"(iii) a description of any additional actions planned for the subsequent year that are proposed to enable the regional office to meet the goal; and

"(B) a statement prepared by the Under Secretary for Benefits explaining how the failure of the regional office to meet the goal affected the performance evaluation of the director of the regional office; and".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 859, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chair, I offer this amendment, which is similar to a provision that was previously passed in the House in the 113th Congress. It improves transparency and provides important information about each regional office's accuracy and productivity.

I think that each regional office is required to submit a report whenever it fails to meet its goal of processing claims within 125 days and with 98 percent accuracy. Those are numbers that VA has set forth. I think that it is very important that we keep a timely track on this and not allow the backlogs to continue for an inordinate period of time.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) having assumed the chair, Mr. ROTHFUS, 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. 5620) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REGULATORY INTEGRITY ACT OF 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5226.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 863 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. 5226.

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

□ 1538

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. 5226) to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to require the publication of information relating to pending agency regulatory actions, and for other purposes, with Mr. ROTHFUS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my bipartisan bill, H.R. 5226, the Regulatory Integrity Act of 2016, a good government transparency bill.

This bill is a simple concept, but I believe it will have an important and positive impact on the public's participation in the regulatory process. That positive impact will, in turn, benefit the regulatory process as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, the public comment period is an essential part of upholding our democratic values. It ensures that Americans will have their voices heard in the Federal Government's regulatory process.

H.R. 5226 helps preserve the integrity of the public commenting in two primary ways. First, the bill defines the parameters of how an agency should communicate when the agency is offering a proposal to the public and when asking that the public provide feedback. This bill requires agencies to do only what you should expect them to do, if the request for feedback was genuine and sincere.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5226 requires the agency to, one, identify itself; two, clearly state whether the agency is accepting public comments or considering alternatives; and, three, most importantly, speak about the regulation in a neutral, unbiased tone.

The people I represent in Michigan's Seventh District are ready to offer honest and thoughtful feedback, but they currently lack confidence that Federal agencies are actually open to their insights and constructive criticism.

There may be no better example of this tendency to ignore the American public than the EPA's Waters of the U.S. Rule. The EPA not only overlooked the very real concerns of the countryside—concerns expressed by my constituents in Monroe, Jackson, and

Lenawee County—but the EPA actually engaged in a social media campaign to gin up support for their proposal.

In fact, the Government Accountability Office found that the EPA undertook a "covert propaganda" campaign by soliciting social media comments in support of their proposed rule. GAO also told the EPA to report this violation to the President and Congress because "the agency's appropriations were not available for these prohibited purposes."

The public comment period is the opportunity afforded to American people to voice their concerns on proposed rules, and agencies must take their input seriously.

Mr. Chairman, this bill simply tells agencies that they need to keep to the facts and avoid soliciting support when they ought to be soliciting comments.

Mr. Chairman, the second way this bill helps to preserve the integrity of the regulatory process is that it establishes transparency requirements for the agency in how it communicates to the public.

The bill requires agencies to post on their Web site some basic information about each communication the agency makes about pending regulatory action. For each communication, the public will be able to see a copy of the communication, the intended audience, the method of communication, and the date the communication was issued.

Additionally, agencies will be required to post online a description of each regulatory action, the date the agency first began to consider or develop each action, the status of each action, and the expected date of completion for each action.

Mr. Chairman, these basic transparency measures will allow the public to have a central source for all communication about a specific regulatory action so that the public can have a full and equal opportunity to understand the intent of the agency.

It will also allow Congress and the American public to verify that communications to the public about regulatory actions are honest, unbiased, and compliant with the requirements of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, although individuals may disagree about how much regulation is appropriate or how intrusive regulations might be, we should all agree that the public's participation is a vital part of legitimizing the rulemaking process. Without input from the public—input that is fully considered by the agency promulgating the rule—something fundamental is missing from the legislation itself.

Unfortunately, we have seen over and over again agencies that seem to believe that the regulatory process is simply a perfunctory act of compliance necessary to reach the end goal of whatever regulatory scheme the agency's staff feels is best.

What we see when the agency diminishes the public input is that the rule-making process is used by agencies to

advocate for what should be a proposed rule rather than used to refine and improve upon the agency's existing thoughts.

□ 1545

In fact, Congress originally established the regulatory process as a way to crowdsource the development of regulations long before the term "crowdsourcing" was even a thing.

Mr. Chairman, this bill helps us return to our original intent of crowdsourcing regulatory efforts, by preventing agencies from boasting to the public about how great their proposal is, instead of honestly and earnestly asking for feedback, constructive criticism, and a dialogue about how best to solve problems. As a result, H.R. 5226 will restore integrity to our regulatory process.

I appreciate the opportunity to bring the bill to the floor today. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5226, and I cannot support this bill as drafted. This legislation is another attempt by House Republicans to attack agency rulemakings with which they disagree. This attack is done under the guise of creating more transparency, but the bill will actually lead to less openness in the agency rulemaking process.

The bill we are considering today supposedly aims to prohibit improper communications by agencies, known as agency aggrandizement. What the bill actually does is muzzle agencies from talking about pending rules.

This bill would prohibit agencies from making public communications to solicit support for or to promote a pending agency regulatory action. Agencies currently are prohibited from grassroots lobbying for an agency rule or from engaging in publicity or propaganda.

The GAO has issued opinions that define what agencies can and cannot say. GAO says that three categories of communications are off limits: one, covert communications; two, self-aggrandizement; and three, purely partisan activities.

This bill goes far beyond that by prohibiting communications that are to promote a rule. Almost anything an agency says would be considered promotion of a rule. The practical impact of this legislation is that almost any action the agency made to communicate the benefits of a rule could be considered to be improperly promoting a pending action.

The bill defines public communication to include every oral, written, or electronic communication. This means that tweets as innocuous and as popular as the Department of the Interior's daily nature photo could even be considered improper promotion. I cannot believe that the sponsors of this

bill would really intend to regulate nature photos on Twitter.

In addition to limiting communications between agencies and the public, this legislation contains a number of other unnecessarily burdensome requirements.

Yesterday, the White House issued a Statement of Administration Policy that said that, if this bill were presented to the President, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill. That statement said: "The Regulatory Integrity Act would be duplicative and costly to the American taxpayer. The separate tracking and reporting of agency communications as prescribed by the bill is unnecessary, is extremely burdensome, and provides little to no value while diverting agency resources from important priorities."

I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 5226.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. Jenkins).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this important issue.

Congress and the courts have stated time and again, agencies cannot use taxpayer funds to lobby Congress on rules and regulations. It is supposed to be perfectly clear, but, unfortunately, we have seen that this administration thinks it is above the law, disregarding the clear differences between disseminating information and lobbying.

In 2004, The New York Times—yes, The New York Times—reported on the EPA's use of taxpayers' funds for a propaganda campaign to promote its proposed clean water rule.

The minority talks about muzzling. Well, we do need to muzzle propaganda. At the same time the EPA was working with outside groups to actively promote the rule on social media like Facebook and Twitter, this covert propaganda came, despite the clear line that prohibits Federal agencies from engaging and lobbying on causes.

Enough is enough, Mr. Chairman. Federal agencies should not be using taxpayer dollars to lobby on behalf of rules and regulations they are issuing, as The New York Times pointed out and discovered.

I have heard from farmers, manufacturers, miners, and more in West Virginia about their concerns with rules such as waters of the U.S. Their concerns are legitimate, and the EPA should not be drowning out criticism by actively lobbying for their own rules on social media.

This is a commonsense bill. This deserves bipartisan support by all Members of Congress. It shouldn't matter which party is in control of Congress or which party is in the White House. It is simply good policy.

I encourage approval of this legislation.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am awaiting additional Members who would like to speak to this issue, but, in the intervening time, let me just say again I certainly, having majored in forestry and land management early in my academic career, love pictures of nature. We are not attempting to stop that from taking place. We are simply saying that the American public deserves the opportunity, in regulatory issues, to make clear public comments and to know, with transparency, what agencies are doing.

To find out, with the new social media opportunities, that agencies like the EPA are using taxpayer dollars to purchase specific tools, electronic media tools, to engage in encouraging people only to comment positively about their rules, that is a great concern. So, Mr. Chairman, I think it is appropriate for us to put a little further block in saying taxpayers ought to be considered and agencies ought to listen to them, and not the other way around.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman. I have a letter in my possession signed by numerous groups, public interest groups, stating their opposition to H.R. 5226. It is a very interesting combination of groups: the AFL-CIO, AFSCME, American Association of University Women, Americans for Financial Reform, Clean Water Action, Consumer Action, Consumer Federation of America, Consumers for Reliability and Auto Safety, Earthjustice, U.S. PIRG, United Steelworkers, Voices for Progress, WE ACT for Environmental Justice, Project on Government Oversight, Public Citizen, Prairie Rivers Network, and NET-WORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice.

What they all agree on is that the Regulatory Integrity Act will significantly undermine a Federal agency's ability to engage and inform the public in a meaningful and transparent way regarding its work on important, science-based rulemakings that will greatly benefit the public.

As a result, the bill will lead to decreased public awareness and participation in the rulemaking process in direct contradiction of the Administrative Procedure Act and agencies' authorizing statutes which specifically provide for broad stakeholder engagement.

They point out that substantial ambiguities in the bill threaten to create uncertainty and confusion among agencies about what public communications are permissible and, thus, risk discouraging them from keeping the public apprised of the important work that they do on its behalf

In an era when agencies should be increasingly embracing innovative 21st century communications technologies needed to reach the public, including

social media, H.R. 5226 sends exactly the wrong message. So that means that all of these groups feel as though this legislation would dampen or chill the public's ability to be able to weigh in on a rule, to be able to even know what those agencies are doing. I just, for the life of me, cannot understand what the urgency is to pass this bill into law and to have the chilling effects that it would have on the public's ability to communicate with its government.

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

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

I thank my friend and colleague from Missouri. I appreciate his concerns, appreciate the list. But in that list, I didn't hear anyone that would have to live directly under the new regulations that are being proposed or people that would offer comment with great concerns of how it would impact them.

I am thinking of the agriculture community in my district, major community in the district, with great concerns about waters of the U.S. and the impact that it would have in doing away with the opportunity of the family farm, in many cases.

So I don't see any significant problems with any ambiguity, if there be any, which this legislation might produce amongst agencies because we are always open to agencies coming to Congress asking questions. What did we mean?

I think debates like this, that I appreciate, give an opportunity to look back and say this is what we debated, this is what we meant to do, and this is how you ought to carry it out. So the issue of any ambiguity that would come up from this legislation, in fact, I don't think it is a problem. It adds more insight.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, again, listening to the critical nature of this issue about communication—I served 18 years in our State legislature. One of the great awakenings to me up here was the fact that, once we pass a law and we tell the administration, who tells an agency to craft a rule to carry out that law, under the Federal system, the agency can do essentially whatever it wants to do.

□ 1600

That rule doesn't officially come back and not go into effect until the Congress gives its stamp of approval. The agency basically can do almost anything it wants. The role, responsibility, and power of Congress is somewhat limited.

In the State legislature, a rule had to come back in West Virginia and get the full approval of the legislature once again. That was the voice of the legislature to say: We think you got it right, agency, or not.

We don't have that luxury here. That is why in this rulemaking process, the communication as the draft rule and proposed final rule get published, we run into the issue where an agency, through all these incredible communication tools, might cross the line and actually try to influence the public comments to bolster their rule, essentially lobbying for their own rule. That is simply wrong. We need to have a clearly defined rule.

That is what this bill does. We need to put the power back in the people and to make sure that they are not unduly influenced by an agency that is simply trying to sell their rule. Communicating with the public is important. We have incredible communication tools. That is a positive thing. But they have to be used in the right way, and that is why this legislation makes sure that they are used in the right way and why this is so important.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my friend from Michigan mentioned that he didn't hear in the list people that may be impacted by this legislation. The list includes 34 different groups, and some of them that I think that all of us represent that would be impacted by this arbitrary legislation are groups like Con-Federation οf sumer America Earthjustice, Environment America, Greenpeace, Natural Resources Defense Council, and Prairie Rivers Network—I am not even sure where that is based, but I represent the confluence of the Mississippi and Missouri rivers right at St. Louis, so water is important to the people in my region-U.S. PIRG, Union of Concerned Scientists, United Steelworkers, and United Support and Memorial for Workplace Fatalities. Those are some of the groups that are represented in this letter.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the U.S. Virgin Islands (Ms. Plaskett).

Ms. PLAŠKETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5226, the Regulatory Integrity Act of 2016, would, we believe, impose duplicative and unnecessary procedural requirements on agencies that would prevent them from efficiently performing their statutory responsibilities and could potentially lead to a less informed public due to the nature of the communication that is requested or not to be requested by this bill. Additionally, Mr. Chairman, these duplicative services will be costly to the American taxpayer.

While we agree that some increased transparency should be considered, this bill actually grinds regulatory processes and has an onerous and chilling reporting requirement to it. The bill increases bureaucratic red tape my Republican colleagues purport to be the problem with government and creates additional oversight by the Federal Government on agencies. We do have the ability to keep agencies from what their rulemaking is through our own appropriation of those agencies and what they do.

If that isn't reason enough not to support this legislation, its added costs to the American taxpayers should do the job. The separate tracking and reporting of agency communications as prescribed by the bill is unnecessary and extremely burdensome and provides little to no value while diverting agency resources from the important priorities and work that the agencies with limited resources as it is are supposed to carry out.

This bill is designed for the majority to more easily combat agency actions that they disagree with.

Mr. Chairman, there are more urgent matters that we need to be taking up at this time that need our immediate attention: the Zika virus, the Flint water crisis, gun violence, and the heroin and opiate crisis that are going on right now. This is really unnecessary time that this Congress should be taking, and we believe that this should be struck down by this Congress.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP), my good friend and colleague

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. WALBERG for all his hard work on this issue. It is a very important issue for this country and the people that we represent.

Every year, unelected bureaucrats create thousands of onerous rules that have the full effect of a law without any input from the people that they will impact—rules like the EPA's waters of the United States rule or the Department of Labor's overtime rule—which I hear about often in my office. These rules are able to be crafted and adopted behind closed doors without ever being voted on by a single elected official with absolutely no transparency and no public debate.

Nevertheless, this administration continues to churn out these rules without regard for the negative consequences or the fact that this rule-making process is contrary to the express terms of the United States Constitution, Article I, section 1, which gives exclusive lawmaking power to the legislative branch.

These rules have so many negative consequences like fewer jobs and less workplace flexibility, and they impact virtually everyone in some way or another. That is why I support Mr. WALBERG's bill, H.R. 5226, the Regulatory Integrity Act. It provides muchneeded transparency into the rule-making process by requiring agencies to post all public comments in a central location. It also prohibits Federal agencies from actively soliciting support for any and all proposed rules during the public comment period.

Mr. Chairman, I have worked here for 2 years, and I am still shocked by the brazen disregard this administration has shown for the rule of law and the United States Constitution. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes" on this measure.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the gentleman

from Missouri, my friend, aware that I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to close by reiterating a few of the problems with the Regulatory Integrity Act. This bill would require agencies to report every interaction with the public regardless of whether it is a phone call, email, tweet, or more formal statement. The bill would prove completely unworkable and would have the effect of chilling agencies' interactions with the public and leading to less transparency with the agency rulemaking process.

I would support a bill that actually improved transparency. This bill will not accomplish that, and I cannot support it. I, again, urge my colleagues to reject this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for the concerns. I think we really want the same thing. We want to make sure that in the process of doing regulation rules, that they fit the need, but I guess I would add to the point that as limited as possible in order to keep the liberty, opportunity and growth in our country is what I would feel to be necessary.

We have regulatory agencies that are—because of their strength, their power, and their pervasiveness—able to direct the course of regulation under the guise of having public comment, under the guise of seeking that advice and even best practices; yet behind the scenes are using resources with some of the abilities they have today with social media and other things to lobby for a particular proposal before they have even looked at the comments from those that have to deal with it, whether it is a corporation or whether it is a farmer or whether it is a union.

As a former proud United Steel worker myself, I understand that regulations are important to make sure that protections are taken. But as a steel-worker, I wanted to know that I had a job to come back to at a site to come back to. The place I worked at in the south side of Chicago is no longer there. Many of the reasons were because of bad decisions by the corporation, but also a regulatory climate that made it difficult to compete.

So all we are asking here is that there be full transparency, that Congress gets more involved in saying yes to good ideas from the agencies or saying no to bad ideas from the agencies, in listening to people and making sure that their concerns are met first and foremost. That is all I ask.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I ask support for H.R. 5226, I believe a commonsense and, yes, a bipartisan proposal to put transparency back into the system

and integrity in the way we do our regulatory reform.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, there is loads of work for Congress to do "before we sleep"—from the budget for the federal government itself to funding for the Zika health emergency before it gets any more out of control.

Instead, the House just wasted time on H.R. 5226, the badly misnamed Regulatory Integrity Act, a bill so costly to taxpayers and so redundant of existing legislation that it has attracted a veto threat.

The bill adds wasteful costs to the regulatory process Republicans incessantly claim is too costly now. H.R. 5226 requires every public communication to be published within 24 hours. Duh! Public communications are by definition—public.

Republicans have never seen a regulation they like. Putting new and costly work on agencies won't make regulations any less acceptable. If the point was the same as usual—to try to deter regulations—Republicans are going to have to try harder.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WESTMORE-LAND). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-63. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 5226

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Regulatory Integrity Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION RELAT-ING TO PENDING REGULATORY AC-TIONS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 306 the following new section:

"\$307. Information regarding pending agency regulatory action

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) AGENCY REGULATORY ACTION.—The term 'agency regulatory action' means guidance, policy statement, directive, rule making, or adjudication issued by an Executive agency.

"(2) AGGRANDIZEMENT.—The term 'aggran-dizement' means—

"(A) any communication emphasizing the importance of the Executive agency or agency regulatory action that does not have the clear purpose of informing the public of the substance or status of the Executive agency or agency regulatory action: or

"(B) any communication that is puffery.

"(3) PUBLIC COMMUNICATION.—The term 'public communication'—

"(A) means any method (including written, oral, or electronic) of disseminating information to the public, including an agency statement (written or verbal), blog, video, audio recording, or other social media message; and

"(B) does not include a notice published in the Federal Register pursuant to section 553 or any requirement to publish pursuant to this sec-

"(4) RULE MAKING.—The term 'rule making' has the meaning given that term under section 551.

"(b) Information To Be Posted Online.-

"(1) REQUIREMENT.—The head of each Executive agency shall make publicly available in a searchable format in a prominent location either on the website of the Executive agency or in the rule making docket on Regulations.gov the following information:

"(A) PENDING AGENCY REGULATORY ACTION.—
A list of each pending agency regulatory action
and with regard to each such action—

"(i) the date on which the Executive agency first began to develop or consider the agency regulatory action;

"(ii) the status of the agency regulatory action:

"(iii) an estimate of the date of upon which the agency regulatory action will be final and in effect; and

"(iv) a brief description of the agency regulatory action.

"(B) PUBLIC COMMUNICATION.—For each pending agency regulatory action, a list of each public communication about the pending agency regulatory action issued by the Executive agency and with regard to each such communication—

"(i) the date of the communication;

"(ii) the intended audience of the communication;

"(iii) the method of communication; and

"(iv) a copy of the original communication.

"(2) PERIOD.—The head of each Executive agency shall publish the information required under paragraph (1)(A) not later than 24 hours after a public communication relating to a pending agency regulatory action is issued and shall maintain the public availability of such information not less than 5 years after the date on which the pending agency regulatory action is finalized.

"(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLIC COMMUNICA-TIONS.—Any public communication issued by an Executive agency that refers to a pending agency regulatory action—

"(1) shall specify whether the Executive agency is considering alternatives, including alternatives that may conflict with the intent, objective, or methodology of such agency regulatory action:

"(2) shall specify whether the Executive agency is accepting or will be accepting comments;

"(3) shall expressly disclose that the Executive agency is the source of the information to the intended recipients; and

"(4) may not-

"(A) solicit support for or promote the pending agency regulatory action; or

"(B) include statements of aggrandizement for the Executive agency, any Federal employee, or the pending agency regulatory action.

"(d) REPORTING.—

"(1) In GENERAL.—Not later than January 15 of each year, the head of an Executive agency that communicated about a pending agency regulatory action during the previous fiscal year shall submit to each committee of Congress with jurisdiction over the activities of the Executive agency a report indicating—

"(A) the number pending agency regulatory actions the Executive agency issued public communications about during that fiscal year:

"(B) the average number of public communications issued by the Executive agency for each pending agency regulatory action during that fiscal year:

"(C) the 5 pending agency regulatory actions with the highest number of public communications issued by the Executive agency in that fiscal year; and

"(D) a copy of each public communication for the pending agency regulatory actions identified in subparagraph (C).

"(2) AVAILABILITY OF REPORTS.—The head of an Executive agency that is required to submit a report under paragraph (1) shall make the report publicly available in a searchable format in a prominent location on the website of the Executive agency.".

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMEND-MENT.—The table of sections for chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 306 the following new item:

"307. Information regarding pending agency regulatory action.".

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 114-744. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BOUSTANY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 114-744.

Mr. BOUSTANY. 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:

Page 3, line 13, strike ''; and'' and insert a semicolon.

Page 3, line 15, strike the period at the end and insert "; and".

Page 3, after line 15, insert the following:

"(v) if a regulatory impact analysis or similar cost-benefit analysis has been conducted, the findings of such analysis, including any data or formula used for purposes of such analysis.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 863, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I am here to offer an amendment to H.R. 5226, the Regulatory Integrity Act of 2016. This amendment is based on legislation I proposed earlier in the year.

By creating a new process that requires the administration to keep a clear, organized, and easy-to-understand list of all proposed and outstanding rules and regulations, we are forcing transparency on bureaucrats who are currently running amok.

I also want to thank my colleague, Mr. LOUDERMILK, for working with me to offer this very sensible amendment.

Our simple amendment requires the administration to make the data collected and the formula used for all Regulatory Impact Analysis, or RIA, publicly available. This is about simple transparency.

In other words, for an example, let's say BSEE, under the Department of the Interior, says that the well control rule—a proposal that will drastically affect the Louisiana energy offshore sector—will only cost the offshore oil and gas industry \$800 million to implement, and industry projections put

that number over \$9 billion, well, BSEE should be required to prove how they reached those figures. They should be required to make completely transparent their assumptions and their methodology. That is what the American people ask for.

□ 1615

The Obama administration is responsible for an unparalleled expansion of the regulatory state, with the imposition of 229 major regulations since 2009, a lot of costs incurred.

These proposals are being made with little regard to impact on businesses at a time of weak economic growth. The constant barrage of new regulations is causing some of the rules to be counterproductive, contradictory, difficult to understand, and impossible to implement.

This simple amendment will allow Congress to send a clear message to the administration that regulations must be based in facts, clearly understood, and completely transparent to the impacted industry and to the American public.

I encourage my colleagues to join us in supporting this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

This amendment does not alleviate my concerns with the underlying bill. In fact, this amendment may lead to more confusion.

It would require an agency to publish a cost benefit analysis for all rules if such a study was conducted. Agencies are already required to conduct a costbenefit analysis for major rules under Executive Order 12866. Agencies publish the results of those analyses in the rulemaking dockets for those rules.

This is an unnecessary amendment, and I oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, this is an absolutely essential amendment because we need more transparency about methods and how these assumptions are built into what they are proposing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Louisiana for working with us on combining two really good amendments to this.

Mr. Chairman, we live in an era right now of vast growth of our government. Those that are bearing the burden of this growth and this overregulation are the American people. The average American family pays \$15,000 a year in hidden regulatory costs. The burden of regulation upon the market and upon the industry today in our businesses is almost \$1.9 trillion, nearly a \$2 trillion impact on our economy that is coming out of our GDP.

If we want to see a recovery, if we want to actually see success in this Nation in our economy, let's reduce the regulation. But we live in an era right now where the mentality of this government is: if it breaths, tax it; if it doesn't breath, subsidize it; and if it is successful, then we will regulate it.

All this amendment does is require that these regulatory agencies be honest with the American people, be transparent with the American people, and let the American people know the cost that is going to come out of their pocketbooks for increasing regulation upon Americans, upon individuals, and upon their businesses.

I thank the gentleman for stepping forward and working with us on this amendment.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The American people want transparency. I don't understand why our friends on the other side of the aisle would be opposed to transparency. All we are asking is that these agencies be truthful and very clear with the American public and provide all assumptions built into their methods of calculating the impact and the cost.

This is a simple amendment. It is a simple ask. We shouldn't even have to ask for this.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. CLAY. 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 Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114–744.

Mr. FLEMING. 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:

Page 3, line 13, strike "; and" and insert a semicolon.

Page 3, line 15, strike the period at the end and insert "; and".

Page 3, after line 15, insert the following:

"(v) if applicable, a list of agency regulatory actions issued by the Executive agency, or any other Executive agency, that duplicate or overlap with the agency regulatory action.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 863, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 5226,

also known as the Regulatory Integrity

My amendment requires agencies to disclose where a proposed rule would duplicate or overlap with other existing rules when they are making the online disclosure required by the underlying bill. Our economy, and small businesses in particular, are suffering under a wet blanket of legislation, and it is particularly onerous when businesses have to comply with multiple sets of these regulations. One area that hits particularly close to home in Louisiana is the EPA's methane rule and its overlap with the BLM's methane and waste reduction rule.

Louisiana's Fourth District is home to the Haynesville Shale, one of our Nation's largest sources for natural gas. BLM doesn't have any authority under the Clean Air Act to regulate emissions, so, instead, they decided to regulate methane emissions under the guise of eliminating waste. This is a poorly disguised attempt to double-regulate those who produce natural gas on Federal lands and comes after BLM has superseded State fracking regulations with their own additional layer of costly Federal regulation.

EPA's regulation alone will make many oil and gas production wells cost prohibitive in today's economy, which of course is their desire as they pursue a "keep it in the ground" agenda. That is why I introduced H.R. 4037, the Keeping Oil and Natural Gas Flowing for Consumers Act, to block EPA's harmful rule and protect consumers.

One example that might appeal to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is with respect to renewable energy. Now, I do not believe the Federal Government should be subsidizing any form of energy. We should have a marketplace where the most affordable and reliable energy sources freely compete with one another. But if my colleagues do want to subsidize wind farms, I would ask them, why do they have 10 different regulatory agencies with 96 forms that impose 3 million hours of paperwork costing an estimated \$177 million to complete? That seems counterproductive to their cause.

The House has recognized the need to eliminate costly and duplicative regulations. In January of this year, we passed H.R. 1155, the SCRUB Act, by JASON SMITH. My amendment would complement that effort by requiring agencies to identify, within their own regulations, where there is duplication or overlap with other regulations and disclose that to the public.

As we seek to root out corruption and prevent agencies from organizing Astroturf advocacy campaigns to promote costly regulations on the public, we must also be on the lookout for commonsense changes we can make to help our struggling economy recover. Identifying and ending duplicative rules is an easy way to start.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does nothing to fix the unworkable reporting requirements in the underlying bill. This amendment would require an agency to report if a proposed rule duplicates or overlaps with an existing regulation.

Executive Order 13563, issued by President Obama in 2011, already requires agencies to review rules for duplication and overlap. This amendment, itself, is duplicative and adds an unnecessary requirement without fixing the underlying problem.

I oppose this amendment, along with the underlying bill, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Missouri. However, if such executive orders were actually enforced, we wouldn't have this problem. That would be great if President Obama's executive orders actually did prevent duplication and overlapping and the conflict and the problems that occurred. That would be great.

But, evidently, people in his own administration, the Obama administration, don't heed the requirements that are set forth by the leader of that, which is President Obama. That is why we need this in law, Mr. Chairman, because Congress itself needs to hold the agencies, and certainly the Obama administration, accountable for not enforcing the very executive orders that they put out.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 114–744.

Mr. McKINLEY. 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:

Page 5, line 3, strike "; or" and insert a semicolon.

Page 5, after line 3, insert the following new subparagraph:

"(B) be sent through the private email account of an officer or employee of the Executive agency; or".

Page 5, line 4, strike "(B)" and insert "(C)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 863, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. McKINLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It is a fairly simple amendment which will

prevent employees and other officers of an executive agency from using private email accounts when discussing pending regulatory actions.

In doing so, we will ensure that there is a clear record of communication throughout the rulemaking process, while making certain that no favoritism is received privately to a particular organization or outside group when drafting a rule.

Private communications—and that is the key word, "private communications"—between those that stand to gain from a pending rule and a regulatory agency raise, I believe, legitimate questions. We have seen this time and time again in the last few years. Specifically, there has been evidence of these private emails being used and working in the shadows with outside groups on cross-State air pollution, the Clean Power Plan, and Pebble Mine, just as examples.

These attempts to circumvent transparency by secretly using an outside group, by providing an outside group a seat at the table when regulations are being developed, is unacceptable and unfair. It has to stop, Mr. Chairman. This amendment would prevent this from happening and go a long way to promoting transparency, accountability, and integrity by our regulatory officials.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and final passage of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that this amendment is simple, but it is simply another excuse for Members on the other side to talk about emails. I believe that the issue that my colleague is attempting to address has already been addressed when, in 2014, President Obama signed into law the Presidential and Federal Records Act Amendments.

That legislation was sponsored by the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, ELIJAH CUMMINGS, and it added into law, for the first time, a specific requirement for Federal employees who use personal email accounts. That law now requires Federal employees, if they create a Federal or Presidential record using a personal email account, to forward a copy of the email to their official account within 20 days of that email.

□ 1630

This amendment would create a unique requirement for emails about rulemaking. I agree that employees should use their government email accounts whenever possible, but this bill is not the place to make new rules about Federal records. I—and I hope my colleagues—will oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Chair, what I could hear was that what we are trying to do here actually is expand that deal with rules and regulations. We understand it can be on other matters. I accept that. If they want to use official communication, that is fine. We just want a record that someone doesn't have to explore to try to find out what that is under rules and regulations.

So, again, I believe that we should stand on this, adopt this amendment, and ultimately pass the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. McKIN-LEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BOUSTANY

Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Bou-STANY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate 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 241, noes 154, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 508]

AYES-241

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

Pitts Lucas Poe (TX) Lummis Poliquin MacArthur Pompeo Posey Marchant Price, Tom Marino Massie Ratcliffe McCarthy Reed McCaul Reichert McClintock Renacci McKinley Ribble Rice (SC) McMorris Rodgers Rigell Roby Roe (TN) McNerney McSally Rogers (AL) Meadows Meehan Rogers (KY) Mica Rohrabacher Miller (FL) Rokita Miller (MI) Rooney (FL) Mooney (WV) Ros-Lehtinen Mullin Roskam Mulvaney Ross Rothfus Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Rouzer Newhouse Royce Noem Salmon Sanford Nugent Scalise Nunes Schrader Olson Palmer Schweikert Paulsen Scott, Austin Pearce Sensenbrenner Perry Sessions Peters Shimkus Peterson Shuster Pittenger Simpson

Adams

Aguilar

Beatty

Bera

Bever

Blumenauer

Bonamici

Brady (PA)

Brown (FL)

Butterfield

Bustos

Capps

Capuano

Cárdenas

Carson (IN)

Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)

Chu, Judy

Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)

Cicilline

Clyburn

Connolly

Convers

Courtney

Crowley

DeFazio

DeGette

Delanev

DeLauro

DelBene

Deutch

Dingell

Doggett

DeSaulnier

Duckworth

Edwards

Ellison

Engel

Eshoo

Foster

Bass

Becerra

Bishop (UT)

Cartwright

Esty

Farr

Cummings

Davis (CA)

Cohen

Clay

Carney

Frankel (FL)

Fudge Gabbard Neal Gallego Nolan Garamendi Norcross Graham O'Rourke Grayson Pallone Bovle, Brendan Green, Al Pascrell Grijalva Payne Hahn Perlmutter Hastings Pingree Brownley (CA) Heck (WA) Pocan Higgins Polis Himes Price (NC) Hinojosa Quigley Honda. Rangel Hover Rice (NY) Huffman Richmond Israel Roybal-Allard Jeffries Ruppersberger Johnson (GA) Rvan (OH) Johnson, E. B. Kaptur T. Kelly (IL) Kennedy Sarbanes Kildee Schakowsky Kilmer Schiff Kind Scott (VA) Kirkpatrick Scott, David Kuster Sewell (AL) Langevin Sherman Larsen (WA) Sires Larson (CT) Slaughter Lee Smith (WA) Davis, Danny Levin Speier Lewis Swalwell (CA) Lipinski Takano Lowenthal Lowey Lujan Grisham Titus (NM) Tonko Luján, Ben Ray (NM) Torres Tsongas Maloney, Van Hollen Doyle, Michael Carolyn Vargas Maloney, Sean Matsui Velázquez Walz McCollum Wasserman McDermott McGovern Schultz Meeks Moore

Murphy (FL) NOT VOTING-36

Moulton

Cleaver Heck (NV) DesJarlais Hensarling Fincher Gutiérrez Jackson Lee

Sinema. Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Stefanik Stewart Stivers Stutzman Thompson (PA) Thornberry Tiberi Tipton Trott Turner Unton Valadao Wagner Walberg Walden Walorski Walters, Mimi Weber (TX) Webster (FL) Wenstrup Westmoreland Wilson (SC) Wittman Womack Woodall Yoder Yoho Young (AK) Young (IA) Zeldin

Zinke

NOES-154

Nadler Napolitano Sánchez, Linda Sanchez, Loretta Thompson (CA) Waters, Maxine Watson Coleman Welch

Yarmuth

Herrera Beutler

Thompson (MS) Johnson, Sam Messer Keating Moolenaar Veasey Lawrence Palazzo Visclosky Loebsack Pelosi Walker Westerman Luetkemeyer Ruiz Williams Lynch Rush Wilson (FL) McHenry Russell Meng Serrano Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PALLONE, and Miss RICE of New York changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidable absent in the House chamber for rollcall vote 508 on Wednesday, September 14, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained at the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted: Rollcall No. 508, "nay."

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 508.

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. FLEISCHMANN) having assumed WESTMORELAND, Acting chair. Mr. 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. 5226) to amend chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, to require the publication of information relating to pending agency regulatory actions, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 863, 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 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

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recom-

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kildee moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5226 to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 5, after line 6, insert the following:

"(d) APPLICABILITY.—The restriction described in subsection (c)(4) shall not apply to any public communication to combat a public health crisis including the Zika virus, opioid abuse, and lead poisoning.".

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

Mr. KILDEE. 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.

This bill is yet another Republican attempt to delay the formation of critical regulations, including those we need to keep our communities safe. In addition, this bill actually prohibits agencies from publicly communicating to the American people about why a proposed regulation or action is beneficial, including vital information about the impact on public health. We cannot allow the underlying bill to impede the government's ability to share critical public health information.

□ 1700

Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit is pretty simple. It would allow agencies to provide critical information to the public in order to combat public health crises, like Zika, like opioid abuse, or like the lead poisoning that has been experienced in my hometown of Flint. I know what happens when we ignore or impede the ability to enforce regulations. Thousands of children in my hometown of Flint, Michigan, have

suffered from lead poisoning.

Even now, I know many Members on both sides of the aisle ask: How is it going in Flint? They often ask me: Is this crisis over; has it been settled? Today, a year after this crisis became public, 2 years after the State of Michigan switched Flint's drinking water source from the Great Lakes to the Flint River in order to save money, 2 years later, 2 years after lead has poured through the pipes into the bodies of children, you still can't drink the water in Flint.

If you came to Flint today, you would see families still lugging bottled water from distribution sites into their homes to drink, to cook, to bathe their children in bottled water. In the 21st century, in the greatest country on Earth, the wealthiest nation ever imagined, we have a city of 100,000 people that can't drink the water that comes from the tap because it is poisoned.

Federal standards require action if water gets above 15 parts per billion. Because the State of Michigan ignored the regulations and assured the public

that the water was safe, we have levels in Flint that have been tested not at 15 parts per billion, 150 parts per billion, 1500 parts per billion, 23,000 parts per billion in the city of Flint today, a year after this crisis became public.

How did this happen? It happened because State agencies decided that dollars and cents come before the health of people, ignored the regulations that are on the books, were prevented from explaining that to the people, and, in fact, told them a story that the water was safe. And a year later—a year later—the State has barely acted, sending Flint a get-well card. As many of you know, I have come to this well time and time again, imploring my colleagues to join me in providing some relief to the people of Flint.

I came here with a lot of folks in 2012, when I was elected. In 2013, one of the first votes I cast on the floor of the House of Representatives was to provide help, much-needed help to the victims of Hurricane Sandy. Not my district, none of that money flowed to my district, but I was proud—I am still proud of that vote because I and so many of us stood with Americans who were facing the biggest struggle they ever faced. Yet, a year later, in this poor community, which in many ways has been left behind before, you still can't drink the water in Flint, and we can't get even a little help to try to rebuild this community.

Look, time matters. We can't wait more months. Every day, every week that passes that this community does not get the help it needs just to make sure that this doesn't happen again, just to fix the distribution system, to replace some of those lead lines so that a year from now or 2 years from now this doesn't happen again and these children are poisoned again, at the very least, for God's sake, at the very least, we ought to be able to help this community provide its families with water that they can drink. That is all I am asking for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am going to say from the outset, I certainly appreciate my good friend. I want to join, as I have all along, in support for my good friend and colleague from Flint in making sure that we do something about what has gone on there, the pain and suffering that they have gone through needlessly.

I am proud to say that I have been supportive and have traveled to Flint and have been supportive of the legislation we have moved from this House. We look forward when we hear possible good reports of optimism that something will be coming from the Senate, that we will do something further in dealing with that problem. I want to stand with my friend on that.

I think there are questions that have to be addressed relative to public health, but in this legislation, that goes way outside of what we are talking about. First of all, in committee, as well as in the Committee on Rules, this amendment wasn't offered. I think it wasn't because it didn't need to be.

Nothing in this legislation precludes an agency from communicating on these issues, whether it be lead poisoning in the water, Zika, or opioid abuse. Nothing precludes that from taking place. In fact, that is what we are encouraging, when agencies are promulgating a rule and a proposed rule has been put forward that they put forward the facts. That is all.

They have a power way beyond the general public to get information out, but, in turn, the general public ought to know that when they have an opportunity for public comment that agencies will honestly listen to what they are offering, and that the American public and American free enterprise system will be heard, and then the opportunity for Congress to interact as well with the bureaucratic agencies, and ultimately a rule will be promulgated and put in place that makes sense for all concerned, and people are protected.

That is what this bill does. It goes against agencies such as EPA. On the waters of the U.S., EPA and organizations should have been assisting Michigan and their environmental protection entities in dealing with issues of lead poisoning. Rather, on waters of the U.S., they were putting out releases, public statements through media, social media, saying: "Choose clean water," "clean water is important to me," "I support EPA's efforts to protect my health, my family, and my community." Send that back in the rulemaking process. They were lobbying, and we have laws against that. This beefs that up and makes it very clear that the bureaucracy will listen to us to meet our needs, to make sure we are taken care of, and ultimately society works well.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit and vote against it, vote it

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

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX. this 5minute 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 185, noes 238, not voting 8, as follows:

McMorris

McSally

Rodgers

[Roll No. 509]

Fudge

Gabbard

Gallego

Graham

Grayson

Grijalva

Gutiérrez

Hastings

Higgins

Hinojosa

Himes

Heck (WA)

Hahn

Garamendi

AYES—185 Frankel (FL)

Adams Aguilar Ashford Bass Beatty Becerra Bera Green, Al Green, Gene Beyer Bishop (GA) Blum Blumenauer Bonamici Boyle, Brendan Brady (PA) Brown (FL) Brownley (CA) Bustos Butterfield Capps Capuano Cárdenas Carnev Carson (IN) Cartwright Castor (FL) Castro (TX) Chu, Judy Cicilline Clark (MA) Clarke (NY) Clay Cleaver Clvburn Cohen Connolly Conyers Cooper Costa Courtney Crowley Cuellar Cummings Davis (CA) Davis, Danny DeFazio

DeGette

Delaney

DeLauro

DelBene

Deutch

Dingell

Doggett

DeSaulnier

Duckworth

Edwards

Ellison

Engel

Eshoo

Esty

Farr

Foster

Doyle, Michael

Honda Hoyer Huffman Israel Jackson Lee Jeffries Johnson (GA) Johnson, E. B. Jones Kaptur Keating Kelly (IL) Kennedy Kildee Kilmer Kind Kirkpatrick Kuster Langevin Larsen (WA) Larson (CT) Lawrence Lee Levin Lewis Lieu, Ted Lipinski Loebsack Lofgren Lowenthal Lowey Luian Grisham (NM) Luján, Ben Ray (NM) Lynch Maloney,

NOES-238

Farenthold

Carolvn

McCollum

McDermott

McGovern

McNerney

Meeks

Moore

Matsui

Maloney, Sean

Abraham Aderholt Allen Amash Amodei Babin Barletta Barr Barton Benishek Bilirakis Bishop (MI) Bishop (UT) Black Blackburn Bost Boustany Brady (TX) Brat Bridenstine Brooks (AL) Brooks (IN) Buchanan Buck Bucshon Burgess Byrne Calvert

Carter (GA)

Carter (TX)

Moulton Chabot Fitzpatrick Chaffetz Fleischmann Clawson (FL) Coffman Fleming Flores Cole Forbes Collins (GA) Fortenberry Collins (NY Foxx Franks (AZ) Comstock Conaway Frelinghuysen Cook Garrett Costello (PA) Gibbs Cramer Gibson Crawford Gohmert Crenshaw Goodlatte Culberson Gosar Curbelo (FL) Gowdy Davidson Granger Davis, Rodney Graves (GA) Denham Graves (LA) Dent Graves (MO) DeSantis Griffith Diaz-Balart Grothman Dold Guinta Donovan Guthrie Duffy Hanna Duncan (SC) Hardy Duncan (TN) Harper Ellmers (NC) Harris Emmer (MN) Hartzler

Heck (NV)

Murphy (FL) Nadler Napolitano Neal Nolan Norcross O'Rourke Pallone Pascrell Payne Pelosi Perlmutter Peters Peterson Pingree Pocan Polis Price (NC) Quiglev Rangel Rice (NY) Richmond Roybal-Allard

Kline Ruiz Knight Ruppersberger Labrador Rvan (OH) LaHood Sánchez, Linda LaMalfa Lamborn Sanchez, Loretta Lance Sarbanes Latta Schakowsky LoBiondo Schiff Long Schrader Loudermilk Scott (VA) Love Scott, David Lucas Serrano Luetkemeyer Sewell (AL) Lummis Sherman MacArthur Marchant Sires Marino Slaughter Massie Smith (WA) McCarthy Speier McCaul Swalwell (CA) McClintock

Thompson (CA) Titus Tonko Torres Tsongas Van Hollen Vargas Veasey Vela Velázquez Visclosky Walz Wasserman

Takano

Schultz Waters, Maxine Watson Coleman Welch Wilson (FL) Yarmuth

Hensarling Herrera Beutler Hice, Jody B. Hill Holding Hudson Huelskamp Huizenga (MI) Hultgren Hunter Hurd (TX) Hurt (VA) Issa Jenkins (KS) Jenkins (WV) Johnson (OH) Jolly Jordan Joyce Katko Kelly (MS) Kelly (PA) King (IA) King (NY) Kinzinger (IL)

Meadows Meehan Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV Mullin Mulvanev Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perry Pittenger Pitts Poe (TX) Poliquin Pompeo Posey Price, Tom Ratcliffe Reed Reichert Renacci Ribble Rice (SC) Rigell Roby Roe (TN) Rogers (AL) Rogers (KY) Rohrabacher Rokita Rooney (FL) Ros-Lehtinen Russell Salmon Sanford Scalise Schweikert Scott, Austin Sensenbrenner Sessions Shimkus Shuster Simpson Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Stefanik Stewart Stivers Stutzman Thompson (PA) Thornberry Tiberi Tipton Trott Turner Upton Valadao Wagner Walberg Walden Walker Walorski Walters, Mimi Weber (TX) Webster (FL) Wenstrup Westerman Westmoreland Williams Wilson (SC) Wittman Womack Woodall Yoder Yoho

Young (AK)

Young (IA)

Young (IN)

Zeldin

Zinke

NOT VOTING-

Des Jarlais Meng Rush Fincher Messer Thompson (MS) Palazzo Johnson, Sam

Roskam

Rothfus

Rouzer

Royce

Ross

McHenry

McKinley

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remain-

□ 1715

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

So the motion to recommit was reiected.

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. CLAY. 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 250, noes 171, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 510]

AYES-250

Barletta Bishop (UT) Abraham Aderholt Barr Black Allen Barton Blackburn Amash Benishek Blum Amodei Bilirakis Bost Ashford Bishop (GA) Boustany Brady (TX) Babin Bishop (MI)

Bridenstine Brooks (AL) Brooks (IN) Buchanan Buck Bucshon Burgess Byrne Calvert Carter (GA) Carter (TX) Chabot Chaffetz Clawson (FL) Coffman Cole Collins (GA) Collins (NY) Comstock Conaway Cook Cooper Costa Costello (PA) Cramer Crawford Cuellar Culberson Curbelo (FL) Davidson Davis, Rodney Denham Dent DeSantis Diaz-Balart Dold Donovan Duffy Duncan (SC) Duncan (TN) Ellmers (NC) Emmer (MN) Farenthold Fitzpatrick Fleischmann Fleming Flores Forbes Fortenberry Foxx Franks (AZ) Frelinghuysen Garrett Gibbs Gibson Gohmert Goodlatte Gosar Gowdy Granger Graves (GA) Graves (LA) Graves (MO) Griffith Grothman Guinta Guthrie Hanna Hardy Harper Harris Hartzler Heck (NV) Hensarling Herrera Beutler Hice, Jody B.

Adams

Bass

Bera

Beyer

Aguilar

Beatty

Becerra.

Blumenauer

Boyle, Brendan

Bonamici

Brady (PA)

Brown (FL)

Butterfield

Bustos

Capps

Capuano

Cárdenas

Carney

Brownley (CA)

Hill Posey Price, Tom Holding Hudson Huelskamp Huizenga (MI) Hultgren Hunter Hurd (TX) Hurt (VA) Tssa. Jenkins (KS) Jenkins (WV) Johnson (OH) Jolly Jones Jordan Joyce Katko Kelly (MS) Kelly (PA) King (IA) King (NY) Kinzinger (IL) Kline Knight Labrador LaHood LaMalfa Lamborn Lance Latta LoBiondo Long Loudermilk Love Lucas Luetkemeyer Lummis MacArthur Marchant Marino Massie McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinley McMorris Rodgers McSally Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perrv Peterson Pittenger Pitts Poe (TX) Poliquin Pompeo

Ratcliffe Reed Reichert Renacci Ribble Rice (SC) Rigell Roby Roe (TN) Rogers (AL) Rogers (KY) Rohrabacher Rokita Rooney (FL) Ros-Lehtinen Roskam Ross Rothfus Rouzer Royce Russell Salmon Sanford Scalise Schrader Schweikert Scott, Austin Scott David Sensenbrenner Sessions Shimkus Shuster Simpson Sinema Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Stefanik Stewart Stivers Stutzman Thompson (PA) Thornberry Tiberi Tipton Trott Turner Upton Valadao Vela Wagner Walberg Walden Walker Walorski Walters, Mimi Weber (TX) Webster (FL) Wenstrup Westerman Westmoreland Williams Wilson (SC) Wittman Womack Woodall Yoder Yoho Young (AK) Young (IA) Young (IN) Zeldin Zinke

NOES-171

Carson (IN) Cartwright Castor (FL) Castro (TX) Chu, Judy Cicilline Clark (MA) Clarke (NY) Clay Cleaver Clyburn Cohen Connolly Convers Crowley Cummings Davis (CA) Davis, Danny DeFazio DeGette

Delaney DeLauro DelBene DeSaulnier Deutch Dingell Doggett Doyle, Michael

Duckworth Edwards Ellison Engel Eshoo Esty Farr Foster Frankel (FL) Fudge Gabbard

(NM)

(NM)

Gallego Garamendi Lofgren Graham Grayson Lowey Green, Al Green, Gene Grijalya. Gutiérrez Hahn Lvnch Hastings Maloney. Heck (WA) Higgins Himes Matsui Hinojosa Honda. Hoyer Huffman Israel Meeks Jackson Lee Moore Jeffries Moulton Johnson (GA) Murphy (FL) Johnson, E. B. Nadler Napolitano Kaptur Keating Nea1 Kelly (IL) Nolan Kennedy Norcross Kildee O'Rourke Pallone Kilmer Kind Pascrell Kirkpatrick Pavne Kuster Pelosi Langevin Perlmutter Larsen (WA) Peters Larson (CT) Pingree Lawrence Pocan Polis Lee Price (NC) Levin Lewis Quigley Lieu, Ted Rangel Lipinski Rice (NY)

Loebsack Roybal-Allard Ruiz Lowenthal Ruppersberger Ryan (OH) Lujan Grisham Sánchez, Linda T. Luián. Ben Ray Sanchez, Loretta Sarbanes Schakowsky Schiff Carolyn Scott (VA) Maloney, Sean Serrano Sewell (AL) McCollum Sherman McDermott Sires McGovern McNerney Slaughter

Smith (WA) Speier Swalwell (CA) Takano Thompson (CA) Titus Tonko Torres Tsongas Van Hollen Vargas Veasey Velázquez Visclosky

NOT VOTING-10

Courtney Johnson, Sam Crenshaw Meng DesJarlais Palazzo Richmond

Rush Thompson (MS)

Walz

Welch

Wasserman

Schultz

Wilson (FL)

Yarmuth

Waters, Maxine

Watson Coleman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1721

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VA ACCOUNTABILITY FIRST AND APPEALS MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota). Pursuant to House Resolution 859 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. 5620.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) kindly take the chair.

□ 1723

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. 5620) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes, with Mr. Westmoreland (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 22 printed in House Report 114-742 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) had been disposed of.

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 114-742 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. TAKANO of California.

Amendment No. 5 by Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. TAKANO of California.

Amendment No. 19 by Mr. TAKANO of California.

Amendment No. 20 by Mr. TAKANO of California.

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. DUFFY of Wisconsin.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. WALZ

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) 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 2minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 250, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 511]

AYES-173

Adams Cooper Green, Al Bass Costa Green, Gene Courtney Beatty Grijalya Becerra Crowley Gutiérrez Bever Cummings Hahn Bishop (GA) Hastings Davis (CA) Davis, Danny Blumenauer Heck (WA) Bonamici DeFazio Higgins Bovle, Brendan DeGette Himes Delaney Hinojosa Brady (PA) DeLauro Honda. Brown (FL) DelBene Hoyer Brownley (CA) DeSaulnier Huffman Butterfield Deutch Israel Capps Dingell Jackson Lee Capuano Jeffries Doggett Doyle, Michael Johnson, E. B. Cárdenas Carney Kaptur Carson (IN) Edwards Keating Kelly (IL) Cartwright Ellison Castor (FL) Engel Kennedy Castro (TX) Eshoo Kildee Chu. Judy Estv Kilmer Cicilline Farr Kind Clark (MA) Foster Kirkpatrick Frankel (FL) Clarke (NY) Kuster Clay Fudge Langevin Cleaver Gabbard Larsen (WA) Larson (CT) Clyburn Gallego Garamendi Cohen Lawrence Lee Connolly Graham Levin Conyers Grayson

Lieu, Ted Lipinski Loebsack Lofgren Lowenthal Lowey Lujan Grisham (NM) Luián Ben Bay (NM) Lynch Maloney Carolyn Matsui McCollum McDermott McGovern McNernev Moore Moulton Murphy (FL) Nadler Napolitano Nolan Norcross

Aguilar

Allen

Amash

Amodei

Ashford

Babin

Barr

Bera

Black

Rl11m

Bost

Brat

Buck

Bucshon

Burgess

Bustos

Byrne

Calvert

Chabot

Chaffetz

Coffman

Cole

Cook

Cramer

Cuellar

Denham

Dent

Dold

Duffy

Barton

O'Rourke Pallone Pascrell Pavne Pelosi Perlmutter Peterson Pingree Pocan Polis Price (NC) Quigley Rangel Rice (NY) Richmond Rovbal-Allard Ruppersberger Rvan (OH) Sánchez, Linda T. Sanchez, Loretta Sarbanes Schakowsky Schiff Schrader Scott (VA) Scott, David

Serrano Sewell (AL) Sherman Sires Slaughter Smith (WA) Speier Swalwell (CA) Takano Thompson (CA) Titus Tonko Torres Tsongas Van Hollen Vargas Veasey Vela Velázquez Visclosky Walz Wasserman Schultz Waters, Maxine Watson Coleman Welch Wilson (FL) Yarmuth

NOES-250

Abraham Fleming Aderholt Flores Forbes Fortenberry Foxx Franks (AZ) Frelinghuysen Garrett Barletta Gibbs Gibson Gohmert Benishek Goodlatte Gosar Bilirakis Gowdy Bishop (MI) Granger Bishop (UT) Graves (GA) Graves (LA) Blackburn Graves (MO) Griffith Grothman Boustany Guinta Brady (TX) Guthrie Hanna Bridenstine Hardy Brooks (AL) Harper Brooks (IN) Harris Buchanan Hartzler Heck (NV) Hensarling Herrera Beutler Hice, Jody B. Hill Holding Carter (GA) Huelskamp Carter (TX) Huizenga (MI) Hultgren Hunter Hurd (TX) Clawson (FL) Hurt (VA) Issa Collins (GA) Jenkins (KS) Collins (NY) Jenkins (WV) Comstock Johnson (GA) Conaway Johnson (OH) Jolly Costello (PA) Jones Jordan Crawford Joyce Katko Crenshaw Kelly (MS) Culberson Kelly (PA) Curbelo (FL) King (IA) Davidson King (NY) Davis, Rodney Kinzinger (IL) Kline Knight DeSantis Labrador Diaz-Balart LaHood LaMalfa Donovan Lamborn Duckworth Lance Latta Duncan (SC) LoBiondo Duncan (TN) Long Ellmers (NC) Loudermilk Emmer (MN) Love Farenthold Lucas Fitzpatrick Luetkemever Fleischmann Lummis

MacArthur Maloney, Sean Marchant Marino Massie McCarthy McCaul McClintock McHenry McKinlev McMorris Rodgers McSallv Meadows Meehan Messer Mica Miller (FL) Miller (MI) Moolenaar Mooney (WV) Mullin Mulvaney Murphy (PA) Neugebauer Newhouse Noem Nugent Nunes Olson Palmer Paulsen Pearce Perrv Peters Pittenger Pitts Poe (TX) Poliquin Pompeo Posey Price, Tom Ratcliffe Reed Reichert Renacci Ribble Rice (SC) Rigell Roby Roe (TN) Rogers (AL) Rogers (KY) Rohrabacher Rokita Rooney (FL) Ros-Lehtinen Roskam Ross Rothfus Rouzer Royce Russell Salmon Sanford Scalise Schweikert Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner