job impacts before they impose them on the businesses and individuals that have to make the tough decisions to close businesses, like the family that manufactures bricks that we referred to yesterday that is looking to have to eliminate two-thirds of the jobs in their business because of repeated increased government regulations, making it less and less likely that they can grow their business, much less add jobs, and are facing the loss of jobs and possibly the loss of the business altogether.

The way to do this is to figure out the impact on jobs before you impose the regulation, and that is what the Rothfus-Barr amendment does. I support that. I oppose this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 113-361.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 10.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In the table of contents of the bill, insert after item pertaining to section 405 the following:

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

Sec. 501. Exception.

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

SEC. 501. EXCEPTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply in the case of a rule made by the Administrator of the Occupational Safety and

Health Administration to prevent combustible dust explosions and fires, or a consent decree or settlement agreement pertaining to such a rule. In the case of such a rule, consent decree, or settlement agreement, the provisions of law amended by this Act shall apply as though such amendments had not been made.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 487, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to this misguided piece of legislation.

This bill would impose layers of red tape and erect new obstacles to protecting American lives.

Congress already has the power to disapprove any rule through the Congressional Review Act, as well as through appropriations bills and other legislation, if it disagrees with a regulation.

This new imposition of nearly 60 additional analytical and procedural requirements is a deliberate effort to impose a procedural choke hold on protecting American citizens.

One regulation that would be affected by this is a proposal by OSHA to prevent a litany of workplace fires and explosions that are caused by combustible dusts.

It has been abundantly clear for a decade that Federal regulatory action is needed to prevent combustible dust explosions and fires.

My amendment would prevent today's bill from getting in the way of this much-needed OSHA regulation, so that OSHA can continue its efforts to prevent combustible dust explosions and fires. This amendment is necessary to protect workers' lives.

In 2003, the Chemical Safety Board found that the existing protections to stop these explosions was grossly inadequate. A Board study has identified hundreds of combustible dust fires and explosions that have caused at least 119 fatalities and 718 injuries over a 15-year period.

The investigators are not alone in demanding action. Tammy Miser of Kentucky testified before Congress about her brother Shawn, who was killed in a metal dust fire at an aluminum wheel plant in Huntington, Indiana, in 2003. She told us that he was left lying there on a smoldering floor after the explosion, while aluminum dust burned through his flesh and muscle tissue; and each breath caused his internal organs to be burned even more.

Shawn wasn't the first to die at work this way, and he won't be the last. It has been more than 6 years since the Imperial Sugar explosion in Georgia that killed 14 workers. That explosion resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars in damages because an unchecked accumulation of sugar dust ignited and caused a chain of explosions, leveling the plant.

These workplace explosions have not stopped. More recently, three workers were killed when a combustible metal dust explosion ripped through the AL Solutions metal recycling factory near Weirton, West Virginia. Flames shot in all directions. Two brothers died from the heat and smoke inside the building. Another man made it out, but he suffered burns over most of his body. He died 4 days later in a Pittsburgh hospital, all because the factory lacked adequate controls to manage metal powders.

In another incident, five workers were killed in three separate events at a factory north of Nashville because an iron powder processing plant failed to abate repeated dust hazards. Each of the five left behind a wife and children. One had four children under 11. These widows have called for their government to protect them.

That is where OSHA comes in. The Chemical Safety Board has recently declared that OSHA's combustible dust rule is one of the most wanted safety protections.

In 2009, OSHA finally started working on a rule to reduce the risk of these explosions. The rulemaking will involve small business panels, risk assessments, public hearings, and an opportunity to comment.

Despite the clear need to move forward, this bill would give special interests new ways to block these vital protections.

The sad truth is that the underlying bill is nothing more than an effort to put the powerful above the lives and limbs of working families and their widows.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. First, let me be very clear to my good friend from California. I share his concern about the kinds of explosions that he is concerned about and want to see appropriate ways to deal with these problems through the regulatory process.

It is pretty clear that OSHA has done a pretty poor job of it thus far, and I believe that this legislation will help to improve the rulemaking process and create greater transparency, so that we will get to a resolution of what needs to be done and not do what does not need to be done, in the most effective way.

The amendment attempts to shield yet another agency in need of good government reform from all of the good government rulemaking reforms in the bill. The bill does not threaten needed regulation in OSHA's jurisdiction, but it simply assures that OSHA will avoid unnecessary regulation; issue smarter, less costly regulation when necessary; and not enter into sweetheart backroom deals for more

regulation under the cloak of judicial orders.

Ironically, the amendment actually could slow down the progress of improving safety in the workplaces of concern. The whole point of the bill is to assure that regulation remains effective while imposing lower costs.

If employers could spend less money on equally effective OSHA dust regulations, then they would be free to invest in additional safety measures on their own; or, of course, they could use the money to hire more workers and pay higher wages.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would just say that OSHA has already undertaken these standards; but if this legislation passes, all of the processes and procedures that are in this underlying legislation would have to go first.

The fact is people are dying at work. They are dying at work because of the fact that they haven't been able to get this standard in place.

This is a very serious standard that directly relates to the lives of these workers in the workplace. To suggest now that they would have to go through this process, if this becomes the law, is just unacceptable when you consider the urgency of this matter.

When we took up this question of grain dust—grain dust explosions, which are some of the most powerful explosions that can take place—that look like a place has been hit by tons of TNT—that was killing workers, they have reduced the number of fatalities by 70 percent, and you rarely hear about grain explosions any longer.

But dust explosions from other sources continue to be the kind of problem that threatens workers on a daily basis when they report to work in these various industries where the standards are not adequate to protect the workers.

As I pointed out in my opening statement, across a number of different industries, that dust collection—whether it is iron or sugar or wheat dust—becomes a huge explosive device that continues to take the lives of workers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from California, let me say that, with regard to the efforts that need to be undertaken when a regulatory process is already underway, is accommodated for in the bill in the new section 553(g), subsection 2(A):

When the agency for good cause, based upon evidence, finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefor in the rules issued) that compliance with subsection (c), (d), or (e) or requirements to render final determinations under subsection (f) of this section before the issuance of an interim rule is impracticable or contrary to the public interest, including

interests of national security, such subsections or requirements to render final determinations shall not apply to the agency's adoption of an interim rule.

So I would argue that this is going to improve and enhance the process, but it is also going to create more transparency; it is going to create more cost-effective rulemaking; and it is going to prevent lawsuits being brought—the so-called sue-and-settle lawsuits—where a friendly government agency is sued by an organization that wants something; and the settlement of the suit leaves out all the parties who are going to have to provide for it, have to pay for it, have the impact on their workers considered. They don't even get notice of that.

So all of these reforms are good reforms that make the regulatory process better.

I do not believe that it will be appropriate to adopt this amendment. I urge my colleagues to oppose it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 113–361.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 11.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In the table of contents of the bill, insert after item pertaining to section 405 the following:

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

Sec. 501. Exception.

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

SEC. 501. EXCEPTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply in the case of a rule that has been recommended in writing by the Inspector General of a Federal agency, including but not limited to those which would improve protections for taxpayers, students, public and workplace safety and health, or increase effectiveness or efficiency of agency activities, or in the case of a consent decree or settlement agreement pertaining to such a rule. In the case of such a rule, consent decree, or settlement agreement, the provisions of law amended by this Act shall apply as though such amendments had not been made.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 487, the gentleman

from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that would exempt from this bill any regulations that have been recommended by the inspector general.

This amendment will improve protections for taxpayers and students, protect public and workplace safety and health, and otherwise increase the effectiveness or efficiency of agency activities.

Inspector generals are the taxpayers' independent watchdogs. They perform an investigative role that is above politics, seeking to find out what has gone wrong and what should be done to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of government.

My amendment would ensure that IG recommendations will not be buried in mountains of red tape that this bill creates. For example, the Department of Labor's inspector general found that the Mine Safety and Health Administration had a regulation with gaping loopholes that allowed mine operators who habitually violated mine safety standards to easily evade sanctions and continue to operate unsafe mines.

Massey Energy expertly exploited these loopholes at its Upper Big Branch mine in West Virginia. Massey consistently putting coal production ahead of safety, with more than 684 mine safety violations in the 18 months prior to the tragic explosion in 2010 that killed 29 miners.

But the most powerful regulatory tool in MSHA's arsenal was not deployed. In fact, the inspector general found that the potentially lifesaving sanctions had never been used over a 32-year period. The price of that 32-year period was the miners' lives.

The inspector general's investigation found that the rule was, by design, set up to be gamed, so it was recommended that MSHA close the loopholes. MSHA then quickly adopted the new regulations that will prevent 1,800 miner injuries each decade.

Had today's bill been the law of the land, that lifesaving rule would be delayed for years; and had this bill's requirement requiring that agencies use the least-costly rule been the law, these dangerous loopholes could be left in place.

Mr. Chairman, after every mine tragedy, elected representatives mourn the dead and declare they will take action to make sure that such tragedies never happen again. Then Congress comes along and works overtime to pass legislation like this, which would delay or block the rules that can save hundreds of lives.

Mr. Chairman, at this time, I would like to yield my remaining 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, in addition to protecting workers, the in-

spector general's office also makes recommendations which call for new and better regulations to protect America's taxpayers.

The Department of Education provides more than \$150 billion every year in aid to more than 15 million college students with grants and low-cost loans. An alarming audit issued just this past week by the Department of Education's IG found that we need to crack down on shysters and fraud rings related to long-distance education.

Despite the Department of Education's recent efforts to curb this fraud, the audit found that sophisticated criminals are able to scam Federal programs through false identities and phony attendance records.

The IG urged the Department to quickly create new rules to ensure that billions of dollars it offers in financial aid are not wasted on people who take advantage of our distance education programs and siphon off precious resources that students and families desperately need.

This bill would cripple and hamper that necessary work. The legislation before us would also hamper the DOE from moving forward with other inspector general recommendations to reduce student loan defaults, root out wasteful spending that would save taxpayers \$1 billion, and strengthen the overall accountability of our Nation's higher education programs.

□ 1315

The bill's lengthy list of at least 60 additional procedures would add years to the rulemaking process and would significantly hamstring the Education Department's ability to adopt regulations that protect taxpayers and students in a timely manner. This amendment would ensure that this bill does not compromise the ability of agencies to follow up on IG recommendations and would protect taxpayers from waste, fraud, and abuse.

All who patted themselves on the back about the student loan bill last summer, you are crippling the ability of this country to help students and families pay for college, which we need as a Nation. Let's adopt the Miller amendment in order to protect the inspector general's integrity and independence to get good reforms to protect the taxpayers and students of America.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, when inspectors general find agency waste, fraud, and abuse and recommend that new regulations be issued or old regulations be modified, the natural instinct of the guilty agency is to try to evade the recommended corrections to its bad behavior. By shielding agencies from the bill's transparency and accountability requirements, the amendment would help them do just that. It

would further entrench the ability of recalcitrant agencies to shirk the recommendations of inspectors general and continue their habits of waste, fraud, and abuse.

Especially in these times of fiscal austerity, we must do everything we can to make sure that agencies pay heed to inspector general recommendations and purge all waste, fraud, and abuse from their operations. The ALERRT Act includes powerful tools to make them do just that.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I was assuming that when the gentleman was speaking about the effectiveness of the inspector general reports that he was going to join in support of the amendment. I guess I misunderstood that.

The point is this:

In the case that I cited, the inspector general came in and found out the agency wasn't using the powers that it had and that it needed additional powers for miners who were trying to avert their obligations under the safety laws of this Nation. Again, that is not an action that should be delayed. That is not a finding by one party or the other or by one group of people in the Congress or the other. That is the inspector general. He looked at the situation and said that this was leading to an increased likelihood of accidents and deaths on behalf of miners and that the rules had to be changed and that they had to be changed right away. I don't know why we would interrupt that process.

That is the point of this amendment. This Congress has a lot of trust, I believe, in the inspectors general, and we should not get in and make them run through a lot of hoops when urgency is the matter.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113-361 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. ROTHFUS of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 8 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 9 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 249, noes 162, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

AYES—249

Aderholt	Duckworth	King (IA)
Amash	Duffy	King (NY)
Amodei	Duncan (SC)	Kingston
Bachmann	Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger (IL)
Bachus	Ellmers	Kline
Barber	Enyart	Labrador
Barletta	Farenthold	LaMalfa
Barr	Fincher	Lamborn
Barrow (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Lance
Barton	Fleischmann	Lankford
Benishek	Fleming	Latham
Bentivolio	Flores	Latta
Bera (CA)	Forbes	Lipinski
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Bishop (UT)	Foster	Loeb
Black	Fox	Long
Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Boustany	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Brady (TX)	Gabbard	Lummis
Bridenstine	Galleo	Maffei
Brooks (AL)	Gardner	Maloney, Sean
Brooks (IN)	Garrett	Marchant
Brown (GA)	Gerlach	Marino
Brownley (CA)	Gibbs	Massie
Buchanan	Gibson	McAllister
Bucshon	Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Burgess	Gohmert	McCaul
Bustos	Goodlatte	McClintock
Byrne	Gowdy	McHenry
Calvert	Granger	McIntyre
Camp	Graves (GA)	McKeon
Campbell	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Cantor	Griffin (AR)	McMorris
Capito	Griffith (VA)	Rodgers
Carter	Grimm	Meadows
Cassidy	Guthrie	Meehan
Chabot	Hall	Messer
Chaffetz	Hanna	Mica
Coble	Harper	Miller (FL)
Coffman	Harris	Miller (MI)
Cole	Hartzler	Miller, Gary
Collins (GA)	Hastings (WA)	Mullin
Collins (NY)	Heck (NV)	Mulvaney
Conaway	Hensarling	Murphy (FL)
Cook	Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)
Costa	Holding	Neugebauer
Cotton	Hudson	Noem
Cramer	Huelskamp	Nugent
Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Nunes
Crenshaw	Hultgren	Nunnelee
Cuellar	Hunter	Owens
Culberson	Hurt	Palazzo
Daines	Issa	Paulsen
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins	Pearce
Denham	Johnson (OH)	Perry
Dent	Jones	Peters (CA)
DeSantis	Jordan	Peterson
DesJarlais	Joyce	Petri
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Pittenger

Pitts	Sanchez, Loretta	Tiberi
Poe (TX)	Sanford	Tipton
Pompeo	Scalise	Turner
Posey	Schneider	Valadao
Price (GA)	Schock	Wagner
Rahall	Schweikert	Walberg
Reichert	Scott, Austin	Walden
Renacci	Sensenbrenner	Walorski
Ribble	Sessions	Weber (TX)
Rigell	Shimkus	Webster (FL)
Roby	Shuster	Wenstrup
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Westmoreland
Rogers (AL)	Sinema	Whitfield
Rogers (KY)	Smith (MO)	Williams
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Wittman
Rokita	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Rooney	Southerland	Womack
Ros-Lehtinen	Stewart	Woodall
Roskam	Stivers	Yoder
Ross	Stockman	Yoho
Rothfus	Stutzman	Young (AK)
Ruiz	Terry	Young (IN)
Ryan (WI)	Thompson (PA)	
Salmon	Thornberry	

NOES—162

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

NOT VOTING—19

Bass	Johnson, Sam	Runyan
Blumenauer	McCarthy (NY)	Rush
Butterfield	Olson	Thompson (MS)
Ellison	Pastor (AZ)	Upton
Frankel (FL)	Reed	Walz
Garamendi	Rice (SC)	
Gosar	Royce	

□ 1346

Messrs. CROWLEY, GUTIERREZ and GARCIA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. YOUNG of Alaska, DUFFY, MEADOWS, SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chair, on roll-call No. 71, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 235, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

AYES—181

Barber	Esty	Lujan Grisham
Beatty	Farr	(NM)
Becerra	Fattah	Luján, Ben Ray
Bera (CA)	Fitzpatrick	(NM)
Bishop (NY)	Foster	Lynch
Bonamici	Frankel (FL)	Maffei
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	Maloney,
Braley (IA)	Garamendi	Carolyn
Brown (FL)	Garcia	Maloney, Sean
Brownley (CA)	Gibson	Matsui
Bustos	Grayson	McCollum
Capps	Green, Al	McDermott
Capuano	Grijalva	McGovern
Cárdenas	Gutiérrez	McIntyre
Carney	Hahn	McNerney
Carson (IN)	Hanabusa	Meeks
Cartwright	Hastings (FL)	Meng
Castor (FL)	Heck (WA)	Michaud
Castro (TX)	Higgins	Miller, George
Chu	Himes	Moore
Ciçilline	Holt	Moran
Clark (MA)	Honda	Murphy (FL)
Clarke (NY)	Horsford	Nadler
Clay	Hoyer	Napolitano
Cleaver	Huffman	Neal
Clyburn	Israel	Negrete McLeod
Cohen	Jackson Lee	Nolan
Connolly	Jeffries	O'Rourke
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell
Courtney	Kaptur	Payne
Crowley	Keating	Pelosi
Cuellar	Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter
Cummings	Kennedy	Peters (CA)
Davis (CA)	Kildee	Peters (MI)
Davis, Danny	Kilmer	Pingree (ME)
DeFazio	Kind	Pocan
DeGette	Kirkpatrick	Polis
Delaney	Kuster	Price (NC)
DeLauro	Langevin	Quigley
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Rangel
Deutch	Larson (CT)	Richmond
Dingell	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Doggett	Levin	Ruiz
Doyle	Lewis	Ruppersberger
Duckworth	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)
Edwards	Loebach	Sánchez, Linda
Engel	Lofgren	T.
Enyart	Lowenthal	Sanchez, Loretta
Eshoo		Sarbanes

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter

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

Bass
Blumenauer
Butterfield

Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey

NOES—235

Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Machant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens

NOT VOTING—14

Ellison
Fudge
Gosar

Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stuckman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Pastor (AZ)
Rice (SC)

Royce
Runyan

Rush
Upton

□ 1353

Ms. BROWNLEY of California changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 232, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

AYES—180

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

Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas

Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1357

Mrs. LOWEY changed her vote from
“no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON
LEE) on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 179, noes 235,
not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

AYES—179

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

Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
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
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters

Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOES—235

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

Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—16

Bass
Blumenauer
Bucshon
Butterfield
Davis, Danny
Ellison
Fudge

Gosar
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
Pastor (AZ)
Polis
Rice (SC)

Royce
Runyan
Rush
Upton

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1401

So the amendment was rejected.

NOES—232

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

NOT VOTING—18

Bass
Blumenauer
Bucshon
Butterfield
Davis, Danny
Diaz-Balart

Ellison
Fudge
Gosar
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
Pastor (AZ)

Rice (SC)
Royce
Runyan
Rush
Upton
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 229, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

AYES—183

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

NOES—229

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

NOT VOTING—18

Aderholt	Davis, Danny	McHenry
Barr	Ellison	Pastor (AZ)
Bass	Fudge	Rice (SC)
Blumenauer	Gosar	Ryunan
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Rush
Cleaver	McCarthy (NY)	Upton

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1405

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
Stated against:

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 75 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 232, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

AYES—181

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

NOES—232

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

NOT VOTING—17

Bass	Gosar	Rice (SC)
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Runyan
Butterfield	Huelskamp	Rush
Davis, Danny	Kaptur	Stivers
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Upton
Fudge	Pastor (AZ)	

□ 1410

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RIBBLE) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration 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, and, pursuant to House Resolution 487, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. ESTY. I am in its present form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Esty moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2804 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISION

SEC. 501. NO DELAY OF ANY REGULATION THAT SAVES TAX DOLLARS, HELPS SMALL BUSINESSES AND VETERANS, PREVENTS DISCRIMINATION, OR PROTECTS CONSUMERS.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply in the case of any rule, consent decree, or settlement agreement that—

- (1) saves tax dollars or provides refunds, rebates, or savings for taxpayers;
- (2) provides assistance and regulatory relief for small businesses;
- (3) expedites or settles cases involving veterans benefits;
- (4) prevents discrimination based on race, religion, national origin, or any other protected category, or that provides pay equity for women; or
- (5) protects the health and safety of consumers, seniors, and children, including ensuring—

(A) the safety of the food supply from salmonella and other food-borne illnesses; or
(B) a safe drinking water supply that is free from toxic substances and chemicals that can cause cancer.

Ms. ESTY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

□ 1415

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESTY. 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.

Mr. Speaker, let's be reasonable here. This bill before us is an ideological attempt to weaken and delay all regulations, even those that protect consumers and small businesses, help veterans, and keep our families safe. I think we can all agree, just as it is ridiculous to say that all regulations are good, it is also ridiculous to say that all regulations are bad.

I am the mother of three children, and I know how important regulations can be to keep our children safe. A few years ago, Congress passed a bill to strengthen standards on baby cribs. Regulations prohibited drop-side cribs and required all new cribs to have stronger mattress supports. And do you know why? To save lives. There were devastating instances of children suffocating and dying because of drop-side cribs. Clearly, this regulation is critical to our children's safety.

But, unfortunately, the bill before us today would delay the implementation of safety regulations like baby crib standards and safety regulations like those that prohibit the sale of contaminated food from China here in America like rat meat labeled as lamb in Shanghai and the Chinese chickens likely infected with bird flu. Americans have the right to know that the food they are feeding their families is safe, and that is why the bill before us today just doesn't make sense.

Delaying all regulations across the board and preventing the Federal Government from rapidly responding to situations, even when the American people are asking for safeguards, is dangerous and harmful.

This ideologically driven bill does not just harm Americans by derailing safety regulations; this bill would also weaken and delay regulations that are important to our economy, regulations that protect consumers and small businesses.

Folks, we are just 6 weeks away from when tax returns are due. Why would we want to pass a bill that may delay provisions that save taxpayers money? Why would we get in the way when taxpayers want their refunds and rebates returned quickly?

But not only that. This bill would delay regulations that would help ensure women receive equal pay for equal work. This bill would weaken regulations that could help protect small

businesses against predatory loans and hinder job growth. This bill would delay protections that could help ensure that workplace environments are safe for all workers. And this bill would delay our efforts to speed up veterans receiving their benefits.

And something that is particularly important to my State and my district, where folks are concerned about fatal accidents and service delays on the Metro-North railroad, this bill would delay the very regulations that will help ensure that Metro-North is safe and timely for commuters. On-time, safe rail service is critical to our State's economy, and this bill could jeopardize that. My district, Connecticut's economy, and our Nation's economy cannot afford this ideological, destructive bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am here today to offer an amendment, an amendment that will help make this bill work better for families and small businesses. I was sent to Congress to get things done, and I am working to eliminate and streamline unnecessary regulations and to help cut through red tape and save taxpayers money. At the same time, though, we know that smart regulations save money and save lives.

I hear all the time from people back home that Washington isn't working for them and that they are sick and tired of partisan gridlock. My constituents want Washington to be responsive to their needs and to get things done. And that is why I oppose this bill. It unnecessarily delays our ability to act swiftly and decisively. My amendment would work to make sure that smart regulations are not weakened or delayed—regulations that could save taxpayers money, that could help small businesses, that expedite veterans' benefits, that protect our families' safety and the safety of our food supply, and that could prevent pay discrimination just because you are a woman or because of your race or sexual orientation.

We were sent here to work together to help the American people, not to engage in an ideological battle. Let's do the right thing. Let's do the responsible thing. I ask all House Members to join with me to vote for this motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressmen HOLDING, COLLINS, and Subcommittee Chairman BACHUS for their hard work on this bill as well as committee staff on both sides of the aisle. Four bills combined into one and still under 100 pages will do much to reform, and in some cases eliminate, hundreds of thousands of pages of Federal Government regulations in the future.

Mr. Speaker, we are more than 5 years into the Obama administration. Real unemployment is still a massive

problem in this country. America's labor force participation is at record lows. The nominal unemployment rate is down, but that is only because desperate Americans dying for work are abandoning the workforce in droves.

Everybody knows that the only real long-term solution is to restart the engines of economic growth in this country. If we could just somehow increase our growth rate by as little as 2 additional percentage points, things would begin to turn around. One way to do that is to pass the ALERRT Act.

The cost of Federal regulation today is estimated to be a staggering \$1.86 trillion. That almost wipes out the \$2 trillion this Nation's manufacturers have just produced, the first time in history we have hit that level in 1 year. There is our 2 percent growth right there, and more, gobbled up by the mind-boggling tide of tyrannical regulation flowing out of Washington.

If we could just cut our regulatory burdens by a portion, we could turn this economy right around. The ALERRT Act would do that. It promises real relief from our regulatory nightmare. If enacted, it would change night to day in terms of the level of regulatory costs Washington imposes on our economy, and it would do so without stopping one needed regulation from being issued.

How do I know? Because it says so right in the bill. Right on page 27, it says:

The agency shall adopt the least costly rule considered during the rulemaking that meets relevant statutory objectives.

Take away a few key words and what does that say? The agency shall adopt the rule that meets statutory objectives.

So the rules will still be made, and statutory goals will still be met. But put the key words back in, and what happens? America starts to save hundreds of billions of dollars it doesn't need to spend, because the agency shall adopt the least costly rule that meets statutory objectives.

Do that over and over again, and that is real money that we will save, real money that can produce jobs for our constituents, real money that hard-working Americans can use to grow their businesses, all without stopping a single needed regulation from being issued.

My friends across the aisle say that won't happen. They say the bill will bring all good rulemaking to a screeching halt. My goodness, it is ObamaCare all over again. My friends across the aisle haven't read the bill. You have to read the bill to know what is in it. If you read the bill, you understand it. You see there on page 27, the agency shall adopt the rule that meets statutory objectives.

My friends, the people in my district and yours are smart. They can read the bill. They can tell that, although Chicken Little and the Boy Who Cried Wolf seem to want to talk about this bill, the sky is not falling and the wolf

is not coming on account of this bill. What is coming on account of this bill is real relief for hardworking Americans and prosperity around the corner.

Vote against this motion to recommit. Vote for this bill. Take Americans' hard-earned dollars out of the hands of Washington's bureaucrats who want to flush it down the regulatory drain. Let it stay in the hands of workers and businessowners who know how to spend it wisely and well. Oppose the motion to recommit. Support the legislation.

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.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 229, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

AYES—187

Barber	Engel	Loeb sack
Barrow (GA)	Enyart	Lofgren
Beatty	Eshoo	Lowenthal
Becerra	Esty	Lowe y
Bera (CA)	Farr	Lujan Grisham
Bishop (GA)	Fattah	(NM)
Bishop (NY)	Foster	Lujan, Ben Ray
Bonamici	Frankel (FL)	(NM)
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	Lynch
Braley (IA)	Gallego	Maffei
Brown (FL)	Garamendi	Maloney,
Brownley (CA)	Garcia	Carolyn
Bustos	Grayson	Maloney, Sean
Capps	Green, Al	Matheson
Capuano	Green, Gene	Matsui
Cardenas	Grijalva	McCollum
Carney	Gutierrez	McDermott
Carson (IN)	Hahn	McGovern
Cartwright	Hanabusa	McIntyre
Castor (FL)	Hastings (FL)	McNerney
Castro (TX)	Heck (WA)	Meeks
Chu	Higgins	Meng
Ciulline	Himes	Michaud
Clark (MA)	Holt	Miller, George
Clarke (NY)	Honda	Moore
Clay	Horsford	Moran
Cleaver	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)
Clyburn	Huffman	Nadler
Cohen	Israel	Napolitano
Connolly	Jackson Lee	Neal
Conyers	Jeffries	Negrete McLeod
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Nolan
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke
Crowley	Kaptur	Pallone
Cuellar	Keating	Pascarell
Cummings	Kelly (IL)	Payne
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Pelosi
DeFazio	Kildee	Perlmutter
DeGette	Kilmer	Peters (CA)
Delaney	Kind	Peters (MI)
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick	Pingree (ME)
DelBene	Kuster	Pocan
Deutch	Langevin	Polis
Dingell	Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)
Doggett	Larson (CT)	Quigley
Doyle	Lee (CA)	Rahall
Duckworth	Levin	Rangel
Edwards	Lewis	Richmond
Ellison	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard

Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano

Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko

Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—229

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

Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo

Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)

NOT VOTING—14

Bass
Blackburn
Blumenauer

Butterfield
Davis, Danny
Fudge

Gosar
Hinojosa

McCarthy (NY)
Pastor (AZ)

Rice (SC)
Runyan

Rush
Upton

□ 1431

Mrs. WAGNER changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. GUTIERREZ changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

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. JOHNSON of Georgia. 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 236, noes 179, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

AYES—236

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

Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger

Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce

Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden

NOES—179

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

Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
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
Loebach
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan

NOT VOTING—15

Bachus
Bass
Blumenauer
Butterfield
Costa

Davis, Danny
Fudge
Gosar
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)

Pastor (AZ)
Rice (SC)
Runyan
Rush
Upton

□ 1438

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2084, ALL ECONOMIC REGULATIONS ARE TRANSPARENT ACT OF 2014

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2804, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section and title numbering, cross-referencing, conforming amendments to the table of contents and short titles, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material on H.R. 3193, the Consumer Financial Protection Safety and Soundness Improvement Act of 2013.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 475 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. 3193.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1441

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. 3193) to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes, with Mr. RIBBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are now into the sixth year of the Obama administration, and probably the two most com-

mon comments I hear from my constituents are "I just can't make ends meet in this economy" and "Washington has become arrogant, unaccountable, and out of touch." At the apex of these sentiments, lies the newly minted Dodd-Frank government agency known as the CFPB. Although many have yet to hear of it, the CFPB is perhaps the single most powerful and least accountable Federal agency in all of Washington.

First, let's speak of its power. Mr. Chairman, when it comes to our credit cards, our auto loans, our mortgages, the CFPB has unbridled discretionary power not only to make them less available and more expensive, but to absolutely take them away.

What does an agency with this kind of power do? It imposes rule like the qualified mortgage rule, or QM for short. Mr. Chairman, what does QM do? According to Federal Reserve data, because of QM, roughly one-third of Black and Hispanic borrowers would not meet the requirements of a QM loan.

CoreLogic, which analyzes mortgage data, has said:

Only half of today's mortgage originations meet QM requirements.

That is egregiously unfair to hardworking Americans.

One of my small town community bankers in east Texas told me recently:

Because of QM, I can't tell you the number of times we have had to tell our good low-to-moderate income customers that we can no longer loan them money to purchase a home to live in.

Mr. Chairman, this is what an agency with too much discretionary power does. It can actually abuse consumers, taking away their homeownership opportunities. That is unfair.

Let's look at what happens to an agency that is not held accountable. Today, the CFPB is spending \$145 million to renovate a \$150 million headquarters building they don't even own. The renovation rate is three times the average Washington, D.C., luxury class A renovation rate. Well, what does \$145 million buy?

Well, it is \$461 per square foot in office renovations. Mr. Chairman, that is more per square foot than was spent to build the Trump World Tower. More than the Trump World Tower. At \$461 per square foot, that was more money than it cost to build the Bellagio hotel and casino in Las Vegas, which at the time, I am told, was the most expensive hotel ever built. Mr. Chairman, this is more money to renovate a building they don't own than Dubai's Burj Khalifa, the single tallest skyscraper in the world. Ironically enough, the architectural firm which designed the Burj Khalifa in Dubai is the same world renowned architectural firm that the CFPB paid over \$7 million to design their headquarter renovations.

Now, according to public documents, Mr. Chairman, some of the Bureau's renovations include "a reflective carnelian granite water table" that will

"lure in the curious passerby." Also for \$145 million of hard-earned taxpayer money, the Bureau is buying "a shady tree bosque" to facilitate "chance interactions in a removed place of rest and contemplation." I mean, I can't make this up, Mr. Chairman. This is how hard-earned money is being squandered. Here it is, the architectural drawings which have been filed publicly.

I have to tell you, Mr. Chairman, I have a lot of people in my district in east Texas who live in mobile homes. They can't afford carnelian granite water tables that apparently the CFPB is going to enjoy that my constituents have to pay for, and the only shady tree bosque to be found in east Texas in the Fifth District are those where hardworking ranchers work their cattle.

□ 1445

Instead of rest and contemplation to be enjoyed by CFPB's employees, because of such blatant waste, my constituents, instead of rest and contemplation, lay awake at night wondering how they are going to pay the bills and make ends meet.

Mr. Chairman, this is what an unaccountable Federal Government agency does. It squanders the people's money because it is not their own and they are not accountable to the people's representatives.

So that is why we are here today, Mr. Chairman. We are here to pass H.R. 3193, the Consumer Financial Freedom and Washington Accountability Act, whose primary author, Mr. DUFFY of Wisconsin, has done excellent work, along with many other members of our committee. This is a package, Mr. Chairman, of commonsense reforms designed to make the CFPB more accountable and more transparent to the American people.

This bill replaces the Bureau's single, unaccountable director with a bipartisan board. It puts the Bureau's employees—whose compensation and benefits average \$178,521, it puts them on the civil service pay scale. It introduces a safety and soundness check on its regulations and gives the American people greater control over the massive, massive quantities of personal financial data that the Bureau is collecting and maintaining on them at this time.

Mr. Chairman, we do need consumer protection, but consumers just don't need to be protected from Wall Street; they need to be protected from Washington as well. H.R. 3193 will protect them from the CFPB, and the House should pass it without delay today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3193, legislation that would gut the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, an agency that has been a critical and effective advocate for our Nation's consumers. Today's vote is just the latest chapter in a relentless Republican attack on consumer protection.