United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2014 No. 33

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 27, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRADLEY BYRNE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I would like to enter into the RECORD this article written by Reverends Eason, Goodroe, and Castillo, all three of Spartanburg, South Carolina, who wrote an article that appeared Tuesday in the Greenville, South Carolina, News entitled, ''God Often Reminds Us to Welcome the Stranger.''

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I participated in another do-nothing Judiciary Committee hearing in this do-nothing Congress. This do-nothing hearing was unique. The goal was to make sure that the President was a do-nothing President as well.

It is not enough for the Republican majority to be setting records for how little they are doing. No. Ignoring immigration reform is bad enough—let alone the minimum wage, unemployment benefits, and the environment.

So the do-nothing Congress held a hearing yesterday entitled, ''Enforcing the President's Constitutional Duty to Faithfully Execute the Laws.'' The intent was clear: attack the President. It was held in the Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over immigration, so there was lots of discussion about deferred action for DREAMers. This is where the President has exercised his power of prosecutorial discretion to temporarily suspend the deportation of people who came here to the U.S. as children.

Apparently, when the President stood just over there last month and delivered his State of the Union address, saying he would use his pen and phone to take executive action where the Congress was taking no action—well, that didn't go over well with this do-nothing Congress.

Look, I know it is easier for Republicans to blame Democrats and blame Obama and make excuses for why they can't do immigration reform this year. You have to keep it connected to reality. You put your principles for immigration reform on the table. You call them ''standards.'' And there were some things I liked and some things I didn't. But what I said was: Good. Thank you. It's a nice start. Let's sit down and talk some more.

NANCY PELOSI and the leadership of the Democratic rank and file in the House said: Good. Great starting point. Let's talk some more.

And the President you don't trust said: Good. It's a great starting point. Let's negotiate.

How did the Republicans respond? When Democrats said: Yes, let's talk; the Republicans said: No, just kidding. Immigration reform is hard. We would rather just talk about how awful it is that people are getting health care through ObamaCare.

You put something on the table, we say let's talk, and you say no, and then blame Democrats for blocking immigration. It makes no sense.

Questioning whether the President has the power to stop the deportation of immigrants who came here as children and have lived here practically their whole lives in the U.S., what are you thinking? The President not only has the power to suspend those deportations, he has the duty to suspend those deportations.

So here we are, with the entire country demanding reform of our immigration system, demanding we change our law. We see the parents of U.S. citizen children being deported and their children put in foster care. And we say there's got to be a better way to handle this situation that is good for the taxpayer, good for the immigrant family, good for our economy, and national security.

House Republicans see the situation and apparently say: No, we refuse to change the law because it is hard and we don't trust the President. And because the law is the law, we must deport them all.

When I and anyone else with a conscience looks at that American child being put in foster care because we have deported his parents and he looks at you doing nothing, we say something has to be done because it is the right thing to do from a moral perspective.

So, let me be clear, Mr. President, if you act to suspend the deportation of a person whose American child will be put in foster care, I will applaud you and so will most everyone on this side of the aisle. It will not only be us applauding. The three evangelical leaders

Printed on recycled paper.

who wrote the essay I entered into the RECORD, all three important religious leaders from Spartanburg, South Carolina, this is how they put it:

Immigration reform is an urgent need—inaction carries a profound human cost and we consistently see this in our ministries.

Hardworking, contributing members of our society live in constant fear of deportation. The victimization of individuals and families goes unreported, and families are torn apart as American-citizen children lose one or both of their parents to deportation proceedings.

They add:

We stand at a critical crossroads. Our broken and antiquated immigration system has precipitated an economic and moral crisis that we can ignore no longer.

Listen to your church elders. While you do nothing, the number on the board behind me continues to increase and the deportation machine continues.

If you don't, I and millions of others across this land will continue insisting that the President exercise his authority to stop deportation and separation of American families. We will force the President to act, and I assure you we will win that fight.

[From the Greenville News, Feb. 22, 2014]

GOD OFTEN REMINDS US TO WELCOME IMMIGRANTS

(By Ricky Eason, Jim Goodroe, and Greg Castillo)

Late last month, House Republicans released standards that will guide their efforts as they move forward on immigration reform. As evangelical leaders, we join voices from the business and law enforcement communities to strongly support this step.

We applaud any progress toward a solution for one of our nation's most complex and critical issues. With President Barack Obama's comments in the State of the Union address, Congresswoman Cathy McMorris Rodgers' mention in her Republican response, and now the release of these standards, bipartisan support for immigration reform is clear.

In a time of bitter division and partisan politics, we call on our nation's leaders to transcend their differences and pass commonsense, broad reform that will strengthen our economy, make our nation safer, and give our undocumented neighbors an opportunity to come out of the shadows and earn legal status.

As faith leaders who call ourselves ''The Three Amigos,'' we represent the three largest ethnic groups in South Carolina. Although we come from communities with different cultural and political perspectives, we stand united in our Christian commitment to share the Gospel with all peoples (Matthew: 28:19), welcome and love the strangers in our midst (Leviticus 19:34, Matthew 25:31–46), and seek justice in our communities (Isaiah 1:17).

Throughout Scripture, God continually reminds His people to love and welcome the immigrants in their midst. As people who arrive to a strange place with no land, family or connections, immigrants are some of the most vulnerable people in any given community. For this reason, they consistently join widows and orphans in the Biblical ''triad of the vulnerable'' that God desires to protect (Exodus 22:21–22).

In our combined 60 years of ministry in the Upstate of South Carolina, we have served and ministered to immigrants from all over the world, documented and undocumented. While undocumented immigrants are often mischaracterized or used abstractly in political arguments, we know these people personally as our neighbors, friends, and brothers and sisters. Immigration reform is an urgent need—inaction carries a profound human cost that we consistently see in our ministries.

Hardworking and contributing members of our society live in constant fear of deportation, the victimization of individuals and families goes unreported, and families are torn apart as American-citizen children lose one or both parents to deportation proceedings. Striking a middle ground between the extreme positions of mass deportation and open borders, we join with House Republicans in advocating for a middle ground where those without documentation can come out of the shadows, make restitution, and get right with the law.

Such an approach is very different from amnesty, which is the absence of legal consequences. Instead, this realistic approach would allow undocumented immigrants to admit culpability and pay their debt to society without separating or harming families or causing undue harm to our nation's economy.

We stand at a critical crossroads. Our broken and antiquated immigration system has precipitated an economic and moral crisis that we can ignore no longer. The Republican standards moved us one step closer to a solution that will protect the border, help grow our economy, and provide an opportunity for undocumented immigrants to earn legal status and fully participate in our communities.

The time for further action is now. Congress needs to overcome its doubts, and keep moving toward the legislation that is so desperately needed.

We join other evangelical leaders from across the country in reaffirming our commitment to earnestly pray for Congress and for immigration reform in 2014.

MODERNIZING OUR DRUG AND DIAGNOSTICS EVALUATION AND REGULATORY NETWORK CURES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, this week we recognize the work of the tireless advocates for rare diseases. I had the honor of serving as the Republican chair of the Congressional Rare Disease Caucus. I consider it a very important responsibility as part of my service here and an honor to work for innovative treatments, new technologies, and to build an atmosphere of appreciation and understanding on Capitol Hill with the hard work of all the patient advocates. Their passion is often driven by the care of loved ones, and their personal stories are profiles in courage.

Hearing from countless advocates, many of whom are here in Washington this week, gives the members of the caucus renewed energy and purpose. Events held during Rare Disease Week highlight what has been accomplished and what still needs to be done, and there is a lot to do, but we will do it together.

I am working on important legislation in this area, the bipartisan Modernizing Our Drug and Diagnostics Evaluation and Regulatory Network, or MODDERN, Cures Act. It will update the Nation's drug evaluation process to encourage the discovery and development of new treatments for chronic and rare diseases. The measure will also create a system that rewards efficiency and effectiveness to the benefit of all persons with rare diseases.

The MODDERN Cures Act will encourage the development of drugs abandoned in the development process. It will create a new category of drugs known as dormant therapies for compounds with insufficient patent protection, drugs that offer the promise to treat conditions with unmet medical needs.

Updating regulatory networks such as patent reform will help open the pipeline for new innovations and therapies. Patients with degenerative conditions, cancers, and rare diseases await the genius of these new solutions. While we do not know the cause or cure of many of these rare diseases or cancers, we do know that awareness is the best protection, information is the best tool for innovation, and well-rounded care during and after treatment is the best therapy. That is our mission in the caucus: to work together to find solutions that make a lasting difference.

I again thank the families and the advocates whose challenges we may never completely understand, but whose commitment to their loved ones is unyielding and inspiring. The caucus pursues its mission in their name.

COMPREHENSIVE DENTAL REFORM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Children's Dental Health Month. It is a critical part of overall health, yet it is also an issue frequently overlooked.

Too often we think of dental care as an optional service, but in reality, it is a critical component of overall health. Its importance first hit home for me 7 years ago when I learned the story of a young Maryland boy named Deamonte Driver.

In February of 2007, 12-year-old Deamonte came from school with a headache, which had started as a toothache days before. His mother, who worked hard to make ends meet with low-paying jobs, searched for a dentist who would accept Medicaid for her children. She found not one dentist. Let me say that again. She found not one single dentist who would care for her children's teeth.

At wit's end, Deamonte's mother brought him to the emergency room, where he received medication for pain, a sinus infection, and a dental abscess. Unfortunately, that was not enough. The bacteria from Deamonte's cavity spread to his brain, and at 12 years old, he died for lack of a simple procedure

early on to remove a tooth. He died less than 20 minutes away from where we stand today.

Deamonte's case served as a jarring lesson on the lack of access to care for many families. At the time of Deamonte's death, fewer than one in three children under the age of 20 in Maryland's Medicaid program received any dental service at all. In the years since, with the passage of the Affordable Care Act and new efforts to ensure a healthier America, we made significant progress in Maryland and across the country. In other words, we have changed the trajectory of so many children's destinies.

Now, 52 percent of children on Medicaid in Maryland receive dental services, even as the number of children enrolled has increased by 25 percent. In fact, through the work of government officials in Maryland's Dental Action Coalition, the State has led the way in increasing access for dental care for children.

Nationally, the number of children enrolled in Medicaid who received dental care in 2010 jumped to 46 percent, numbers that suggest progress, but also signal the work left to be accomplished.

The implementation of the Affordable Care Act has made a difference, allowing millions more children to receive critical medical and dental care right now. Even more children could access these services if Republican Governors in some States reverse their decisions to block the expansion of Medicaid.

I have often said that our children are the living messages we send to a future we will never see. Yet, even with the improvements we have seen, more must be done to ensure that both children and adults have access to needed treatment and preventive care. That is why I introduced the Comprehensive Dental Reform Act.

My legislation would provide funding to improve access to dental care through health clinics, school-based services, and other options for underserved populations; extend comprehensive dental coverage to Americans on Medicare, Medicaid, and VA benefits; increase the number of oral health professionals in communities in need; help support research and education to better integrate oral health with regular care.

We have come a long way, but more must be done to protect the dental health of our children and every American. If we can assure no child loses his or her life because a dentist couldn't be found to pull a tooth, Deamonte's death won't be in vain.

□ 1015

CALIFORNIA WATER: IT'S THE STORAGE, STUPID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, President Obama visited the drought-stricken Central Valley of California. He announced his administration's response: he wants to spend another billion dollars to study climate change.

Well, I think I can save him the trouble. The planet has been warming, on and off, since the last Ice Age, when glaciers covered much of North America. The climate has been changing since the planet formed, often much more abruptly than it has in recent millennia.

Until the planet begins moving into its next ice age, we can reasonably expect it will continue to warm, on and off. That is going to mean less water that can be stored in snowpacks and, therefore, more dams will need to be constructed to store that water.

There, I just saved a billion dollars. You are welcome.

Everyone thinks that the Colorado River is the mother lode of all water in the Western United States, but the Colorado is a junior system to the mighty Sacramento River system.

The difference is this: we store 70 million acre-feet of water on the Colorado and only 10 million acre-feet on the Sacramento. The rest is lost to the ocean.

Droughts are nature's fault. They are beyond our control. Water shortages, on the other hand, are our fault.

We have not built major water storage on the Sacramento system since 1979 because of opposition from the environmental left and, most recently, from this administration. Indeed, we have had to fight back against its attempts to tear down perfectly good existing dams, including four hydroelectric dams on the Klamath River.

Even in years of plenty, this administration has insisted on diverting 200 billion gallons of water from Central Valley agriculture for the amusement of the delta smelt, devastating the economy, drying up a quarter million acres of fertile farmland, and throwing thousands of California families into unemployment.

Because of opposition from the environmental left, we have been unable to even raise the spillway of the Exchequer Dam by a lousy 10 feet in order to add 70,000 acre-feet of storage at Lake McClure.

Because of radical environmental regulations, 800,000 acre-feet of desperately needed water—that is a 1-acre column of water, 150 miles deep—was drained from Shasta, Oroville, and Folsom Lakes last fall, knowing full well that we were heading into a potentially catastrophic drought.

Now, Governor Brown proposes to spend $14 billion for cross-delta tunnels that will produce exactly zero additional storage and exactly zero additional hydroelectricity.

Yet, for a fraction of that cost, roughly $6 billion, we could complete the Shasta Dam to its design elevation, which would mean 9 million acre-feet of additional water storage, nearly doubling the storage capacity of the Sacramento River system.

Everyone has seen the eerie pictures of Folsom Dam as its lake lay almost completely empty. For just a few billion dollars, we could complete the Auburn Dam, upriver of Folsom, that would hold enough water to fill and refill Folsom Lake nearly 2½ times.

That is in addition to 800 megawatts of electricity for the region and 400-year flood protection for the Sacramento Delta. The billions we are currently spending on delta levee repairs is to protect against a 200-year flood.

Both projects have been stalled for decades because of environmental opposition. Enough is enough.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a crossroads, and it is time to choose between two very different visions of water policy.

One is the nihilistic vision of the environmental left, increasingly severe government-induced shortages, higher and higher electricity and water prices, massive taxpayer subsidies to politically well-connected and favored industries, and a permanently declining quality of life for our children, who will be required to stretch and ration every drop of water and every watt of electricity in their bleak and dimly lit homes.

The other is a vision of abundance, a new era of clean, cheap, and abundant hydroelectricity, great new reservoirs to store water in wet years to assure abundance in dry ones, a future in which families can enjoy the prosperity that abundant water and electricity provide, and the quality of life that comes from that prosperity.

It is a society whose children can look forward to a green lawn, a backyard garden, affordable air-conditioning in the summer and heating in the winter, brightly lit homes in cities, and abundant and affordable groceries from America's agricultural cornucopia.

This is a time of choosing.

HONORING REVEREND FREDERIC D. REESE DURING BLACK HISTORY MONTH 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in continuing my commitment to honoring African Americans from Alabama during this Black History Month, today I rise to honor the renowned educator, pastor, and civil rights activist Reverend Dr. Frederick Douglas Reese on this occasion of Black History Month 2014.

For his dedication and distinguished service to the city of Selma and the State of Alabama, I pay tribute today to the life and work of Reverend Dr. F.D. Reese. This beloved pastor and civil rights activist marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, in 1965, along with hundreds of other supporters.

By the mid-1960s, Reese was president of the Dallas County Voters League and was also a local teacher who presided over the Selma Teachers Association. Discouraged by Selma's efforts to hinder voter registration for African Americans, Reverend Reese advocated that the teachers press to make sure that the students actually went to register to vote.

Reese invited Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and members of the SCLC to lead Selma's voting rights protest. King's staff helped organize months of demonstrations in Selma, with Reverend Reese's assistance.

Reverend Reese is a historical figure of modern history known for his support of the civil rights and voting rights movement. Reverend Reese rose to national prominence as a civil rights leader after Selma's ''Bloody Sunday.'' He later marched with Dr. King from Selma to Montgomery as an advocate of voting rights.

Reverend Reese was born November 28, 1929. A believer in education, Reverend Reese graduated from Alabama State University and Livingston University, and also attended Southern University, the University of Alabama, and Auburn University before receiving his doctorate of divinity from Selma University.

Reverend Reese has served the Selma and Dallas County community faithfully for over six decades, and his exemplary work and commitment to social justice is well-known. Notably, Reverend Reese has never left his beloved community of Selma, where he helped to make it a center for the voting rights movement in the 1960s.

He remains active today, and he is known for saying that his fight today is to get young people to realize that the movement is still continuing. ''I tell young people,'' he said, ''that they cannot rest on our victories. We have to remain committed. That means registering to vote and participating in what this country has to offer. That means making a difference to others.''

Reverend Reese has stated that he marched so that everyone, regardless of color, could become a first-class citizen in America. Reverend Reese knows that you have to stand for what you believe in. He became nationally known for his beliefs and inspired others to stand as well.

Reverend Reese has remained committed to education and service. He became a principal in Selma, as well as a city council member, serving for over 12 years on the Selma City Council. He also ran for mayor in 1984 and led a campaign to motivate Walmart executives to hire African Americans as store managers.

In 2000, he was honored for his civil rights work by having a stretch of 3 miles of U.S. Highway 80, which was where he led the Montgomery to Selma March, named after him. It is now known as the Frederick Douglas Reese Parkway. The FDR Christian Academy in Indiana is also dedicated to him.

Reverend Reese has been a pastor of Selma's Ebenezer Baptist Church since 1965. Although he is retired from teaching, he is still very much active in Ebenezer Baptist Church, where he serves as the head minister emeritus and delivers a sermon each and every week.

On behalf of the Seventh Congressional District, the State of Alabama, and this Nation, during this Black History Month, I ask my colleagues to join me in acknowledging and celebrating the accomplishments of Reverend Dr. Frederick Douglas Reese from Selma, Alabama.

THE PATIENT OPTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as the truth of ObamaCare continues to come out, we see that the promises of this administration are just not factual.

ObamaCare is crushing our economy. It is killing jobs, and it is hurting hardworking Americans and family businesses the most.

There is a solution. It is called the Patient OPTION Act. It is H.R. 2900. It repeals ObamaCare in full, and it replaces it with free market, patient-centered reforms.

The Patient OPTION Act is a set of reforms that will revitalize American health care, not through government interference but by giving doctors and patients full control over their dollars and their decisions. In fact, it is the only health care plan that completely removes bureaucrats from everyone's personal health care decisions.

The Association of American Physicians and Surgeons has endorsed the bill, and now FreedomWorks is standing behind the OPTION Act as well. In fact, FreedomWorks said: ''The OPTION Act stands as the best conservative health care reform package yet released, and it should be considered for a vote as the House votes on alternatives to ObamaCare.''

While ObamaCare continues down the path of destruction and failure, the OPTION Act stands ready to provide health care relief that the American people want and need.

The Patient OPTION Act will make health insurance cheaper for everyone, so that most Americans can buy health insurance that they need at a price that they can afford. It will provide access to good quality health care for all Americans, no matter what a person's financial status is or even if they have preexisting conditions, and it will save Medicare from going broke.

I urge the House to vote on the Patient OPTION Act so we may put the final nail into the coffin that is ObamaCare and move towards real patient-centered care.

I finally urge the American people to contact their Congressmen and their Senators to cosponsor the bill and demand from leadership a vote in the U.S. House and the Senate on the Patient OPTION Act.

Through the voice of We the People, the strongest political force in America, we can repeal ObamaCare and replace it with true health care reforms that will make health insurance more affordable and accessible for everyone.

I hope that the American people and my colleagues will look toward the OPTION Act as an example of what real patient-centered health care and insurance looks like and bring this bill before the House and the Senate for a vote immediately.

PRESS FREEDOM DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the continued imprisonment of journalists in Egypt, and to restrictions on press freedoms worldwide.

Al Jazeera, the news network, has called today, Thursday, February 27, Press Freedom Day. Reporters in more than 30 cities around the world, including in Washington, D.C., and San Francisco, are holding vigils to remember all the journalists currently at risk from governments that restrict the most valuable of international rights: the right to a free press and to freedom of speech.

The military-led government of Egypt has engaged in wholesale repression of the media, especially outlets thought to be sympathetic to the Muslim Brotherhood, since overthrowing President Mohamed Morsi in June 2013.

□ 1030

This repression culminated with the arrest of three Al Jazeera employees on December 29, 2013. On that day, Egyptian authorities arrested three employees of Al Jazeera and accused them of ''spreading lies harmful to State security and joining a terrorist group.''

Another 20 journalists were prosecuted this year for ''airing false news,'' among other apparently meritless charges.

Today, four Al Jazeera reporters are currently being detained in Egypt in the Tora Prison compound for their reporting from Egypt. They are charged with being members of the organizations on which they were reporting, a charge that Al Jazeera and other international media organizations and press protection groups have rejected.

Peter Greste, Al Jazeera English's Nairobi-based correspondent; Mohammed Fahmy, their senior producer in Egypt; and Baher Mohamed, their producer in Egypt, are all being held in one small cell in Egypt at that prison under difficult and, to put it gently, Spartan conditions.

They are allowed out of their cell for only 1 hour a day, and they have been detained since December 29. They had been separated, but I would thank the Egyptian authorities for at least bringing them together, so they can at least lean on each other for support.

Abdullah al-Shami, the Al Jazeera Arabic correspondent, has been held since August of 2013 and has been on a hunger strike, protesting his detention since January. Their families in Australia, Canada, and Egypt are working tirelessly for their freedom.

I can empathize with the fear and concern their families face each day, worrying about the physical and mental health of their loved ones.

Locking up reporters has never stopped the world from finding out what is going on in a country, particularly in this modern world.

Egypt is a proud nation with a proud history and has been a longtime ally of the United States of America. The Egyptian people, regardless of which government, party, or individuals they support, have made it clear: their choice is one of democracy and freedom.

For those goals to be achieved, freedom of the press and freedom of speech must be respected and promoted. I encourage the Egyptian Government and the Egyptian judiciary to immediately release these four journalists, as well as all other journalists currently detained, and to allow all members of the news media to operate in an unrestricted environment that is free from harassment, censorship, and arbitrary arrest and detention.

As White House spokesman Jay Carney has said:

> The restrictions on freedom of expression in Egypt are a concern, and that includes the targeting of Egyptian and foreign journalists and academics simply for expressing their views.

Earlier this month, I sent a letter signed by 15 Members of the Congress, urging the Secretary of State to take immediate action to help secure the release of these journalists in Egypt; and as Egypt struggles to find its identity, it is important for the international community to remind the Egyptian leadership—and all world leaders—of the need for a free press.

The imprisonment and prosecution of journalists sends a clear and ongoing message of harassment and intimidation to all journalists in Egypt. Free those journalists. A free society requires a free press.

OBAMACARE IS OFF THE MARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if you thought the Obama administration's rollout of www.healthcare.gov was bad, believe it or not, it got worse for another section of our citizens.

Back in Michigan, the Second District is home to a higher number of Latino citizens than any other congressional district in the State of Michigan; and like thousands of other residents across Michigan, Hispanic Michiganians are forced to deal with higher costs, the potential loss of their doctor, and canceled insurance policies all because of ObamaCare. These citizens are in need of the same information that we are all in search of.

Well, after being delayed for more than 2 months, the administration finally unveiled its Spanish language Web site, cuidadodesalud.gov, that contained an embarrassing amount of Spanglish. Even I couldn't come up with that much Spanglish.

Frankly, it is insulting that the administration would simply make up words, rather than provide an accurate translation of the President's signature achievement.

One friend made the humorous observation that it is just as bad in Spanish as it is in English, and nobody can work with it in Spanish either.

Well, Latinos are more adversely impacted in many ways by soaring premiums because the median age of the Hispanic population is actually 10 years younger than the national average; therefore, they are seeing these premiums soar, as it shifts those costs to younger Americans.

It is predicted that younger citizens are the very folks who are needed to sign up for this program in order to make it actuarially sound, but these are the same folks who are not doing so right now.

The focus of the debate, instead, needs to be on patient-centered solutions that not only lower costs, but deliver high-quality care to more citizens, none of which, unfortunately, ObamaCare actually does. I believe it is time to repeal and replace this failed policy.

You know, Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have led with numerous options, such as the Patient OPTION Act, as Dr. BROUN was just talking about; Dr. PRICE of Georgia; Dr. BENISHEK of my home State of Michigan; the Republican Study Committee plan—a number of plans are out there that have been proposed that I think would be a far better solution to those things that we can all agree on: having greater access for more people at a lower cost.

But I think one thing we can all agree on in any language is that ObamaCare is off the mark.

THE HOMELESS MIDDLE CLASS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the hardworking Americans who are being left behind in this country. Some sectors of our economy are recovering from the great recession, but not all boats are rising, not even close.

I recently spent a night in a homeless shelter and was dismayed that it was filled with members of the middle class and that earning above the minimum wage did not protect them from having to share a dorm room with dozens of other people.

The reality is a subclass of workers has emerged who do play by the rules and work hard, but find that they are literally only one step away from living on the streets by a single medical emergency or a slow day, if you are working for tips at $2.13 an hour. They work full time; but after putting in a full day, they go home to a homeless shelter.

We interact with these people every day. They take our food orders; they fix our cars and bag our groceries. They aren't looking for handouts or begrudging the success of others, but are simply trying to meet their basic needs. They face huge obstacles in finding a home in housing markets where rental costs have escalated beyond their reach.

Working 40 hours a week used to mean a minimum standard of living and a foothold on the first rung of the economic ladder to the middle class, but not anymore.

Let me tell you about some of their stories. One woman I spoke to was working at a Safeway in the bakery department. Her husband was working at OfficeMax in the warehouse. They were full-time wage earners, and they were living in a homeless shelter because they had to put together so much money for the first and last month's rent.

No one should be forced to live in shelters while they are working full time; but according to the National Center on Family Homelessness, 29 percent of the homeless in this country have jobs.

Let me tell you who else populates homeless shelters: veterans. That night, I listened to several veterans battling PTSD. One Iraq veteran who saw heavy combat said he once had a six-figure job in a Silicon Valley company before falling prey to drugs and alcohol.

We talked for a long time, as he slowly and haltingly unfolded his story about the worst side of battle that torments him to this day. He said: My country forced me to do terrible things.

Another veteran said she was raped while serving, but was eventually dishonorably discharged for admitting she was gay during the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy days. Her life has spiraled down since then.

A single mother with four children at another shelter I visited told me she was hastily evicted when the unit she rented was deemed illegal by housing authorities. Her $19 an hour job made her too rich for child care assistance, forcing her into homelessness. By the way, the father is nowhere to be found to pay child support.

After listening to the hardships of working families, veterans, and single mothers, I left the next day, committed to doing more. We should all be doing more in Congress. We should all be spending a night in a homeless shelter in our districts to hear the stories of our constituents; or just spend a few

hours at one. It will inform you in ways that go way beyond the mere numbers.

We need to understand why 1.6 million children are homeless at least one night in the year and why the number of homeless children enrolled in public schools has risen 72 percent since 2006.

Our inaction is crippling working families, single mothers, and veterans who have sacrificed so much for this Nation. I call on my colleagues today to take the homeless shelter challenge.

Talk to your constituents who do not have a home, and meet the families who are failing because of our indifference and our inaction.

VENEZUELA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend my voice to those who are being brutally silenced by the Nicolas Maduro regime in Venezuela.

After 15 years of suffering under Hugo Chavez's rule, the people of Venezuela have watched their liberties continue to be violently stripped away as Maduro further radicalizes the country's failed policies.

These policies produce the highest inflation rates in Latin America, leading to shortages of such basic goods as milk and toilet paper, and sending Venezuela into a desperate downward economic spiral that worsens every day.

The corruption that is enabled by the Maduro government and its supporters has also contributed to a society that is plagued by rampant violence. In this country of 30 million inhabitants, nearly 25,000 homicides were committed last year alone.

Worse still, the vast majority of these murders went unpunished, creating a climate of impunity that leaves ordinary citizens paralyzed by fear and hopeless about their own future and the future of their country.

As if this was not harsh enough, Mr. Speaker, Venezuelans are now facing the regime's repressive and violent actions. Weeks ago, Maduro and his cronies unleashed a bloody crackdown on students as they demonstrated against the regime's failed policies and peacefully demanded their basic human rights and democratic freedoms.

These students are expressing the sentiments of millions of Venezuelans who are sick and tired of the regime's destructive policies and fear for what may happen next. These students were exercising freedom of expression and peaceful assembly, yet Maduro responded to their brave calls of liberty with tear gas, rubber bullets, beatings, and live ammunition.

As the number of Venezuelan protesters swelled to the millions, Maduro has only stepped up the violence and his attempts to silence his critics by censoring radio and social media platforms.

By controlling the flow of information and the major media outlets, Maduro perpetuates his absurd conspiracy theories which cast blame on everyone, but himself, for this crisis of democracy in Venezuela.

Through the use of intimidation, unjust detentions, and violence, Maduro has followed the familiar playbook of other rulers who fear the desire of their citizens to live in freedom and under the rule of law.

This is especially the case with the brutal Castro tyranny, which has the biggest stake in keeping Maduro in power because of its mutual disdain for freedom, for democracy, for liberty, for the rule of law, and because of Castro's dependence on Venezuelan oil.

We have witnessed the Castro regime parachute in their own hired guns to help the Maduro regime continue its oppressive tactics against the people of Venezuela.

□ 1045

Since the countrywide protests began on February 12, Maduro's regime has murdered at least 14 Venezuelans, injured or unjustly detained hundreds more, and committed the worst abuses against protesters as stories of torture and other human rights violations continue to pour in.

This relentless repression will continue and intensify unless the United States and the international community speak with a unified voice and help to promote the rule of law, the human rights, and the democratic aspirations of the Venezuelan people.

I hope that we will be able to say that we did not stand idly by as the Venezuelan people were brutally repressed and that we had a voice in making sure that people knew what was going on in Venezuela. I hope that we will be able to say that we stood for justice, that we stood for peace, that we stood for human rights, that we stood for freedom, and that we stood for the rule of law at the moment when these were needed the most.

THE NEW CHANCE FOR A NEW START IN LIFE ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I do believe that we in this country have an obligation, commitment, and duty—and just simply out of friendship—to be concerned about the American people in the many ways that they come to this Congress or to their Members of Congress or to their elected officials. After contributing over the years to make America great, when they are in their time of need, it is most appropriate for us to respond.

It is now going on almost a year that we have not responded to hardworking Americans who, over the years, have contributed taxes. Maybe some of them are veterans who served in the United States military and are willing to make the ultimate sacrifice, and now in their time of need we are fiddling and dillydallying. Unfortunately, we are doing so because our friends on the other side of the aisle cannot recognize that, but for the grace of God, there go I.

No, these individuals are not standing in line to get unemployment insurance. They are standing in line to apply for jobs. Because the people who are eligible for unemployment insurance are individuals who have worked most every day of their life, but, unfortunately, they have found in times of economic upswings and downswings, maybe because of their training or maybe because of being a recent veteran, that they are not able to get a job immediately.

This Congress has delayed over and over again where our friends on the other side of the aisle and those Republicans in the other body claim that they cannot offer one vote to be able to pass unemployment insurance.

These individuals need our commitment, America's commitment, as they have given a commitment to us. Right now in America, there are now 48 million Americans living in poverty, 22 million children. Some of the individuals here were not at minimum wage, but they are individuals that are working and making minimum wage and can't make it either.

We must confront these issues. There must be the attitude of the Good Samaritan in this Congress. I have introduced H.R. 3888, the New Chance for a New Start in Life Act of 2014. It provides grants to nonprofits and State and local governments to train individuals for the emerging industries, the new jobs, so that individuals such as those waiting in line for employment can find employment. I would like to add that legislation as we move forward on the extension of unemployment insurance—1.3 million, 1.5 million and growing, because every week some individual who is unemployed maxes out on the 26 weeks of what they get in unemployment insurance in the State. That is why this is called emergency unemployment insurance. That is why it is called insurance, because it covers individuals who have worked, who have contributed and who have worked.

So it is disappointing that we are here again not being able to extend the unemployment insurance again, not being able to put on the floor of the House and get a vote for increasing the minimum wage to $10.10, a bill that has been filed for more than a year, and to be able to look working families directly in the eye and suggest that they can survive on less than the increase of the minimum wage.

There are businesses that will support this. There are businesses who recognize that, as they provide for their employee, that employee churns into the economy. That employee is a consumer. That employee tries to buy a house or pays their rent or goes out and buys items for their children or for their elderly parents or for themselves.

Why don't we understand that investment is what America is all about? Because America is not broke, and we have the opportunity to invest and to create more research and development, but we are living under the umbrella with the big elephant in the room—sequester. That doesn't make sense, because this country is one of the richest countries in the world.

I can assure you that, if we invest in America, we will create jobs, and those jobs will then churn the economy again and continue to bring down the debt. I don't know why a commonsense approach to building this economy up should not be the direction of this country.

Yesterday, I spoke at a high-speed rail summit. It is very clear that a building of high-speed rail will create thousands of jobs and increase mobility of Americans, but yet the image is that we are broke, and that is a very sad commentary.

As I listened to the ads that were utilized in my State of Texas, individuals not running for Congress or the United States Senate but running for State offices, all they can talk about is standing up against Obama. I want to stand with President Obama and stand with him to build this country and make it greater. That should be the message: invest in people. That is what will make America the Nation that all have looked to.

AID FOR UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I first want to recognize Annie Lowrey and Michael Gordon—they are reporters from The New York Times—because I will summarize their article and plagiarize other portions of it in talking about Ukraine.

The world watched in wonder, concern, excitement, and sometimes horror, and marveled at the tenacity and the resiliency of the Ukrainian people. However, Ukraine is in desperate need now of billions of dollars—and quickly. Its economy is shrinking; its government treasury is empty; its foreign exchange funds are low; and its banking system is fragile. Which brings us to the point of: What are the next steps?

The first step is for the Ukrainian people to organize an interim government. I call upon them to do it as rapidly as they can so that the international community has someone then to negotiate with and deal with some of these pressing matters, and that they go into a positive direction in doing that.

The second thing is for the capitals of Brussels and Washington, D.C., to take immediate action to help offset some of these dire financial constraints that Ukraine has.

I want to applaud Secretary Kerry for already trying to address this and floating the idea of $1 billion that would then go to immediate aid, and I want to call upon the European Union, headquartered in Brussels, and all the individual European countries to do the same. It is important now for this financial faith and confidence so that the people of Ukraine can continue to move forward and develop some financial security in this transitional period.

This is also critical in that this occurs as a bridge before the International Monetary Fund weighs in. The International Monetary Fund obviously needs to have a stable government to deal with. It also needs to have—and will ask for—reforms, transparency, rule of law, and some financial controls to get the ledger solidified in Ukraine, and that is what they should do.

So the important aspect of this debate is that the individual countries that have concern about the stability of what were formerly called the captive nations, the Eastern Bloc, now countries that want to be in the European community of free, democratic institutions, that there has to be a bridge so that, obviously, the chaos that has been involved in the country of Ukraine will not continue post the departure of their President and so that stability can reign.

I call upon the people of Ukraine to keep the faith and work hard and move forward on these reforms. I call on the governments—as I mentioned before, my own government, and the governments of the European Union—to offer immediate assistance, and I call for the International Monetary Fund to move as expeditiously and as quickly as possible to help stabilize the situation in Ukraine.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF TUSKEGEE AIRMAN CAPTAIN LEON ''WOODIE'' SPEARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Each February during African American History Month, Americans come together to celebrate the important contributions of African Americans throughout the Nation. I am proud to share the remarkable story of one of my constituents, Hayward resident, Captain Leon ''Woodie'' Spears.

Growing up near an airfield, young Woodie always dreamed of flying. After attending college, he was given the opportunity to achieve his dreams. Woodie was among the few selected to join other young African Americans in Alabama at the Tuskegee Airfield, where he was trained to fly. During training, Woodie overcame very tough odds, battling prejudice and racism, to earn his wings and the honor of serving with the Tuskegee Airmen.

Following training, then-Lieutenant Spears was sent to Italy at the height of World War II, serving with the all-African American 332nd Fighter Group.

Woodie's tensest moment came in March 1945, when his plane was hit by antiaircraft fire at 32,000 feet. He was forced to make an emergency landing in Germany, only to be taken prisoner later by the German Army. Later, Woodie was able to locate Russian forces and found his way back to safety.

Captain Spears and his fellow Tuskegee Airmen proved themselves in battle abroad, but upon returning home, they faced another battle—the struggle for equality. Denied basic human dignity, they fought back. With like-minded citizens, they changed America for the better, and, of course, that fight, their struggle, still continues today.

For their brave service during World War II, the Tuskegee Airmen were collectively awarded the Congressional Gold Medal in 2007. Captain Spears was among those present to receive this prestigious honor.

After Captain Spears' military career, he dedicated his life to public service, toured the country to share his military experiences during the time of segregation, and spoke up for equality for all. Although Captain Spears is no longer with us, we are reminded of the life motto he lived by: Dare to dream.

Captain Spears is just one of many African Americans with a unique story that makes our country what it is today. The story of Captain Spears reminds us that the United States has come a long way, but that we still have a much longer way to go to truly reach equality for all.

I will not rest until all Americans have an equal opportunity to achieve their dreams.

A RESPONSE TO TWO U.S. SENATORS REGARDING PUERTO RICO STATEHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the junior Senator from Mississippi and the junior Senator from West Virginia spoke on the Senate floor about Puerto Rico's political status. Because Puerto Rico is a territory and not a State, we have no Senators who can respond to these two Senators on the Senate floor. So, as the only elected representative in Congress of the 3.6 million U.S. citizens that live in Puerto Rico, I respond now.

The Senators discussed the referendum that was held in Puerto Rico in November 2012. However, neither Senator mentioned that, on the first question in that referendum, 54 percent of voters said they do not want Puerto Rico to be a territory, which means that my constituents no longer consent to the current status.

Likewise, neither Senator noted that, during a Senate hearing on the referendum held last August, the senior Democrat and the senior Republican on the Committee on Energy and

Natural Resources agreed that it was indisputable and clear that the people of Puerto Rico oppose the current territory status.

□ 1100

Finally, in their remarks yesterday, neither Senator acknowledged that in the referendum, statehood received more votes than any other status option, including the current status. In short, the Senators' discussion of the historic referendum was clearly deficient.

In addition, both Senators expressed opposition to the Puerto Rico Status Resolution Act, which I introduced last year in the House and which was introduced earlier this month in the Senate. The two Senators have every right to oppose this legislation, which calls for an up-or-down vote in Puerto Rico on the territory's admission as a State and outlines the steps the Federal Government would take if a majority of voters favor admission. But to argue, as the Senators did, that the bill excludes other options other than statehood makes no sense. A binary vote, by definition, is not exclusive. Those who support statehood can vote ''yes,'' and those who oppose it can vote ''no.'' This was precisely the format of the votes that led to Hawaii and Alaska becoming States.

I ask the Senators: Do you believe those earlier votes were unfair or exclusionary? In any event, there are now 132 Members of the House and Senate who have cosponsored the Puerto Rico Status Resolution Act and, therefore, disagree with these two Senators' characterization of the bill. Both Senators sought to contrast their opposition to the Puerto Rico Status Resolution Act with their apparent support for a Puerto Rico-related appropriation that the President included in his fiscal year 2014 budget request at my urging, and that recently became law. Under this appropriation, funding would be provided for the first federally sponsored vote in Puerto Rico's history, to be held among one or more options that are consistent with U.S. law and policy and that would ''resolve'' the status issue. Contrary to the suggestion made by both Senators, a vote on Puerto Rico's admission as a State is a perfectly valid and logical way to structure the federally sponsored plebiscite to be held pursuant to this appropriation.

Both Senators also expressed the view that the status debate is a ''distraction'' from efforts to tackle Puerto Rico's economic and fiscal challenges. This argument is familiar, but it is false. The reality is that Puerto Rico's economic problems are structural in nature and are rooted in the territory's unequal and undemocratic status. No wonder my constituents are relocating to the States in unprecedented numbers.

I look forward to the day when the men, women, and children I represent have the same rights and responsibilities as their fellow U.S. citizens residing in the States that the two Senators represent. We do not seek special treatment. We seek equality, and we intend to achieve it.

WAR ON POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, it was 50 years ago that then-President Lyndon Johnson declared a war on poverty.

I rise today to join my colleagues in recognizing the 50th anniversary of this declaration, this promise that America will be a better place for the generations that come after us. I join them in restating our commitment to fighting for policies that lift all Americans up.

That American Dream that we so often speak of, it only happens if we embrace national initiatives that respect and encourage that dream—guaranteeing a fair wage, promoting educational opportunity, and investing in an economy that works for the 21st century. That is what we should be spending our time on here in Congress, not gutting consumer and safety protections, or political distractions like we see on this week's agenda.

I am not worried that the Republican Party has surrendered in the war on poverty; I am worried that they were never interested in it to begin with. A life in poverty shouldn't be a life sentence with no future, but for too many Americans, that is exactly what it is.

Mr. Speaker, 46.5 million Americans live in poverty today; 16 million of those are children. In my hometown of New York City, that is one in three children. One in three children. These families, these children, find themselves trapped in poverty, and they need a government that is willing to help them out of that morass.

Helping those in need has long been a part of our country's philosophy. That is why we have unemployment insurance for when workers lose a job through no fault of their own. That is why we have Social Security so that seniors no longer have to live out their final days in grinding poverty. That is why we have SNAP benefits so that no child goes hungry in the richest Nation on Earth.

These programs and other lifelines are under threat, putting millions of Americans in danger of slipping further into poverty. We cannot let that happen. We cannot let the threads of our social safety net slip apart. We have to make sure that a hard day's work pays enough to make ends meet.

Today, we have millions of Americans who are the working poor. That means they get up every morning, get dressed, go to work, and they put in 40-plus hours of work—or I would suggest even more—every week, but they are not making enough money to pay the bills or even meet basic needs like food and shelter. To me, that is not how America should be. If you work a full-time job, you should be able to feed and support your family, but the fact is, someone who works full time on minimum wage only makes about $14,000 a year—$14,000 a year. That is just not enough money, no matter how many ways you slice it to make ends meet, and it is definitely not enough to take care of children or families. It shouldn't be this way.

For all of our differences, we should be united in the desire to give our children a better way of life than we had. That is what I know my grandparents were thinking when they immigrated here from Ireland, just like many others.

They passed the Statue of Liberty, the famous signal of hope and opportunity. The words at the base say, ''Give me your tired, your poor.'' The Statue of Liberty doesn't say we should forget about poor children. No, it says give us your tired, give us your poor. Give us.

Imagine what a wonderful message that is, that America is actually about helping the poor. It is because that is who we are as Americans. That is what the war on poverty demands of us, living up to the ideals we have set for our country.

I urge every one of my colleagues to look inside themselves and recommit themselves to fighting the war on poverty, a fight that, as President Johnson said, we cannot afford to lose.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 8 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Compassionate and merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pray that You bless this country we love with all our hearts. We thank You for those who founded our Republic upon faith, respect for law, and constitutional rights of individuals, and the common good of the Nation and all its citizens.

Fan the flame of freedom in the hearts of all Americans, and especially those who serve in the Armed Forces. Strengthen the resolve of all the Members of this people's House, that they, attentive to Your commands, may follow their consciences and always do what is right as they wrestle with complex issues.

Grant that what they say with their lips they believe in their hearts, and what they believe in their hearts they may bring to practice in their lives and in our Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GALLEGO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

A COMMONSENSE APPROACH TO REFORMING HEALTH CARE

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, last week, I held health care town halls all across my district. Constituents shared their experience with the President's health care law. While parts of the law have helped a few, a majority of people have been hurt.

We heard from a mother with a mentally ill, disabled son who lost his plan, small business owners who had to cut employee hours to avoid the law's penalties, and even a woman battling cancer who is now facing an uncertain future because of the law. They aren't lying.

Many promises made before the law's passage haven't and couldn't be kept. Americans have a right to feel frustrated.

It is time Washington stops imposing a law that is clearly not working. We were promised lower costs. Instead, the President's own analysts reported at least 11 million people who work at small businesses will see their premiums climb while their take-home pay drops.

House Republicans offer a step-by-step, commonsense approach to reforming our health care system that really does lower costs, providing access to quality care that people need.

We remain focused on policies that grow the economy and make life better for all Americans.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF EL PASO

(Mr. GALLEGO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, El Paso, Texas, has a rich and vast history spanning back hundreds of years. With the Ysleta Mission established in the 1600s, it has deep roots in Catholicism, but it wasn't until 1914 that the Roman Catholic Diocese of El Paso was established by Pope Pius X.

On March 3, the Roman Catholic Diocese of El Paso will celebrate its 100th anniversary. The diocese provides invaluable and multilingual services to 10 counties covering nearly 27,000 miles of southwest Texas.

From the historic missions Ysleta, Socorro, and San Elizario, through the Davis Mountains, and on to the Big Bend country, the diocese is rich in history.

While these three missions are a focal point of the 100th birthday celebration, all the churches in the diocese play a critical role in their respective communities and, through these historic missions and the far-flung churches where priests and nuns still ride the circuit, the Diocese of El Paso has a profound impact on young and old alike.

As a member of the Diocese of El Paso, I wish them great success over the next 100 years.

Feliz cumpleanos. Happy Birthday.

SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to pass additional bipartisan Iran sanctions legislation. While we are all hoping the diplomatic efforts to address Iran's nuclear program are successful, Congress must not neglect its responsibility to be prepared for all outcomes.

Changes to Iran's nuclear programs have been minimal thus far, and Iran continues to assert that it will not dismantle its nuclear facilities. In fact, Iran's Supreme Leader himself has predicted that diplomatic talks ''will lead nowhere.''

Iranian state television continues to air documentaries showing simulated attacks on Israel and on American forces as well. Passage of additional sanctions will demonstrate to the Iranian regime that the American people will not be swayed by empty rhetoric or a disingenuous commitment to peace.

Congress must stand together and reinforce our diplomatic quest for disarmament with the legislative tools necessary to support this goal.

PACE FINANCING PROGRAMS

(Mr. MCNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in supporting clean energy initiative financing programs like PACE to help people and businesses invest in renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies.

Thanks, in part, to increased energy efficiency, consumption of energy is down 5 percent nationally from 2007 levels. However, the growth of new renewable energy capacity has slowed down from 18 gigawatts installed in 2012 to 5.4 gigawatts in 2013, in part, due to a lack of access to capital.

PACE financing programs allow property owners to pay back the costs of clean energy technologies over longer periods of time. Property owners can recoup their investments through property assessments.

By encouraging distributed energy production and energy efficiency, property owners quickly increase the value of their properties. PACE programs are voluntary, and property owners across the country are eager to sign up.

SMALL BUSINESS JOB PROTECTION ACT

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, the President has unilaterally delayed the employer mandate again. It is hard not to blame him.

Last week, CMS reported that 11 million Americans who work at small businesses will have higher premiums because of the President's health care law. The employer mandate will make this bad situation worse.

That might be why the President decreed that it will only apply to businesses with more than 100 employees, instead of those with 50 employees, as the law requires, at least for now.

This is a needed temporary reprieve, but it should be granted by Congress, not Presidential decree.

The President's behavior is lawless. As The Washington Post described it, the President has shown an ''increasingly cavalier approach to picking and choosing how to enforce this law.''

I encourage our colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 2577, the Small Business Job Protection Act, which is my bill to permanently codify this relief. Let's not forget that Congress, not the President, makes the laws.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND CRAWFORD W. KIMBLE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Reverend Crawford W. Kimble, pastor

emeritus of the Good Hope Missionary Baptist Church, which was originated in Freedmen's Town in 1872, and my dear friend. My sympathy to Mrs. Kimble and all of his family.

Reverend Kimble died earlier this week in Houston at the age of 95. He will be laid to rest on Saturday, March 1, 2014.

Reverend Kimble was the fifth of six pastors at the Good Hope Missionary Baptist Church. He served as pastor for approximately 35 years. His dream was part of the building of Good Hope in its current location on North MacGregor.

Reverend Kimble was born in Elgin, Texas, on March 24, 1918, and he followed the ministerial paths of both his father and grandfather. He began preaching at 33. He started his church in 1951, and he joined it.

He preached his first sermon in 1959, and later became the pastor to many giants of Texas, including the Honorable Barbara Jordan, the first African American United States Congresswoman from the South, and Dr. Lonnie Smith, who played an important role in minority voting rights in primary elections.

It is astounding to find that prior to becoming Reverend Kimble, he was in the newspaper business as an editor of the Houston Informer. He was also part of The Kansas City Call, which was the oldest African American newspaper, and it ended with The Kansas City Call that he was a part of.

After more than 30 years in retirement, Reverend Kimble continued to write. He had many books, and he also was part of the Crawford W. Kimble senior living facility, which he lived in in the Fourth Ward, Freedmen's Town, that was named after him by Reverend Elmo Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that this giant is deserving of our honor and respect and commendation, and let us all remember his book, ''Watch the Tree, It Might Fall on You.''

Reverend Kimble, may you rest in peace. God bless you, and God bless your family.

IN SUPPORT OF WOMEN FOR LIFE

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with the Women for Life in Venezuela. These women, headed by opposition leader Maria Corina Machado and the wife of an opposition leader who is in jail, Leopoldo Lopez, who is also a leader in this march, they have dressed in white, and they have carried white flowers as they march peacefully, demanding that the Maduro government end its violent suppression of pro-democracy movements in Venezuela.

In these protests, at least 14 people have been killed by the state thugs of Maduro, and many more have been unjustly harassed, detained, and beaten.

It is poignant that these women model themselves after the Ladies of White in my native homeland of Cuba, because Maduro seeks to do to the Venezuelan dissenters what the Castro brothers do to theirs: silence them through intimidation.

This is a classic example of an autocratic regime's false notion that might is right, but we must show Maduro and other violators that the world is watching, and that we will not allow these transgressions to pass unnoticed.

I stand in solidarity with the Women for Life in Venezuela, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

SET ASIDE THE DO-NOTHING AGENDA

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the 1.9 million unemployed Americans, including nearly 21,000 in Nevada, people who are struggling to put food on the table, a roof over their heads, and gas in their car.

Despite the daily struggle that these people have making ends meet while looking for a new, good-paying job, House Republicans have refused to bring a bill to the floor that would extend their critical lifeline. In fact, since the beginning of the 113th Congress, House Republicans have failed to bring a single jobs bill to the floor.

The American people have made it clear that they want this Congress to work to find solutions that represent a balanced approach, not partisan ideology that is out of touch with their needs and priorities.

I urge House Republicans to set aside their do-nothing agenda, address the serious challenges facing our country, and take meaningful action to achieve real results for the people we are sent here to serve.

TAX REFORM

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, for more than four decades I have owned my own business. I am a business guy, and I can say with certainty that today's economy is the hardest economy our country has seen from a small business standpoint.

Taxes and regulations are killing businesses, stifling growth, and preventing educated, qualified individuals from becoming job creators themselves.

America's Tax Code deals some of the harshest penalties for those who contribute most to the economy. We have the highest corporate tax rate in the world, and the top wage earners pay most of the Federal income taxes.

To restore fairness for all taxpayers, we need to cut the corporate rate to a real 25 percent, and collapse the current six tax brackets to just two, at 10 and 25 percent.

We need to cut the capital gains tax, the dividends tax, and eliminate the inheritance tax. We need an improved R&D tax credit to give the American manufacturers the ability to compete globally. With these cuts, we need to ensure that hard-earned taxpayer dollars taken by the IRS are no longer subject to waste, fraud, and abuse.

In the end, it is about simplifying and enabling American businesses to compete worldwide, putting more money into Americans' wallets than Uncle Sam's, and creating cash flow and opportunity for America. It is a winning formula. It has worked before. Let's try it again.

In God we trust.

□ 1215

A LIVING WAGE

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I signed a discharge petition in an effort to force an up-or-down vote on legislation that I have cosponsored, and that is H.R. 1010, the Fair Minimum Wage Act, which would increase the Federal minimum wage to $10.10 over the period of the next few years, giving up to 25 million Americans a well-deserved pay raise.

Many Americans who work at the minimum wage live in poverty; and I know that there are some in this body, particularly on the other side, who fundamentally don't even believe that there ought to be a minimum wage. That is a minority view.

Republicans and Democrats across the country believe that not only should we have a minimum wage, but that it ought to be increased. A recent poll showed that 71 percent of Americans favor an increase in the minimum wage.

So for those who believe that there ought to be a wage that is a living wage, it has to be a wage that does not put people in poverty. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to sign the discharge petition, and let's have a vote to give Americans the raise that they deserve.

CONGRATULATING THE 2014 WINTER OLYMPIANS

(Mr. STEWART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate all 230 American athletes who participated in the Sochi Olympics, and I am proud to say that 15 of these Olympians were from my home State of Utah and that seven of them won medals. Through their talent, their skill, and dedication, they represented Utah and our country very well.

These Utah athletes come from very different backgrounds. Some of them

are in the middle of their careers. Some of them are military members. Some are students. Many of them are parents.

They showed dedication and effort and that sacrifice can lead to success. These athletes should inspire all of us to strive to achieve our goals. As a father, I have seen their example inspire my six children.

While these Olympians weren't guaranteed a medal, that didn't stop them from working and sacrificing in every way to achieve their goals. We should all continue to look to these Olympic athletes for inspiration, to become better, and to be more dedicated to our goals, even when it is tough.

I wish these athletes good luck in the future and thank them for their inspiration.

WIND POWER

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, climate change is real and is happening now. To reduce the harmful effects of human-caused greenhouse gas pollution, this Nation and the world must transition to clean energy sources. That is why I am here today to support wind power and for extending the renewable electricity production tax credit.

My home State of California has been a leader in deploying this key technology, and it has paid dividends. Wind powers over 2.1 million California homes, and California is the home to 21 wind manufacturing facilities which have helped to stimulate capital investments of over $11 billion.

The California wind industry also supports over 7,000 jobs, ranking California as the second-highest wind-related job incubator in the Nation.

Wind power is part of the energy portfolio of the future. Let's make that future happen now and support the production tax credit.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, last week, the nonpartisan Office of the Chief Actuary for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services reported that as many as 11 million small business employees throughout the United States may see their health premiums rise after full implementation of ObamaCare.

That means approximately 14 percent of the men and women who are participating in the U.S. workforce will have less take-home pay and higher costs for services that they are forced to buy.

Just last week, I met with small businesses in Grand Junction, Colorado, and discussed this very issue. They told me about how they already provide affordable, quality health care plans for their employees. However, like many small businesses, they are concerned and confused about what the future holds for them under the President's health care law.

We can provide certainty to businesses, families, and every American looking to have affordable and accessible health care, but the President's health care law isn't the answer. Almost every week, there are new reports of increased costs and decreased access to care.

Why don't we put people first, rather than putting government first? That is why I support replacement legislation, such as H.R. 2300, making it market-based, affordable, and lower cost for our people.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MR. GEORGE SAJEWYCH

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to pay tribute to an American hero, Mr. George Sajewych, a U.S. citizen who experienced firsthand the violence in Kiev while peacefully assembling in solidarity with the people of Ukraine.

An esteemed, long-time retired broadcaster for the Voice of America, originally from Chicago, Mr. Sajewych was one of many journalists to have endured ruthless violence firsthand when he was beaten by Berkut police forces.

The attack left him bleeding in the street, surrounded by the shreds of the helmet that he had worn for protection. His motorcycle helmet shattered by the beating. He was hospitalized after having suffered serious injuries.

I commend Mr. Sajewych for his fortitude and continuing resolve in standing for freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press, the fundamentals of an open society.

I urge our President to swiftly impose targeted financial and travel sanctions on any Ukrainian Government official found to have endorsed this brutal violence and to channel all financial assistance offered by our country to Ukraine only to those who are committed to upholding the rights of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of press.

Let us praise Mr. Sajewych for his courage and inspiration, standing at liberty's side.

HONORING THE DEDICATION OF THE SAM JOHNSON HIGHWAY

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the naming of U.S. Highway 75 in north Texas as the Sam Johnson Highway, after my friend and our colleague, Representative SAM JOHNSON. This Monday, over 200 gathered to attend the public sign unveiling ceremony in Collin County, Texas.

This highway is a major artery in the north Texas area. The recognition it now provides is fitting, but can never repay Congressman JOHNSON for his sacrifice and service for our country, first in the U.S. Air Force during the Korean and Vietnam wars, including 7 years as a prisoner of war in Vietnam.

After returning and being reunited with his family, he put years of hard work into being an entrepreneurial homebuilder in his community. He went on to serve in the State legislature and now serves as the U.S. Representative to Collin County, which he calls home.

I am honored to work with him in this Congress and on the Ways and Means Committee. I would like to thank my friend from Texas, SAM JOHNSON, for his years of service to our communities and our Nation.

SPECIAL INTERESTS IN ELECTIONS

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, we need a government by the people and for the people, not a government run by the special interests and for the corporations. But how do we get there?

First, we remove barriers to voting. From overcoming hurdles to absentee voting and difficulty with registration, to long lines at the polls, more can be done to make sure that our elections work for all voters.

We should take a good long look at the thoughtful recommendations of the President's bipartisan election commission, which listened to voters and to election officials and bundled together the best ideas.

Second, we can't let the big money interests choose our leaders. We need public campaign financing, like the bill recently introduced by my colleague, Representative SARBANES of Maryland.

In a post-Citizens United world, the voices of special interests will be much louder than those of average Americans, unless we act now and bring back government run by the people and for the people.

VENEZUELA

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the last several weeks, the people of Venezuela have risen up to protest the corruption, the food shortages, the soaring crime rates, and particularly, the alarming repression in Venezuela.

Mr. Speaker, since the protests began, more than 500 people have been arrested, approximately 150 injured, and over a dozen have been killed. It is disgraceful to think the Chavez-Maduro regime has actually managed

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

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

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

Now is the time to stand with the Venezuelan people.

ANNIVERSARY OF SUPREME COURT UPHOLDING 19TH AMENDMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMERICA'S RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

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

Mr. COTTON. Yesterday, I introduced the LOCAL Act, a bill allowing the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to restore joint management programs with local nonprofit organizations to construct, operate, and maintain recreational facilities at lakes and reservoirs across the country.

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

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

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

□ 1230

SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

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

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

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

NATIONAL LATINO ENROLLMENT WEEK

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, the administration has declared this week to be National Latino Enrollment Week in the hopes of mounting a special push—a big rush—of Latinos rushing to sign up for the Affordable Care Act because it is supposedly going to help their lives in so many ways. Yet Latinos nationwide, like millions of other Americans, are discovering that they just can't afford the Affordable Care Act. Not only is it causing them to lose coverage, but they also see their premiums rise and have their health care plans canceled.

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

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

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

ALL ECONOMIC REGULATIONS ARE TRANSPARENT ACT OF 2014

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

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

□ 1232

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2804) to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to publish information about rules on the Internet, and for other purposes, with Mr. YODER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

Sec. 501. Exception.

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

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

SEC. 501. EXCEPTION.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

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

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

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

A poll conducted by the American Lung Association found nearly three of four respondents believe we shouldn't have to choose between this health and safety standard and promoting the economy on the other hand. They understand that is a false choice and that we can and must do both. But my friends on the other side of the aisle continue to perpetuate this canard that government regulation is a heavy boot on the neck of business in America.

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

Sec. 501. Exception.

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

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

SEC. 501. EXCEPTION.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

□ 1245

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for his explanation. We have noted 653, and you are absolutely right. It thrusts that in the hands of the President of the United States, but I would argue that the Congress created the Department of Homeland Security with a Secretary to be able to be the first line of defense, and I would argue that it is important that we exempt the Secretary of the Department from that because of their number one responsibility, which is securing the homeland, and we live in a different climate.

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

Sec. 501. Exception.

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

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

SEC. 501. EXCEPTION.

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

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

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

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

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

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

Nevertheless, the House Republican leadership continues to bulldoze its deregulatory agenda through Congress. This deregulatory train wreck threatens to send us back to the days before the Wall Street collapse, a financial catastrophe that could have been avoided by responsible policies. Instead of working together to come to a bipartisan solution and end sequestration, this Congress has continued an agenda to make life worse for American families. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Johnson amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1300

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

Sec. 501. Exception.

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

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

SEC. 501. EXCEPTION.

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

Sec. 501. Exception.

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

TITLE V—EXCEPTION

SEC. 501. EXCEPTION.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, in addition to protecting workers, the inspector general's office also makes recommendations which call for new and better regulations to protect America's taxpayers.

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

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

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

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

□ 1315

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point is this:

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. ROTHFUS of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 71]

AYES—249

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

NOES—162

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

NOT VOTING—19

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

□ 1346

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

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 72]

AYES—181

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

NOES—235

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Pastor (AZ)
Rice (SC)
Royce
Runyan
Rush
Upton

NOT VOTING—14

Bass
Blumenauer
Butterfield
Ellison
Fudge
Gosar
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)

□ 1353

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 73]

AYES—180

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

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

NOES—232

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

NOT VOTING—18

Bass
Blumenauer
Bucshon
Butterfield
Davis, Danny
Diaz-Balart
Ellison
Fudge
Gosar
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
Pastor (AZ)
Rice (SC)
Royce
Runyan
Rush
Upton
Waxman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1357

Mrs. LOWEY changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 74]

AYES—179

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

NOES—235

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

NOT VOTING—16

Bass
Blumenauer
Butterfield
Davis, Danny
Ellison
Fudge
Gosar
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
Pastor (AZ)
Polis
Rice (SC)
Royce
Runyan
Rush
Upton

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1401

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 75]

AYES—183

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

NOES—229

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

NOT VOTING—18

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1405

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

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

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

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 76]

AYES—181

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

NOES—232

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

NOT VOTING—17

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

□ 1410

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RIBBLE) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2804) to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to publish information about rules on the Internet, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 487, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Ms. ESTY. I am in its present form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISION

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

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

(1) saves tax dollars or provides refunds, rebates, or savings for taxpayers;

(2) provides assistance and regulatory relief for small businesses;

(3) expedites or settles cases involving veterans benefits;

(4) prevents discrimination based on race, religion, national origin, or any other protected category, or that provides pay equity for women; or

(5) protects the health and safety of consumers, seniors, and children, including ensuring—

(A) the safety of the food supply from salmonella and other food-borne illnesses; or

(B) a safe drinking water supply that is free from toxic substances and chemicals that can cause cancer.

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1415

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are more than 5 years into the Obama administration. Real unemployment is still a massive problem in this country. America's labor force participation is at record lows. The nominal unemployment rate is down, but that is only because desperate Americans dying for work are abandoning the workforce in droves.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

My friends, the people in my district and yours are smart. They can read the bill. They can tell that, although Chicken Little and the Boy Who Cried Wolf seem to want to talk about this bill, the sky is not falling and the wolf is not coming on account of this bill. What is coming on account of this bill is real relief for hardworking Americans and prosperity around the corner.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 77]

AYES—187

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

Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—229

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

NOT VOTING—14

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

□ 1431

Mrs. WAGNER changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. GUTIERREZ changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 179, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

AYES—236

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

NOES—179

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

NOT VOTING—15

Bachus
Bass
Blumenauer
Butterfield
Costa
Davis, Danny
Fudge
Gosar
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
Pastor (AZ)
Rice (SC)
Runyan
Rush
Upton

□ 1438

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 475 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3193.

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

□ 1441

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3193) to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes, with Mr. RIBBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

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

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

CoreLogic, which analyzes mortgage data, has said:

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

That is egregiously unfair to hardworking Americans.

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

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

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

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

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

Now, according to public documents, Mr. Chairman, some of the Bureau's renovations include ''a reflective carnelian granite water table'' that will ''lure in the curious passerby.'' Also for $145 million of hard-earned taxpayer money, the Bureau is buying ''a shady tree bosque'' to facilitate ''chance interactions in a removed place of rest and contemplation.'' I mean, I can't make this up, Mr. Chairman. This is how hard-earned money is being squandered. Here it is, the architectural drawings which have been filed publicly.

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

□ 1445

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Since opening its doors in 2011, the CFPB has gone to bat for those who have been subject to the deceptive practices of unscrupulous financial institutions. Though it has been immensely successful, Republicans have tried to undercut it in every way possible.

Mr. Chairman, in just over 2 years, CFPB's enforcement actions have resulted in over $3 billion being directly refunded to more than 9.7 million consumers and servicemembers.

The CFPB has ensured that all consumers have fair and transparent access to consumer financial products and services. It has written important mortgage rules that prevent lenders from engaging in the risky and irresponsible practices that led to the collapse of the housing market and fueled the 2008 global financial crisis; and it continues to go after industries and institutions that, for years, have not been held accountable for abusive and deceptive practices.

The CFPB ensures that the tens of millions of consumers who interact with large consumer reporting agencies, debt collectors, payday lenders, and nonbanks originating mortgage loans have an advocate in their corner.

In fact, in fiscal year 2013, the CFPB was a party in 13 enforcement actions related to deceptive marketing, unlawful debt collection, discrimination on the basis of age, unlawful charging of fees, and fraudulent mortgage relief schemes, among other violations.

Since the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau opened its doors, more than 269,000 individual consumer complaints have been received, and it has stood up for our Nation's Active Duty military who so greatly serve us, returning more than $12.5 million to them under the Military Lending Act.

Just yesterday, CFPB announced a lawsuit against a large for-profit college chain, accusing it of preying on students by pushing them into high-cost loans, very likely to end in default.

But my friends on the other side of the aisle don't believe that we should have a consumer advocate in government. They would prefer that these unscrupulous actors continue to take advantage of consumers without interference.

The simple fact is that H.R. 3193 would accomplish this goal, obstructing the CFPB's ability to protect consumers from deceptive marketing, unlawful debt collection, lending discrimination, overcharge fees, and other illegal activity. The bill does so by undermining CFPB's leadership, ending its autonomy, and tying its funding to Congressional appropriations, among other ways.

In fact, Republicans have brought this bill to the floor claiming a cost savings, but they know that the only way a savings is realized is by slashing the budget of the CFPB, the sole agency charged with consumer financial protections.

But that is not all. The provisions included in this measure would eliminate the position of the CFPB director in favor of some five-member commission that would increase bureaucracy—encouraging, inviting—and encumber its ability to take action on behalf of consumers. It would water down the CFPB's rulemaking authority by lowering the bar for overturning its rules.

Many of the amendments offered today would make this bill even worse. For example, the measure offered by Congressman DESANTIS would repeal the Bureau's exclusive rulemaking authority, dispersing responsibility for protecting consumers among the same regulators who failed miserably in this task in the run-up to the financial crisis.

It is striking to listen to my friends on the opposite side of the aisle talk about the importance of consumer protection and then push a measure that is an obvious attempt to completely undermine and obstruct the CFPB's ability to protect consumers, students, seniors, and servicemembers.

If holding the Bureau accountable to its mission to protect American consumers truly is a Republican's goal, then why are we considering a bill which is strongly opposed by more than 100 organizations with long records of standing up for the interest of consumers?

I would urge my colleagues to oppose this damaging measure so the CFPB can continue its outstanding work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the distinguished chairman of our Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee and a real leader in preserving consumer opportunity and rights.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman of our committee for his leadership and for yielding me time this afternoon.

I would also like to thank my colleagues Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER for their leadership in drafting the components of this bill before us today.

As we have heard, the debate before us today is not new. We have been working for the past 3 years to enact commonsense structural reforms to the CFPB. During debate in the last Congress, our friends on the other side of the aisle said that it was premature to reform this burgeoning agency. They argued that it was too early to tell how the Bureau would operate.

Well, 2½ years later, this is what we know: The Bureau continues to be unresponsive to bipartisan requests for information about their operations. For example, last spring, the Bureau released guidance for indirect auto lending practices.

Over the last year, Republican and Democrat Members have requested information, both in person and in writing, about the data the Bureau used to support their guidance. Despite these requests, the Bureau refuses to provide substantive answers to the Members' questions.

Over the last year, Members—and I have in particular—expressed significant concern about the effect the CFPB's new rules will have on mortgage availability for low- to moderate-income borrowers. Despite this, the CFPB has moved forward with the rules.

We have also heard that the Bureau is spending over $100 million to renovate its headquarters. As we learned, the renovation per square foot will cost more than building the Trump World Tower and the Bellagio.

These examples are indicative of an agency that is unaccountable to Congress and to the American taxpayers. Moving the Bureau's leadership structure to a bipartisan commission will ensure that there is a diversity of opinion as the agency crafts new rules, no matter who the President is.

A more diverse leadership structure will result in more balanced rules that provide consumers with sufficient transparency to choose the financial products that best suits their needs.

We are also bringing greater accountability to this agency by putting the Bureau on the regular appropriations schedule. Budgetary control is a critical tool for this Congress, no matter who the President is, to ensure the actions of this agency truly benefits consumers.

I thank the sponsors for their hard work.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), ranking member on the Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her hard work on the Financial Services Committee.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3193, which is a blatantly partisan assault on the CFPB and on American consumers.

I think it is telling that just 4 months after the first government shutdown in 17 years, the Republicans want to remove the CFPB's independent source of funding and subject it to Congress' deeply dysfunctional appropriations process.

It is telling because it exposes the true purpose of this bill. It is not to make the CFPB more accountable, but rather to undermine, defund, and hinder its ability to act to protect consumers in every possible way.

The dysfunction that led to last year's 16-day shutdown is exactly why we gave the CFPB an independent source of funding in Dodd-Frank. We wanted to insulate the CFPB from the political games and partisan brinksmanship that, unfortunately, became a staple of the appropriations process.

Another key reason for creating the CFPB was to make sure that we have at least one regulator whose sole purpose is protecting consumers. Prior to the financial crisis, consumer protection had, unfortunately, become an afterthought of the banking regulators whose primary mission was protecting the safety and soundness of the banks, but not consumers.

□ 1500

When Congress created the CFPB, the whole point was to create a regulator whose sole focus would be to protect consumers. The reason Congress did this was that, prior to the financial crisis, consumers were an afterthought, a secondary thought, a third thought, or usually not even thought about at all. So it was a huge step forward to have a department that was focused on protecting consumers from new products that were harmful and from innovations that were not tested that were harmful to the consumers and the economy as a whole, which led to the financial crisis.

This was a huge step forward for consumers when it was created. Unfortunately, this bill before us today is a huge step backwards because it would give the safety and soundness regulators more authority to veto the CFPB's consumer protections in the name of bank profits—just like in the old days. Let's remember that, in just its first 2½ years, the CFPB has already made huge strides on a number of important consumer protections—from new mortgage protections to credit cards to payday lending.

An independent source said the credit card bill of rights that was supported by the CFPB saves consumers $20 billion a year. That is a huge step forward for consumers, and the Bureau has been willing to make sensible changes when it has needed to. Last year, the Bureau adopted amendments to the CARD Act that would allow stay-at-home spouses to take out credit cards in their own names. This was a commonsense fix for an unintended problem for stay-at-home spouses who were creditworthy, and they made the decision so that they were able to get these credit cards. That is a huge step forward, and I worked with Mrs. CAPITO on it from across the aisle. The Bureau continues to work hard to develop consumer safeguards in rapidly growing areas, such as prepaid cards and overdraft protection, both of which many Members on both sides have a keen interest in seeing going forward.

In short, the CFPB's work has already made the lives of American consumers and our constituents better on a day-to-day basis. This bill would undermine these results, and it would weaken the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, so I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

I would like to place in the RECORD independent organizations—literally well over 100—that are in support of the CFPB and that are in opposition to this bill. They are good government groups, credit groups, individual legislators, and local and State partners, all of whom are in opposition to the bill that undermines the work of the CFPB, which is there to protect consumers.

FOLLOWING ARE THE PARTNERS OF AMERICANS FOR FINANCIAL REFORM.

All the organizations support the overall principles of AFR and are working for an accountable, fair and secure financial system. Not all of these organizations work on all of the issues covered by the coalition or have signed on to every statement.

AARP; A New Way Forward; AFL-CIO; AFSCME; Alliance For Justice; American Income Life Insurance; American Sustainable Business Council; Americans for Democratic Action, Inc.; Americans United for Change; Campaign for America's Future; Campaign Money; Center for Digital Democracy; Center for Economic and Policy Research; Center for Economic Progress; Center for Media and Democracy; Center for Responsible Lending; Center for Justice and Democracy; Center of Concern; Center for Effective Government; Change to Win; Clean Yield Asset Management.

Coastal Enterprises Inc.; Color of Change; Common Cause; Communications Workers of America; Community Development Transportation Lending Services; Consumer Action; Consumer Association Council; Consumers for Auto Safety and Reliability; Consumer Federation of America; Consumer Watchdog; Consumers Union; Corporation for Enterprise Development; CREDO Mobile; CTW Investment Group; Demos; Economic Policy Institute; Essential Action; Green America; Greenlining Institute; Good Business International; HNMA Funding Company.

Home Actions; Housing Counseling Services; Home Defender's League; Information Press; Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy; Institute for Global Communications; Institute for Policy Studies: Global Economy Project; International Brotherhood of Teamsters; Institute of Women's Policy Research; Krull & Company; Laborers' International Union of North America; Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Main Street Alliance; Move On; NAACP; NASCAT; National Association of Consumer Advocates; National Association of Neighborhoods; National Community Reinvestment Coalition; National Consumer Law Center (on behalf of its low-income clients); National Consumers League.

National Council of La Raza; National Council of Women's Organizations; National Fair Housing Alliance; National Federation of Community Development Credit Unions; National Housing Resource Center; National Housing Trust; National Housing Trust Community Development Fund; National NeighborWorks Association; National Nurses United; National People's Action; National Urban League; Next Step; OpenTheGovernment.org; Opportunity Finance Network; Partners for the Common Good; PICO National Network; Progress Now Action; Progressive States Network; Poverty and Race Research Action Council; Public Citizen; Sargent Shriver Center on Poverty Law.

SEIU; State Voices; Taxpayer's for Common Sense; The Association for Housing and Neighborhood Development; The Fuel Savers Club; The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; The Seminal; TICAS; U.S. Public Interest Research Group; UNITE HERE; United Food and Commercial Workers; United States Student Association; USAction; Veris Wealth Partners; Western States Center; We the People Now; Woodstock Institute; World Privacy Forum; UNET; Union Plus; Unitarian Universalist for a Just Economic Community.

List of State and Local Partners

Alaska PIRG; Arizona PIRG; Arizona Advocacy Network; Arizonans For Responsible Lending; Association for Neighborhood and Housing Development NY; Audubon Partnership for Economic Development LDC, New York NY; BAC Funding Consortium Inc., Miami FL; Beech Capital Venture Corporation, Philadelphia PA; California PIRG; California Reinvestment Coalition; Century Housing Corporation, Culver City CA; CHANGER NY; Chautauqua Home Rehabilitation and Improvement Corporation (NY); Chicago Community Loan Fund, Chicago IL; Chicago Community Ventures, Chicago IL; Chicago Consumer Coalition; Citizen Potawatomi CDC, Shawnee OK; Colorado PIRG; Coalition on Homeless Housing in Ohio; Community Capital Fund, Bridgeport CT; Community Capital of Maryland, Baltimore MD; Community Development Financial Institution of the Tohono O'odham Nation, Sells AZ.

Community Redevelopment Loan and Investment Fund, Atlanta GA; Community Reinvestment Association of North Carolina; Community Resource Group, Fayetteville A; Connecticut PIRG; Consumer Assistance Council; Cooper Square Committee (NYC); Cooperative Fund of New England, Wilmington NC; Corporacion de Desarrollo Economico de Ceiba, Ceiba PR; Delta Foundation, Inc., Greenville MS; Economic Opportunity Fund (EOF), Philadelphia PA; Empire Justice Center NY; Empowering and Strengthening Ohio's People (ESOP), Cleveland OH; Enterprises, Inc., Berea KY; Fair Housing Contact Service OH; Federation of Appalachian Housing; Fitness and Praise Youth Development, Inc., Baton Rouge LA; Florida Consumer Action Network; Florida PIRG; Funding Partners for Housing Solutions, Ft. Collins CO; Georgia PIRG; Grow Iowa Foundation, Greenfield IA; Homewise, Inc., Santa Fe NM.

Idaho Nevada CDFI, Pocatello ID; Idaho Chapter, National Association of Social Workers; Illinois PIRG; Impact Capital, Seattle WA; Indiana PIRG; Iowa PIRG; Iowa Citizens for Community Improvement; JobStart Chautauqua, Inc., Mayville NY; La Casa Federal Credit Union, Newark NJ; Low Income Investment Fund, San Francisco CA; Long Island Housing Services NY; MaineStream Finance, Bangor ME; Maryland PIRG; Massachusetts Consumers' Coalition; MASSPIRG; Massachusetts Fair Housing Center; Michigan PIRG; Midland Community Development Corporation, Midland TX; Midwest Minnesota Community Development Corporation, Detroit Lakes MN; Mile High Community Loan Fund, Denver CO; Missouri PIRG; Mortgage Recovery Service Center of L.A.

Montana Community Development Corporation, Missoula MT; Montana PIRG; New Economy Project; New Hampshire PIRG; New Jersey Community Capital, Trenton NJ; New Jersey Citizen Action; New Jersey PIRG; New Mexico PIRG; New York PIRG; New York City Aids Housing Network; New Yorkers for Responsible Lending; NOAH Community Development Fund, Inc., Boston MA; Nonprofit Finance Fund, New York NY; Nonprofits Assistance Fund, Minneapolis M; North Carolina PIRG; Northside Community Development Fund, Pittsburgh PA; Ohio Capital Corporation for Housing, Columbus OH; Ohio PIRG; OligarchyUSA; Oregon State PIRG; Our Oregon; PennPIRG; Piedmont Housing Alliance, Charlottesville VA; Michigan PIRG; Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center, CO; Rhode Island PIRG.

Rural Community Assistance Corporation, West Sacramento CA; Rural Organizing

Project OR; San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority; Seattle Economic Development Fund; Community Capital Development; TexPIRG; The Fair Housing Council of Central New York; The Loan Fund, Albuquerque NM; Third Reconstruction Institute NC; Vermont PIRG; Village Capital Corporation, Cleveland OH; Virginia Citizens Consumer Council; Virginia Poverty Law Center; War on Poverty—Florida; WashPIRG; Westchester Residential Opportunities Inc.; Wigamig Owners Loan Fund, Inc., Lac du Flambeau WI; WISPIRG.

Small Businesses

Blu; Bowden-Gill Environmental; Community MedPAC; Diversified Environmental Planning; Hayden & Craig, PLLC; Mid City Animal Hospital, Phoenix AZ; UNET.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, it is now my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the distinguished majority leader, who has been a tireless advocate for consumer choice and freedom throughout this debate on this unaccountable Bureau and who has led our Congress' effort to bring bills to the floor to stop government abuse.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank both gentlemen from Texas for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Consumer Financial Freedom and Washington Accountability Act.

Our constituents deserve an open government that can easily be held accountable. We in the House have got to be focused on reforming this government so we can create an America that works again. The Founders of our country created this democratic system to include a series of checks and balances to prevent any institution from becoming too powerful, and, today, it is as important as ever to keep those checks and balances strong.

Right now, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is an independent agency within the Federal Reserve System that is full of unelected bureaucrats who enjoy an unprecedented amount of power with a serious lack of accountability to any of the three branches of government.

American consumers should not have to fear Federal bureaucrats who can eliminate access to their credit options, collect information on their personal finances without their knowledge or consent, or limit the availability of a mortgage due to the onerous Qualified Mortgage rule that the CFPB put in place last month.

Working families who are struggling to make ends meet during these hard economic times should also not have to worry about their hard-earned tax dollars being spent so recklessly and irresponsibly by government agencies. We have recently learned that the Federal Reserve's inspector general opened up an investigation to find out why a renovation to the CFPB's headquarters skyrocketed from $55 million to $145 million in under 2 years. This reckless waste is one of the most dangerous kinds of government abuses. The American workers' pocketbooks are not Washington's ATM machine.

The bill before us today provides solutions to these problems with important structural changes that will place the levers of power in a bipartisan panel, as opposed to a single director, while subjecting the CFPB to the regular appropriations and oversight processes, guaranteeing more accountability.

This is an opportunity for us to show the American people that we are committed to restoring trust in government. By passing these commonsense reforms in a bipartisan fashion, we can hold Washington more accountable to the people we are supposed to protect. So let's pass this bill and take one step closer to stopping government abuse.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman HENSARLING, Chairman NEUGEBAUER, Representatives DUFFY, BACHUS, WESTMORELAND, and FINCHER, and the rest of the Financial Services Committee for their hard work on this issue. I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislation so we can begin to make America work again for everybody.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative LYNCH, who is a member of the Financial Services Committee and who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, U.S. Postal Service and the Census.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentlelady for yielding and for her work on behalf of American consumers.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3193, the so-called Consumer Financial Protection and Soundness Improvement Act.

Let's be clear about what my friends on the other side of the aisle are trying to do here today.

They would really like to completely repeal the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Many of the sponsors of this act are the ones who tried to defeat the creation and empowerment of the CFPB to begin with. To be mindful, this is the only financial regulator solely responsible for protecting American consumers from unfair, deceptive, and abusive financial products. My friends on the other side of the aisle would like to destroy it, so they are trying to pass off this ''death by a thousand cuts'' approach as improvements to the Bureau's structure.

This bill will bog down the consumer bureau in bureaucratic and congressional red tape. It will make it more difficult for the Bureau to seek out and retain qualified employees. It will also allow the companies that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is supposed to be regulating to have more information, better information—more accurate information, more extensive information—about consumers than the CFPB that is responsible for protecting them will have.

In sum, it will make the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau a second-class and ineffective regulator, sending the signal to bad actors in our financial markets that we are not really serious about consumer protections, and this bill will do nothing to make consumers safer.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting ''no'' on H.R. 3193.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER), the chairman of the Housing and Insurance Subcommittee, who is a key coauthor of this bill, ensuring that the CFPB is accountable through the congressional appropriations process, and who is a real champion of preserving housing opportunities from Washington bureaucrats.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank Chairman HENSARLING.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is kind of interesting that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to want to justify this ''spending gone wild'' agency, an agency that last year alone had a budget overreach of nearly $100 million.

That is the reason that I introduced title II of this bill, which really says two things: one, that we take this agency out of the Fed and make it a stand-alone entity; and two, that we put it on budget, a normal appropriations process, where Members of Congress can begin to sit down and look at the budget that is presented to them by the agency—how you are going to spend their money. Maybe we would have prevented some of these overreaches that happened.

I don't think that anybody thinks that government should just have an unlimited purse, and this is what this agency basically has. If they run out of money—spend too much money—they just reach over into the Fed and take that money out. No other agency that I know of in the government has that, and I think the hardworking American people and the hardworking people of the 19th District feel like agencies ought to come and bring their budgets, like in other areas of government, and explain and prove why they need that money.

Interestingly enough, the CFPB has 1,500 employees, 60 percent of them making over $100,000 and 5 percent of those making more than Cabinet secretaries. Mr. Chairman, again, we think there needs to be more accountability here.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. This agency can draw up to $500 million each year, really. In fact, some of the requests for transfer were done on small pieces of paper.

Can you imagine a three-line paragraph saying, ''Please send over $150 million. We have run out of money''?

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3193 begins to bring the accountability that the American taxpayers not only deserve but desire.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington, Representative HECK, who is a

member of the Financial Services Committee and who has paid a lot of attention to this issue.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the ranking member very much.

Mr. Chairman, I am from Washington State, and I am about to commit a sacrilege. We could have saved a lot of trees and a lot of time if we had had a one-sentence bill that simply said: ''End the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.''

We could have had an honest debate then about whether we should have any government agency with the mandate to protect consumers from deceptive financial marketing and abusive financial practices. We could have had a discussion about what the CFPB has accomplished thus far and whether it is accessible to Americans, whether its proposed streamlined forms are more effective at educating Americans, whether its rules are thoroughly researched and revised after comments from all sides. Instead, we are having a debate over reorganizing and defunding and subordinating and other matters of process and organization that are all, frankly, designed to kill CFPB by a thousand cuts.

I think the proposition here is fairly straightforward and remains a mystery to me. If one desires to do away with the CFPB, why not have the courage to introduce that bill straightforwardly?

Ordinarily, I don't assign motives or characterize intent on the part of people who advance legislation. The fact of the matter is many of those who are advocating for this bill's passage opposed the creation of the agency flat out. The fact of the matter is that a companion bill—granted, one not in this—even re-titled the agency and took the words ''consumer protection'' out. The fact of the matter is, if there were more credible arguments in support of this legislation, I think we would be a little more careful with the facts.

Here is a fact: there isn't a penny of taxpayer dollars that supports CFPB. It is fee-based. Here is a fact omitted: more than 60 percent of the costs associated with the alleged remodel budget, which is an estimate—a fact omitted—is associated with upgrading to code. Now, I know for another fact that the people who are making that argument do not want civil servants to occupy unsafe and unhealthy buildings.

□ 1515

But most importantly—this is the part that really gets me—we are going to spend a lot of time on this today and in committee, and we are going to pass it to the Senate, and we all know what its fate is going to be, right down into the ground. Well, that is fine. People have the right to make their point, but what is the opportunity cost of making that point in committee and on the floor? At least one of the opportunity costs is getting to work on actual regulatory relief.

We have several bipartisan bills for regulatory relief. Some form of the CLEAR Act, not all the Members on my side support it, but some do. We could actually get to work on regulatory relief if we would set aside our efforts for this messaging and exercise.

As for me, no matter what the form, I am going to vote ''no'' on any bill that kills the CFPB, any bill. I will vote ''no'' because of the work the CFPB does on behalf of my constituents.

I will vote to preserve the Office of Servicemember Affairs and the great work that Holly Petraeus is doing. They have a special mandate to protect the men and women in uniform. I have the privilege to represent Joint Base Lewis-McChord, tens of thousands of uniformed personnel. If you ever talk to anybody—I don't see how anybody who has a military base even near their district can support this legislation.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WATERS. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chair, I don't see how anybody who has a military base anywhere near their district can support this legislation.

I will vote to protect the experts who are laying the groundwork for the first national consumer protection rules on payday loans and other short-term, high-interest loans. I will vote to defend the Bureau's work protecting students from high-interest-rate loans and creating a uniform set of borrower rights and protections for all student loans, public or private. If we really want a stable, predictable business environment, we wouldn't be going down this path.

At the end of the day, again, the proposition is very straightforward. If you support consumer protection, you will vote ''no'' on this legislation. If you oppose consumer protection, you will vote ''yes.'' But I entreat you, I plead with you, to please vote ''no.''

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds to encourage the gentleman from Washington to read section 1017 of the Dodd-Frank Act, and he would discover that the CFPB is funded by the Federal Reserve, which happens to be taxpayer money.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), the vice chairman of our Housing and Insurance Subcommittee.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues have done a good job of listing some of the problems of CFPB. I would like to give you an example of some of the overreach of this new agency already.

A small community bank in my district, they purchased a small lending company. With that lending company comes the lease of the building that they are operating their office out of. The CFPB comes in and says the lease is $300 per month over the course of 9 months over what the rate should be for that area. They go in and tell the bank that they are going to fine them $107,000 for this lease, which is nothing the bank made. It doesn't impact consumers, yet they are fined $107,000. The bank eventually settles for $80—plus $30,000 in attorneys' fees.

Mr. Chairman, this is an example already of this new agency's overreach. It has got to stop. H.R. 3193 does that. I urge support for that bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I am waiting for additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), the chairman of our Capital Markets and GSE Subcommittee.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Financial Protection claims unlimited power to define and regulate every conceivable financial transaction in the country, and yet it claims to be unaccountable to no one. So I find it disturbing that the Bureau collects private credit card data on Americans and does so without the knowledge of those Americans. Its effort is so vast that the Bureau collects information on over 990 million credit card accounts.

According to Dr. Thomas Stratmann, Professor of Economics and Law at George Mason University:

> There are costs and potential harms to collecting and maintaining massive databases of personal financial information; including the potential for abuse, or violation of consumer privacy, and security concerns in the event of a data breach.

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau believes that actions must go unquestioned, and now it wants your credit card information, too. This legislation before us protects citizens by protecting and prohibiting the Bureau from collecting Americans' nonpublic personal financial information without first receiving the express permission of the consumer.

I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to respect the financial privacy of all Americans and support this legislation.

Ms. WATERS. I continue to reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased now to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the chairman of the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I appreciate my colleagues for their leadership on this important legislation.

I rise in support of it to bring some balance to an otherwise unaccountable bureaucratic agency, perhaps the most powerful agency in government with the least amount of public accountability. It has no accountability to the administration, very little to Congress, and even less to the American people. As a result, it should come as no surprise that this Bureau has operated with less transparency and less concern for fiscal discipline than even a very low bar and low standard we hold for our Federal tax dollars.

Due to this lack of accountability, certain expenditures have been called into question; in fact, their building expenditures, which is a beautiful release of a $150 million plan to renovate a building that they are leasing. Now, it is a very rare thing and pretty silly in real estate to do an enormous upfit for a building that costs $153 million—that is the appraised value—and to put $150 million at $461 a square foot into that building. It makes no sense unless you understand that these are your tax dollars at work to build luxury a couple of blocks from the White House.

These buildings are just another example of why this agency needs to be held accountable to not just the American people and the taxpayers, but to the taxpaying public and those of us who care about having access to good financial products while protecting.

So that is why I support this legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am now happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT), the vice chairman of our Capital Markets and GSE Subcommittee.

Mr. HURT. I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue. I thank him for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the Consumer Financial Freedom and Washington Accountability Act.

As I travel across our Virginia's Fifth District, I continue to hear troubling stories about the impacts of the CFPB. I have heard from consumers, community banks, and credit unions about how the unchecked authority of the CFPB is restricting consumer choice, creating an atmosphere of economic uncertainty, and increasing costs.

Real consumer protection requires that we shift power from Washington bureaucrats to American consumers by providing access to competitive markets with choice, information, and accountability. This bill would help achieve that goal by adding much-needed oversight and transparency to this far-reaching new government agency without weakening consumer protection.

These bipartisan checks and balances will protect our community banks and credit unions who play a critical role in providing capital to our small businesses and working families. At a time when too many Americans remain out of work, it is critical that we continue to support policies that will help restore certainty to the marketplace, create jobs, and protect our consumers.

I urge support of this good bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), the chief deputy whip who also serves on the Financial Services Committee and is cochair of the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, let me thank our ranking member for the time.

I urge a ''no'' vote on H.R. 3193 today. It is a bad bill, and it is bad for consumers, bad for Americans.

As I listened to my colleagues, one of them mentioned the CFPB offers uncertainty. Well, here is some certainty for you. You cannot cheat consumers. That is certainty enough for me. Another one said, well, you know, the CFPB doesn't offer choice. Here is a choice. You can offer any product that is fair and transparent to consumers.

That is exactly what my friends on the other side of the aisle object to. They don't want average Americans to be able to get a financial services product that is fair, that is balanced, and that makes sense in the marketplace.

You have nothing to fear from the CFPB if you do not offer a product that is designed to bilk consumers. If you do, I can see why you might be quite upset at the activity of the CFPB.

The bottom line is this is a bad bill. It will set our country back, and in fact, I believe consumer protection is at the very heart of the recession that we just went through.

Now, of course, we have heard ad nauseam that it was the housing goals and it was the other sort of measures that caused the recession, but the fact is the recession was caused because large numbers of home buyers were bilked into mortgages that they couldn't afford, that were difficult to understand, with high pressure tactics and were incentivized, even to be guided and steered to products that were more high cost than the ones they qualified for.

Then we packaged these things into mortgage-backed securities that were unsound to begin with. The rating agencies said they were fine, took out a form of insurance on them, and then when the house of cards fell, the whole economy went with it.

Consumer protection is at the heart of the problem. Consumer protection is the solution to this problem, and so this effort to undermine the CFPB today under the guise of H.R. 3193 is wrong.

Mr. Chair, we are at a whose side are you on moment. Are you on the side of Mom and Pop, of the small business owner, of the consumer trying to get a house loan or other form of credit? Or are you on someone else's side who is not in favor of a fair product?

I have said to my community bankers, look, your opponents before the crash didn't have the regulator; now, everyone has one. The CFPB offers a level playing field for all. Now everybody offering mortgage products has a degree of accountability. This is good for the financial services sector, not bad.

Since the CFPB was created following the financial crisis, it has received, Mr. Chair, more than 250,000 consumer complaints. Mr. Chair, who are these 250,000 complaints supposed to be directed to but for an agency that is responsive to them? Who would my friends on the other side of the aisle have these people go to to try to get their problems solved? We know that they weren't being listened to before the CFPB.

Now that the CFPB exists, a quarter of a million complaints and untold numbers of complainants have come forward to say, Please help me. Half of these complaints have been in the mortgage servicing area alone. Of the 3,135 complaints from my own State of Minnesota, 1,320 have been related to mortgage issues. This bill threatens to turn off access to these consumers, and I will not stand silently by while they do this.

This is a bad bill.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

□ 1630

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, this is a bad bill. Among the CFPB's many accomplishments, they have refunded more than $3 billion—billion with a ''b''—to more than 9 million consumers. That is good fiscal stewardship.

Now, the CFPB oversees industries that previously were not regulated by the Federal government, including credit reporting agencies, nonbank mortgage providers, debt collection agencies and payday lenders. All of that consumer protection would end if this bad piece of legislation were to pass.

Say no, resoundingly. Vote ''no'' on this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Consumer Financial Freedom and Washington Accountability Act. I thank Congressman DUFFY and Chairman HENSARLING for their leadership on this issue.

The CFPB is disgracefully unaccountable to the American people. Richard Cordray and future directors of the Bureau are virtually unchecked by Congress and the President.

We have seen what happens when bureaucrats so powerful are left so unaccountable. In its 3 short years, the CFPB has burned through its budgets and riffled through the private financial data of millions of Americans.

Hoosiers deserve consumer protections, but they also deserve integrity and accountability. After talking with families, small businesses, community banks, and credit unions back home, I am proud to support the commonsense reforms before the House today.

Let's replace the CFPB's Director with a five-member commission to ensure healthy discussion and bring more seats to the table. Let's rein in the CFPB's budget so that the Members of Congress from both parties can protect their constituents. Let's prohibit government bureaucrats from using private personal information without the consumers' consent.

Mr. Chairman, let's protect and empower American consumers, not Washington bureaucrats.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire whether the gentlelady has any more speakers?

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, we have one speaker on the way.

Mr. HENSARLING. We have plenty of speakers here, Mr. Chairman. I would be glad to lend the gentlelady a few if she needs some people to speak.

Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3193 which, amongst many other things, replaces the single Director with a five-member commission.

I would remind my friends across the aisle that this brings the bill into the original spirit of Dodd-Frank, which, when it left this House several years ago, had eventually a five-member commission. All we are trying to do is get back to that original intention.

Further, during the discussions in committee, we focused on the membership of that commission and how it would be a decent idea to have people who are on the commission who actually knew something about the industries that they were regulating.

For example, the CFPB regulates insured banks, non-depository financial institutions, credit unions, all of which are very unique. Wouldn't it be nice to actually have folks regulating those industries who knew something about them?

This is not rare in the world of regulation. The FDIC, which oversees State banks, has been required to have someone on its commission for years who actually has experience regulating State banks. It has not been a problem for the FDIC, and it would not be a problem for the CFPB.

We need to pass this bill for a variety of reasons but, first and foremost, we need to replace the single Director with a five-man commission, and for that, I hope that we pass the bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member.

I only rise for one simple point, and that is to correct the RECORD when it comes to this claim that the CFPB engages in massive, excessive data collection of consumers' information. It is not true.

Anyone listening to this debate, Mr. Chairman, should know that the CFPB does not monitor the accounts of particular consumers and does not track the financial behavior or activities of any individual customer.

The CFPB is already prohibited by law from collecting personally identifiable information in the course of its market-monitoring responsibility. Although the Bureau does collect certain information as part of its responsibility to identify and monitor market trends and proactively address emerging consumer credit issues, this information is deliberately depersonalized and aggregated to ensure consumers' sensitive information is protected.

Now, this is critically important because speaker after speaker is trying to scare consumers into believing that somebody is looking at their personal data. It is not true. It is not true, and I think it is important for people listening to this debate to know that.

Requiring the Bureau to seek consent on an individual level in order for it to access aggregated or anonymous data is not only a hindrance to the CFPB's core mission of regulating the entities that offer consumer financial products or services, but it is a burdensome requirement and, of course, intended simply to slow down, gum up, undermine, and break down the institution itself.

It is not true. People's data is safe. Looking for aggregate trends and proactively addressing emerging problems, as would have been very helpful as we got closer to the financial foreclosure crisis just a few years ago, is what the CFPB is doing.

It is doing what it is supposed to do. It is doing it well, and I don't know why any fair-minded person would be against that.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that the CFPB is building a database containing full credit report data on 53 million borrowers who took out mortgages since 1998. The project manager said: "It is easy to reverse-engineer and identify the people in our database."

CFPB has a credit card database of at least 991 million credit cards and approximately 136 million Americans. The Bureau is collecting a database of credit reports on 8.6 million Americans. They continue to collect personalized data from Americans without their permission. It is unacceptable.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is one of the largest Federal undertakings in recent history, created by Congress yet unaccountable to Congress. One man is tasked with oversight of essentially the entire financial services industry.

Director Cordray works hard for consumers, but no single individual can have sufficient expertise to make determinations that impact low-income families, community banks, mortgage lending, auto lending, credit card users and students.

A real estate lawyer in my district who represents clients who specialize in lending to low-income people, whose clients have a foreclosure rate of less than 5 percent, commented:

> The only way these folks can own a home is to finance the purchase from an unconventional source. My clients get financial information from the prospective buyers relating to their ability to pay, but it does not meet the thresholds established to qualify as a Qualified Mortgage.

This year, that lawyer advised all his clients to discontinue lending. This is the same story we are receiving from our community banks.

These are the results of an unaccountable agency with insular focus. H.R. 3193 would bring much-needed accountability and ensure that enough experts are at the decision table that American families are actually protected by Federal regulations, not harmed by unintended consequences, a situation we have seen all too often in recent months.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the chairman for yielding me time. I particularly want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) for his leadership on this important issue and for standing up on behalf of hardworking American families.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3193 and urge its passage by this House.

The Financial Services Committee has, on multiple occasions, asked the question "Who protects consumers from the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection?"

Unfortunately, the answer for the last 3½ years has been nobody. Today, this House has an opportunity to change that.

The underlying bill includes a number of provisions to ensure that the very basic principles of good government apply to the Bureau, and it puts an end to the special treatment granted to the Bureau under Dodd-Frank.

These are commonsense, pro-consumer provisions that will help protect hardworking American families and taxpayers from yet another Washington bureaucracy that thinks it knows what is in their best interest.

I urge the passage of this bill.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, this legislation is about holding Washington accountable. The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection is one of the most powerful and unaccountable agencies in the entire Federal Government. Unfortunately, the Bureau reaches deeply into the everyday lives of Kentuckians.

In following its partisan agenda, the Bureau makes it harder for small businesses on Main Street to get a loan to

grow their business. The Bureau makes it harder for families in Kentucky to obtain a mortgage to purchase a home, including for manufactured homes. The Bureau even makes it harder to get financing discounts that help Kentuckians purchase their car or truck.

The Bureau is so out of touch that it even regulates Bath County, in my district, one of the most rural counties in America, as ''non-rural.''

These concerns are not only voiced inside of Washington. Just last week I was in Powell County, and a small business owner raised his hand during my public event to talk about how the Bureau's rules are harming his ability to do business in his community.

This avalanche of red tape coming out of the Bureau is making life harder for millions of Americans, which is why we need to pass this legislation that will reform the Bureau in a way that reins in the misguided rules that stem from its partisan excesses and unaccountable culture.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Subcommittee on Government Operations.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished ranking member and my friend from California.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this latest Republican assault on the CFPB. It is truly baffling to see my colleagues' continued attempts to undermine the only Federal regulator created to protect American consumers.

Contrary to the talking points of the other side, this mash-up of bills will only burden the CFPB with more bureaucracy, not less. For example, the bill would replace the Director, who has been on the job for just 6 months, after the Senate Republicans held up his confirmation for 2 years, with a cumbersome five-person commission.

The bill also seeks to take the CFPB out of the Federal Reserve and make it subject to annual congressional appropriations. My Republican colleagues claim this is to provide tougher oversight, but that is a ruse. They have already stated they would defund CFPB altogether if they could.

As ranking member of the House Oversight Subcommittee on Government Operations, I firmly believe in accountability, but I would note that Director Cordray has been before this Congress 46 times since CFPB was created. I would call that pretty responsive oversight.

After the 2008 Wall Street meltdown, safeguarding our financial system ought to be a primary concern, but this bill would, once again, place the interest of banks over those of consumers. As we saw during the financial crisis, innovation led to a wave of untested and sophisticated financial products, allowing dishonest actors to take advantage of many Americans.

Dodd-Frank, which my Republican friends fought against tooth-and-nail, remains Congress' sole substantive response to the greatest financial meltdown since the Great Depression.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle found it necessary not only to fight against any attempt at regulating Wall Street, but waged much of the battle against the CFPB itself. Republicans in the Senate waged a 700-day battle to prevent a confirmation of CFPB's Director—700 days.

In just a short amount of time, since his confirmation, CFPB has become an effective champion for all Americans. It has fielded more than 280,000 consumer complaints.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WATERS. I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNOLLY. This bill is a bad idea. It is an anti-consumer bill. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

□ 1545

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, much more accountability and transparency is needed in Washington, especially at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

The Bureau wields broad and unchecked power over our economy, from banks to businesses to anyone who uses credit or payment plans. Abuses of that power, enabled by a lack of accountability and transparency, harms families and businesses up and down Main Streets in Pennsylvania and across the Nation.

That is why I rise today in strong support of the Consumer Financial Freedom and Washington Accountability Act. Importantly, this commonsense legislation better protects consumers by prohibiting the Bureau from using personal and private financial information without their knowledge and consent.

It also makes the Bureau subject to the regular authorization and appropriations process. This increases the American people's ability to demand accountability through their elected representatives.

The legislation will also replace a single and unaccountable director with a bipartisan five-member commission and establish more reasonable thresholds for reviewing and repealing regulations.

These changes will help rein in the regulatory overreach coming from Washington, D.C., elites. It will ensure a diversity of viewpoints is represented whenever the Bureau makes decisions that will directly impact families and businesses across the Nation.

These very reasonable reforms will protect consumers and our Nation's financial system by providing for more rigorous oversight of the powerful and unaccountable Bureau.

I urge my colleagues to support this good-government legislation.

Ms. WATERS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am now especially pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), who is the vice chairman of our Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee and the chief author of the legislation of which we debate today.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for all the work that he has put in on this consumer financial protection reform bill. This is really a bill about accountability and transparency.

As has been discussed today, the CFPB is collecting information on almost 1 billion credit cards—1 billion credit cards—which means if you are an American and you have a credit card, the CFPB is collecting and monitoring your transactions.

So what we have done is said: Listen, if you are here to protect a consumer, why don't you ask the consumer for permission and consent to take their information?

If we care about the American citizenry—if we care about consumers and don't care about Big Government and the information they have on us, let's give them the power. Let's ask them. That is all we do. Empower the American citizenry.

Again, let's empower Congress and the American people as well. When we don't fund agencies through this institution, we lose authority; we lose oversight.

Let's take that power and control back into Congress, and let's actually put the power back in the hands of the people; but if you empower the Fed to fund this agency, you have taken the control away from this institution. That is wrong.

One of the most important reform parts of this bill is meaningful to me because I come from rural America; and the way that the law is structured is that if a bad rule comes from the CFPB, it can be overturned.

You can go to FSOC and say: Listen, this rule is going to create systemic risk; meaning, it is going to have a negative impact on our economy. It should be overturned.

Now think about what kind of financial institutions can go to FSOC and say: This rule is bad; overturn it.

Is it the small community bank? Is it the credit union in rural America? Heck, no. But if you are a big Wall Street bank, you have been given a voice in the way my friends across the aisle have structured this law.

Big banks on Wall Street who created the crisis are given a voice to have rules from the CFPB overturned, but you have left the small banks and credit unions in my district voiceless to say: this rule is going to hurt us.

That is wrong.

Listen, we want to talk about protecting consumers, giving a voice to consumers, making sure Big Government isn't breathing down their backs.

Want to know who protects consumers and finance? Our credit unions,

our small community banks. And guess what? The Credit Union National Association, they endorse and support our bill. The National Association of Federal Credit Unions endorsed and support this bill. The Independent Community Bankers endorsed and support this bill.

This is the right thing to do. Let's empower Congress and empower the American people. Let's reform the CFPB and actually make it work.

Ms. WATERS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman HENSARLING for the time and for allowing me to speak on this important issue; and I also thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) for his the leadership on this legislation.

This legislation is absolutely necessary to bring pragmatic reforms to CFPB. The CFPB needs transparency. It needs accountability. It needs privacy reforms.

The first main goal of this legislation is to replace the single all-powerful director with a five-person independent commission. This will allow for a healthy debate and to bring rules and regulations that are proposed at this agency.

It would put CFPB on a regular budgetary cycle with annual appropriations. This will shield the very American taxpayer from wasteful spending and allow Congress the proper oversight that this agency absolutely needs.

One of the key provisions of this bill prohibits CFPB from accessing, collecting, and analyzing the American people's personal financial data without their express permission.

In the wake of the regulation tsunami coming from D.C., it is time that Congress exercise its authority to help rein in government bureaucrats and help provide the clarity to business owners across the country.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. WATERS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3193.

I am an automobile dealer, and my family has been in the business for 63 years.

CFPB is kind of interesting because what we have done now, we have absolutely abandoned the rulemaking process, and we have gone to another type of influencing people; and the relationship that car dealers have with their customers is sometimes to navigate a very difficult financial system to get their loans arranged.

But no, we want to do it a different way. We want to do it with guidance. Here is the way it kind of works. It is like the policeman walking his beat and pulling out his billy club and tapping it on his hand and saying: I strongly suggest you follow my guidance.

There is no oversight on this. This group of people are going to make decisions by not even consulting us, the people. We do represent the people, and I would like to think that we can come together once in a while to do what is in the best interest of the people that we represent, not a Republican issue, not a Democratic issue, but an American issue.

We have to do these things. Again, strong suggestions that you follow my guidance, as opposed to letting people sit down and negotiate themselves, that is not the way the American system works.

It never has, never will. It never should have happened. CFPB should have never come to the light of day.

Ms. WATERS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to, once again, reiterate my strong opposition to this harmful legislation which will weaken the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, an agency created to protect consumers and defend them against bad actors and practices throughout our financial system.

Just in case we are losing sight of what this Bureau is all about, we have many citizens out there who are the victims of false advertising. People advertise something. They advertise a price. They advertise a product. They go to buy the product. It is not there. It costs more money.

Debt collectors, how many of our citizens have been harassed by debt collectors, calling them in the middle of the night, asking for information, and charging them with things they have never been involved in?

Don't forget those payday loans. Poor people run out of money, go to a payday lender, get charged 500 percent for a payday loan.

What about those private postsecondary schools where all of those students who are trying to get an education are forced into getting loans, are encouraged to get loans, get ripped off, don't learn anything, can't get a job?

What about those mortgage lenders who tricked all of those people into mortgage loans and they end up losing their homes? What about discrimination against the aged? What about what they did to our good men and women who served in different branches of the military for all of us and got ripped off by payday lenders?

This is what the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is all about. I don't know how anyone could think that we shouldn't have protection for our consumers. Our consumers are finding out that, finally, we have something.

They are calling our telephone number, (855) 411–2372, to get some help. They are going to our Web site, www.consumerfinance.gov. Over 289,000 citizens have gone to this www.consumerfinance.gov Web site. They have called this telephone number, (855) 411–2372, because, finally, they have a bureau that is paying attention to all of the rip-offs, all of the fraudulent advertising, all of the overcharging of fees, all of what they did not have protection from in the past.

We realized, at some point in time, that all of our regulatory agencies that were supposed to be paying attention were not. Now, we have protection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

To protect consumers, you first need to make sure they have the power to consume; and under the Obama administration economic policies, tens of millions of our fellow citizens are either unemployed or underemployed. They don't have the income to consume. That is not consumer protection.

Part of the problem is the CFPB because true consumer protection, Mr. Chairman, empowers consumers in innovative, transparent, competitive markets; and it respects the intelligence and the dignity of the American citizen; and it preserves their economic liberty to choose the mortgages, the credit cards, and, yes, even the payday loans that they choose to consume.

But instead, Mr. Chairman, many of my friends on the other side of the aisle would love to take away ''In God we trust'' and put up there ''In government we trust.''

The American people are tired of unaccountable, arrogant Washington bureaucrats, the unaccountable, the unelected who are taking away their homeownership opportunities, taking away their credit cards, and insulting them by saying: I am from Washington. I am smarter than you. I am better than you. I know what is best.

It is time for us to pass the Consumer Financial Freedom and Washington Accountability Act; and I particularly thank Messrs. DUFFY, BACHUS, and NEUGEBAUER for authoring this key piece of legislation. I urge its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chair, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), which is a cornerstone of the Dodd-Frank Act, has already proven invaluable in ensuring that financial products offered to American consumers comply with federal law and are not abusive or misleading.

The CFPB has brought transparency, accountability and clarity to our markets.

Because of the CFPB's work, our residential mortgage lending system is now governed by standards that cap the points and fees a lender may charge, limit risky loan products, and prohibit loans with terms longer than 30 years.

CFPB has also enacted new rules to end the abuses in the mortgage servicing process that were so common before the financial crisis. These rules require servicers to credit payments the day they are received and to respond to customer inquiries in a timely manner.

They also limit ''dual tracking'' to ensure borrowers are not foreclosed on while they wait to see if they qualify for a loan modification.

And through its enforcement actions, CFPB has already recovered approximately $3 billion for consumers who have been the victims of abuse. As of this month, the CFPB has received and is processing more than nine thousand complaints from residents of Maryland alone.

Unfortunately, rather than ensuring the CFPB has all of the resources it needs to help consumers, Republicans in the House have routinely sought to undermine the CFPB and the bill before us today simply continues that attack.

The only way to protect our constituents from entities that would take advantage of them is to vote against this bill and oppose all efforts to roll back the consumer protections enacted in the Dodd-Frank legislation.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to the Consumer Financial Protection Safety and Soundness Improvement Act, H.R. 3193.

As designed by Dodd-Frank, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—CFPB—is the only agency whose final rules can be overruled by a vote of other financial regulators.

This was explicitly included in Dodd-Frank to ensure that CFPB guidelines do not unduly jeopardize the safe functioning of the U.S. financial system.

However, the inaptly named H.R. 3193 is yet another transparent attempt by Members of the majority to weaken the authority of the only federal agency responsible for protecting consumers in their financial dealings.

If enacted, H.R. 3193 would not only broaden the ability to overturn CFPB rules, but would also lower the threshold required to do so.

This would make it more difficult for the CFPB to meet its mission of creating and enforcing federal consumer financial laws, and would be a significant step backward in the effort to improve oversight and supervision of our nation's financial institutions.

It is repugnant to me that after millions of Americans had their financial security imperiled by the predatory practices of mortgage lenders, originators and servicers, that Members of this House would consider this bill designed to weaken the one financial regulator focused on returning temperance to deals where there was once greed, and prudence to markets where there was previously ''irrational exuberance.''

I urge my colleagues to stand up for the American people by voting ''no'' on H.R. 3193.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, H.R. 3193 is a clear attempt to undermine the independence and effectiveness of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. As such, I oppose passage of this legislation.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) was created by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Bill in response to widespread market abuses that helped precipitate the financial crisis and is the first ever independent watchdog charged with the sole task of protecting the financial lives of America's families. Since its inception, the CFPB has handled nearly 270,000 consumer complaints and secured more than $3 billion in relief for almost 10 million consumers through enforcement actions against bad actors who were violating the law. It has established important oversight for industries ranging from payday lenders to debt collectors to credit reporting agencies. And it has generally received high marks from industry leaders and consumer advocates alike for the openness and evenhandedness of its operations. Not surprisingly, the Senate confirmed the CFPB's first director Richard Cordray by a bipartisan vote of 66–34 in the summer of last year.

Rather than building on this track record of success, H.R. 3193 would weaken the CFPB by bureaucratizing its structure, placing additional constraints on its operations, slashing its funding and subjecting that funding to the political pressures of the annual appropriations process. If the majority really believed the annual appropriations process was necessary to ensure the proper oversight of our federal banking regulators, this legislation would be recommending similar treatment for the Federal Reserve, or the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. It doesn't—which tells you all you need to know about the consistency of the conviction underlying this bill.

In my judgment, the CFPB is succeeding at its job of protecting consumers in a fair and transparent marketplace. Accordingly, I urge a no vote.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I would like to express my opposition to H.R. 3193, the Consumer Financial Protection Safety and Soundness Improvement Act of 2013. This legislation would strip essential mandates from an agency that was created to protect consumers from risky practices that caused the financial crisis.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) has successfully refunded over $3 billion to consumers who were financially harmed by deceptive practices. The vital protections the CFPB provides must not be overlooked; without its oversight, consumers will be exposed to greater risk in financial markets.

Since its creation in 2011, the CFPB has collected over $80 million in civil penalties from financial institutions that harmed consumers. They also have handled more than 269,900 complaints from consumers. Thirty million consumers would not be subject to federal protections from improper debt collections if the CFPB did not exist.

Additionally, without the presence of the CFPB, twelve million consumers that use pay day lending would not be protected by federal supervision, and 200 million consumer credit reports would not be protected from unscrupulous behavior. The CFPB should be applauded for its efforts to end harmful practices in the marketplace. Rather than abrogate this successful agency, the CFPB should retain its current structure and mandate so that it can continue to be an exemplary model for other bank regulators.

The CHAIR. 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 113–36 modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 113–350. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 3193

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 ''Consumer Financial Freedom and Washington Accountability Act''.

SEC. 2. FINANCIAL PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 1011 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5491) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 1011. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FINANCIAL PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an independent commission to be known as the 'Financial Product Safety Commission' (hereinafter referred to in this section as the 'Commission'), which shall regulate the offering and provision of consumer financial products or services under the Federal consumer financial laws. The Commission shall be considered an Executive agency, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code. Except as otherwise provided expressly by law, all Federal laws dealing with public or Federal contracts, property, works, officers, employees, budgets, or funds, including the provisions of chapters 5 and 7 of title 5, shall apply to the exercise of the powers of the Commission.

''(b) AUTHORITY TO PRESCRIBE REGULATIONS.—The Commission may prescribe such regulations and issue such orders in accordance with this title as the Commission may determine to be necessary for carrying out this title and all other laws within the Commission's jurisdiction and shall exercise any authorities granted under this title and all other laws within the Commission's jurisdiction.

''(c) COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of the Vice Chairman for Supervision of the Federal Reserve System and 4 additional members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among individuals who—

''(A) are citizens of the United States; and

''(B) have strong competencies and experiences related to consumer financial protection.

''(2) STAGGERING.—The members of the Commission appointed under paragraph (1) shall serve staggered terms, which initially shall be established by the President for terms of 1, 2, 4, and 5 years, respectively.

''(3) TERMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each member of the Commission appointed under paragraph (1), including the Chair, shall serve for a term of 5 years.

''(B) REMOVAL.—The President may remove any member of the Commission appointed under paragraph (1).

''(C) VACANCIES.—Any member of the Commission appointed under paragraph (1) appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term to which that member's predecessor was appointed (including the Chair) shall be appointed only for the remainder of the term.

''(D) CONTINUATION OF SERVICE.—Each member of the Commission appointed under paragraph (1) may continue to serve after the expiration of the term of office to which that member was appointed until a successor has been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, except that a member may not continue to serve more than 1 year after the date on which that member's term would otherwise expire.

''(E) OTHER EMPLOYMENT PROHIBITED.—No member of the Commission appointed under paragraph (1) shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

''(d) AFFILIATION.—With respect to members appointed pursuant to subsection (c)(1), not more than 2 shall be members of any one political party.

''(e) CHAIR OF THE COMMISSION.—

''(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Chair of the Commission shall be appointed by the President from among the members of the Commission appointed under subsection (c)(1).

''(2) AUTHORITY.—The Chair shall be the principal executive officer of the Commission, and shall exercise all of the executive and administrative functions of the Commission, including with respect to—

''(A) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed under the Commission (other than personnel employed regularly and full time in the immediate offices of members of the Commission other than the Chair);

''(B) the distribution of business among personnel appointed and supervised by the Chair and among administrative units of the Commission; and

''(C) the use and expenditure of funds.

''(3) LIMITATION.—In carrying out any of the Chair's functions under the provisions of this subsection the Chair shall be governed by general policies of the Commission and by such regulatory decisions, findings, and determinations as the Commission may by law be authorized to make.

''(4) REQUESTS OR ESTIMATES RELATED TO APPROPRIATIONS.—Requests or estimates for regular, supplemental, or deficiency appropriations on behalf of the Commission may not be submitted by the Chair without the prior approval of the Commission.

''(f) NO IMPAIRMENT BY REASON OF VACANCIES.—No vacancy in the members of the Commission shall impair the right of the remaining members of the Commission to exercise all the powers of the Commission. Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that if there are only 3 members serving on the Commission because of vacancies in the Commission, 2 members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. If there are only 2 members serving on the Commission because of vacancies in the Commission, 2 members shall constitute a quorum for the 6-month period beginning on the date of the vacancy which caused the number of Commission members to decline to 2.

''(g) SEAL.—The Commission shall have an official seal.

''(h) COMPENSATION.—

''(1) CHAIR.—The Chair shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level I of the Executive Schedule under section 5313 of title 5, United States Code.

''(2) OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION.—The 3 other members of the Commission appointed under subsection (c)(1) shall each receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

''(i) INITIAL QUORUM ESTABLISHED.—During any time period prior to the confirmation of at least two members of the Commission, one member of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Following the confirmation of at least 2 additional commissioners, the quorum requirements of subsection (f) shall apply.

''(j) OFFICES.—The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia. The Commission may establish regional offices of the Commission in order to carry out the responsibilities assigned to the Commission under the Federal consumer financial laws.''.

(b) BRINGING THE COMMISSION INTO THE REGULAR APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.—Section 1017 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5497) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending the heading of such subsection to read as follows: ''BUDGET, FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, AND AUDIT.—'';

(B) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(D) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F) of paragraph (1), as so redesignated;

(2) by striking subsections (b) and (c);

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (c), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) and inserting the following:

''(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $300,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2014 and 2015.''; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

(c) ENSURING THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE COMMISSION.—The Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 is amended—

(1) in section 1012(c), (12 U.S.C. 5492 (c)) by striking paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5); and

(2) in section 1014(b), (12 U.S.C. 5494(b)) by striking ''Not fewer than 6 members shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the regional Federal Reserve Bank Presidents, on a rotating basis.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION ACT OF 2010.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subparagraph (B), the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is amended—

(i) by striking ''Director of the'' each place such term appears, other than where such term is used to refer to a Director other than the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection;

(ii) by striking ''Director'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Financial Product Safety Commission'', other than where such term is used to refer to a Director other than the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection; and

(iii) in section 1002 (12 U.S.C. 5481), by striking paragraph (10).

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 is amended—

(i) in section 1012(c)(4) (12 U.S.C. 5492 (c) (4)), by striking ''Director'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Financial Product Safety Commission'';

(ii) in section 1013(c)(3) (12 U.S.C. 5493 (c) (3))—

(I) by striking ''Assistant Director of the Bureau for'' and inserting ''Head of the Office of''; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''Assistant Director'' and inserting ''Head of the Office'';

(iii) in section 1013(g)(2) (12 U.S.C. 5493(g)(2))—

(I) by striking ''ASSISTANT DIRECTOR'' and inserting ''HEAD OF THE OFFICE''; and

(II) by striking ''an assistant director'' and inserting ''a Head of the Office of Financial Protection for Older Americans'';

(iv) in section 1016(a) (12 U.S.C. 5496(a)), by striking ''Director of the Bureau'' and inserting ''Chair of the Commission''; and

(v) in section 1066(a) (12 U.S.C. 5586(a)), by striking ''Director of the Bureau is'' and inserting ''first member of the Commission is''.

(2) DODD-FRANK WALL STREET REFORM AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT.—The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in the table of contents for such Act by amending the item relating to section 1011 to read as follows:

''Sec. 1011. Establishment of the Financial Product Safety Commission.'';

(B) in section 111(b)(1)(D) (12 U.S.C. 5321(b)(1)(D)), by striking ''Director'' and inserting ''Chair of the Financial Product Safety Commission''; and

(C) in section 1447 (12 U.S.C. 1701p-2), by striking ''Director of the Bureau'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Financial Product Safety Commission''.

(3) ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER ACT.—Section 920(a)(4)(C) of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693o–2(a)(4)(C)), as added by section 1075(a)(2) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, is amended by striking ''Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection'' and inserting ''Financial Product Safety Commission''.

(4) EXPEDITED FUNDS AVAILABILITY ACT.—The Expedited Funds Availability Act (12 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), as amended by section 1086 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, is amended by striking ''Director of the Bureau'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Financial Product Safety Commission''.

(5) FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT.—Section 2 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1812), as amended by section 336(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended by striking ''Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Chair of the Financial Product Safety Commission''.

(6) FEDERAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION COUNCIL ACT OF 1978.—Section 1004(a)(4) of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3303(a)(4)), as amended by section 1091 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, is amended by striking ''Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau'' and inserting ''Chair of the Financial Product Safety Commission''.

(7) FINANCIAL LITERACY AND EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT.—Section 513 of the Financial Literacy and Education Improvement Act (20 U.S.C. 9702), as amended by section 1013(d)(5) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, is amended by striking ''Director'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Chair of the Commission''.

(8) HOME MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1975.—Section 307 of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2806), as amended by section 1094(6) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, is amended by striking ''Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Financial Product Safety Commission''.

(9) INTERSTATE LAND SALES FULL DISCLOSURE ACT.—The Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act (15 U.S.C. 1701 et seq), as amended by section 1098A of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, is amended—

(A) by amending section 1402(1) (15 U.S.C. 1701(1)) to read as follows:

''(1) 'Chair' means the Chair of the Financial Product Safety Commission;''; and

(B) in section 1416(a) (15 U.S.C. 1715(a)), by striking ''Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection'' and inserting ''Chair''.

(10) REAL ESTATE SETTLEMENT PROCEDURES ACT OF 1974.—Section 5 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2604), as amended by section 1450 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, is amended—

(A) by striking ''The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Director')'' and inserting ''The Financial Product Safety Commission''; and

(B) by striking ''Director'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Financial Product Safety Commission''.

(11) S.A.F.E. MORTGAGE LICENSING ACT OF 2008.—The S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.), as amended by section 1100 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, is amended—

(A) by striking ''Director'' each place such term appears in headings and text, other than where such term is used in the context of the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, and

inserting ''Financial Product Safety Commission''; and

(B) in section 1503 (12 U.S.C. 5102), by striking paragraph (10).

(12) TITLE 44, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 3513(c) of title 44, United States Code, as amended by section 1100D(b) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, is amended by striking ''Director of the Bureau'' and inserting ''Financial Product Safety Commission''.

(e) DEEMING OF NAMES.—

(1) BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION.—Any reference in a law, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall be deemed a reference to the Financial Product Safety Commission.

(2) DIRECTOR.—Any reference in a law, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall be deemed a reference to the Chair of the Financial Product Safety Commission.

SEC. 3. RATE OF PAY FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE FINANCIAL PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1013(a)(2) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5493(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) COMPENSATION.—The rates of basic pay for all employees of the Financial Product Safety Commission shall be set and adjusted in accordance with the General Schedule set forth in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to service by an employee of the Financial Product Safety Commission following the 90-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. CONSUMER RIGHT TO FINANCIAL PRIVACY.

(a) REQUIREMENT OF THE FINANCIAL PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION TO OBTAIN PERMISSION BEFORE COLLECTING NONPUBLIC PERSONAL INFORMATION.—

(1) REQUIRED NOTIFICATION AND PERMISSION.—Section 1022(c)(9)(A) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5512(c)(9)(A)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''may not obtain from a covered person or service provider'' and inserting ''may not request, obtain, access, collect, use, retain, or disclose'';

(B) by striking ''personally identifiable financial'' and inserting ''nonpublic personal''; and

(C) by striking ''from the financial records'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''unless—

''(i) the Financial Product Safety Commission clearly and conspicuously discloses to the consumer, in writing or in an electronic form, what information will be requested, obtained, accessed, collected, used, retained, or disclosed; and

''(ii) before such information is requested, obtained, accessed, collected, used, retained, or disclosed, the consumer informs the Financial Product Safety Commission that such information may be requested, obtained, accessed, collected, used, retained, or disclosed.''.

(2) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENT TO CONTRACTORS OF THE FINANCIAL PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION.—Section 1022(c)(9)(B) of such Act (12 U.S.C. 5512(c)(9)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

''(B) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENT TO CONTRACTORS OF THE FINANCIAL PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION.—Subparagraph (A) shall apply to any person directed or engaged by the Financial Product Safety Commission to collect information to the extent such information is being collected on behalf of the Financial Product Safety Commission.''.

(3) DEFINITION OF NONPUBLIC PERSONAL INFORMATION.—Section 1022(c)(9) of such Act (12 U.S.C. 5512(c)(9)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) DEFINITION OF NONPUBLIC PERSONAL INFORMATION.—In this paragraph, the term 'nonpublic personal information' has the meaning given the term in section 509 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6809).''.

(b) REMOVAL OF EXEMPTION FOR THE FINANCIAL PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION FROM THE RIGHT TO FINANCIAL PRIVACY ACT.—Section 1113 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3413) is amended by striking subsection (r).

SEC. 5. CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) COUNCIL VOTING PROCEDURE.—Section 1023(c)(3)(A) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5513(c)(3)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''⅔'' and inserting ''a majority''; and

(2) by inserting before the period the following: '', excluding the Chair of the Financial Product Safety Commission''.

(b) REVIEW AUTHORITY OF THE COUNCIL.—Section 1023 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5513) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall''; and

(B) by striking ''regulation or provision would put the safety and soundness of the United States banking system or the stability of the financial system of the United States at risk'' and inserting ''regulation which is the subject of the petition is inconsistent with the safe and sound operations of United States financial institutions''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (3)(B)(ii), by striking ''would put the safety and soundness of the United States banking system or the stability of the financial system of the United States at risk'' and inserting ''is inconsistent with the safe and sound operations of United States financial institutions'';

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B);

(C) by striking paragraph (5); and

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (6), (7), and (8) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively.

(c) SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS CHECK.—Section 1022(b)(2)(A) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5512(b)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by adding ''and'' at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) the impact of such rule on the financial safety or soundness of an insured depository institution;''.

The 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 113–350. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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. RIGELL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 113–350.

Mr. RIGELL. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 6. ANALYSIS OF REGULATIONS.

Section 1022 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5512) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) ANALYSIS OF REGULATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each time the Commission proposes a new rule or regulation, the Commission shall—

''(A) carry out an initial regulatory flexibility analysis for such proposed rule or regulation, which shall be carried out as closely as possible to those initial regulatory flexibility analyses required under section 603 of title 5, United States Code, but which shall analyze the financial impact of the proposed rule or regulation on covered persons, regardless of size; and

''(B) carry out an analysis of whether the proposed rule or regulation will impair the ability of individuals and small businesses to have access to credit.

''(2) REPORT.—The Commission shall issue a report to the Council on each analysis carried out under paragraph (1), and make such analysis available to the public.

''(3) USE OF EXISTING RESOURCES.—The Commission shall use existing resources to carry out the requirements of this subsection.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 475, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend and colleague from Texas, Chairman HENSARLING, and all of those who worked on this underlying legislation, H.R. 3193.

My amendment strengthens that legislation, and I really respect how it was crafted, the legislation that underlies my amendment. It really is much needed.

□ 1600

My amendment is focused on one of the most critical ingredients that is necessary for those that are trying to start a new business or to grow an existing business, and that is access to credit. Now, I offer my amendment based on my own real-world experience. It is about 22 years ago that I started my business, and I was able to start it and to grow it and to say these wonderful words to so many fellow Americans in Virginia's Second Congressional District, ''You are hired.'' I was able to say those words because one of the ingredients I had available to me was access to credit.

I offer my amendment today based, as well, on the clear, united, and truly rational voice that is being articulated by Virginia's Second Congressional District, and that is that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is truly and irrefutably, in their view and in mine, damaging and harming their ability to have access to credit.

Common ground is something that I come to work every day seeking to advance. I am convinced, absolutely, that it is here and it can be found. In fact, this gridlock that we so often experience truly is hurting our country. But

as I listen to my colleagues so often on the other side—and I have been up here and had the privilege of serving in this institution 3 years—quite frankly, when I hear statements like we don't care about consumers, I take offense at this. And I have listened to it for 3 years, and I think that it does a disservice to this House and to the American people to continually claim that we don't care about the American consumer or that we don't care about the environment or the poor or the aged. Indeed we do. And this represents my best judgment, and the best judgment of so many, that this underlying legislation in my particular amendment would help consumers. I am convinced of this.

What my amendment does is it requires the Bureau to simply do this: to consider and to calculate in a very careful way exactly how the impact—the adverse impact that these regulations that are being put forth by this organization—would affect credit. Now, indeed, isn't this common ground? It is really common sense. Before you take any action to do something, you ought to take a moment to consider what that action might do in inhibiting individual Americans and businesses from accessing credit.

I think it is critical, too, that we look at the organization itself. This is an organization that is really outside of the scope of accountability that we really should be requiring of each and every agency in the Federal Government. It is largely outside the accountability and the influence of Congress. And this is quite striking: it is largely out of the influence of the President. In a unique way, and I think in a harmful way, it is largely outside of the accountability of the court system.

Look, common sense will just tell you that is not a good idea for any agency to be outside of accountability. Each Member here is accountable to our own district. The actions that have been taken by this organization already, sure, we can find a few that have been helpful and I think ought to continue—taking care of our military and making sure that businesses operate in an ethical manner—but, overwhelmingly, what we are seeing is this: that the sum of all things is it is hurting the American consumer, and it is hurting our ability of fellow Americans to access credit. That is why I urge support for the underlying legislation and my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MARCHANT). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I rise in opposition to this amendment, and I will take a moment just to respond to the gentleman from Virginia who seemed a little bit disturbed that we would claim that they do not care about consumers. The proof of the pudding is in the eating, sir, and because of the way that the Republicans have opposed the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the manner in which we have described today that you have attempted to dismantle this Bureau, the way that you have tried to deny it having a strong Director, for all of those reasons, it is absolutely clear that you do not wish to have a Bureau that protects our consumers.

And so when we make these charges, we make them because we have proof. We have the information, we have the actions, and we have all that you have done to demonstrate that you really don't want a Bureau to protect the consumers of this country.

The fact is that Americans want banks to be regulated in order to prevent the kind of economic catastrophe that we are recovering from to this day. Because Republicans haven't been able to repeal the Dodd-Frank Act, you have focused on making it impossible for the agencies to enact the rules required by the Wall Street reform bill. Your new strategy is to prevent our regulators from functioning by saddling them with burdensome and duplicative cost-benefit requirements.

Let's take a moment to talk about the cost of the financial crisis. The United States Department of the Treasury measured the cost of the financial crisis at $19.2 trillion in loss of household wealth and 8.8 million in lost jobs. Communities of color were hit particularly hard, losing over 50 percent of their household wealth. Millions of borrowers have been foreclosed upon, and millions more remain underwater and struggling to stay in their homes to this day.

A report by the Government Accountability Office on the cost-benefit analysis of the Dodd-Frank Act stated:

> If the cost of a future crisis is expected to be in the trillions of dollars, then the act likely would need to reduce the probability of a future financial crisis by only a small percent for its expected benefit to equal the act's expected cost.

Beyond all of this, this amendment is a solution in search of a problem. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is already required to perform cost-benefit analysis on its rules and evaluate impacts on small businesses. The CFPB has repeatedly demonstrated its commitment to minimizing the impact of its rules on small banking institutions and small businesses.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Chairman, tell me how much time is remaining, please.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlelady's remarks. I still hold the view that the sum of all things that I have heard in our district is that the Bureau is doing more harm than good.

I urge, again, my colleagues to vote for the underlying legislation and my amendment which would help protect individual Americans and businesses in their ability to seek credit, which is an essential part to keeping our economy growing and creating more jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a recorded vote.

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 2 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113–350.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chair, I offer my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 6. REPEAL OF EXCLUSIVE RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.

Section 1022(b) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5512(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (4).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 475, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, James Madison told us in the Federalist Papers:

> If men were angels, no government would be necessary. And if angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary.

And so as I look at this agency which lacks all the traditional measures for constitutional accountability, I am reminded by that insight. The Founding Fathers understood human nature, and they understood that people in positions of power will eventually, at some point, abuse that power. That is just inherent in the nature of man, and so they built a government to have checks and balances.

As I look at this consumer financial protection agency, I am wowed by the amount of power that has been invested in this: very limited executive accountability, the CFPB Director is essentially the financial czar of the country, and no budget oversight by Congress. I know we are trying to change that in this bill, but Madison said that the most effectual check that we have in Congress is the power of the purse.

There is this huge amount of deference in terms of what judicial review

is allowed to be done. The courts are instructed to defer to the CFPB. The problem with that is that there are a lot of novel concepts in this bill. Terms are introduced that don't necessarily have a definition in other regulatory history, and the CFPB is basically going to be given carte blanche to go forward on that. And when asked about some of these terms, the CFPB Director said, well, you kind of figure it out when you see it, and it is a puzzle that we are putting together.

Well, that is not acceptable, and I think the American people need to have recourse to the courts. So what my amendment does is it reinstitutes judicial review, and it removes this excessive deference that has been granted to the CFPB.

I hear reports about all this data that is being collected on American citizens—credit card transactions and debit card transactions, millions of these things are being done. Are we just supposed to say that the people should have no recourse in case that is abused? We are just supposed to trust the CFPB in terms of how they use that data?

The bottom line is you have an agency that is combining legislative power, executive power, and judicial power. That is contrary to our constitutional structure and contrary to the separation of powers doctrine, and I don't think most Americans have confidence that some far, distant Bureau should just be left to their own devices and that somehow they will be able to make all these decisions better for individual Americans than they can make for themselves.

So I urge the adoption of my amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was designed with one goal in mind: we were giving consumers a fair shake in the marketplace by making sure they finally had a regulator who was on their side. The CFPB is the only agency with the expertise and the mission to focus on developing trends in the consumer finance marketplace, identify abuses, and stop them before they lead borrowers into financial ruin.

Prior to the passage of the Dodd-Frank Act, consumer financial laws were supposed to be enforced by cooperation amongst all of the regulators. But as we now know all too well, safety and soundness concerns time and again trumped those of consumer protection, leading to the system where all of the regulators were responsible and none of them were accountable.

It was precisely this inattention to consumer protection that allowed the crisis to boil up under regulators' noses, leaving American families to foot the bill. Fortunately, Congress learned the lesson that strong protections for consumers are essential to maintaining a stable and sound economic foundation.

Upon passage of the Dodd-Frank Act, this House finally had put a cop on the beat with exclusive authority to issue sensible rules that protect every American. We are confident that the CFPB will continue to work diligently with prudential regulators to make sure their rules are consistent with the safe and sound operations of banks, ensuring that both rulemaking and enforcement authorities reside exclusively with the CFPB and will increase confidence in consumer markets and also ensure certainty for businesses and financial institutions.

Returning to the broken model that existed before the crisis just doesn't make good sense. So I would urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment. The notion that somehow we are just going to put all this trust in the CFPB and why you can't have the ability to go into court and have the courts review some of their actions to me just doesn't cut it. I would much rather err on the side of having protections for the American people from government agencies that have too much power than err on the side of giving the agency an excessive amount of power and just hoping that they exercise that in a prudent fashion.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment. I applaud the other Members who have been involved in crafting this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman and Members, we have had discussions with Members on the opposite side of the aisle about protection for our consumers. We have heard them tell us everything about people should have choices. They can go and hire their own lawyers, they can go into court. They can do all of these things. The fact of the matter is, government does have the responsibility to protect consumers. This is a government of laws and rules that we put together for businesses. We allow businesses to operate in certain ways, but we cannot allow them to run roughshod over consumers.

Like I said, prior to Dodd-Frank, that is, the reform, we had nobody looking out for consumers. We had our financial services agencies of government saying that their real job was for safety and soundness, not for consumer protection. So we have had news media, we have had nonprofit agencies, we have had groups getting together trying to address all of these abuses, all of these problems all by themselves. Well, guess what? Now we have a cop on the block. It is your government. This consumerfinance.gov Web site is there for all of our citizens. This telephone number, (855) 411–2372, is there for our consumers to call, and while you are calling the Bureau, call your elected officials also and ask them why they don't stand up for you, why they are on the floor of Congress advocating against your right to have protection from all of these kinds of abuses. Enough is enough.

Americans consumers are losing dollars every day because of crooks and schemes and thieves and on and on and on, and now you get rid of the very agency that would protect them from all of these schemes? I am so happy that we have reform. I am so happy that now the American people can rely on their government to come to their aid.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. WATERS. 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 Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113–350.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 6. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) ''The Congress acknowledges and honors the tremendous work of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection in protecting and providing relief to consumers from instances of unfair, deceptive, and abusive practices in financial markets.

(2) The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection has refunded over $3 billion to approximately 9.7 million victims of deceptive or abusive practices in financial markets since its inception.

(3) The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection has continued to engage with consumers, industry, Congress, and other regulators to promulgate rules making U.S. financial markets the fairest, safest, and most robust in the world.

(4) Changes to the current management, oversight, or funding of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection would undermine the mission of the Bureau.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Congress—

(1) acknowledges the meritorious work of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection; and

(2) supports the Bureau's ongoing mission by preserving the current management, oversight, and funding structure of the Bureau.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 475, the gentlewoman

from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward. It simply provides a sense of Congress that acknowledges the tremendous work done by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau as it was originally conceived in Dodd-Frank and how it has been operating to this point.

The agency, Mr. Chair, has refunded $3 billion to 9.7 million victims of unfair, deceptive, and abusive practices in financial markets. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has helped people, and fraud has been curtailed. The message has been sent to the next generation of financial hustlers that there is a dedicated cop on the beat in financial markets.

The singular and dedicated mission of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is to protect consumers of financial products from schemes, and it inspires trust in our markets that attracts capital and promotes allocations of that capital to productive, legitimate endeavors.

My amendment affirms that the current management, oversight, and funding source, as enshrined in Dodd-Frank, are the best way to preserve the integrity and independence of the agency, and to ensure that we don't return to the bad old days and bad old ways that put the ox in the ditch by creating the 2008 financial crisis and the $700 billion bailout.

Now, H.R. 3193 openly acknowledges that it would alter and neuter the agency's mission because H.R. 3193 would rename the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to the Financial Product Safety Commission, removing, Mr. Chairman, consumers from the equation, both in name and function. It would subject the agency's funding to protect consumers to the unwieldy appropriations process, sequester, defunding amendments, instead of the outside independent funding vis-a-vis these powerful financial institutions.

Now, whether intentional or not, Republicans, Mr. Chair, have shown their hand with the omission of consumers in H.R. 3193, and despite the euphemistic name of the bill as written, this bill would alter the mission and cripple the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau by focusing on protecting financial products rather than consumers. Whatever the intent, Mr. Chairman, consumers would be thrown under the bus by removing the cop from the Wall Street beat.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I find this to be a most curious amendment from the gentlelady from Wisconsin, and we do enjoy her participation on the committee, but it is a curious amendment because if it is accepted, and I believe the House is going to pass it, then it says the House is on record as saying we are going to do something but we just didn't feel really good about it. In other words, her amendment does nothing to the underlying bill except a sentiment that says we shouldn't have passed it in the first place. So it is a curious, curious amendment, Mr. Chairman.

I personally, and I don't think the House, want to be on record as saying that the CFPB has given us the fairest, safest, and most robust capital markets in the world. I have no doubt there are many good men and women who work there. They have done some important work. But fair? Fair, Mr. Chairman? An agency in the name of consumer protection that would deny one-third of current Black and Hispanic homeowners the opportunity to own a home? This is fair? It is just incredible.

We have brought this up several times in this debate, Mr. Chairman, and we hear crickets chirping on the other side of the aisle. Now if a private company did that, there would be riots in the street, but it is okay if government has a disparate impact on minorities. I don't know if that is fair. We have had testimony in our committee that literally half—half—of the mortgages today, according to CoreLogic, wouldn't qualify under the QM rule promulgated by the CFPB. I am not going to go on record saying that is fair; that it is somehow fair that half of Americans who otherwise would have qualified for a mortgage can no longer have it?

To say that somehow the current oversight is adequate to this agency, an agency that sets its own budget, an agency that is spending $145 million to renovate a $150 million building they don't even own, to give us a tree bosque, to give us granite water features? This is somehow a good use of the taxpayer money, a reflective carnelian granite water table, triple the renovation rate of class A luxury space in Washington?

If there was ever an agency, Mr. Chairman, that demands accountability to the American people, this is it. You do not protect consumers by taking away their rights, their freedoms, their ability to shop in competitive and transparent markets, and you do not protect them by taking away their income and spending it on a lavish palace for unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I always enjoy the chairman of the Financial Services Committee and his lavish explanations.

I just want to clear up some of the confusion and bewilderment that he seems to be under with regard to minority and Latin borrowers. He has said over and over and over again, he has talked about and referred to the Qualified Mortgage standards under the new rules. The new standards have just taken place, and I think that minorities will find that 95 percent of the mortgages today will fall within the Qualified Mortgage standards.

Now having said that, I will just say that the chairman should look at something other than the PATH Act toward restoring the GSEs, if he is very concerned about minorities, and I would join him in that to be able to get mortgages.

I would say that to clear up his bewilderment here, I just want to congratulate the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau because it is a fact that they have supported the refund of $3 billion to 9.7 million victims of unfair practices.

I agree with him: the purpose of this bill and the reason that they won't accept this amendment is because they don't want to go on record that they support consumers over all of these very, very lucrative financial products that are out there, and they want no regulation, which is why we saw the 2008 meltdown, the no rules of the road. They want to return to the days when there was an ability to drive the economy over the cliff and to deceive consumers to the point that they could and would become victims. So I can understand the chairman's reluctance to accept this language.

Mr. Chairman, I enter into the RECORD our defense of our claims, and I yield back the balance of my time.

RESPONSE TO COREL OGIC ANALYSIS OF QUALIFIED MORTGAGE (QM) STANDARDS, CRL ISSUE BRIEF; FEBRUARY 20, 2013

The recently released CoreLogic report ''The Mortgage Market Impact of Qualified Mortgage Regulation'' has received a lot of attention due to its finding that 48 percent of the mortgage market would not qualify as a ''safe loan'' under new Qualified Mortgage (QM) guidelines.

Corelogic uses a ''waterfall'' analysis to estimate the proportion of 2010 mortgage originations that do not meet one or more of the QM criteria. While a waterfall approach is a reasonable methodology for estimating the proportion of recent originations that fall outside of QM standards, there are problems both with the specifics of CoreLogic's model and its assumptions about the expiration of the GSE exemption that significantly undercut the usefulness of its estimates of the impact of the QM rule.

Removes Loans with Credit Scores less than 640: As part of estimating the impact of QM, CoreLogic included a restriction on credit scores. Specifically, the waterfall analysis first removes loans with credit scores below 640 ''because they resemble subprime loans.'' In fact, five percent of originations are removed solely based on this criterion. This exclusion is not warranted because the QM guidelines do not place any restrictions on a borrower credit score.

Assumes that borrowers who received loan products with prohibited QM features would not be able to access QM-eligible loan products in the future: The other waterfall layers used to estimate the QM impact are: total debt-to-income (DTI) ratio over 43 percent; whether the loan was negatively amortizing, balloon or interest only; low- or no-documentation; and loan terms of greater than 30 years. These restrictions result in exclusions of 24 percent, 1 percent, 16 percent, and 2 percent respectively. Based on this analysis,

while it might be reasonable for the report to estimate that 43 percent of 2010 originations did not meet these new QM guidelines, it is not reasonable to infer that none of these borrowers could have received QM loans if the rule had been in place in 2010. While having a high DTI may be a difficult barrier that many borrowers cannot overcome, the disqualifying loan terms, such as negative amortization options or terms of greater than 30- years, can easily be avoided in most cases by simply

Re-structuring the loans into amortizing 30 year loans. Similarly, most borrowers who received no-doc or low-doc loans in 2010, the origination year analyzed in the report, likely could have documented their incomes. Therefore, the inference that none of the 19 percent of borrowers that had disqualifying loan products could have received QM loans is unwarranted.

Assumes the GSE exemption expires: As the report recognizes, most of the 24 percent of loans to borrowers with high DTIs are currently being made by GSEs or insured by FHA and these loans automatically qualify as QM under a temporary exemption (up to seven years). Indeed, the report acknowledges that the impact of the QM rule on loans currently being made would be'' minor''. Given the uncertainties concerning GSE reform and mortgage finance that will need to be resolved over the next seven years, it is not at all clear that the temporary exemption will in fact end in seven years.

[From the Housingwire, Oct. 28, 2013]

IT'S OKAY TO LEND OUTSIDE QM: CFPB DIRECTOR RICHARD CORDRAY

(By Kerri Ann Panchuk)

It's likely mortgage bankers attending the Mortgage Bankers Association 100th Annual Convention & Expo in Washington, D.C, eagerly awaited the arrival of Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Director Richard Cordray.

After all, the regulatory landscape stemming from the 2010 Dodd-Frank Act has left the lending industry shell-shocked by not only the CFPB's new enforcement authority, but by all the lending/servicing rules slated to take effect in January.

If bankers are worried about this new CFPB-era, Cordray told the crowd: Don't be.

In his speech, the CFPB director basically asserted that in many cases, non-qualified mortgages with the right underwriting are perfectly fine even if they fall outside the QM boundaries. This mirrors past statements in which Cordray said he doesn't anticipate an outbreak of QM-related litigation.

Where he stops short—or simply doesn't go—is in explaining how lenders know at the beginning of the origination cycle that what they've done outside QM in terms of underwriting is sufficient enough to protect them later on if someone were to perhaps raise an ability-to-repay claim.

Lawyers up for litigation love gray lines, but those wanting to prevent future ability-to-repay litigation are likely to prefer black and white rules. Cordray shows optimism around the idea that responsible lenders are still safe outside QM, but no specifics were given on how the CFPB would address non-QM lending decisions down the road if a default were to occur. Yet, he seems to be saying don't over worry as long as standards are in place.

And when it comes to the 3% points-and-fee threshold, Cordray has another strong viewpoint, saying ''though no data is available to model the precise impact of the three-percent threshold for points and fees mandated by the statute, that threshold is more than three times the average lender origination fees reported by Bankrate.com in its most recent annual survey, and our rule provides an even higher threshold for smaller loans.''

He added that the definition of a qualified mortgage already covers most of the loans made today. And even loans not covered by QM can still be generated as long as lenders use ''sound underwriting standards and routinely perform well over time,'' the director told the MBA crowd. Again, what does 'perform well over time' mean? That part is not as clear.

As an example, Cordray told the audience, he is aware of borrowers who may possess considerable other assets, but who remain stifled by high debt-to-income ratios that force them outside the QM standards. As long as lenders ensure the best underwriting standards, they should be fine, Cordray said.

''Lenders that haye long upheld such standards have little to fear from the ability-to-repay rule; the strong performance of their loans over time demonstrates the care they have taken in underwriting to ensure that borrowers have the ability to repay,'' Cordray added.

''Nothing about their traditional lending model has changed, and they should continue to offer the same kinds of mortgages to borrowers whom they evaluate as posing reasonable credit risk—whether or not they meet the criteria to be classified as qualified mortgages.''

Cordray further noted that lenders who refuse to lend outside QM will be at no greater risk, absent other factors, of facing fair lending allegations.

The CFPB director once again cited data from Mark Zandi, chief economist for Moody's Analytics, noting that 95% of the mortgages made today fall within the qualified mortgage standard.

''Some, such as CoreLogic, have put out much lower figures, but by their own admission, those figures were not intended to take account of the expanded definition of QM that will actually take effect in January but instead were offered as projections of a distant future when the temporary expansion expires,'' Cordray explained.

□ 1630

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to my friends on the other side of the aisle—and the gentlelady from Wisconsin, I would draw her attention to the Federal Reserve bulletin, November 2013, Volume 99, No. 4, page 37, that clearly shows, again, according to the Federal Reserve, that 34 percent of Blacks and 32 percent of Hispanics would not meet the new QM standard based upon the 43 percent debt-to-income requirement.

Now, this is Federal Reserve data. If the gentlelady or any other Member on the other side of the aisle wishes to refute this data from the Federal Reserve, they are certainly free to do so on their time.

But again, I am not going to go on record saying this is fair. I haven't heard anybody rebut what CoreLogic has said, that when fully implemented, half of today's mortgages would not qualify under the QM rule. This is not fair.

Mr. Chairman, somebody has to protect consumers from the CFPB. Consumers, yes, they have to be protected from Wall Street, but they have to be protected from Washington as well.

You do not protect consumers by having unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats in Washington whose average salary is over $175,000—salary and benefits—to somehow say: I am from Washington. I am smarter than you. I will decide whether or not you get a mortgage.

It is arrogant; it is unfair; it is abusive. It must stop. We should reject the gentlelady's amendment, and we should adopt the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. 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. HOLDING) having assumed the chair, Mr. MARCHANT, 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. 3193) to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 492 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 492

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. 899) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, 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 Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in 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. 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. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. 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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

House Resolution 492 provides for a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 899, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act.

Mr. Speaker, every year, bureaucrats in Washington impose thousands of regulatory mandates on local governments and small businesses. Those mandates can be costly, stretching city and State budgets and making it harder for American businesses to hire.

The Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, H.R. 899, will ensure that the people who write these regulations in Washington know exactly what they are asking the American people to pay and whether the costs of compliance might make it harder for family businesses to meet payroll and stay afloat.

H.R. 899 will force Washington to think more carefully about regulatory costs before it passes them on to Americans. This bill is about transparency and accountability, and it is something Democrats and Republicans can all support.

In 1995, Congress passed the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, UMRA, legislation designed to prevent the Federal Government from imposing unfunded mandates onto State and local governments or private businesses without policymakers or the public knowing the costs of such policies.

UMRA's main objective was to force the Federal Government to estimate how much unfunded mandates would cost local governments and businesses and rein in out-of-control mandates.

UMRA ensured public awareness of the crushing financial burden of Federal mandates on employers and State and local governments. However, UMRA has not been amended since 1995, and some subtle changes are needed to preserve and improve on the act's initial purpose.

UMRA was a good bill, but over time, some shortcomings became apparent such that the Clinton and, later, Obama administrations had written executive orders to fix the loopholes within it.

As many of my colleagues can confirm, it takes a lot of creativity and hard work to pass legislation as a member of a minority party.

When Democrats gained control of Congress back in 2007, I sat down with my staff to think about legislative ideas that could gain sufficient bipartisan support to clear a Democrat Congress. This bill is the result of those efforts.

H.R. 899 has bipartisan DNA. It codifies those administrative fixes championed by Presidents Clinton and Obama and promotes good government accountability and transparency.

As a testament to this fact, the bill is cosponsored by three of my Democrat colleagues here in the House: Representatives MIKE MCINTYRE, COLLIN PETERSON, and LORETTA SANCHEZ.

I owe them a debt of gratitude for their efforts in promoting this commonsense bill.

I am especially grateful to Representative JAMES LANKFORD, a Republican cosponsor of this bill, who has worked tirelessly to promote its passage here in the House. We wouldn't be here today without his efforts.

A common refrain in this business is that nobody wants to see how the sausage is made, meaning that the process of drafting and passing legislation is so ugly that it would repulse people. In this case, I disagree.

I am extremely proud of this bill and extremely proud of the process by which it has been advanced in the House. It has been a pleasure to work with colleagues from both sides of the aisle on this measure, and I appreciate their support and counsel.

The Unfunded Mandates Reform and Transparency Act of 1995 was a model for bipartisanship, and my hope is that my bill leaves a similar legacy.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, my friend, Ms. FOXX, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we continue down this path of considering bills that are going nowhere. I sincerely wish my friends on the other side of the aisle would stop this Conservative merry-go-round.

The majority leader called this week ''stop government abuse week.'' Abuse? Really?

My friends on the other side of the aisle have continued to ignore the plight of middle class and working poor Americans, immigrants hoping for a better life for their families, and denying the undeniable impact of climate change, just to name a few.

This is even after shutting down the government for purely political purposes and playing a game of chicken with the debt limit; and yet, my Republican friends are calling routine government work ''abuse.'' That seems like a stretch to me.

Abuse is when underregulated industries spill unknown chemicals into the West Virginia water supply. Abuse is when coal ash pours into the waters of North Carolina, when Wall Street bankers crash our economy after taking advantage of underfunded and overworked regulators; that is exactly the kind of abuse that the government needs to stop.

You want to talk about abuse? Let's talk about today's measure.

This bill will not make the regulatory process more balanced or transparent. It will strangle it in red tape. It will not make rulemaking more fair. It will tip the scales in favor of businesses with the most resources.

Under this measure, improving access to health care and restraining the financial institutions that have unleashed havoc on our economy will become even more difficult.

It is nothing more than poorly disguised political fodder aimed at stymieing the executive branch's rulemaking power in favor of some corporate interests that run amuck on the environment and American workers.

Most egregious is the requirement for agencies to provide the private sector early consultation on major rules.

This would give well-funded industry an unfair advantage not afforded to the general public and other stakeholders like public interest, taxpayer, and environmental groups.

Clearly, the interest in amending UMRA only extends to certain privileged parties.

If my friends on the other side of the aisle want to see what happens when you allow private interests to run rampant without any government regulations, they need only look to the smog-filled skies above China.

This bill also politicizes independent agencies designed to protect the rights of hardworking Americans. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Securities Exchange Commission, National Labor Relations Board, Consumer Product Safety Commission, as well as the Federal Communications Commission—I might add they kind of left out the Federal Reserve for some reason I don't understand—but all of those other agencies will all have to answer to the whims of politics.

It also forces agencies to choose the cheapest regulatory option over the

best. This is legislating the answer to the same kind of question that a homeowner has to decide when hiring a contractor: Do you want it done cheap, or do you want it done right?

Look, I get it. I understand where we are in the Congressional cycle; but I think that it is unfortunate that my friends across the aisle would rather score political points and write bumper stickers than actually legislate.

While I think it is a good thing that most of these partisan measures will never go anywhere, I can't help but point out that we should be making better use of our limited time here.

We should be raising the minimum wage in order to give millions of hard-working Americans the pay they have earned.

Nearly 5 years have passed since the last increase in the Federal minimum wage.

□ 1645

Currently, a full-time minimum wage worker makes less than $16,000 per year, which is below the poverty line for a family of two or more.

This is unacceptable. It is time for Republicans to end their relentless obstruction and to join Democrats in an effort to provide for the middle class.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I really respect and appreciate my colleague from Florida, but there is nothing in this bill that would stop the development of rules and regulations by the executive branch, absolutely nothing. All we want to do is make sure that the cost of those rules and regulations is totally transparent.

Also, I appreciate my colleague's saying that we shouldn't be passing bumper sticker bills. We joked about this bill. The title for it, if you abbreviate it, is ''UMITA.'' That anagram hardly comes trippingly off the tongue, and it really wouldn't make much of a bumper sticker for us.

He also indicates that this bill is going to be dead on arrival in the Senate, so we should just give our attention to something else. I know my colleague knows this: the House of Representatives is mentioned very first in the Constitution. I believe the Founders intended for us to do our job and to do it well here. We shouldn't be thinking ''it is my way or the highway.'' This is a bill that has been cosponsored by Democrats, and I believe it will get a lot of Democrat votes. The logic from my colleague is that because this House is predominantly Republican that we should at the outset just acquiesce to the Democrat-led Senate or do nothing at all, but that is not how the legislative process works. There has to be a give and take.

I believe the House will pass this legislation tomorrow, and if the Senate wants to change it and send it back, fine—we will work it out—because that is our job, and that is the way it works, but I reject the notion that the Senate will not act on this bill. As I said, it is not a Republican bill; it is a bipartisan bill. It has Republican and Democrat cosponsors. My conversation with our Senate colleagues suggests this bill could clear the Senate and be signed into law by the President—this President.

Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that, last year, the President signed 76 laws—64 of those came from the House of Representatives and only 12 from the Senate, if I am accurate. If not, I will correct the RECORD. It is wrong for us to say we shouldn't be passing bills in the House because anything sponsored by a Republican will go nowhere in the Senate since the Democrats control it, because the evidence from last year, obviously, disproves that.

Mr. Speaker, since the 1995 passage of UMRA, experts across the political spectrum agree that the bill has led to the generation of important information about the potential impacts of mandates proposed in legislation and regulations. However, since its inception, there have been very few revisions to the law while various exclusions and exceptions have cropped up, creating loopholes limiting the act's coverage.

H.R. 899 builds on the success of UMRA by drawing upon executive orders enacted by the last two Democrat Presidents to close loopholes, streamline the cost-reporting process, and clarify the responsibilities of those in charge with complying with these requirements.

Independent regulatory agencies like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Federal Communications Commission are currently exempted from UMRA. H.R. 899 will require even these independent regulatory agencies to analyze the costs of their proposed mandates before they are imposed on the public.

H.R. 899 would also treat ''changes to conditions of grant aid'' as mandates, triggering an UMRA cost analysis. Legislation or regulations that force States or localities to make changes in order to qualify for Federal grant aid would no longer be exempt from scrutiny.

H.R. 899 will guarantee the public always has the opportunity to weigh in on regulations. Whereas UMRA only triggered cost analyses for regulations that were publicly announced through a ''notice of proposed rulemaking,'' this bill will require all regulations, whether a notice of proposed rulemaking was issued or not, to complete cost analyses.

H.R. 899 will also equip Congress and the American people with better tools to determine the true cost of regulations. Analyses required by H.R. 899 will have to factor in real-world consequences, such as lost business profits, costs passed on to consumers, and changed behavior costs when considering the bottom line impact of Federal mandates.

Finally, H.R. 899 will ensure government is held accountable for following these rules. If the requirements set forth by UMRA and UMITA are not met, a judicial stay may be placed upon regulations.

This legislation is purely about good government. It is about being open and honest about the cost of regulations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would advise my good friend from North Carolina that I have no further requests for time and that I am prepared to close or to reserve as she sees fit.

Mr. Speaker, does my colleague want me to go forward and close or does she want me to reserve?

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we are not quite ready to close.

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

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, according to a report issued by the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, the number of economically significant rules in the pipeline, which are those that could cost $100 million or more annually, has increased by more than 137 percent over the past decade.

Section 12 of my bill responds to such concerns by requiring Federal agencies to conduct a retrospective analysis of an existing Federal regulation at the request of a committee chairman or ranking minority member. The retrospective analysis submitted to the requesting member and to Congress is to include:

One, a copy of the Federal regulation;

Two, the continued need for the Federal regulation;

Three, the nature of comments or complaints received concerning the Federal regulation;

Four, the extent to which the mandate may duplicate another Federal regulation;

Five, the degree to which technology or economic conditions have changed in the area affecting the Federal regulation;

Six, an analysis of the retrospective costs and benefits of the Federal regulation that considers studies done outside the government; and

Seven, the history of legal challenges to the Federal regulation.

Since the duty to promote public accountability and transparency in Federal regulatory policy is endless, this provision builds on the strengths of UMRA by helping ensure ongoing compliance with legislative intent.

This kind of ongoing monitoring, identified as a priority by section 5 of Executive Order 12866, issued by President Clinton, and by section 6 of Executive Order 13563, issued by President Obama, is critical for adapting to changing circumstances that shaped initial UMRA cost estimates.

This helps ensure a fresh look at regulations to make certain they remain

consistent with their initial purpose and have not become overly burdensome, outdated, or unnecessary. This is just one of many bipartisan initiatives contained in my bill that further underscores the need for my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, section 3 of my bill has received praise from State and local government advocacy groups as it would allow a committee chairman or ranking member to request that the Congressional Budget Office perform an assessment comparing the authorized level of funding in a bill or resolution to the prospective costs of carrying out any changes to a condition of Federal assistance being imposed on any respective participating State, local or tribal government.

The purpose of this provision is to highlight costs the Federal Government is passing along to State and local governments that would otherwise remain hidden but borne by taxpayers regardless of which governmental entity is taxing them.

CBO Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin's statement before the Committee on Government Reform on March 8, 2005, speaks further to this issue, saying:

According to UMRA, the conditions attached to most forms of Federal aid, including most grant programs, are not mandates. Yet complying with such conditions can sometimes be burdensome. In particular, States consider new conditions on existing grant programs to be duties not unlike mandates. Two often-cited examples of such conditions are the requirements for receiving Federal funding under the No Child Left Behind Act and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Those laws require school districts to undertake many activities, including, respectively, designing and implementing Statewide achievement tests and preparing individualized education plans for disabled children, but only if they wish to receive certain Federal education grant funds.

In other words, these mandates escape UMRA's scrutiny because current law doesn't define this type of cost shifting as a ''mandate.'' My bill closes this loophole. The landmark Supreme Court decision, the National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius, hinged, in part, on this very issue.

Although the Affordable Care Act's Medicaid expansion was not technically considered a ''mandate'' under UMRA, it required States to dramatically expand the program or risk losing all funding. For this reason, the Supreme Court ultimately deemed this provision unconstitutional.

Justice Roberts wrote that this portion of the Affordable Care Act violated the Constitution because:

Congress has no authority to order the States to regulate according to its instructions. Congress may offer the States grants and require the States to comply with accompanying conditions, but the States must have a genuine choice whether to accept the offer. The States were given no such choice in this case. They must either accept a basic change in the nature of Medicaid or risk losing all Medicaid funding.

In this way, the Affordable Care Act provides a contemporary, salient case study in how important it is for legislators and the public to have access to critical information concerning the costs of Federal decrees.

My bill will put this important information in the hands of Congress and the American people. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

With that, I would be prepared to close if the gentleman from Florida is prepared, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentlelady.

I indicated I was prepared to close, but I have been advised that we need to occupy a little time as well. So I yield myself such time as I may consume, and we will try to be slow about it.

Mr. Speaker, in this particular legislation, the minority views that were developed allow, among other things, the following:

The Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act would be an assault on health, safety, and environmental protections. This legislation would erect new barriers to slow down the regulatory process, and it would give corporations an unfair advantage in the regulatory process;

Section 5 of the bill would repeal language that excludes independent regulatory agencies from the reporting requirements of the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act, with the exception of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve and the Federal Open Market Committee. I spoke to that earlier. I found that passage strange.

□ 1700

The Office of Management and Budget is responsible for overseeing the UMRA process. Since the independent agencies would be under the direction of OMB for purposes of UMRA compliance, this could compromise the independence of those agencies.

Section 7 of H.R. 899 would create a new point of order in the House of Representatives for legislation containing an unfunded mandate, making it more difficult to enact legislation.

Section 8 would incorporate a cost-benefit requirement from Executive Order 12866, but it would not include language from the same executive order directing agencies to perform these assessments to the extent feasible.

Section 10 would require agencies to provide impacted parties in the private sector—but not other stakeholders—with an advanced opportunity to provide input on proposed regulations. It would require agencies to conduct consultations with private sector businesses as early as possible, before the issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking. Expanding this consultation requirement only to the private sector could allow businesses to have an advantage over other stakeholders, as I mentioned previously, such as taxpayers and environmental groups, with reference to the development of regulatory proposals.

During consideration of this bill by the committee, one of the Members offered an amendment that stated that any opportunities or rights afforded to a corporation under this section shall also be afforded to any interested individual. The amendment was rejected.

My good friend on the other side mentioned the fact that I pointed out that we continue to have one House legislation that goes nowhere in the Senate. And she pointed correctly to the fact—and I stand with her if it needs to be corrected—that there were 76 measures that reached the President's desk, and that 64 of them came out of the House of Representatives. Not knowing all of the statistical imperatives, my belief would be that of that 64 that came out of House of Representatives, a substantial number of them had companion legislation. I questioned whether or not this particular measure that we are addressing today has companion legislation in the Senate, and that is why I feel that it is not going to go anywhere.

Listen, one side is arguing that we need to start the 2014 election right now and don't do anything else that is going to allow for both bodies—it is true, as my colleague said, that the Constitution mentions the House of Representatives first, but it does not give the House of Representatives autonomy in the sense that they, and they alone, can pass legislation. So there is a requirement here that has not been being met, and that is that the Senate and House confer on matters of legislation and then offer it up to the executive branch.

We seem to have circumvented that process. And what we are doing, rather than pass, or at least address—I am fascinated by the fact that I don't believe my colleagues have the courage of their convictions. If we were to put a flood insurance measure on the floor not on suspension, I doubt very seriously that it would not pass. It will pass if it were to come to the floor that way.

I believe that if we offer up a reasonable minimum wage, I don't think anybody in this country can say that $16,000 for a family of two or more people is sufficient in order for them to be able to meet requisites having to do with food and rent alone, let alone educating their children or providing daycare.

I don't think anybody really is against those who paid into the employment system receiving unemployment compensation, and yet we find ourselves here repeatedly addressing a significant number of matters.

Someone wrote the other day, if they got a stain on their tie, it would be because of ObamaCare. My goodness gracious, people, we are a legislative body. We could be about the business of serious legislating. That kind of legislating would require, among other

things, not just bipartisan activity as this legislation has manifested itself as being bipartisan, but it would allow that we would really sit down and talk through the things that are needed in this country.

There is nobody around that doesn't believe that we have bridges that are in disrepair. I haven't found anyone that said that if we invested in infrastructure, that it would not create more jobs in this country. The people want us to do this, and not to do one-sided, one-way measures that are not going to go anywhere anytime soon.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I hear my colleague on the other side of the aisle. I frankly don't think there is much more serious legislation around here than this piece, as I said earlier. UMITA doesn't exactly come trippingly off the tongue, and it isn't the most scintillating legislation out there, but it has great bipartisan support, which is what my colleague said we should be doing. So I am curious about his going off talking about a lot of other things other than this.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that multiple provisions in my bill, including sections 8 and 9, would codify general principles of good government embodied in President Clinton's Executive Order 12866 and President Obama's Executive Order 13563.

Section 8 closes a blatant, often exploited loophole inconsistent with legislative intent and the spirit of the law. Again, I think this legislation is doing exactly what the Congress should be doing, and that is sticking with legislative intent and making sure that we are looking after the fact that the laws we pass are adhered to.

Since title II of UMRA says that agencies must develop a written statement describing the effects of their regulations on State, local, and tribal governments, as well as the private sector, ''unless otherwise prohibited by law,'' some agencies have concluded that general statutory language limiting the consideration of economic costs in setting regulations ''prohibits'' them from preparing a written statement evaluating the non-cost elements.

Reasserting legislative intent, this section of my bill prevents this loophole from being exploited for purposes of ignoring UMRA requirements by clarifying that agencies must conduct UMRA analysis unless a law ''expressly'' prohibits them from doing so.

This simple wording change makes a world of difference by clarifying that agencies must conduct UMRA analyses unless a law ''expressly'' prohibits the disclosure.

Another way UMRA's cost disclosure requirements have been exploited by ambitious rulemakers is by deeming a proposal an emergency and thereby forgoing the notice of proposed rulemaking, or NPRM, process, which is the avenue through which the public weighs in on proposed regulation.

Without compromising the ability to issue mandates in emergency scenarios, section 9 of the underlining bill removes the perverse incentive for agencies to forego NPRMs by requiring them to fulfill UMRA cost disclosure requirements within 6 months of issuing the urgent decree.

Modest bipartisan provisions such as these highlight additional reasons for my colleague to support the rule and underlying bill.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, but I am prepared to close if the gentleman from Florida is prepared.

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

I will insert in the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy, and I will only lift one paragraph, and that is the last paragraph and sentence.

''H.R. 899 would unnecessarily add to the already robust analytical and procedural requirements of the rulemaking process. In particular, H.R. 899 would create needless grounds for judicial review, unduly slowing the regulatory process. In addition, it would add layers of procedural steps that would interfere with agency priority setting and compliance with statutory mandates.''

I guess, not surprisingly to my friends on the other side, ''If H.R. 899 were presented to the President, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.''

Mr. Speaker, contrary to my friend's favorite rhetoric, the free market does not solve all problems. Markets fail. We have seen that, have we not? Government is the actor of last resort when the market does not create the necessary incentives for businesses and individuals to protect the public good.

What is more, Federal regulations are not strangling the economy or preventing growth. In fact, it is quite the opposite.

As the Office of Management and Budget has reported, major Federal regulations issued over the last 10 years resulted in annual benefits from $193 billion to $800 billion, while costs are only between $57 billion to $84 billion.

It seems to me that an $84 billion investment with an $800 million return is not a bad thing.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that would raise the minimum wage to $10.10 an hour and give at least 25 million Americans a well-deserved pay raise.

A business in the constituency that I serve did this on their own. Jaxson's Ice Cream Parlour in Dania Beach raised it because they said they feel the pain of the people that work with them and that they made a fair profit and wanted to share it with them.

The American people are calling for an economy that works for everyone, not just those at the top.

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 of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question. Vote ''no'' on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 899—UNFUNDED MANDATES INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2013

(Rep. Foxx, R–NC, and 4 cosponsors, February 27, 2014)

The Administration is committed to ensuring that regulations are tailored to advance statutory goals in a manner that is efficient and cost-effective, and that minimizes uncertainty. By layering on additional, burdensome judicial review and other unnecessary changes to the regulatory process, H.R. 899, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2013, would introduce needless uncertainty into agency decision-making and undermine the ability of agencies to provide critical public health and safety protections. Accordingly, the Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 899.

When a Federal agency promulgates a regulation, the agency must adhere to the robust and well-understood procedural requirements of Federal law, including the Administrative Procedure Act, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, the Paperwork Reduction Act, and the Congressional Review Act. In addition, for decades, agency rulemaking has been guided by executive orders issued and followed by administrations of both political parties. These require regulatory agencies to promulgate regulations upon a reasoned determination that the benefits justify the costs, to consider regulatory alternatives, and to promote regulatory flexibility.

The President's regulatory approach has been consistent throughout his Administration. We don't have to choose between protecting the health, welfare, and safety of Americans and promoting economic growth, job creation, competitiveness, and innovation—we can do both. To this end, Executive Order 13563 requires careful cost-benefit analysis, increased public participation, harmonization of rulemaking across agencies, and flexible regulatory approaches. Through executive orders and other presidential directives, agencies must ensure that they take into account the consequences of rulemaking on small businesses. And, through Executive Orders 13579 and 13610, the Administration has also taken important steps to promote systematic retrospective review of regulations by all agencies, including encouraging independent agencies to conduct such a review. Collectively, these requirements promote flexible, cost-effective regulation.

H.R. 899 would unnecessarily add to the already robust analytical and procedural requirements of the rulemaking process. In particular, H.R. 899 would create needless grounds for judicial review, unduly slowing the regulatory process. In addition, it would add layers of procedural steps that would interfere with agency priority setting and compliance with statutory mandates.

If H.R. 899 were presented to the President, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, as proud as I am of this legislation, I realize that its passage on Friday will not be front-page news.

I understand that ''Bipartisan Group of Lawmakers Band Together to Close Technical Loopholes in UMRA'' isn't exactly a riveting headline, but what we are doing here is important.

In Congress, we often focus our energy and attention on those issues that are most divisive and controversial. There are real substantive disagreements between the two parties and among the American people.

But Congress must do the hard things, and every now and then we get an opportunity to do something easy. This should be easy. The reforms in this bill are ''low hanging fruit.''

These are modest reforms supported by Republicans and Democrats alike. Some of these changes merely codify executive orders issued by the last two Democrat Presidents.

□ 1715

Some of my colleagues have suggestions for improvement and have offered amendments to this bill. Great. I welcome their suggestions. Those amendments will be discussed here tomorrow in an open and transparent process.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, every Democrat amendment that was submitted has been included in this rule.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this sensible legislation that will enhance transparency, accountability, and awareness of Federal mandates. I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, when the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform filed its report (H. Rept. 113–352, Part 1) to accompany H.R. 899 on February 14, 2014, it included an exchange of letters between the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and the Chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The letter from Chairman Sessions was inadvertently dated February 11, 2013 and was intended to be dated February 11, 2014.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 492 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 2. 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. 1010) to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage. 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 Education and the Workforce. 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 recommit 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1010.

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.

Ms. FOXX. 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 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 192, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—225

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

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

NAYS—192

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

NOT VOTING—13

Blumenauer
Davis, Danny
Gardner
Gosar
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
Pastor (AZ)
Rice (SC)
Runyan
Rush
Schwartz
Upton
Walden

□ 1743

Ms. BONAMICI and Messrs. NADLER and YARMUTH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. POSEY, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. ADERHOLT changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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 of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 190, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

AYES—227

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

NOES—190

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

NOT VOTING—13

Blumenauer
Davis, Danny
Gardner
Gosar
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
Pastor (AZ)
Rice (SC)
Runyan
Rush
Schwartz
Upton
Walden

□ 1750

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.

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION SAFETY AND SOUNDNESS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEWART). Pursuant to House Resolution 475 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3193.

Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) kindly take the chair.

□ 1752

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113–350 offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113–350 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. RIGELL of Virginia.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. DESANTIS of Florida.

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. RIGELL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 250, noes 167, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

AYES—250

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

NOES—167

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

NOT VOTING—13

Blumenauer
Davis, Danny
Gardner
Gosar
Hinojosa
McCarthy (NY)
Pastor (AZ)
Rice (SC)
Runyan
Rush
Schwartz
Upton
Walden

□ 1757

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 79, 80, and 81, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 186, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

AYES—227

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta

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

NOES—186

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

NOT VOTING—17

Blumenauer
Davis, Danny
Gardner
Gosar
McCarthy (NY)
Mullin
Nolan
Pastor (AZ)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Rush
Schock
Schwartz
Upton
Walden

□ 1801

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chair, had I been present for rollcall vote No. 82, (on agreeing to the DeSantis amendment), I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 236, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

AYES—181

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

NOES—236

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas

Luetkemeyer	Peterson	Shimkus
Lummis	Petri	Shuster
Maffei	Pittenger	Simpson
Marchant	Pitts	Smith (MO)
Marino	Poe (TX)	Smith (NE)
Massie	Pompeo	Smith (NJ)
Matheson	Posey	Smith (TX)
McAllister	Price (GA)	Southerland
McCarthy (CA)	Rahall	Stewart
McCaul	Reed	Stivers
McClintock	Reichert	Stockman
McHenry	Renacci	Stutzman
McKeon	Ribble	Terry
McKinley	Rigell	Thompson (PA)
McMorris Rodgers	Roby	Thornberry
Meadows	Roe (TN)	Tiberi
Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Tipton
Messer	Rogers (KY)	Turner
Mica	Rogers (MI)	Valadao
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Wagner
Miller (MI)	Rokita	Walberg
Miller, Gary	Rooney	Walorski
Mullin	Ros-Lehtinen	Weber (TX)
Mulvaney	Roskam	Webster (FL)
Murphy (PA)	Ross	Wenstrup
Neugebauer	Rothfus	Westmoreland
Noem	Royce	Whitfield
Nugent	Ryan (WI)	Williams
Nunes	Salmon	Wilson (SC)
Nunnelee	Sanford	Wittman
Olson	Scalise	Wolf
Palazzo	Schock	Womack
Paulsen	Schrader	Woodall
Pearce	Schweikert	Yoder
Perry	Scott, Austin	Yoho
Peters (CA)	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
	Sessions	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Bachus	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz
Blumenauer	Pastor (AZ)	Upton
Davis, Danny	Rice (SC)	Walden
Gardner	Runyan	
Gosar	Rush	

□ 1806

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. MAFFEI changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. HOLDING, 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. 3193) to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 475, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I am opposed to it in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Shea-Porter moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3193 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 6. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING DATA BREACHES, FINANCIAL FRAUD, AND PREDATORY LENDING.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, may be construed as prohibiting the agency responsible for the regulation of consumer financial products and services pursuant to the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 from the following:

(1) In the case of a company that has had a data breach resulting in the release of financially sensitive personally identifiable information—

(A) consulting with the company about the breach,

(B) working with such company to identify seniors, service members, students, and other consumers affected by the breach, and

(C) providing those consumers with materials on the steps that should immediately be taken to protect themselves from financial fraud, including instructions for cancelling and replacing compromised credit cards, templates for requesting that fraudulent charges be removed from credit card bills and credit reports, and information on credit monitoring products,

so long as such company refunds the agency for the costs the agency incurs in providing such services.

(2) Monitoring and supervising payday lenders on or near military bases, in order to protect service members and their families from being targeted by predatory lenders that engage in unfair, deceptive, and abusive practices, or to undertake enforcement actions against predatory lenders to provide refunds and reimbursements to service members targeted and harmed by such practices.

(3) Investigating and enforcing sanctions related to fraud concerning fees for private student loans or for the usage of automatic teller machines (''ATMs'').

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

Mr. HENSARLING. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill and will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, just a few years after a financial meltdown that crashed our economy and punished middle class families, some politicians here want to go back to the days when Wall Street wrote its own rules and consumers got the short end of the stick. We all know how that worked out. It brought a tremendous financial crisis.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau emerged out of the ashes of that financial disaster. Congress had learned a hard lesson: consumers needed a watchdog. That is what the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is all about. It is a watchdog for consumers. It stands up for people, including students, seniors, and veterans who are often targeted by predatory financial lenders with shady products. Why on earth would we want to hamper the CFPB?

In its short lifetime, the Bureau has secured more than $3 billion for nearly 10 million consumers, including members of the military. It has received more than 270,000 consumer complaints. It has taken action against any payday lenders and debt collectors who take unfair advantage of our Nation's consumers.

The CFPB is working to protect consumers from some of the worst abuses in the financial marketplace, but the bill we are considering today would undermine its work.

□ 1815

First, the bill changes the structure of the CFPB to a five-member commission instead of a single director. In a Congress that is so divided and dysfunctional, it is not fair to mire the Bureau in political gridlock and make it less able to carry out its mission.

Second, this bill would defund the CFPB. Under the guise of transparency, its opponents want to cripple the Bureau by tying it up in Congress. They say this will result in significant cost savings. If they don't fund it properly, of course it will end up in savings.

We would also save money on food inspection if we would only stop inspecting food, but that doesn't mean we would be better off. Defunding the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau comes at the expense of American consumers.

The bill also allows other bank regulators who failed to protect consumers to overrule the CFPB, and it cripples the Bureau's ability to oversee consumer financial markets.

Our constituents don't want us to weaken consumer protections. They actually want us to extend consumer protections to include protection of our personal data and information.

Today's motion to recommit builds on this work and makes sure that Congress is focused on consumer protection. This motion ensures that seniors, servicemembers, students, and other consumers affected by security breaches are promptly notified that their data has been compromised.

Even more importantly, it makes sure that consumers know what steps to take to recover from and how to prevent additional financial fraud. In the event of a personal data breach, companies need to do more than simply alert consumers that it happened. They need to work with the CFPB to inform consumers about how to remove fraudulent charges and monitor their credit going forward.

The motion also addresses a growing problem of predatory lenders targeting our servicemembers and their families. These lenders are taking advantage of loopholes in current law to profit from bad loans that have outrageous interest rates.

They take advantage of our servicemembers by obscuring these interest rates. Some lenders even target our servicemembers looking for home mortgages. This activity is reprehensible, and Congress should stop this activity.

Students are another population this motion would protect. For example, the CFPB recently started investigating campus financial products, such as school-issued debit cards that students use to access financial aid. These cards often have hidden fees, which can add up for students and families who are already struggling to pay for college.

What makes this even worse is that many college campuses don't have fee-free ATMs, so students are being hit with debit card fees and then hit again when they want to access that money. The CFPB needs to be able to make sure that banks aren't taking advantage of our students.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit will make sure that we pass a bill that is fair to consumers, not just banks.

I urge all my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on these commonsense changes, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, first, I am just very pleased that our friends on the other side of the aisle actually found somebody to offer the MTR since they apparently, earlier today, were having trouble finding speakers to come to the floor and defend what is probably the most powerful and least accountable government agency in the history of the Republic.

It would be difficult to defend this agency; but let me first dispense with the motion to recommit.

Number one, as we read, this Dodd-Frank did not grant the CFPB power over data breaches, so this part of the MTR is irrelevant. The other portions are redundant.

Mr. Speaker, a more important point is: How can anybody come to the floor to defend an agency that is collecting such massive quantities of data? I find it somewhat ironic that the MTR seemingly is concerned about data breaches to a government agency that is collecting data on 53 million borrowers who took out mortgages since 1998.

The person in charge of the project has testified that it is easy to reverse-engineer the identities of 95 percent of these records. The CFPB, in their credit card database, is collecting at least data on 991 million credit cards held by roughly 60 percent of the adult U.S. population.

Where is the angst and the anxiety and the concern for the possible data breaches of CFPB? How about their consumer credit panel, where they are collecting the database of credit reports on 8.6 million Americans? I mean, it seems to be a contest between CFPB and NSA who can collect the most data on American citizens. Stay tuned on who wins that competition.

And then, Mr. Speaker, we have an agency that, notwithstanding its benign yet Orwellian title, is abusing consumer rights. We have already had the QM rule—Qualified Mortgage rule—promulgated where the Federal Reserve says one-third of Black and Hispanic homeowners can no longer qualify for their mortgages. Where is the outrage there?

CoreLogic, which is a firm that collects data in our mortgage market, has said: When fully implemented, this rule of this agency that is supposed to protect our consumers, half—half—of the mortgages would no longer qualify.

So no wonder Democrats were having trouble finding speakers to defend this.

And then last, but not least, an agency that has no accountability, that sets its own budget, notwithstanding the testimony of the head of the agency who said that he was not building a palace, yet they take $145 million of hard-earned taxpayer money to renovate a $150 million building they don't even own.

On a square-foot basis, Mr. Speaker, this is three times the average class A luxury renovation space in Washington, D.C. On a square-foot basis, it costs more for the CFPB to have their headquarters than it cost to build the Trump World Tower.

On a square-foot basis, it costs more to renovate their headquarters than it does to build the Bellagio Hotel and Casino, at the time the single most expensive hotel in America.

Mr. Speaker, on a square-foot basis, it cost more than the Burj Khalifa in Dubai, the single tallest building in the world, and there are similarities because the CFPB spent $7 million on the same world-renowned architectural firm to design their building.

Mr. Speaker, again, this is one of the most powerful and least accountable agencies in the history of the Republic. True consumer protection is about competitive, innovative transparent markets that respect the dignity and the liberty of every American citizen to buy the mortgage and get the credit card that they want that is best for them and their families.

Let's respect them. Let's hold accountable government. Let's dispense with the motion to recommit, and let's vote ''aye'' on the Commercial Financial Freedom and Washington Accountability Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 223, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

AYES—194

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
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)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)

Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—223

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

NOT VOTING—13

Blumenauer
Davis, Danny
Fortenberry
Gosar
McCarthy (NY)
Pastor (AZ)
Rice (SC)
Runyan
Rush
Schwartz
Upton
Walden
Woodall

□ 1830

Mr. CÁRDENAS changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 182, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

AYES—232

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

NOES—182

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

NOT VOTING—16

Blumenauer
Fortenberry
Gardner
Gosar
McCarthy (NY)
Pastor (AZ)
Pittenger
Posey
Rice (SC)
Runyan
Rush
Schwartz
Upton
Walden
Wasserman Schultz
Welch

□ 1839

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 85, I was on the floor and voting in this

vote series. However, my "yes" vote was not recorded. My vote should be recorded as "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 71 on the Rothfus amendment on H.R. 2804, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 72 on the Connolly amendment on H.R. 2804, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 73 on the Jackson Lee amendment on H.R. 2804, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 74 on the Jackson Lee amendment on H.R. 2804, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 75 on the Miller (CA) amendment on H.R. 2804, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 76 on the Miller (CA) amendment on H.R. 2804, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 77 on the Motion to Recommit with Instructions on H.R. 2804, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 78 on the passage of H.R. 2804, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 79 on Ordering the Previous Question on H.R. 492, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 80 on Adoption of the Rule on H.R. 492, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 81 on the Rigell amendment on H.R. 492, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 82 on the DeSantis amendment on H.R. 492, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 83 on the Moore (WI) amendment on H.R. 492, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 84 on the Motion to Recommit with Instructions on H.R. 492, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 85 on passage of H.R. 492, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 3729

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 3729, a bill originally introduced by Representative Andrews of New Jersey, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING PENN STATE UNIVERSITY'S PANHELLENIC DANCE MARATHON

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Pennsylvania State University IFC-Panhellenic Dance Marathon, otherwise known as ''THON,'' for another tremendous, record-breaking fundraising total in support of the fight against childhood cancer.

The largest student philanthropy in the world, THON is a yearlong fundraising effort where students work in numerous ways to raise money for the cause. The effort culminates with a final 46-hour event where over 700 students partake in a no-sitting, no-sleeping dance marathon, and thousands more cheer on their efforts. All proceeds from THON benefit the Four Diamonds Fund, an organization dedicated to battling childhood cancer.

This year, I had the honor of attending THON. The energy and enthusiasm from those in attendance was nothing short of breathtaking as the students went on to raise $13.3 million, surpassing the $12.4 million last year. Penn State has raised over $110 million in THON's history.

Mr. Speaker, as a proud Penn State alumnus, I want to thank all of the students and families for providing this outstanding emotional and financial support to the children, families, researchers, and the staff of the Four Diamonds Fund.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Black History Month.

I am humbled by leaders in my district, like Lawrence McClain, a pioneer who opened up Homestead to new settlement; Officer Clifford Hollis, the first African American police officer in Florida City and Homestead; as well as Chief Rolle, the first African American police chief.

There have been numerous historic accomplishments in my district thanks to people like Doris Ison and Colonel Hartley, who helped in health care and made a difference to African Americans in South Dade. We have also seen the torch of public service passed down from the late Reverend Ferguson and Senator Larcenia Bullard to Florida City Commissioner Avis Brown, Senator Dwight Bullard, Commissioner Moss, and longtime civic educator and activist, Rosemary Fuller.

We must always remember the great leaders who have come before us, marching forward as we fight for civil rights and equality for all.

HONORING RED LARSON ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I honor one of the most respected dairy leaders in the State of Florida, Red Larson, as he celebrates his 90th birthday.

In the 1930s, Red worked the local paper route, saving and investing his money until he could purchase his first dairy cow. By the time he graduated from high school, he owned six cows, rented eight more, and had 21 calves. After a half century of hard work, Red merged 37 dairies into the three that now make up Larson Dairy, Incorporated, which he and his two grandsons currently own and operate. Larson Dairy produces 120 million pounds of milk annually, making it one of the largest dairies in the United States. The Larson name is synonymous with Florida dairy.

Truly a constant source of knowledge and experience, Larson served on the USDA Dairy Advisory Committee, and he has been inducted into both the Dairy Hall of Fame and the Florida Agricultural Hall of Fame.

I am honored to recognize Red Larson on his 90th birthday and to thank him for his longstanding dedication and contributions to the U.S. dairy industry.

□ 1845

NATIONAL EATING DISORDERS AWARENESS WEEK

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize National Eating Disorders Awareness Week. Approximately 30 million Americans battle eating disorders at some point in their lives. Eating disorders affect both women and men and span nearly every socioeconomic and racial demographic.

Yet, due to widespread stigma, those who struggle often struggle alone. Eating disorders are the most deadly form of mental illness. Between 10 and 20 percent of those suffering from anorexia do not survive their disease.

Indeed anorexia, binge eating, bulimia, and other eating disorders often lead to serious medical complications, including organ failure and heart disease.

Despite this grave threat to public health, our research, prevention, and treatment efforts remain shamefully underfunded.

This National Eating Disorders Awareness Week, I urge my colleagues to take action and to join me, cosponsor H.R. 2101, the Federal Response to Eliminating Eating Disorders Act. We can and we must do better.

IT IS TIME FOR WASHINGTON TO QUIT WASTING MONEY

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Washington to quit wasting money. A good place to start is to eliminate duplicative programs. Why should we pay twice for the same thing? We shouldn't.

Nonpartisan inspectors general found that management at Federal agencies wasted $67 billion by failing to implement cost-cutting recommendations. This is unacceptable.

We must take action to eliminate duplicative and wasteful government programs such as the duplicative USDA catfish inspection scheme I fought to eliminate. This program has spent $30 million of your money and hasn't inspected a single fish. This is just one example.

The people of this Nation deserve no less than a government that is transparent and wisely spends the hard-earned tax dollars of the people. I am proud to support legislation this week that addresses wasteful spending. It is time to rebuild trust with the American people and get government out of the way.

THE PEACE CORPS' 53RD ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Peace Corps Week and congratulate the Peace Corps for celebrating its 53rd anniversary this Saturday. The Peace Corps is doing great work around the world with 7,200 volunteers and trainees working on projects in 65 countries. Their work reaches every corner of the world.

However, none of this could be accomplished without the great volunteers. These volunteers come from all around our country, but from my home State in Minnesota and my district, we have got a pretty good track record of producing members. In fact, there are currently over 200 different Minnesotans volunteering in the Peace Corps, and 30 of those volunteers come from the Third District.

Last year, our State ranked seventh in producing these volunteers for the Peace Corps, and my district was actually one of the highest performing in the country.

Mr. Speaker, recently I had the chance to welcome, and also join, Acting Director Carrie Hessler-Radelet to come to Minnesota to participate in a recruiting event. I can tell you that after 53 years, the desire to volunteer for the Peace Corps is as strong as ever.

I would like to commend all the Peace Crops volunteers, both past and present, for their service.

UAW NLRB ELECTION AT CHATTANOOGA VOLKSWAGEN PLANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Progressive Caucus. The Progressive Caucus wants to discuss with the American public issues that are important, that are timely, and that should be happening in this current Congress.

Tonight we are here to talk about a number of issues, one being the very important need to raise the minimum wage in this country.

Before we start that dialogue, we also want to talk about another issue that has happened just recently in this country and that has a little bit to do with my background growing up.

I grew up in Kenosha, Wisconsin. Kenosha, Wisconsin, was a company town. We had one very large employer, American Motors Company. We made Pacers and Gremlins and a bunch of cars that maybe were unique for their time and may be collectable now, but certainly stood out in history. But American Motors did something really amazing for the community I grew up in. We were able to grow up in a strong, middle class community. People had family-supporting wages. And the reason they had family-supporting wages is not only because of American Motors Company and later Renault and Chrysler, but also because of the United Autoworkers Union, a union that worked very collaboratively with the companies that were there in Kenosha and made sure that not only did people get a good, fair wage to support their families, but also they worked hard and they made sure those companies were profitable and delivered a very good quality product for the American people.

So, that was my experience growing up. My neighbors, my family, my friends all wound up having someone in their family working with American Motors Company or a company that fed into that, and we had good wages and people had a good chance to grow up in a middle class environment.

Unfortunately, all too often we see these attacks across the country on unions making it harder and harder for people who work for a company to have a voice in their company. What happened just 2 weeks ago was there was a union election at a Volkswagen plant in Chattanooga, Tennessee. They had an election that was conducted by the National Labor Relations Board where workers were deciding whether or not they were going to have a voice, collective voice in their workplace. They were deciding whether or not they were going to unionize and join the United Auto Workers.

There were two extraordinary things about this election: First, the company was neutral. The company had made the decision to stay out of the choice because, after all, this was a decision to be made by the workers. We have seen time and time again how employers can easily interfere with this choice by workers. After all, they write your paycheck; they can decide whether or not you get that promotion; they can fire you. So an employer can wield an immense and powerful influence over the workers who are trying to make a decision whether or not they want to unionize, and they can wield that power lawfully and sometimes they wield it unlawfully. In this case, the employer of Volkswagen said: You know what? This is the workers' decision. Let's leave it up to them.

That doesn't happen very often in this country. For that reason, the employer chose to embrace the notion that its employees had the freedom to choose. That happened in Chattanooga.

There is a second extraordinary thing that happened in this election, and that is, despite the fact that the employer was neutral, a free and fair election was still rendered impossible because of interference and threats from outside parties. What we saw here was unprecedented, and the shameful actions by outside parties interfered in a private decision by some 1,300 workers on whether or not they would organize for a better life.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. POCAN. I yield, yes, absolutely, to Mr. MILLER from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to join you in your remarks in expressing outrage about the situation in Chattanooga.

In this case, these outside parties included both well-funded interest groups and publicly elected figures dead set on stopping the workers from joining the union. It wasn't enough for these outside parties to say publicly that they did not like unions. It wasn't enough for them to say publicly to the autoworkers, hey, we know what is best for you and your family, vote against the union. It wasn't enough for them to say we don't want unions to get a toehold on the south. No. They were not going to let the workers decide for themselves. They were angry with Volkswagen, who was officially neutral. They were angry that Volkswagen had a long track record of successfully working with labor unions through joint work councils that innovate and reduce company costs. They were angry that a majority of the workers actually signed cards saying they wanted the UAW to represent them.

They were afraid of what would happen if the NLRB election process was actually on the level.

In the end, free and fair union elections became their biggest fear. Imagine that. In the end, a free and fair election became their biggest fear. So they decided they couldn't let that happen. If Volkswagen wouldn't scuttle this election, then these outside officials would. They laid in wait, and on the eve of the election, they then launched their assault: a barrage of untrue and inflammatory statements, the kind that we see from union busters all the time, the kind that are designed to coerce, to scare, to intimidate, to bully, and to bully, and to bully hardworking auto plant workers into rejecting the union.

One of these third parties, an elected official, went to the press on the first day of the voting, the first day the workers had a chance to vote, and he said that he had been ''assured,'' if the workers vote against the union, Volkswagen would manufacture a new line of SUVs in Chattanooga. And lo and behold, what happened? This last-minute bombshell led to a press frenzy, banner headlines, a barrage of TV coverage, all reporting and repeating the threat that jobs in Chattanooga were now on the line with this vote. Never mind that the company denied it. Never mind that that elected official's claim wasn't true. As he said, he had been ''assured,'' the junior Senator from Tennessee said.

Mr. POCAN. I thank my friend from California.

What you said is worth repeating. Volkswagen put out a formal denial of the claim, making clear that there was absolutely no link between the vote and the placement of the SUV facility in Chattanooga, yet this elected official went out and did it again. He moved to discredit the company, astonishingly suggesting that the company was using old talking points, suggesting that he had the company's new secret talking points.

What happened here wasn't someone just expressing their view. What happened here was someone communicating a promise of benefits if workers voted one way, backed up by some mystery assurance. What happened here was someone communicating a thinly veiled threat that jobs would be lost if the workers voted another way, again backed up by some mysterious assurance.

The National Labor Relations Act is our Nation's premiere worker rights law. Like many of our civil rights laws, many heroic Americans in the last couple of generations gave their lives to secure the right to freely associate, to take considerate action to improve their lot collectively, to bargain collectively for better wages and better job security, for health care, for fair wages, and for a safe workplace.

These workers were all brave, and they did not give in to thugs and battles. This National Labor Relations Act outlaws bribes and threats in the midst of union elections. It does so for a reason. Those acts are not speech; they are more than speech. They render a free and fair election impossible.

In the case of UAW and Volkswagen in Chattanooga, since voting was already underway when the acts were committed, there was no opportunity to cure them. The votes were cast, and after 3 days the election was over. After an election, there are now three nonunionized Volkswagen plants in the world: one in Russia, one in China, and one in Chattanooga.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. On the last point the gentleman made, the reason these worker councils—why Volkswagen was neutral is that they had found these worker councils to help them lead this industry in innovation, to be one of the largest and most successful automobile companies in the world. And, in fact, they have used these worker councils in plants all around the world because that is the mechanism by which they have continued to be a leader and continued to have the growth that they have had and to have the products that they have had. And somehow—somehow—as you point out, in Russia and in China and now in Chattanooga, that motto is being rejected, not because Volkswagen rejected it, but because the election process was not allowed in China, it was not allowed in Russia, and was rigged and jimmied and obstructed by outside forces during that election in the United States.

□ 1900

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for taking this time.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you.

While we definitely want to make sure we are talking about all the issues that are important to this country, and minimum wage is one that we want to also talk about tonight, we wanted to take this time just to highlight what happened, this travesty two weeks ago, and we hope that this will be cured.

Outside officials, regardless of their perspective, shouldn't be involved in the election, but we want to make sure we are highlighting what happened, because that election was not fair.

Thank you very much, gentleman from California, for all your many years of service on this.

At this point, we would like to also discuss tonight something that is very important. The Democrats, this week, took on what sometimes is considered a very unique measure in this House, it is called a discharge petition, because we have been fighting for over a year to try to raise the minimum wage in this country.

There is a bill introduced by the gentleman from California and Senator HARKIN from Iowa that would raise the minimum wage to $10.10 within 3 years.

If we had kept up with inflation since 1968, the minimum wage right now would be something like $10.60.

Instead, we are at $7.25, and people can't get by. You certainly can't be in the middle class on that wage, and certainly it makes it hard to aspire to be in the middle class on that minimum wage.

We need to do everything we can to help lift that rising tide for everyone who gets that minimum wage because 16.5 million people will immediately get a pay increase, and another 8 million people will very likely get an increase because they are at that margin already and their wage will be lifted already.

These aren't numbers coming from the Democrats. These are numbers coming from the Congressional Budget Office, our nonpartisan entity that provides us facts and figures.

By giving the Nation a boost in the minimum wage, we help the economy, we help those who are in the middle class and aspiring to be in the middle class, and we can make this country a lot better for everyone trying to get by.

At this point I would like to yield to one of my colleagues from the State of Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT), one of my freshman colleagues who has also been the president of our freshman class.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Thank you, Mr. POCAN.

I want to say, at the outset, that I was impressed with the colloquy that you had with our colleague from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), and I wish to associate myself with those comments. They were very well-taken.

I, for one, and I know I speak on behalf of the entire Congressional Progressive Caucus, but I, for one, hope that the National Labor Relations Board revisits what happened in Chattanooga, because what we believe here in America is free and fair elections, and that includes labor union elections as well.

We are here to talk about raising the minimum wage, and it was only appropriate that Mr. MILLER from California was here with us this evening because he is one of the coauthors of H.R. 1010, the bill to raise the minimum wage to $10.10, a modest proposal, I should add.

But let me attempt to address this House. I know that there are those who think that everything that could be said about raising the minimum wage has already been said, but allow me to address this House as if nothing had been said about raising the minimum wage in this country to $10.10.

It is simply a matter of arithmetic. You know, if you just take what people were making at a minimum wage in the late 1960s in this country and put it on a cost index, a consumer price index, any kind of measure of inflation that has gone on since 1968, you see that, as my colleague and good friend from Wisconsin mentioned, it is well over $10.10 an hour. It is something like $10.60 an hour.

So this is indeed a modest proposal to turn the minimum wage up from the

mid-sevens to $10.10 an hour, and there are good, solid reasons we have in this country for doing this.

My fellow Members of the House, you have to remember what life is like for people who are making $7.25, $7.50, $7.75. People who are in that range are not bringing home enough money to make a living wage. They don't have enough money for the necessities of life.

People who are working full time—you have heard the expression ''the working poor,'' that is who we are talking about. These are the working poor.

Think about what our society has to do for the working poor. These are the people who have to take advantage of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the SNAP benefits. They used to be called food stamps.

These people don't make enough money, even though they work full time, to feed their families properly, so they resort to help from the SNAP program. Who pays for the SNAP program you might ask?

All of us do. U.S. taxpayers, John Q. Public pays for the SNAP program, so it is John Q. Public, not the employers of these people making the $7 per hour, not the employers paying for that, it is John Q. Taxpayer picking up the difference.

It is the taxpayers paying for the SNAP benefits for the workers who, although they are working full time, their employers are not paying them enough so that they can feed their families, give them the very basic necessities.

What else?

These are people that live in section 8 housing, low-income housing. Everybody knows that, the projects. That is where they live, the people who make minimum wage right now and try to feed and clothe and shelter their families on minimum wage in this country.

So who pays the supplemental amount to keep the section 8 housing program going?

It is us. It is John Q. Public, John Q. Taxpayer. It is the American taxpayers picking up the difference because not enough is being paid to these workers so that they can sustain their families. But that is not all.

What about Head Start?

These are families that can't afford to send their kids to preschool because when they are making minimum wage, they can't pay the minimal fee to send your kid to preschool.

So where do they go?

They go to Head Start. Head Start, a federally funded program.

Who pays for that?

You already know the answer. You do. It is the American taxpayer. It is John Q. Public paying for Head Start because we have got working families that don't make enough even to send their little kids to preschool.

What is the point of all of this?

The point is that these employers paying the minimum wage to these workers are paying so little that the American taxpayers have to step in and improve the lives of these people to such a basic level that they can feed them and clothe them and shelter them and give them the basic elemental education.

In other words, these employers are freeloaders. They are getting a free ride off of the American public because they are paying the minimum wage, which is in the sevens and it should be in the tens.

Listening to this debate, the owner of a small business might say, well, wait a minute. That means I have to lay people off because I only have so much money to pay my employees, so if you up the minimum wage to $10.10, I don't have as much money to pay each person, so I have to lay somebody off so I can pay the remaining people the $10.10 an hour.

That is a fallacy. It is a completely bogus argument, and let me tell you why: because that assumes that your business is a zero sum game. It is not.

To prove that, we need go back a century to a great American businessman, a self-made man, Henry Ford out of Dearborn, Michigan. What did he do?

He started one the greatest auto companies in the world. A central tenet of his business principles was that he was going to pay his workers a living wage, and he did.

They asked him, Mr. Ford, why are you paying your workers so much? You don't have to do this.

The answer is: I want my workers to be able to afford the things that I am building. If these people can't afford what I am building, then I don't have a market.

That is where the magic word comes in: customers. If you pay $10.10 to your employees, it is not just your employees getting that increase in wages, it is everybody else's employees. Everybody in America, instead of making in the sevens, they get up to $10.10, and all of a sudden they have a few more coins jingling in their pockets, and they might show up in your place of business.

You are making customers out of millions and millions and millions of Americans by paying them a working wage, a living wage, a wage that will enable them to become your customers.

So don't write off this argument, and don't fall for the same old argument that has been used, trotted out time and time again for why we shouldn't raise the minimum wage. If we here in America had believed and followed that argument, the minimum wage would still be $2.25 instead of what it is now.

So think of the customers you will get. This is why raising the minimum wage just to what we would raise it to to account for inflation since 1968 makes sense.

Mr. POCAN. Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to a question?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. POCAN. So what you just said, talking about the buying power, putting that much money back into the economy, you know, I look at it this way. If you are someone who is making minimum wage and you get your wage increased to about $10.10, that extra money is not going to go into a savings account for something in the future. You are probably going to be buying things right now. You are going to buy a sofa maybe.

The average CEO now makes 354 times what the average worker makes. Back in the late eighties it was about a 40–1 ratio. Now it is 354 times.

When we put money into an average low-wage worker, that money goes immediately into the economy. They can buy a sofa.

But when the gains that we have had in this country have gone, largely, to the top executives, the top 1 percent, the top 1 and 2 percent, how many sofas can you buy at that rate? How does that affect the economy?

Do you have any idea how many sofas you think you could buy if you are a CEO to try to keep up with and help stimulate the economy?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. If stacked end to end, how far into space would those sofas reach is the question.

It is a great point, Mr. POCAN. Of course, you know the answer. The answer is this: when we put that extra money in the pockets of the people who are making the minimum wage in this country, they don't put that money in their brokerage accounts just to languish and not help others in the economy. They plug that money right back into the American economy, and it turns into growth and it turns into jobs.

That is what we were doing in 1968 when our economy was humming along and we were the pride of the free world. That is what we need to do again.

We need to think about stimulating our economy the old fashioned American way, by paying American workers a living wage.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you very much again, gentleman. I appreciate it.

I would also like to yield some time to another one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN). He is a freshman, but a returning freshman from the State of Minnesota, my neighboring State, from the great iron ranges of Minnesota.

Mr. NOLAN. I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I want to associate myself with your remarks and those of the gentleman from California regarding what has happened at Volkswagen and the importance of the union movement in this country.

If anyone wants to know where the economic success of the middle class in this country has come from, you just need to follow the union movement. As the union movement grew and strengthened, so did the middle class and jobs and opportunities, and as we have seen the decline in recent years, we have seen a similar decline in income and jobs and opportunities.

If anyone thinks for one moment that elections don't have consequences,

they need to take a look at their history.

I come from the Iron Range. We have got a lot of mining and steelworkers up there. Back in 1948, if you will allow me to just do a little history here, and leading up to that, the steelworkers union proposed contracts that would allow them to negotiate pensions and health care benefits, and wouldn't you know, the NLRB, in 1947, said, no, you can't do that. That is not okay. That is off the table. That is not a subject for negotiation.

Guess what?

Not many people had pension benefits and health care at the time.

Well, it became a big issue in the 1948 election, and Harry Truman, as we all know, won the election.

□ 1915

Well, guess what? He had the opportunity to appoint a number of people to the NLRB, and that issue was brought before the NLRB again. And guess what? This time, the NLRB ruled that, no, it is appropriate for unions to negotiate for pensions, to negotiate for health care benefits; and that is a result of an election contest and the union movement, coming together, was a genesis of a generation that had prosperity and opportunities—perhaps unparalleled—anywhere in the history of this country.

I have submitted, back when my generation entered into the employment market, if you were going to be a failure, you had to have a plan. There was just such an abundance of opportunities, and I am sometimes ashamed and embarrassed that my generation doesn't want to step up and do for this generation and the next generation what was done for us.

So I commend you for what you are doing here today, and I also want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. We could go on, and we could add more to the litany of the things that are causing the rest of us to subsidize the businesses in this country.

And I know about business. I spent the last 32 years of my life in business. I am a business guy. It breaks my heart to see working men and women having to go to the food shelves to get food to feed their family.

So I rise here tonight to talk about the minimum wage just briefly. You know, we hear about all these millions of new jobs that have been created in recent years. One of my constituents said to me the other day: You know, it is a darn good thing we have created millions of new jobs because a guy needs two or three of them to make a living.

Well, that is, in fact, what is happening; and it is of small comfort to someone who is working these minimum wage jobs to know that, if they can put two or three of them together, they can provide for their family, make the rent payment, the mortgage payment, buy the groceries and clothing for the kids; but you put in two or three jobs, there is no time left for the family.

A minimum wage increase is pro-family. It is pro-American. It is the foundation of what made this country the great country that it is.

Mr. Speaker, I hear all the time in my district, as I travel and stop at the cafes and the filling stations and the convenience stores, about these people that are working two and three jobs just to make ends meet, all because our minimum wage is simply not enough to take care of our families.

The lack of a decent and fair minimum wage is unfair to families. It is unfair to children. It is unfair to the elderly. It is unfair to the hardworking mothers and fathers, men and women in this country who go to work every day, providing the goods and services that we need so that we can continue on the path of the great Nation that we have been.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we raise this minimum wage. Where I come from, morality and ethics dictated. If someone is willing to go to work every day and every week and every month to provide essential goods and services for the rest of us and this Nation, they are entitled to a wage that would allow them to live with a modicum of comfort and dignity. That is what this is all about.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us vote on this issue. You know what the outcome will be. We will increase the minimum wage if we are given an opportunity to vote on it here in this House. I know there are plenty of Republicans and Democrats who will vote to do that. Let's restore democracy to this institution.

Let's allow this matter to be brought before the House. Let's have a vote on it. Let's give America a pay raise now. It is desperately needed.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) and Members of the House.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. NOLAN, I think what you are referring to is exactly what the Democrats are doing this week. We are initiating a discharge petition. We need to get 218 Members of this House to sign that to force a vote.

The House leadership has refused to let us have a vote on giving America a pay raise; and because of that, we are taking what is generally a pretty unusual motion—in other words, to discharge—to actually get enough people to sign and say: we want to vote on this, so we can pass it.

And I completely agree with you, Mr. NOLAN. If we put this on the floor, it will pass, unless the Republican leadership doesn't allow us to get this up here.

So I thank you for all of your efforts, not only just to get people to sign the discharge petition, but for all of the middle class families of Iron Range, Minnesota.

Mr. NOLAN. Thank you.

Mr. POCAN. One of the things that we have talked about tonight is the value of why we want to increase the minimum wage, why it is going to put money into the economy right now. Again, this isn't the Democrats saying that. These are economic experts. These are some of the economists of the country.

The Economic Policy Institute has said that, if we raise the minimum wage, we would actually create 85,000 new jobs, in their calculation, within 3 years and put a $22 billion boost to the economy; and that means $500 million alone to the State of Wisconsin—$500 million to my State and $22 billion to the overall economy.

And what is more, you would lift 900,000 Americans out of poverty, according to the Congressional Budget Office. So we would lift people out of poverty, give people the ability to support their families and the ability to actually have a chance at living in the middle class.

Right now, on the minimum wage, your monthly gross salary is about $1,250. Now, how many of you think you could live paying your rent or mortgage, paying for groceries, paying for your utilities, paying for gas or a bus or however it is you get around?

Think about the bills you have. Could you live on $1,250 a month? And that is what the minimum wage is right now, less than the real value in current dollars that it was in 1968. It should be up to $10.74, I believe, if we kept up with inflation.

There are a lot of myths out there. You are going to hear people on the other side of the aisle say: well, this is all for teenagers. Why are we going to lift the wage?

The average person who receives minimum wage is 35 years old. What percentage of the people earning minimum wage are teenagers? Twelve percent. Again, that is not the Democrats saying that. The Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan agency we go to for numbers, says that.

So if we raise the minimum wage, we will lift 900,000 people out of poverty, directly support 24.5 million workers, about two-thirds of those people directly with an increase in wage at the minimum wage level and another third who are at the $10 level, who will also see a ripple effect of a boost in wages.

We will help the economy right now by putting that money into the economy in all the ways that were talked about tonight, and we know that this will not have a detrimental effect on the economy.

Now, some will say that it is going to cost jobs. I will tell you, in my State of Wisconsin, I spent 14 years in the legislature before I came to Congress; and every time we raised the minimum wage, there was an increase in jobs available. More people went into the workforce because we were actually offering a greater wage and people are given an incentive to get into the workforce.

There are studies that compare State by State, county by county, where one

had a minimum wage increase and one didn't; and there has been no ill effect in the county that did versus didn't, based on raising the minimum wage.

There are 600 economists, including seven Nobel economics prize winners, who agree that it will have no or negligible effect to the increase of jobs; but everyone agrees, it will help those people who are currently either living in poverty, working for minimum wage—two, three jobs to get by—or those who are just making above it and will see that ripple effect.

So there is no question, we need to give the workers of this country a pay raise. For all too long, we haven't done it. For all too long, we haven't kept up with inflation. You simply can't get by on roughly $15,000 a year. That $1,250 a month is impossible.

We are not talking about teenagers. We are talking about the average person being 35 years old, heads of households who are working one, two, maybe three part-time jobs just to get by.

So the Progressive Caucus is here tonight. And this is why we are talking not only about what happened at the union election in Chattanooga, but about raising the minimum wage.

The Democrats in this House have initiated a discharge petition to force a vote. Let us vote, Mr. Speaker. Let us vote on raising the minimum wage because if you let us vote, I know there are enough fair-minded Republicans that will join with the Democrats in this Chamber; and we will raise the minimum wage, but only if we are allowed to.

We are making every effort, and the Progressive Caucus will continue to do this. We were the ones who went and asked the President to raise it for people who get Federal contracts, and the President made that order. We are very happy the President did that.

But we are going to continue to push this in every way possible, so that people can live comfortably in the middle class and those who aspire to can get into the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I thank you for allowing the Progressive Caucus to have this time this evening, and I yield back the balance of my time.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we are here today as part of the New Democratic Coalition Immigration Task Force, which I am proud to cochair along with my colleagues, Representative GARCIA and Representative CASTRO.

I am here to discuss immigration reform and what the path forward is for an issue that over 70 percent of the American people agree, an issue that right now threatens the security of this country, that continues to cost taxpayers money; but with the passage of a simple bill that already more than two-thirds of the Senate has supported would reduce our deficit by hundreds of billions of dollars, finally secure our border, restore the rule of law within our country, and ensure that, never again, will we have millions of people in this country here illegally.

More than a year ago, the New Democratic Coalition helped pave the way for immigration reform with the release of detailed principles on comprehensive immigration reform.

Our principles express support for commonsense reforms that reduce bureaucratic backlogs, reunite families, create jobs for Americans, and spur competitiveness.

In August, we issued a letter to Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, demanding that he introduce a comprehensive immigration reform bill; and if he failed to do so, we would introduce our own.

Well, no bill was forthcoming, so New Democratic Coalition members worked with a diverse group of colleagues on both sides of the aisle to introduce the House's only bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill, H.R. 15, last October.

Since then, we have met with countless stakeholders, from business owners to law enforcement to agriculture to the faith-based community, all who support moving the ball forward and support our bill, H.R. 15. Businesses, tech companies, faith leaders, and our voters are demanding action on fixing our broken immigration system.

Yet despite a level of consensus rarely seen in our country on an issue—and rarely seen in Washington on an issue—the loudest, most extreme voices on the other side of the aisle have thus far been successful in preventing this body from acting and solving a problem that the American people want solved.

One of my Republican colleagues even equated DREAMers—young de facto Americans who grew up in this country and know no other country and want nothing more than to pay taxes and contribute to make America better—one of my Republican colleagues compared DREAMers with drug mules, with disparaging remarks about the size of their calves; and he continues to refuse to apologize for his hateful comments.

These kinds of deplorable, intolerant remarks are dividing our country, but they should not divide this Chamber. They should not prevent a commonsense bill from coming forward.

House Republicans need to reject the offensive and unproductive rhetoric of some of their Members and finally show real leadership on immigration reform that a majority of Republican voters support.

The only floor vote that we have even had this entire legislative session on immigration was a vote to defund the Deferred Action program, to defund the docket program, a vote to deport DREAMers, to not allow DREAMers to get right with the law and get a provisional renewable working permit. Sadly, that amendment passed the House.

We were able to stop it. It didn't happen. The docket program continues. We encourage President Obama to extend the docket program.

But just to show the American people where Congress is and what the Republicans have done, the only immigration bill that they have even voted on was to deport DREAMers. The House majority can't continue to sit by and allow extremists to define their party.

□ 1930

Now, the release of immigration principles by the Republicans on reform was a very positive first step, and we encourage the Republicans to work with Democrats to construct a bill based on these principles, many of which we believe are consistent with those of the New Democratic Coalition and consistent with H.R. 15. We are happy to look at new ideas built on the principles that we can establish together and a commitment to fix our broken immigration system.

But, again, our patience can't last forever. If there is continued Republican failure to bring a bill forward, we will have no option but to take out a discharge petition on the only bipartisan bill that exists. If the Speaker won't lead, I hope that the membership of this body will lead, take the agenda into our own hands, and allow a vote that will pass, a bill that will then pass the Senate and be signed by the President.

We are joined by a cochair on the New Dem Immigration Task Force, a leader in the fight to reform our immigration system, the Representative from Texas (Mr. CASTRO.)

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congressman POLIS, and thank you for your leadership on the issue of comprehensive immigration reform.

I am proud to join you and Congressman GARCIA of Florida as cochairs of the New Dem Coalition advocating for comprehensive immigration reform. As you mentioned, there are very compelling moral and economic reasons for the United States Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform in the year 2014.

We know, for example, that there are a handful of American industries, four or five or six major American industries, that literally would not exist the way they do and would not be nearly as productive as they are but for immigrant labor—both legal and undocumented immigrant labor. For example, we know that about 40 percent of the tech businesses that have been started in Silicon Valley have been started by foreign-born persons, by immigrants. We know, for example, that with respect to the agricultural industry, they self-report that 50 percent of their workers are undocumented, which probably means that 75 percent of their workers are undocumented.

So, on everything from the high-tech industry to the agriculture industry, construction and other trades, we can appreciate, especially myself coming from the great State of Texas, that Texas does more trade than any other State in the Nation. It has the longest border with Mexico of any State in the Nation. We can appreciate the role that immigrants have played in our society and continue to play in our economy.

I want to share with you, Congressman, just a quick story of an immigrant that I met recently back home in San Antonio, because I know that over the course of this debate there has been a lot of divisiveness and some disparaging remarks that have been made about immigrants. The overwhelming majority of these folks are not people who come to America to do us any harm or to commit crimes. These are people who are fundamentally seeking a better life in the way that, throughout the generations, people have come here to this country.

A few months back, right around the time of the government shutdown, I went back home to San Antonio. I was home for about 36 hours, and my hair had gotten too long, so I decided to get a haircut. It was a Sunday, and the place that I usually go to was closed. So I drove around and I came to a strip mall. I was looking for a place that might be open.

I came across this place called J Cuts. I went inside and sat down. There was a woman who welcomed me into the chair, and she started telling me her story as she was cutting my hair. She told me the story of how she arrived in the United States. She said that she had come from Latin America I guess about 25 years ago, that she had come in a raft of inner tubes across the Rio Grande. She had ended up marrying—and I imagine, marrying an American citizen—and becoming a U.S. citizen.

This woman said that she worked for a few years cleaning houses and cleaning businesses. She had often been cheated out of money by her employers. She mentioned that one job that had promised her $1,000 turned into $100. After that, she worked at Fantastic Sams and Supercuts, a few haircutting chains, and that is how she learned how to speak English.

But the long and short of it is, eventually this woman, Ms. Gonzalez, came to own her own hair salon, became an entrepreneur, and was now employing other people. She said her brothers who also immigrated also were businessowners now.

So those are very promising and not atypical stories of immigrants who come here and are very productive members of our society and who have a lot to contribute.

It has been my hope throughout this debate that, in the rhetoric that comes out of the United States Congress, we will realize and acknowledge that immigrants play such an important role in the life of our Nation and that they always have, that this is a nation of immigrants and continues to be a nation of immigrants.

I would also say that there is a scarier day in America than a time when everybody wants to come here. The scarier day is a time when nobody wants to come here, and that is a day that we should truly be worried about.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

The strength of our Nation, a nation built on immigrants, is that the best, brightest, and hardest working from across the world want to move here. The countries that have a bigger problem today are those that are losing those people—not us, the country that stands to gain some of the best, most highly motivated and talented people from across the world, just as my great-grandparents came to these shores to make our country stronger. I know that, by working together, we can accomplish that.

Have you ever seen the unprecedented degree of coalition behind immigration reform? Have you ever seen agriculture, the faith-based community, and the business community—and labor and business together—on an issue in your time in public service or before? Have you ever seen that on an issue?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. No. You raise an incredible point. I served 10 years, five terms in the Texas Legislature. This is my first term in Congress.

But consider this: Last year, in 2013, we had what was, on record, the least productive Congress in American history. Something like only 58 bills went to the President's desk. So you can imagine in this place there is a lot of gridlock. The wheels, essentially, in 2013 came to a halt.

But of all of the major issues, immigration reform is the one that had the most bipartisan support and the strongest support. And consider this for a second: I think it was sometime in the summer the President of the United States had a press conference over at the White House, and he had standing on either side of him the head of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the head of the AFL–CIO. Now, think about that for a second. How often do you have the head of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the head of the AFL–CIO standing next to each other agreeing on anything? But that is how deep and how profound the wide range of support is for comprehensive immigration reform.

And it is not just business and labor, it is people from throughout the political spectrum: the evangelical community that, quite honestly, has been fairly conservative, so the religious community and the social advocates who are ordinarily on the left. It has just been a wide array of people from throughout the political spectrum who have come out in support of comprehensive reform, which really begs the question of why Congress has not moved on this issue when, on the other side, there has been no organized opposition.

There has been a clear indication that a majority of Americans support comprehensive immigration reform, and so it has left a lot of Americans wondering why on Earth Congress can't pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. POLIS. I think most Americans, like myself, are somewhat offended that we don't have the rule of law in this country. There are millions—10 million, 12 million. We don't even know how many people that are here illegally. We don't know where they are. We don't know what they are doing. It is a security risk. It is an economic risk. Are they paying taxes? There have been studies that show they pay some; they might not be paying others. We need to fix this.

I have gone to town halls in the most conservative part of my district, and I say, is there anyone here who thinks the immigration system is working great? I haven't met a single constituent who does. They want it fixed. They want to make sure that people are required to get right with the law and get in line behind people who did it the right way and are already in line for eventual green card or citizenship.

That is exactly what the bipartisan bill proposes. It provides a way that people can register with the law, mandatory workplace authentication to ensure that anybody who gets a job going forward has at least the provisional status that allows them to have that job. Only about under 10 percent—I think it is 8 or 9 percent—of companies in this country use E-Verify. We need to improve E-Verify. There is money to do that in the bill to make sure it is correct more often. And then, of course, we need to make it mandatory along with the route, of course, for the people that need to go to work the next day to have the provisional permit that they need to go to work the next day and get in line behind other Americans, other people that are in line for citizenship or a green card.

There are a lot of misperceptions out there about the bill. One thing that is important to talk about is that this bill that is being proposed, the bipartisan immigration reform, H.R. 15, as well as the Senate bill, don't confer citizenship on anybody. Zero people are made citizens under this bill. That is as it should be. You don't want to reward illegal behavior. What you want to do is say get right with the law, pay a fine, a penalty, you violated the law.

What should the penalty be? Pay that fine, register, and get right with the law. And do you know what? If you demonstrate that you have become a productive American, you learn English, you have a job, and you support your family, in 13 years, 12 years, 15 years, you can stand for American citizenship, take a test and eventually become an American citizen.

But no one should be rewarded for violating the law under this bill, and

no one is. What it does is it creates the line. What is so frustrating today is people say, ''Oh, why don't they get in line?'' when, in reality, there is no line. If you are a parent of an American child who is growing up here, there is no line for you to be gone for 20 years while your child is being raised without you. That doesn't make any sense. You have to create a way that we can do this within the system of law that is to the benefit of the American people, prevents people who don't have documentation from undermining wages for other Americans, makes sure that they can buy their own health care so that taxpayers aren't left on the hook for health care for people that can't even buy insurance if they wanted.

There are practical reasons that this saves money for the average American family. This helps push up wages for the average American family. It reduces our deficit by hundreds of billions of dollars. We could use that as a pay-for. We always look for ways—we could use that as a pay-for for a tax cut for the middle class. We could use it as a pay-for to fund universal preschool. We could use it as a pay-for to ensure that we have the military preparedness we need to meet the challenges of the 21st century or to honor our veterans who have served us in our recent conflicts.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. You bring up a wonderful point, which is that you have got—we have, in our Nation, 10 to 15 million people, undocumented immigrants, who essentially are off the radar that we can't account for. And so a large part of this bill is bringing those people out of the shadows and making sure that we can account for their activities, making sure that they are paying taxes and that they are able to purchase health care insurance.

Right now, as you know in Colorado, and certainly we know in Texas, when somebody shows up at a county hospital and they can't afford to pay for their services, their emergency services, all of us, as taxpayers, end up paying those bills, and that includes a lot of undocumented folks. And those services, of course, have to be provided. Everybody needs to be provided emergency services. So this would be a way to essentially bring them under the grid, understand who they are, and bring them into society's fold. Those are definitive benefits of the bill that we propose.

Mr. POLIS. Another sector it would be great for is the real estate industry and homes. Many immigrants who don't have their status currently are forced to rent, sometimes under the table. They would be able to finance and buy their own homes, helping to revitalize areas that have high vacancy rates and lots of foreclosures. We have areas in Colorado that continue to be hit by foreclosures. We would love to introduce new buyers to those markets and help ensure that families have good, stable homes to raise their American children in.

□ 1945

Another thing that I think a lot of Americans don't realize is that in many cases the children of these families are American nationals. So you might have in one family two Americans, one person with a green card, and two that don't have paperwork. So what should the solution be? Should it be to send all of them to another country? Are you going to send an American citizen who has never even been to another country back to another country because they are an 8-year-old? Are you going to force them into the foster care system because you are just taking the parent?

This country is about family values. Immigration reform should unite families, and we should celebrate what is the backbone of our strength as a Nation, the American family.

We are joined by another leader in the battle to replace our broken immigration system with one that works for our country, the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. I thank the distinguished member from Colorado.

I would like to explain a little bit about why I believe we have the greatest country on the planet. It is because people like my parents with only a first- and second-grade education, without much opportunity in the country that they were born and raised in, started a new life here in the United States of America, which gave me and my brothers and sisters, all 11 of us, more opportunities here in America than we could have had in my parents' home country.

Every day I am in this sacred Chamber serving the American people, I count my blessings. I personally know what comprehensive immigration reform can accomplish, not only for 11 million undocumented people who are already our neighbors and friends but for American businesses and the U.S. economy.

I mentioned about my mother and father with a first- and second-grade education and how their children got to go to college. We have doctoral degrees and master's degrees and bachelor's degrees. Every single one of our households pays more in taxes today than my parents ever made in gross income in any given year. I point that out because this country was founded on immigrants. It is that immigrant spirit that today is creating more jobs and American-born citizens. This is a country where people are given hope. This is a country where people come from other parts of the world, and they kiss the ground that they have arrived on and they love our country. They love this country. They love what they have made now their country, and they are contributors to what is great about this country, the greatest economy in the world.

House Republicans have a choice to make on immigration reform. Are they going to do what is right for Americans, or will they let anti-immigrant Members of this Congress, who absurdly call good students right here in America, the DREAMers, they call them drug mules, will they let these people be the messengers of their party about immigration reform?

That is why the Chamber of Commerce and more than 630 business organizations are urging us, Congress, to modernize our broken immigration system. We must create a less cumbersome path to legal immigration. Improving our outdated system will encourage long-term success. Comprehensive immigration reform will attract young foreign workers who will help reduce the deficit by as much as $1.2 trillion over the next 20 years. That improves America. They will help the economy grow by nearly 5 percent over the next 20 years. They will jump-start housing recovery, adding $68 billion every year to our American construction economy.

American wages will increase, and legal immigrants will add more than $100 billion in tax revenue to benefit all Americans.

Moreover, attracting the best and brightest talent abroad will cement America's competitiveness in the global economy for generations to come. We need to fix this broken immigration system. We need to stop sending these bright Ph.D.'s who come to love America, who get the degrees, and then we just send them home when they want to stay here and create a company that will employ American citizens, create wealth for American citizens right here on our soil.

Forty percent of Fortune 500 companies were founded by immigrants or their children. Tech giants like Google, eBay, and Intel were founded by first- or second-generation Americans. These pioneering companies employ millions of Americans. Alongside American-born citizens, immigrants have spurred significant innovation and conducted critical research, pushing the United States forward.

I urge Congress to tackle the bureaucratic immigration backlog, reunite families, and supercharge the economy for all Americans. Comprehensive immigration reform must happen, and it must be done well, creating a modern system that is fair and efficient for everyone. A comprehensive immigration reform bill will require people who came here undocumented, yes, to pay fines; yes, to learn English; and will secure our borders even more than they are secured today. That is the kind of comprehensive immigration bill that I think every American wants to see happen. Unfortunately, the leadership of this House of Congress is unwilling to put that bill on the floor. That is why I am here today, to urge commonsense action on the floor of the United States Congress so we can do what is best for the economy of the United States of America, and that is to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from California, who has been a tremendous leader in the fight to fix our broken immigration system, for his heartfelt comments.

I wanted to quote from last week a Wall Street Journal op-ed that criticized the Republicans' failure to act. It is not every day that The Wall Street Journal criticizes Republicans with harsh words. It is kind of one of those ''man bites dog'' stories, but they didn't mince words. The Wall Street Journal wrote:

> Republicans have killed immigration reform for now, but a recent study shows in the real economy it is needed. The irony is that many Republicans who support handouts to farmers oppose reforms that wouldn't cost taxpayers a dime and would help the economy.

So rather than help farmers succeed in the private sector by hiring employees they want, the Republicans are seeking to keep them on the public dole, giving them taxpayer money rather than allowing them to operate in the marketplace and sell their products at the market.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office found that the Senate comprehensive bill, which H.R. 15 is based on, would raise wages for Americans by $470 billion, create an average of 120,000 jobs for American citizens, and increase the growth of our GDP by 3.3 percent.

Polls continue to show that vast majorities of the American people support immigration reform—Republicans, Independents, Democrats, every demographic, every State supports immigration reform. Congress' failure to act is becoming inexcusable. Look, if the Republican majority puts together a bill based on the principles they laid out, let's have a floor discussion, and let's get something done. If they fail to fill the promising words of those principles with an actual bill, then we will take the only bipartisan bill we have, H.R. 15, and file to discharge it. What does that mean? That is the only way that the membership of the House of Representatives can bring a bill to the floor without the Speaker's blessing. We would love to work through the Speaker. We challenge the Speaker to lead. We applaud, and our new Dem coalition put out a statement applauding the immigration principle, saying we can find common ground and pass a bill. But there needs to be a bill. If there is not, let's move forward with the one we have, which would pass tomorrow on the floor of the House.

I am honored to yield to a leader in the fight to reform immigration, a cochair of the New Democratic Coalition Immigration Task Force, my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA).

Mr. GARCIA. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

There should be no question by now that immigration reform is good for America, and Americans want immigration reform. Nearly 80 percent of Americans agree, and up to 70 percent of Republicans support reform with a pathway to citizenship. The issue is not simply about justice and fairness. It is about ensuring America's economic prosperity.

In Florida alone, legalizing all the currently undocumented immigrants would generate $1.3 billion of new tax revenue and create 97,000 new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, fixing our broken immigration system will help small businesses expand, foster innovation, increase productivity, raise wages, and help create thousands of jobs. Comprehensive immigration reform makes all Americans better, makes our country richer, and makes opportunity for all.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great tragedies of some countries is they fail to realize what they are truly good at. If there is something that America is better at than any other Nation, it is making Americans. Throughout the history of this great Nation, generation after generation, we have made new Americans better Americans and a greater America.

The statement Mr. POLIS mentioned earlier referring to DREAMers as drug mules was ludicrous, but doubling down on those remarks was downright appalling. You know, the gentleman from Iowa not only offends DREAMers, offends the undocumented, he offends all Americans. In defending this statement, claims have been made that detractors only criticize the choice of language, and then he goes further by saying those who attack him simply won't engage on the facts.

Well, yes, the choice of words is offensive, and as the son of an immigrant, I am offended, but the claims are also patently false. They shouldn't be an excuse for not moving immigration reform.

I want to thank my colleagues tonight, and I want to thank the Speaker for the time. The time has come to pass immigration reform. The opportunity is now. Let us not wait. It hurts our country.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. UPTON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

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

A BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on February 27, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 2431. To reauthorize the National Integrated Drought Information System.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 28, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4832. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticides; Satisfaction of Data Requirements; Procedures to Ensure Protection of Data Submitters' Rights [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0456; FRL-9904-32] (RIN: 2070-AJ58) received January 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4833. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-176, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4834. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-187, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4835. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-188, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4836. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting extension of the waiver of Section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act, Pub. L. 107-511, with respect to assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4837. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-186, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4838. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting decisions pursuant to the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4839. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting memorandum of justification; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4840. A letter from the Vice President, Office of External Affairs, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Regulatory Flexibility Act certification for proposed amendments to OPIC's Freedom of Information Act regulations; Privacy Act regulations; and Touhy regulations received February 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4841. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Permits and Regulations, Division of Migratory Bird Management, Department of the

Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Hunting; Revision of Language for Approval of Nontoxic Shot for Use in Waterfowl Hunting [Docket No.: FWS-R9-MB-2011-0077; FF09M21200-134-FXMB1231099BPP0] (RIN: 1018-AY59) received February 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4842. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Status for Eriogonum codium (Umtanum Desert Buckwheat) and Physaria douglasii subsp. tuplashensis (White Bluffs Bladderpod) and Designation of Critical Habitat [Docket Nos.: FWS-R1-ES-2012-0017; FWS-R1-ES-2013-0012] (RIN: 1018-AX72; 1018-AZ54) received February 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4843. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Chromolaena frustrata (Cape Sable Thoroughwort) [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2013-0029] (RIN: 1018-AZ51) received February 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4844. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Arctostaphylos franciscana (Franciscan Manzanita) [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2012-0067; 4500030114] (RIN: 1018-AY63) received February 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4845. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Island Fisheries; 2014 Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures [Docket No.: 131028907-4042-02] (RIN: 0648-XC954) received February 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4846. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Tanner Crab Area Closure in the Gulf of Alaska and Gear Modification Requirements for the Gulf of Alaska and Bering Sea Groundfish Fisheries [Docket No.: 120405263-3999-02] (RIN: 0648-BB76) received February 12, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4847. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2014 Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Pollock, Atka Mackerel, and Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amounts [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XD060] received January 29, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4848. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for the State of New Jersey [Docket No.: 111220786-1781-01] (RIN: 0648-XD030) received February 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4849. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Little League Baseball, transmitting the Annual Report of Little League Baseball, Incorporated for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1084(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2641. A bill to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–363, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Natural Resources discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2641 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD:

H.R. 4104. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the 7.5 percent threshold for the medical expense deduction for people 65 or older; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 4105. A bill to establish a Maritime Goods Movement User Fee and provide grants for international maritime cargo improvements and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARR (for himself and Mr. BERA of California):

H.R. 4106. A bill to provide for the development and dissemination of clinical practice guidelines and the establishment of a right of removal to Federal courts for defendants in medical malpractice actions involving a Federal payor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 4107. A bill to reduce the number of nuclear-armed submarines operated by the Navy, to prohibit the development of a new long-range penetrating bomber aircraft, to prohibit the procurement of new intercontinental ballistic missiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 4108. A bill to establish a grant program for nebulizers in elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GRIMM, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ENYART, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 4109. A bill to require the President to designate a legal public holiday to be known as National First Responders Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. GARCIA):

H.R. 4110. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to encourage private employers to hire veterans, to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the reasonable efforts an employer may make under the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act with respect to hiring veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 4111. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to implement various reforms to the social security disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 4112. A bill to require that activities carried out by the United States in South Sudan relating to governance, reconstruction and development, and refugee relief and assistance will support the basic human rights of women and women's participation and leadership in these areas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 4113. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to consider projects involving rural communities in the selection of alternative water source projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. McNERNEY (for himself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 4114. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for property certified by the Environmental Protection Agency under the WaterSense program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NOLAN (for himself, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 4115. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to temporarily waive certain vehicle weight limits for covered logging vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4116. A bill to direct the Librarian of Congress to obtain a stained glass panel depicting the seal of the District of Columbia and install the panel among the stained glass panels depicting the seals of States which overlook the Main Reading Room of the Library of Congress Thomas Jefferson Building; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 4117. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H. Res. 493. A resolution expressing support for the designation of February 28, 2014, as ''Rare Disease Day''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD:

H.R. 4104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 4105.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 4106.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

Article III, Section 1

Article III, Section 2, Clause 1

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 4107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 4108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 4109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 4110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 4111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

''. . . and provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States . . .''

''. . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers . . .''

This legislation seeks to reform the Social Security Disability Insurance program. Therefore, it will affect the general welfare of the United States.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 4112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 4113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 4114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 4115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The clause states that the United States Congress shall have power ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 4117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article XVI of the Constitution—Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes . . .

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 20: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 24: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. COLE, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 139: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 140: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 184: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 279: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 365: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 460: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 515: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 522: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 562: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 647: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 654: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 683: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 713: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 719: Mr. REED.

H.R. 741: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 792: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 855: Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 871: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 872: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 873: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 920: Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 946: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 997: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 1020: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 1084: Ms. BASS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1091: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1108: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1199: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1249: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 1250: Mr. SIRES and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1286: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1292: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1343: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 1461: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 1462: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1473: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1518: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1528: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1563: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1565: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 1593: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1597: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1599: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1694: Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 1708: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1726: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1750: Mr. HALL, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1775: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 1784: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1837: Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 1843: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1845: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1852: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1915: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1953: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1962: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1979: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2066: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2084: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2139: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2160: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2247: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 2315: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 2364: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 2368: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2387: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2520: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2536: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 2538: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 2548: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 2607: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2643: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 2783: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
H.R. 2788: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 2847: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2854: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2918: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 2939: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 2959: Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 2996: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 3086: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 3116: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3155: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 3168: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 3189: Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 3211: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 3305: Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 3318: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3335: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 3344: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3361: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 3441: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 3461: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 3467: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3469: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 3482: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 3494: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3505: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATTA, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 3508: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3529: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 3530: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3544: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 3546: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3593: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 3619: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3620: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 3629: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 3635: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 3643: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 3657: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 3658: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3663: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3670: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DELANEY, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 3673: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 3698: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 3712: Mr. CROWLEY and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 3723: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 3781: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3793: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3824: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 3850: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 3859: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 3870: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3872: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 3877: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3892: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3895: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 3921: Mr. LEWIS and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 3930: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. COOK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 3978: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ENYART, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3982: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3986: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 3997: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 4006: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 4008: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4012: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 4031: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 4056: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 4064: Mr. OLSON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 4069: Mr. GARDNER and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 4076: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. NOLAN.
H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. BUCSHON.
H. Con. Res. 70: Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MENG, and Mr. MICHAUD.
H. Res. 36: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H. Res. 109: Ms. BORDALLO.
H. Res. 112: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H. Res. 190: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H. Res. 356: Mr. STIVERS.
H. Res. 418: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H. Res. 422: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H. Res. 425: Mr. LATTA.
H. Res. 456: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARRIS, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 476: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. LATTA.
H. Res. 479: Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Res. 480: Mr. MORAN.
H. Res. 488: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, and Mr. POE of Texas.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

70. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Wilton Manors, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 2013–0114 urging the State Administration and Florida Legislature to support the regulation and licensing of Recovery Residences and Sober Houses throughout the State; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

71. Also, a petition of the Town of Dover, New Jersey, relative to Resolution 269–2013 urging the Congress to invest additional federal dollars in maintaining the highways and improving the transportation infrastructure in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.