

records and explanations, all conducted by agency officials with subject matter expertise that courts lack in the sciences, medicine, engineering, statistics, accounting, economics and financial markets, and the full gamut of professional disciplines.

Because the policy preferences of individual judges will matter more than ever, litigants will spend even more time and effort forum shopping for their favorite judges. On top of these ills, de novo judicial review of vast administrative records would further slow the wheels of the American legal system, to the detriment of every business or individual trying to get justice from our crowded and overworked courts.

What is most surprising is to see support for this bill from traditional opponents of judicial activism. Some supporters appear to favor the bill because they hope to undo burdens on businesses. In doing so, they are willing to sacrifice food safety; clean air and water; worker protections; safeguards against discrimination; and even the stability and security of our banks and financial institutions.

It should be noted, however, that the bill would also allow unelected judges to overrule the decisions of future conservative administrations. It is worth remembering that NRDC was the losing party in the Chevron decision. If this bill had then been law, the Reagan administration's effort to streamline pollution controls for new factories would likely have been overturned, not upheld as it was by the Supreme Court.

Our Constitution puts elected officials in charge to give political accountability. Turning over the authority to unelected and non-expert judges should not be an option. We urge all members to oppose H.R. 4768.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Lastly, I would point out that there is a strongly worded veto threat by the President about this legislation should it ever find its way to the Senate and to the President's desk. The President points out that this legislation is not in the public interest and that it would add needless complexity and delay to the judicial review of regulatory actions. For those reasons, among other things, he has issued a veto threat.

So this is a piece of legislation that is a messaging piece. My friends on the other side of the aisle know that it is not going anywhere, but it is promoting their message, which is deregulation. Despite all of the regulation and legislation needed to address pertinent issues that the American people are demanding action on right now—the Zika virus, Puerto Rico, gun violence, and gun reform legislation—there are so many other things that we could and should be working on, but instead we are enthralled here with these messaging bills that are not going anywhere.

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

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

The list of organizations that stand up for separation of powers, that stand up for liberty, and that stand up for common sense is long.

It includes the American Farm Bureau Federation, TechFreedom, the American Consumer Institute, Americans for Tax Reform, the Center for

Freedom and Prosperity, Competitive Enterprise Institute, Digital Liberty, Free the People, the Independent Women's Forum, Institute for Liberty, the Mississippi Center for Public Policy, the National Taxpayers Union, Protect Internet Freedom, the Taxpayers Protection Alliance, and Tech Knowledge, just to name some.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is very important. It will pass this House with a strong vote. It needs to be taken up by the United States Senate. It needs to be signed into law by the President of the United States, but it will also be heard across the street at the United States Supreme Court, where I know there are Justices who know that the Chevron doctrine needs to be reconsidered because it is an abandonment of the responsibility and the power of the judicial branch of our government to cede this kind of power and this kind of authority to the bureaucracy. It is wrong; it needs to be overturned; and I urge my colleagues to vote to do so tonight.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RATCLIFFE) having assumed the chair, Mr. RIGELL, 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. 4768) to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RIGELL) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5602, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5607, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 5606, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

INCLUSION OF ALL FUNDS WHEN ISSUING CERTAIN GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5602) to amend title 31, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to include all funds when issuing certain geographic targeting orders, and for other purposes, 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 356, nays 47, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 401]

YEAS—356

Adams	Courtney	Hartzler
Aderholt	Cramer	Heck (NV)
Aguilar	Crawford	Heck (WA)
Allen	Crenshaw	Hensarling
Amodei	Cuellar	Herrera Beutler
Ashford	Culberson	Higgins
Babin	Cummings	Hill
Barletta	Curbelo (FL)	Himes
Barr	Davis (CA)	Holding
Barton	Davis, Rodney	Honda
Bass	DeFazio	Hoyer
Becerra	DeGette	Hudson
Benishek	Delaney	Huffman
Bera	DeLauro	Hultgren
Beyer	DelBene	Hunter
Bilirakis	Denham	Hurd (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Dent	Hurt (VA)
Bishop (MI)	DeSantis	Israel
Bishop (UT)	DeSaulnier	Issa
Black	Deuth	Jackson Lee
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Jeffries
Blumenauer	Dingell	Jenkins (KS)
Bonamici	Doggett	Jenkins (WV)
Bost	Dold	Johnson (GA)
Boustany	Donovan	Johnson (OH)
Brady (PA)	Doyle, Michael	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (TX)	F.	Johnson, Sam
Brooks (IN)	Duckworth	Jolly
Brown (FL)	Duffy	Joyce
Brownley (CA)	Edwards	Kaptur
Buchanan	Ellison	Katko
Buck	Ellmers (NC)	Keating
Bucshon	Emmer (MN)	Kelly (IL)
Bustos	Engel	Kelly (PA)
Butterfield	Eshoo	Kennedy
Byrne	Esty	Kildee
Calvert	Farr	Kilmer
Capps	Fitzpatrick	Kind
Capuano	Fleischmann	King (IA)
Cárdenas	Flores	Kinzinger (IL)
Carney	Forbes	Kirkpatrick
Carson (IN)	Fortenberry	Kline
Carter (TX)	Foster	Knight
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)	Kuster
Castor (FL)	Franks (AZ)	LaHood
Castro (TX)	Frelinghuysen	LaMalfa
Chabot	Gabbard	Lance
Chaffetz	Gallego	Langevin
Chu, Judy	Garamendi	Larsen (WA)
Ciçilline	Gibbs	Larson (CT)
Clark (MA)	Gibson	Latta
Clay	Goodlatte	Lawrence
Cleaver	Govdy	Lee
Clyburn	Graham	Levin
Coffman	Granger	Lewis
Cohen	Graves (GA)	Lieu, Ted
Cole	Graves (LA)	LoBiondo
Collins (GA)	Graves (MO)	Loebsack
Collins (NY)	Grayson	Lofgren
Comstock	Green, Al	Long
Conaway	Green, Gene	Loudermilk
Connolly	Grijalva	Love
Conyers	Guthrie	Lowenthal
Cook	Hahn	Lowe
Cooper	Hanna	Lucas
Costa	Hardy	Luetkemeyer
Costello (PA)	Harper	