

I stand today in full support of Loretta Lynch as our next U.S. Attorney General. Let's confirm her as our next Attorney General, and let's make history.

TWO VISIONS FOR OUR NATION'S FUTURE

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, Americans have a choice of two contrasting visions for our Nation's future.

One vision features higher taxes, more debt, and greater burdens on hardworking families. The administration's budget would drown our Nation \$27 trillion in debt. It would never ever balance.

Its proponents pat themselves on the back for running these annual deficits, saying they have and could be worse. Only in D.C. is a half-trillion dollar deficit greeted with a pat on the back.

Further, if Congress had accepted the administration's previous budget proposals, the Federal Government would be 20 percent larger today, more bloated, and less efficient.

The other vision put forth by Congress leads to a balanced budget at the end of the decade, and it stops devastating tax increases. The congressional budget reduces spending by over \$5.5 trillion and calls for a fairer and simpler Tax Code so small businesses can create jobs and provide the better-paying jobs Americans are desperate for.

Mr. Speaker, Congress' proposal actually invests in the future and places our Nation on a path towards paying off our debt—rather than adding to it—by making government more efficient, effective, and accountable.

Now is the time for the parties to work together to implement a vision that keeps our Nation on the path to prosperity, that keeps debt off the backs of working families, and that balances our Federal budget.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 17, 2015 at 9:19 a.m.:

Appointments:

Senate Delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group Conference.

Senate Delegation to the Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Group Conference.

Senate Delegation to the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group Conference.

U.S.-China Interparliamentary Group Conference.

Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1029, EPA SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD REFORM ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1030, SECRET SCIENCE REFORM ACT OF 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 138 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 138

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1029) to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-10. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

ments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1030) to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-11. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 138 provides for the consideration of two important pieces of legislation to create a more transparent

and accountable Environmental Protection Agency, one that works in an open manner for all of America. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate for each of the bills contained within the rule. Further, amendments were made in order for each bill, for a total of six amendments from Members of both parties.

Mr. Speaker, the first bill contained in this rule, H.R. 1029, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015, brings greater accountability and oversight to the Board of appointed advisers which the EPA uses to review the scientific basis for its official actions. Created in the late 1970s, the Science Advisory Board was intended to be a check on the EPA in order to ensure that the Agency's math and statistics were all in order before it promulgated rules or regulations.

In fact, the original authorization for the Board made clear that the Science Advisory Board was to report to both the Environmental Protection Agency and to Congress on its findings. However, over the course of the past several decades since its inception, the Science Advisory Board has become little more than a rubberstamp for whatever the EPA Administrator wishes to accomplish. With the Board members being handpicked by the Administrator, they are likely being chosen primarily on the basis that they hold the same view of the environmental world as whoever the head of the EPA is at any given time.

The bill before us would provide for a more balanced representation on the Science Advisory Board, setting out parameters regarding whom the Administrator can choose and ensuring that State and local governments have representation on the Board so the Board is not comprised solely of environmental activists, as has been the case for some time now. Indeed, current regulations exclude industry experts from serving on the Science Advisory Board but not officials from environmental advocacy groups—in other words, special interests. These new regulations are necessary to ensure against any appearance of impropriety on the Science Advisory Board.

This legislation becomes even more critical when one considers that the numerous regulations currently being considered by the Environmental Protection Agency could have enormous impacts on the Nation's economy. From proposed carbon regulations to the ratcheting down of ozone regulations, the Science Advisory Board has been tasked with reviewing the science that will back up some of the most expensive rules in the history of the Environmental Protection Agency. It is critical that the American people have confidence that the Federal Government is doing what is justified. The fear is that, absent significant reforms to the Environmental Protection Agency's process, this simply will not be the case.

The second bill contained in this rule, H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Re-

form Act, is also intended to make the Environmental Protection Agency's rulemaking process more transparent. This was at one time a goal of the current administration's. We seem to have lost that somewhere along the way. The legislation states that the Environmental Protection Agency may take official action on an environmental regulation only if it has identified all of the scientific and technical information upon which it has based its decision, and these must be publicly available studies that can be independently peer reviewed. This would bring the EPA's process in line with how many scientific journals operate when they publish peer-reviewed studies.

Further, the bill is prospective, and it will not interfere with any enacted rules or regulations by the Environmental Protection Agency. To address concerns expressed during the Science Committee's consideration of the bill, the legislation spells out that nothing in these requirements would jeopardize any privacy concerns with scientific studies. The CDC successfully makes its studies available. It redacts personal information, and it does not expose any test subject's personal information. The EPA should have no problem similarly complying with these requirements.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are waking up to how much of the United States economy the EPA is attempting to regulate—from carbon dioxide to ozone—and people are rightly anxious over how these new and, in some cases, unprecedented rules will affect some consumers' wallets. It is reasonable and expeditious to ensure that the science that the EPA relies upon to craft its regulations simply be transparent and simply be available for all to see and not for just that select group of industry insiders that the EPA deems worthy to see its work products.

Even the congressional committees that are charged with the legitimate oversight of the Environmental Protection Agency's actions have had difficulty in obtaining basic scientific justifications for the actions taken by the EPA over the last few years. The bills before us today will begin the process of making the Environmental Protection Agency accountable to the very constituency that it claims to protect—the American people.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS, for yielding the customary 30 minutes. I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills.

Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate to have put the most recent Republican manufactured crisis of funding the Department of Homeland Security behind us. This was not the first crisis caused by the extreme rightwing in this body,

and I am certain that it won't be the last. In looking ahead to the balance of the year, I am sure that my Republican colleagues are preparing themselves to continue with the same trend.

For example, the current suspension of the debt limit, which expired on March 15, is a crisis. By the end of this month, Congress has to act on the so-called "doc fix" or else—crisis. The highway trust fund is set to run out of money in about 3 months. There is another crisis. At the end of June, the Export-Import Bank will have to be reauthorized—crisis. That takes us all the way to the end of the fiscal year, in September, when we push reset and have to do it all again from the beginning. This is no way to govern, and it is not what Americans who are struggling to put food on the table want or deserve.

I haven't mentioned the two bills in question today. That is not by accident. It is because they are typical go nowhere, do-nothing pet projects. Mr. Speaker, having served on the Rules Committee for as long as I have and having made the prediction, as my colleagues on the Democratic side of the Rules Committee have repeated, that the legislation is going nowhere, I think that we have been confirmed virtually every time.

These two measures are attempts by corporate interests to compromise the Environmental Protection Agency's integrity and stock its scientific review board with sympathizers. Neither will become law. "Secret science" might sound scary, but the rhetoric has outpaced the reality. Furthermore, this bill will not improve the EPA's science or make it more transparent. In fact, the bill's impossible standards and mechanisms will actually force the Environmental Protection Agency to ignore major and consequential studies.

De-identifying the data is not so simple. Firstly, just because the data is de-identified doesn't mean that it will stay de-identified. We are all familiar with how much personal information is readily available. Only a few pieces of information are required to reconnect the de-identified dots across the Internet and social media. Moreover, de-identifying the data means removing critical information that often renders the results not reproducible, which, under the regime created by this bill, would then force the EPA to ignore legitimate and, possibly, important studies.

□ 1245

Dr. BURGESS pointed out that it would protect the wallets of some. I am equally concerned about the bodies of all.

The other measure we are considering today, H.R. 1029, will give private industry substantial influence over the EPA. As we should have learned from the economic collapse, stuffing the regulatory agency with industry-affiliated experts is like leaving the wolves to mind the flock.

Mr. Speaker, I find it most unfortunate that my Republican colleagues continue to bring up do-nothing bills that will go nowhere and then spend the rest of their time doing everything in their power to oppose the President of the United States. Quite frankly, the American people deserve better.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of response.

Mr. Speaker, I remind the body that there was an election held in November of last year, and the results of that election are now part of history. Prior to that election, it is true, there were bills passed in the House of Representatives that were submitted to the Senate for action, and basically nothing happened. The then-Senate majority leader had made a decision that he was going to prevent any legislation from passing, he was going to prevent his Members from having to take a vote that might be construed as difficult, and he was certainly going to prevent the President from being in a position of having to veto any legislation.

I would just remind people that the process is the House and Senate each pass their bills; they agree in a conference committee to any differences. If that conference report is passed by both Houses, indeed, it is submitted to the White House for action, and that action may, indeed, be a veto. But you know what, Mr. Speaker? That veto is actually an important part of the process.

Right now people are unaware of where the President is on several issues because he has simply never had to render a decision; it has always been a full stop over at the Senate majority leader's desk. The American people spoke loudly last November that they did not want that process to continue.

Now, one may successfully argue that in 2012 the American people voted for divided government, but in 2014 they said: You know, that is not working out so well for us, and we are willing to give the Senate, to return a voice to the Senate.

We are now giving the Senate an opportunity. These bills were both passed last year. The gentleman from Florida knows that very well. We had this very same argument on the floor of the House last fall. Both bills essentially died in the Senate. It is my hope now that we will give the Senate yet another opportunity. It is a new day, new Senators, new majority leader. Let them have a chance to act.

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

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself an additional 2 minutes just to speak briefly on the substance of H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act. This is a bill that requires the Environmental Protection Agency to base its regulations on science, not only on science, but science that is available to the public and subject to independent verification. Who could be against that?

That is part of the scientific process. That is part of scientific inquiry. You balance things, propose a theory; someone proposes an alternate; you get the data, collect the evidence, do the studies, do the experiments, make that generally available, and come to a conclusion.

This is a transparency bill. The administration ran on the concept of transparency. We are simply trying to help them fulfill that obligation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the March 3, 2014, statements of the administration on the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act and Secret Science Reform Act.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 1029—EPA SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD
REFORM ACT OF 2015

(Rep. Lucas, R-OK and 24 cosponsors)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 1029, which would affect the ability of EPA's Science Advisory Board (SAB) to form panels and perform its essential functions. The SAB, along with other functions, reviews the quality and adequacy of certain scientific and technical information used by EPA or proposed as the basis for EPA regulations. Therefore, it is imperative that the SAB be composed of the most knowledgeable scientific and technical experts available. The Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), which governs Federal advisory committees such as the SAB, provides for balanced panels and subcommittees that include experts with diverse backgrounds who represent wide-ranging perspectives.

H.R. 1029 would negatively affect the appointment of experts and would weaken the scientific independence and integrity of the SAB. For example, the bill would impose a hiring quota for SAB members based on employment by a State, local, or tribal government as opposed to scientific expertise. The bill would also place limitations on SAB members' participation in "advisory activities that directly or indirectly involve review and evaluation of their own work." Determining the practical meaning of "indirect" involvement will be difficult and consequently problematic to implement. The provisions on appointment of experts to the SAB and various other requirements could also preclude the nomination of scientists with significant expertise in their fields.

In addition, H.R. 1029 would add burdensome requirements on the SAB with respect to solicitation of and response to public comments, above and beyond those imposed by FACA. These new requirements would saddle the SAB with workload that would impair its ability to carry out its mandate. Further, H.R. 1029 would add an unnecessary, burdensome, and costly layer of requirements for hazard and risk assessments without defining the scope of these requirements and absent recognition that many high profile assessments already are reviewed by the SAB.

If the President were presented with H.R. 1029, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 1030—SECRET SCIENCE REFORM ACT OF 2015
(Rep. Smith, R-TX and 28 cosponsors)

The Administration strongly supports regulatory transparency, but strongly opposes H.R. 1030. The bill would impose arbitrary, unnecessary, and expensive requirements that would seriously impede the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) ability

to use science to protect public health and the environment, as required under an array of environmental laws, while increasing uncertainty for businesses and States.

H.R. 1030 could be used to prevent EPA from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating any "covered action" until legal challenges about the legitimate withholding of certain scientific and technical information are resolved. Provisions of the bill could be interpreted to prevent EPA from taking important, and possibly legally required, actions, where supporting data is not publicly available, and legal challenges could delay important environmental and health protections. For example, the data underlying some scientifically-important studies is not made broadly available in order to protect the privacy of test subjects, and modeling that EPA uses for a variety of purposes are not EPA property and therefore cannot be publicly released. H.R. 1030 could interfere with EPA's ability to take actions based on such data. In short, the bill would undermine EPA's ability to protect the health of Americans, would impose expensive new mandates on EPA, and could impose substantial litigation costs on the Federal government. It also could impede EPA's reliance on the best available science.

Instead of an overly broad bill that would tie EPA's hands, the Administration urges the Congress to support the Administration's efforts to make scientific and technical information more accessible and regulations more transparent. A bill consistent with the principles expressed in the Administration's Executive Order 13563 "Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review" and the December 2010 Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) Memorandum on Scientific Integrity, as well as implementation of the Administration's recent open data and public access initiatives (e.g., OSTP's February 2013 policy memorandum on Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Scientific Research) would greatly benefit the American people. EPA also has embarked on several initiatives that enhance access to and transparency of data and science used to inform policy and regulatory decisions.

If the President were presented with H.R. 1030, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. I would urge that my colleague who made the comment that we don't know where the President is, well, there is where the President is.

I would also ask rhetorically, if it is that all these things that we passed that I said were going nowhere last year, why is it that we haven't had anything go anywhere this year with both a Republican Senate and a Republican House, and neither of these measures is going to go anywhere nor are they going to go to conference, and I believe people know that.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we are going to offer an amendment to the rule that would allow the House to consider the Promoting U.S. Jobs Through Exports Act. This bill would renew the Export-Import Bank's charter for an additional 7 years, ensuring certainty for U.S. exporters and businesses through 2022.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services and my good friend.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida for his leadership on this important issue. I applaud him, Leader PELOSI, and Whip HOYER for their efforts to ensure we support policies that create American jobs and keep U.S. businesses competitive.

I find the contrast with the bills we consider this week particularly striking as the out-of-touch Republican leadership wastes our time with measures that deny science and strip workers of critical rights.

Mr. Speaker, I am in disbelief that we are still debating the future of the Export-Import Bank, which we know supports hundreds of thousands of jobs and levels the playing field so that American businesses, large and small, can compete globally. The facts underscore what is at stake.

In fiscal year 2014, Ex-Im Bank approved more than 3,400 transactions with a total estimated export value of \$27.5 billion. This support is estimated to have sustained 164,000 export-related U.S. jobs. Over the past 5 years, it is estimated that the Bank has created or sustained more than 1.2 million private sector jobs. Moreover, all this was accomplished as the Bank returned over \$674 million back to the American taxpayers just last year.

Over the past two decades, the Bank has generated a surplus of \$6.9 billion for U.S. taxpayers, but for months a handful of extremists in this Chamber have refused to accept the numerous and widespread benefits provided by the Export-Import Bank to our economy. They have ignored these numbers as well as the diverse array of interests who support the Bank, such as the United States Chamber of Commerce; the National Small Business Association; the National Association of Manufacturers; labor unions, such as the AFL-CIO; and many others.

Instead, they have decided to follow the talking points of extremist groups like Heritage Action and the Club for Growth. I find it ironic that Republicans are actively working to ensure this important engine of job creation closes its doors while also waging war with President Obama over the Keystone XL pipeline, which even the most inflated estimates say would create far fewer jobs than Ex-Im.

However, I have been heartened to see a number of frustrated Republicans, some of them even Tea Partiers themselves, say enough is enough and have chosen to stand up for real workers and businesses rather than a handful of ideologues dictating policy from a Washington think tank. I applaud the 58 Republicans who courageously have come out against their leadership in favor of renewing the Export-Import Bank's charter.

As we take an important vote that will bring Export-Import Bank legislation to the floor today, I ask those Republicans to once again show their courage, show their leadership, and show your constituents who rely on the

Export-Import Bank for jobs and economic growth that you are willing to do what is best for them and not what is politically expedient.

Democrats want to provide certainty for the businesses and workers who rely on the Bank, and that is why I, along with Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Whip HOYER of Maryland, recently introduced legislation to reauthorize, reform, and reenergize the Export-Import Bank. The measure takes a sensible approach to renewing the Bank, extending its charter for 7 years, increasing its lending authority to meet the needs of U.S. exporters, and modernizing the Bank's programs to better serve small- and medium-sized businesses.

I couldn't be prouder of my democratic colleagues, 189 of whom joined as cosponsors just a few days after being introduced. Such widespread support sends a strong message to America's manufacturers, businesses, and workers that Democrats are united in preserving an institution that for decades has helped this Nation create jobs and grow the economy; and it makes clear that if those supportive Republicans were to join us, this Congress could pass an extension of the Export-Import Bank's charter today.

Mr. Speaker and Members, this is the right thing to do for our workers and for our businesses and for our Nation. Let's stand up for what is right.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of a response.

I appreciate the comments on the Export-Import Bank. I would point out to the body that today's rule has under consideration bills dealing with regulating the Environmental Protection Agency. The House did pass an extension of the Export-Import Bank charter last December that follows through until June of this year. There will be ample opportunity for us to have this debate and engage in debate as, indeed, people of this country want us to do. Today is not the time for that debate. Today is the day for deciding whether or not this body will further regulate the EPA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would think the time to create American jobs is anytime, and sooner rather than later.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), my good friend, the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HASTINGS for yielding to me.

I, too, rise in support of H.R. 1031, the Promoting U.S. Jobs Through Exports Act of 2014, which reauthorizes the Export-Import Bank long term. I am so proud to have been able to introduce this legislation, along with our ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services, Ms. WATERS, and Representatives HECK and HOYER.

The bill has 189 Democratic cosponsors. You add that number to the 57 Republicans that are supportive of Representative FINCHER's legislation to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank and just do the math there: 189 and 57, far and above any kind of majority needed to reauthorize this important jobs creation, jobs engine, and I would hope that this body would move forward on reauthorizing this legislation.

My district of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, has a very strong manufacturing and industrial base. I believe that we are maybe second in the country that really depends on a strong manufacturing and industrial base for our basic economic activity, and the small manufacturers in Milwaukee utilize the Export-Import Bank to export goods and services to places like China and India.

One of the narratives, the untrue narratives about the Export-Import Bank is that it is a utility for big companies like Boeing, it is the Bank of Boeing. Well, not so much. There is an endless supply chain, like the ones that I have visited recently.

I just recently went to a shop in Milwaukee that employs 30 people—30 people—yet they export U.S. goods to work on the Panama Canal.

□ 1300

The president of that company just flat out stated that he doesn't exist without the Export-Import Bank. Folks, it is just that simple.

I have heard many debates and arguments about the importance of passing stuff like Keystone, which is debatable as a job creator, and where it does create jobs, it is in a very small geographic area—whereas the Export-Import Bank creates hundreds of thousands of jobs in all of our districts.

Folks, it is just really that simple. The Export-Import Bank is a necessary part of our discussion about creating jobs.

Until we get past the political arguments that are being made about hanging the Export-Import Bank out there as low-hanging fruit to demonstrate our willingness to cut off so-called corporate welfare so that we can then get at cutting off entitlement programs to people, until we get past that cynical debate, I don't think that we are going to see very much in the way of improving our job creation performance in the United States.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of a response.

Talking about job creation is well and good, but we should also concern ourselves about job erosion and job loss. I don't know if the EPA is the number one Federal agency involved in job erosion and job loss, but it is right up there.

If you talk to anyone at home in your district about what is the Federal agency that is responsible for more job destruction, the EPA, if not at the top of the list, is right behind some of the others.

What we are about today is to regulate the regulator. It is not even to regulate the regulator, just have the regulator disclose to us what information upon which they are relying to make those regulations.

Why does the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act matter? Because the Science Advisory Board plays a critical role in reviewing the scientific information that forms the foundation of costly EPA regulations. What is the cost of those EPA regulations, Mr. Speaker? The cost is jobs.

The work we are doing today is important. I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule and in favor of the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), my good friend and a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the previous question in order that I might support Mr. HASTINGS' effort to offer the amendment to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Here is why. The Export-Import Bank is a job-creating machine. Over the last 5 years, it has created—by good and scientifically-based estimates—about 1.2 million well-paying jobs, good-paying jobs, the kind of jobs that you can have and buy a home and send your kids to college and that touch every congressional district in the State. The Export-Import Bank is a job-creating machine.

The Export-Import Bank is also a deficit-reducing machine. Not one red penny in the last generation has been used to subsidize it. In fact, \$7 billion has been transferred to the Treasury to reduce the deficit. It was \$1 billion 2 years ago, \$675 million last year, and a projected \$8 million this year. The Export-Import Bank is a deficit-reducing machine.

In addition to that, it is a superperformer, by any private sector measure. I come from the private sector. How they conduct their business is the envy of the financial services sector.

It has a default rate of less than—you are hearing this correctly—.175 percent and a collection rate over 50 percent. It is a superperformer; yet the Export-Import Bank goes away in exactly 105 days—poof, gone, vanished.

The gentleman from Texas asked a very good question, a fair question: Why now? Well, the answer is: The clock is ticking, tick tock, tick tock. There are 105 days to go; yet the committee of jurisdiction has not had a hearing, has not scheduled a markup, and has issued no notice for either.

In fact, when we had the committee oversight plan before us, what did the committee chair do? He opposed a neutrally worded amendment that said, Let's take up the Export-Import Bank

and subject it to regular order. That is all. Let's go through regular order.

There is no intent to take up the Export-Import Bank—no hearing, no markup, a rejection of regular order. That is why now.

It has been said, erroneously, that the Export-Import Bank primarily benefits Big Business—principally, aerospace. That is so wrong on so many levels, I cannot exaggerate it.

To begin with, 90 percent of the transactions of the Export-Import Bank go to small business, but it also fails to understand something, this argument coming from people who are supposed to understand the private sector.

Take a company like Boeing, a pride of America. Please remember, ladies and gentlemen, there are only two companies on the face of the planet that produce large airplanes, and America has but one of them. Do you know what they rely on? 12,000 businesses in their supply chain, many of which are small.

Here is the fact. Last week, I was home in a town called Puyallup, which most people can't even pronounce. It is a beautiful community of 38,000 people. It is not anywhere near Renton or Everett, where the airplanes are manufactured.

Do you know how many small businesses there are in the confines of the city limits of Puyallup that supply the aerospace industry and benefit from the Export-Import Bank? Seventeen, small businesses everywhere, but it is also stand-alone small businesses.

Another in my district is called Pexco. They produce traffic cones and the like that they sell internationally. Ex-Im financed \$2.3 million of their product last year.

I had a couple in my office just a few weeks ago from eastern Washington. I don't even represent them. They have agricultural products, mint extract and mint oil. Before they began working with the Export-Import Bank, one-third of their gross revenues were in exports. They began working with them, and their domestic side has grown. Now, it is two-thirds.

I had another agricultural interest in the office. They said that 5 years ago, 5 percent of their business was export. They did not use the Export-Import Bank. They began using it, and it is now 50 percent.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, let us remember that there are 60 developed nations on the face of the Earth, and if we allow our Export-Import Bank to expire, we will be the only one on the face of the planet without an export credit authority.

Let me tell you, China is rubbing their hands in anticipation because, in addition to Airbus—remember, we are 2 to 8 years away from China manufacturing a wide-body airplane. They can't wait for the Export-Import Bank to expire so they can capture market share.

Why in the world would we unilaterally disarm? Remember this: We are

only 5 percent of the world's population.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HECK of Washington. If we want to keep and grow our middle class, we need to learn how to sell into the growing middle class of the rest of the world, and that requires the Export-Import Bank.

The Export-Import Bank is a job-creating machine, a deficit-reducing machine, and a superperformer. The votes are here. It is 190, by the way—not 189—and 58 on that side of the aisle.

There is a part of me, a voice in me that wants to shout: Let my people go. The votes are here. It is not scheduled for a hearing. Let Mr. HASTINGS offer his amendment. Let's reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind Members we are talking about the EPA today, a job-destroying agency.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate my friend and colleague from the Rules Committee yielding me time to speak on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak on the rule for H.R. 1030 and H.R. 1029 because I think, frankly, it fits into what I have just been hearing, but I think it fits in sort of maybe a perverse way, but also a very good way, because it emphasizes exactly what we need to be talking about here, and that is jobs, that is the economy, that is good growth, that is good government, that is the things that we are supposed to be doing and working on that and finding out why certain things don't get done.

Anybody watching over the last little bit would actually have a concern as to what we are doing, and I think it goes back to a simple understanding that there is a very clear understanding of why and who is offering what amendments and what bills up here. The Republican majority is offering a vision in which people are empowered in government, not taking the incentives away.

I think it was summed up very well in a statement just the other day from the administration that actually said that their definition, if you will, of a burdensome regulation was something that burdened the employees of a government agency.

I think it is very clear from our perspective that what is a burdensome regulation is something that burdens American businesses and burdens the scientific communities and burdens those in which government is putting its finger on and stifling. There is a big difference here. All you have to do is watch what is said and watch what is done, and you will begin to see that.

I will not be supporting, as we go back to these bills, all the amendments

made in order under this rule. I am still pleased that we, as a House, are considering them as we come to the floor and also that the House will ultimately work its will.

One of the key differences highlighted is in how we as conservatives and others in this body look at H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle in the committee markup of this legislation argued that "this marks a radical departure from longstanding practices."

I hope this is the case, for these acclaimed "longstanding practices" have favored interest group agendas over scientific integrity, back rooms over public participation, and sacrificed transparency and openness at the altar of political expediency.

Conservatives in this body believe that Congress should not tolerate an administration who refuses to make public the scientific data behind numerous EPA regulations, regulations that are crippling the ability of businesses to survive in this economic climate created and sustained by the failed policies of this administration.

This administration issued a statement of opposition, as I just talked about a moment ago, saying that underlying measures in these bills would be "burdensome" on the government. I think if our Founders were hearing this today, they would stand up and say: That is not what we intended.

Read the document. The document said a limited, structured government that supports the people, that supports our welfare, and supports the cause of the United States of America, not in a form in which government is the problem in finding out these problems and keeping from areas in a scientific community, in the business community.

There is a clear, distinct difference here. What is burdensome on government is what then turns around and becomes burdensome on the American people. You see, conservatives in Congress try to streamline and reform our regulatory system, ensure that cost and benefits of regulations are analyzed before it is implemented, and we are told that that is burdensome.

While the conservatives are being criticized for burdensome reforms, they are also, at the same time, pushing through \$181.5 billion in regulations just last year.

Apparently, the administration has redefined burdensome to mean something that most do not. It is just another example of a disconnect.

Now, what is often said at this point is that conservatives and Republicans don't want clean water. They want to destroy the environmental integrity. They want bad air and poor traffic control and maybe everything else in the world that you want to say because there is a belief that government will fix all that.

There is a proper role for government, but in this environment, let's have transparency, let's have openness,

let's have public participation. Let's not keep stuff away from the American people. That is what they are asking for. That is what they expect from their government.

Instead of marginalizing the honest debate about science and being about scientific enterprise, instead of saying that they are for something that nobody is for, let's be honest about the legislation.

If you don't really want to talk about the legislation, let's talk about everything else in the world. That is a good way to distract. We don't want to talk about a process that is broken. We will talk about something else.

No, it is not going to happen this time. I agree with the previous speaker. Let my people go. Let my people go. Let the government be open. Let the government be transparent.

Let the government be limited so that the American people are not limited, the American people have all they need, and that is the purpose of these bills.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am always fascinated when our colleagues come to the floor of this great deliberative body and argue against government. The last time I looked, all 435 plus 6 of us and the 100 United States Senators sought public office to be involved in making government better.

□ 1315

The government is the people of the United States. And it is not only the respective agencies; it is also our counties, our parishes, our districts, our cities that are the government. When we say that, it makes it sound as if the government is bad, and defense is the only entity that all of us agree is our responsibility.

But yes, clean water is our responsibility, and, yes, emissions that cause harm to the environment and to individuals are our mission. Those are responsibilities of government.

Yes, air traffic control is a responsibility of government. Yes, the way our roads are undertaken, or the repair of bridges, yes, that is the government.

So I have a lot of trouble with an antigovernment attitude when, in fact, we are just being anti-ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, we know that science is the formation of conclusions upon a foundation of testable observation. Sometimes mistakes are made, and they can be construed as valuable because you learn what not to do the next time.

Government, for example, operated NASA and still has some role in that, and many of the experiments that were failed experiments led to us understanding how to develop the microwave and how to develop scientific heart devices that have benefited the American people. Yes, that was the government.

But this Republican-caused crisis was resolved in the same way it was a few weeks back, the same way it was resolved the last time the Republicans shut down the government. It was resolved on the backs of Democrats.

When the other party decides to work with the Democratic Party, the American people benefit from its government, and we saw evidence of that in the Homeland Security financing measure.

Given how often we find ourselves in similar situations, I can't help but wonder what hypothesis my friends are trying to test. I do not think that seeing how far our security and economic stability can bend before breaking is what is meant by "the great American experiment."

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

First off, I want to bring us back to the issue at hand today; that, is the rule for consideration of H.R. 1029 and H.R. 1030.

H.R. 1029 protects jobs by helping to ensure that important scientific advice is balanced and unbiased. The bill promotes public participation and encourages the Science Advisory Board to draw on State and private sector expertise, fairly simple concepts.

H.R. 1030 is a transparency bill that simply asks the EPA to show its work before implementing regulations that cost billions of dollars and destroy jobs. Transparency and reproducibility are basic tenets of science. Costly environmental regulations should only be based on data that are available to independent scientists and to the public.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, if the EPA has nothing to hide, then there is no good reason to keep this data from the American people.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of the two important bills to provide for an open and transparent rulemaking at the Environmental Protection Agency. I certainly thank the authors for their thoughtful legislation. I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 138 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R.1031) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes. General debate shall

be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1031.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled

"Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the resolution, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1191.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 181, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—232

Abraham	Crawford	Hardy
Aderholt	Crenshaw	Harper
Allen	Culberson	Harris
Amash	Curbelo (FL)	Hartzler
Amodei	Davis, Rodney	Heck (NV)
Babin	Denham	Hensarling
Barletta	Dent	Herrera Beutler
Barr	DeSantis	Hice, Jody B.
Barton	DesJarlais	Hill
Benishek	Diaz-Balart	Holding
Bilirakis	Dold	Huelskamp
Bishop (MI)	Duffy	Huizenga (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Black	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Blackburn	Ellmers (NC)	Hurd (TX)
Blum	Emmer (MN)	Issa
Bost	Farenthold	Jenkins (KS)
Boustany	Fincher	Jenkins (WV)
Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (OH)
Brat	Fleischmann	Johnson, Sam
Bridenstine	Fleming	Jolly
Brooks (AL)	Flores	Jones
Brooks (IN)	Forbes	Jordan
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Joyce
Buck	Foxx	Katko
Bucshon	Franks (AZ)	Kelly (PA)
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Byrne	Garrett	King (NY)
Calvert	Gibbs	Kinzinger (IL)
Carter (GA)	Gibson	Kline
Carter (TX)	Gohmert	Knight
Chabot	Goodlatte	Labrador
Chaffetz	Gosar	LaMalfa
Clawson (FL)	Gowdy	Lamborn
Coffman	Granger	Lance
Cole	Graves (GA)	Latta
Collins (NY)	Graves (LA)	LoBiondo
Comstock	Griffith	Long
Conaway	Grothman	Loudermilk
Cook	Guinta	Love
Costello (PA)	Guthrie	Lucas
Cramer	Hanna	Luetkemeyer

MacArthur	Poliquin	Smith (TX)
Marchant	Pompeo	Stefanik
Marino	Posey	Stewart
Massie	Price, Tom	Stivers
McCarthy	Ratcliffe	Stutzman
McCaul	Reed	Thompson (PA)
McClintock	Reichert	Thornberry
McHenry	Renacci	Tiberi
McMorris	Ribble	Tipton
Rodgers	Rice (SC)	Trott
McSally	Rigell	Turner
Meadows	Roby	Upton
Meehan	Roe (TN)	Valadao
Messer	Rogers (AL)	Wagner
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Walden
Miller (MI)	Rokita	Walker
Moolenaar	Rooney (FL)	Walorski
Mooney (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walters, Mimi
Mullin	Ross	Weber (TX)
Mulvaney	Rothfus	Webster (FL)
Murphy (PA)	Rouzer	Westerman
Neugebauer	Royce	Westmoreland
Newhouse	Russell	Whitfield
Noem	Ryan (WI)	Williams
Nugent	Salmon	Wilson (SC)
Nunes	Scalise	Wittman
Olson	Schweikert	Womack
Palazzo	Sensenbrenner	Woodall
Palmer	Sessions	Yoder
Paulsen	Shimkus	Yoho
Pearce	Shuster	Young (IA)
Perry	Simpson	Young (IN)
Pittenger	Smith (MO)	Zeldin
Pitts	Smith (NE)	
Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)	

NAYS—181

Adams	Fattah	Meng
Aguilar	Foster	Moore
Ashford	Frankel (FL)	Moulton
Bass	Fudge	Murphy (FL)
Beatty	Gabbard	Nadler
Becerra	Gallego	Napolitano
Bera	Garamendi	Neal
Beyer	Graham	Nolan
Bishop (GA)	Grayson	Norcross
Blumenauer	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Bonamici	Green, Gene	Pallone
Boyle, Brendan	Grijalva	Pascarell
F.	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Perlmutter
Brown (FL)	Hastings	Peters
Brownley (CA)	Heck (WA)	Peterson
Bustos	Higgins	Pingree
Butterfield	Himes	Pocan
Capps	Honda	Polis
Capuano	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Cárdenas	Huffman	Quigley
Carney	Israel	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Cartwright	Jeffries	Richmond
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	T.
Clay	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kind	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Connolly	Kuster	Schrader
Cooper	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Crowley	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Cuellar	Lee	Sherman
Cummings	Levin	Sinema
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Sires
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Slaughter
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Speier
DeGette	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	Lowenthal	Takai
DeLauro	Lowe	Takano
DelBene	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (CA)
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
Dingell	(NM)	Tonko
Doggett	Lynch	Torres
Doyle, Michael	Maloney,	Tsongas
F.	Carolyn	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Edwards	Matsui	Veasey
Ellison	McCollum	Vela
Engel	McDermott	Velázquez
Eshoo	McGovern	Visclosky
Esty	McNerney	
Farr	Meeks	

Walz Waters, Maxine Yarmuth
Wasserman Watson Coleman
Schultz Welch

NOT VOTING—19

Collins (GA) Lummis Scott, Austin
Conyers McKinley Smith (WA)
Graves (MO) Payne Wilson (FL)
Hinojosa Roskam Young (AK)
Hudson Rush Zinke
Hurt (VA) Sanford
Lewis Schock

□ 1348

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Ms. DEGETTE, ESTY, and CLARKE of New York changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 116 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 116, ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 138. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 180, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

AYES—236

Abraham	Cook	Grothman
Aderholt	Costello (PA)	Guinta
Allen	Cramer	Guthrie
Amash	Crawford	Hanna
Amodei	Crenshaw	Hardy
Ashford	Culberson	Harper
Babin	Curbelo (FL)	Harris
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Hartzler
Barr	Denham	Heck (NV)
Barton	Dent	Hensarling
Benishek	DeSantis	Herrera Beutler
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Hice, Jody B.
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Hill
Bishop (MI)	Dold	Holding
Bishop (UT)	Duffy	Huelskamp
Black	Duncan (SC)	Huizenga (MI)
Blackburn	Duncan (TN)	Hultgren
Blum	Ellmers (NC)	Hunter
Bost	Emmer (MN)	Hurd (TX)
Boustany	Farenthold	Hurt (VA)
Brady (TX)	Fincher	Issa
Brat	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (KS)
Bridenstine	Fleischmann	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (AL)	Fleming	Johnson (OH)
Brooks (IN)	Flores	Johnson, Sam
Buchanan	Forbes	Jolly
Buck	Fortenberry	Jones
Bucshon	Fox	Jordan
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Joyce
Byrne	Frelinghuysen	Katko
Calvert	Garrett	Kelly (PA)
Carter (GA)	Gibbs	King (IA)
Carter (TX)	Gibson	King (NY)
Chabot	Gohmert	Kinzinger (IL)
Chaffetz	Goodlatte	Kline
Clawson (FL)	Gosar	Knight
Cole	Gowdy	Labrador
Collins (GA)	Granger	LaMalfa
Collins (NY)	Graves (GA)	Lamborn
Comstock	Graves (LA)	Lance
Conaway	Griffith	Latta

LoBiondo	Perry	Smith (NE)
Long	Peterson	Smith (NJ)
Loudermilk	Pittenger	Smith (TX)
Love	Pitts	Stefanik
Lucas	Poe (TX)	Stewart
Luetkemeyer	Poliquin	Stivers
MacArthur	Pompeo	Stutzman
Marchant	Posey	Thompson (PA)
Marino	Price, Tom	Thornberry
Masse	Ratcliffe	Tiberi
McCarthy	Reed	Tipton
McCaul	Reichert	Trott
McClintock	Renacci	Turner
McHenry	Rice (SC)	Upton
McMorris	Rigell	Valadao
Rodgers	Roby	Wagner
McSally	Roe (TN)	Walberg
Meadows	Rogers (AL)	Walden
Meehan	Rogers (KY)	Walker
Messer	Rohrabacher	Walorski
Mica	Rokita	Walters, Mimi
Miller (FL)	Rooney (FL)	Weber (TX)
Miller (MI)	Ros-Lehtinen	Webster (FL)
Moolenaar	Ross	Wenstrup
Mooney (WV)	Rothfus	Westerman
Mullin	Rouzer	Westmoreland
Mulvaney	Royce	Whitfield
Murphy (PA)	Russell	Williams
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (SC)
Newhouse	Salmon	Wittman
Noem	Scalise	Womack
Nugent	Schweikert	Woodall
Nunes	Sensenbrenner	Yoder
Olson	Sessions	Yoho
Palazzo	Shimkus	Young (IA)
Palmer	Shuster	Young (IN)
Paulsen	Simpson	Zeldin
Pearce	Smith (MO)	Zinke

NOES—180

Adams	Fattah	McGovern
Aguilar	Foster	McNerney
Bass	Frankel (FL)	Meeks
Beatty	Fudge	Meng
Becerra	Gabbard	Moore
Bera	Gallego	Moulton
Beyer	Garamendi	Murphy (FL)
Blumenauer	Graham	Nadler
Bonamici	Grayson	Napolitano
Boyle, Brendan	Green, Al	Neal
F.	Green, Gene	Nolan
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	Norcross
Brown (FL)	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Brownley (CA)	Hahn	Pallone
Bustos	Hastings	Pascarell
Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Capps	Higgins	Perlmutter
Capuano	Himes	Peters
Cárdenas	Honda	Pingree
Carney	Hoyer	Pocan
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Polis
Cartwright	Israel	Price (NC)
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Rangel
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Ruiz
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	Kilmer	T.
Connolly	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Costa	Kuster	Schakowsky
Courtney	Langevin	Schiff
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Cummings	Lawrence	Scott, David
Davis (CA)	Lee	Serrano
Davis, Danny	Levin	Sewell (AL)
DeFazio	Lewis	Sherman
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Sinema
Delaney	Lipinski	Sires
DeLauro	Loebach	Slaughter
DelBene	Lofgren	Speier
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Lowe	Takai
Dingell	Lujan Grisham	Takano
Doggett	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Doyle, Michael	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
F.	(NM)	Titus
Duckworth	Lynch	Tonko
Edwards	Maloney	Torres
Ellison	Carolyn	Tsongas
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Van Hollen
Eshoo	Matsui	Vargas
Esty	McCollum	Veasey
Farr	McDermott	Vela

Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Coffman	McKinley	Schock
Conyers	Payne	Scott, Austin
Graves (MO)	Ribble	Smith (WA)
Hinojosa	Roskam	Young (AK)
Hudson	Rush	
Lummis	Sanford	

□ 1355

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 117, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIRE-FIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—415

Abraham	Bridenstine	Cohen
Adams	Brooks (AL)	Cole
Aderholt	Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)
Aguilar	Brown (FL)	Collins (NY)
Allen	Brownley (CA)	Comstock
Amash	Buchanan	Conaway
Amodei	Buck	Connolly
Ashford	Bucshon	Cook
Babin	Burgess	Cooper
Barletta	Bustos	Costa
Barr	Butterfield	Costello (PA)
Barton	Byrne	Courtney
Bass	Calvert	Cramer
Beatty	Capps	Crawford
Becerra	Capuano	Crenshaw
Benishek	Cárdenas	Crowley
Bera	Carney	Cuellar
Beyer	Carson (IN)	Culberson
Bilirakis	Carter (GA)	Cummings
Bishop (GA)	Carter (TX)	Curbelo (FL)
Bishop (MI)	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Black	Castro (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Blackburn	Chabot	DeFazio
Blum	Chaffetz	DeGette
Blumenauer	Chu, Judy	Delaney
Bonamici	Cicilline	DeLauro
Bost	Clark (MA)	DelBene
Boustany	Clarke (NY)	Denham
Boyle, Brendan	Clawson (FL)	Dent
F.	Clay	DeSantis
Brady (PA)	Cleaver	DeSaulnier
Brady (TX)	Clyburn	DesJarlais
Brat	Coffman	Deutch