only the Olneyville New York System has remained an iconic part of this community.

So I am saying congratulations to Greg Stevens and his sister, Stephanie Stevens Turini, on the well-deserved honor. I know that their dad is looking down on them very proudly today. Congratulations.

IMMIGRATION COVERAGE BIASED

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the issue of immigration continues to simmer, but it is not because of any substantive news in Congress. It is driven by the media and the coverage is slanted.

In the last 3 months, the three Capitol Hill publications have run over 30 stories about immigration. By a 10 to 1 ratio, they promoted amnesty for illegal immigrants over the need for border security.

Articles in The Washington Post and The Wall Street Journal reflect the same media agenda. These publications also published over 30 pro-amnesty articles, but not a single pro-enforcement article.

The national media should give the American people the facts, not tell them what to think. We need more objective news stories and fewer opinion pieces masquerading as news reports.

TEAM 26'S RIDE ON WASHINGTON

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Team 26 for continuing the call for commonsense gun violence prevention.

This Saturday, Team 26 begins their second Ride on Washington. This courageous group of men and women will be biking 400 miles from Newtown, Connecticut, in my district, to Washington, D.C.

Team 26 is made up of parents whose children attend or attended Sandy Hook Elementary School and folks who have lost loved ones to gun violence. They ride to honor the victims of gun violence from Newtown and from across the country, and they ride to urge Congress to act.

Team 26 rides to bring the message of peace, hope, and love. Let's listen to Team 26 and put politics aside.

Mr. Speaker, let us vote to enact meaningful gun violence prevention legislation this year.

NATIONAL FROZEN FOOD MONTH

(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 acknowledge National Frozen Food Month, and in doing so, one of my home State's own frozen food companies, Better Baked Foods.

Headquartered in North East, Pennsylvania, in the Fifth District of Pennsylvania, with facilities in Erie, Pennsylvania, and New York, Better Baked Foods is currently celebrating its 50th anniversary.

Over the years, Better Baked has built a reputation as an affordable option for nutritious snack foods. Today, the company proudly employs over 300 associates who produce over 325,000 pieces of frozen French bread pizzas, flatbreads, and breakfast sandwiches.

By devoting the necessary resources to its people, equipment, and facilities, Better Baked is continually working to ensure that it meets consumer demand and grows its operation.

I am proud to honor a company that is constantly innovating to improve its products while also recognizing the hard work and the efforts of its employees.

Mr. Speaker, in celebration of National Frozen Food Month, I wish to applaud Better Baked Foods and the entire frozen food industry for their hard work and continued contributions to strong local economies, through jobs and quality, affordable meals for our Nation's consumers.

BOYS 2 MEN

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud President Obama's new initiative, My Brother's Keeper, and to highlight one organization in our district doing outstanding work to mentor young men.

Boys 2 Men was created in November 2002 by Clayton Muhammad, with the mission of bringing young Black and Latino men together to build a bond of brotherhood and to redefine manhood. The organization has been a phenomenal success.

The members of Boys 2 Men are graduating from high school, going to college, and serving our country in the military.

Boys 2 Men has produced outstanding young men like Gilberto Chaidez, a graduate of West Aurora High School and a senior at the University of Illinois majoring in civil engineering. Gilberto was named the National Star Student of the Year by the Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers.

Jamario Taylor is a graduate of East Aurora High School and a senior at Western Illinois University. Jamario is a record-holder in the high jump and a top-ranked NCAA athlete.

Alexander Sewell is a graduate of Roosevelt University in Chicago. Alex went on to work in the office of Leader PELOSI; for the Secretary of Energy, Steven Chu; and now in the office of Senator LANDRIEU.

Initiatives like Boys 2 Men and My Brother's Keeper are invaluable resources to help young men get their lives on the right track, even if, despite everyone's best efforts, some of them end up working for the United States Congress.

LET'S RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, once again, to call for this body to bring H.R. 1010 to the floor and raise the Federal minimum wage.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will falsely claim that this will kill jobs. They misrepresent the findings of a recent CBO report. The important takeaway from that CBO report is that raising the minimum wage to $10.10 an hour will raise the wages of more than 16 million Americans and bring nearly 1 million Americans out of poverty.

In the 1990s, when the Clinton administration raised the minimum wage, the Republicans also argued that doing so would kill jobs, but the exact opposite happened. What we saw following the minimum wage increase in the 1990s was the greatest number of jobs created in a 4-year period.

A rising tide lifts all boats, Mr. Speaker. Let's raise the minimum wage. Let's grow our economy, and let's put people back to work.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2824, PREVENTING GOVERNMENT WASTE AND PROTECTING COAL MINING JOBS IN AMERICA; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2641, RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 501 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 501

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. 2824) to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to stop the ongoing waste by the Department of the Interior of taxpayer resources and implement the final rule on excess spoil, mining waste, and buffers for perennial and intermittent streams, 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

Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–41 modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2641) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, 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 the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–39. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of March 6, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to a measure addressing loan guarantees to Ukraine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 0915

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bills.

House Resolution 501 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 2641, the Responsibility of Professionally Invigorating Development Act, known as the RAPID Act. The resolution also provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 2824, Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America.

Lastly, the resolution provides suspension authority for legislation to provide much-needed financial relief to the government of Ukraine.

The resolution makes in order all of the amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules regarding the RAPID Act. It makes in order half of the amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules regarding the coal jobs bill.

Of the amendments made in order, more than half are sponsored by my colleagues across the aisle. The resolution provides for a robust debate in the House of Representatives.

In July, the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial, and Antitrust Law held a hearing on H.R. 2641. The subcommittee reported the bill favorably, without amendment, by voice vote. On July 31, the Committee on the Judiciary ordered H.R. 2641 favorably reported without amendment.

In August, the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held hearings on H.R. 2824. In November, the Committee on Natural Resources, by a bipartisan vote, voted favorably for the bill and reported it out.

Mr. Speaker, the bills before us today garnered majority support and bipartisan support for one simple reason: they ensure the regulatory process works for Americans, as intended by Congress.

Across the Nation, energy and infrastructure projects are being significantly delayed. In some cases, the environmental reviews have continued on for a decade or more. According to a study by the Chamber of Commerce, current delays are costing more than $1 trillion in economic development; and those delays are also prohibiting the creation of 1.9 million jobs.

As our country continues to struggle through a lackluster recovery, ensuring these beleaguered studies are completed would help generate jobs and create economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, in 2011, President Obama's Council on Jobs and Competitiveness recommended action to simplify regulatory review and streamline project approvals to accelerate jobs and growth.

Just this year, in his State of the Union, President Obama called for permit streamlining. He said action must be taken to ''slash bureaucracy and streamline the permitting process for key projects so we can get more construction workers on the job as fast as possible.''

News reports like to highlight our disagreements. In fact, it often seems that there is nothing that we can agree on. That is not true. Earlier this term, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 3080, the Water Resources Reform and Development Act. That bill passed by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote of 417–3.

The RAPID Act is nearly identical legislation to streamlining provisions contained in H.R. 3080 and the streamlining proposals from the President.

The House-passed WRRDA provided a process for Army Corps of Engineers-led studies to be concurrently reviewed in more of a parallel, as opposed to a linear fashion by multiple agencies. The President initiated a similar proposal, where studies had to be completed within 3 years.

The President and each Member of Congress who supported WRRDA should support this bill. The RAPID Act is simple. It allows multiple agencies to study the environmental impacts of a project at the same time. Because the agencies will have a better process by which to study a project, the RAPID Act establishes a reasonable and efficient timeline for completion of the study.

That is it. The RAPID Act provides a better process and a better timeline. The RAPID Act does not alter or weaken any of our environmental laws. The RAPID Act does not require that environmentally sensitive areas be developed.

The RAPID Act does not force agencies to approve projects. It simply reforms our permitting and regulatory

process to allow our Nation's most important infrastructure projects to move forward in a timely manner.

The President has asked for this to happen. 417 House Democrats and Republicans have supported this already. The bill should pass the House overwhelmingly with bipartisan support. This bill will get Washington out of the way of our economic growth and put unemployed Americans on a pathway back to work.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 2824, Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America. H.R. 2824 stabilizes the out-of-control regulatory scheme involving the Department of the Interior.

In 2008, after a 5-year exhaustive process, the Office of Surface Mining finalized a rule to protect our streams from excessive coal waste. The rule was supposed to go into effect on January 12, 2009.

However, the process was sidelined by a sue-and-settle gambit that the OSM, under President Obama's administration, used to attempt to rewrite the already finalized rule.

Since that settlement, the administration has spent 5 additional years and billed hardworking American taxpayers an additional $10 million attempting to rewrite the rule.

H.R. 2824 is simple. It tells OSM to put in place the 2008 rule, study the results, and report to Congress. If the study reveals a need to draft a new rule, then a new rule should be drafted. By putting in place the already finalized 2008 rule, H.R. 2824 ensures that our streams are safe while further study is conducted.

It is easy to see why these underlying bills should garner strong bipartisan support. They are measured and balanced in their approach to our project study and regulatory processes. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying pieces of legislation.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my good friend from Florida, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Just last week, I found myself standing here, managing a rule for two very similar bills. At the time, I thought we were on a merry-go-round, aimlessly moving in useless circles. I will stand by that analogy again today.

When similar bills came before Congress last session, the Senate didn't pass them. The President said he would not sign them, as he has this particular legislation. It seems to me that these measures are a foregone conclusion.

Ultimately, the same tired talking points might be a fun ride for some, but they will never actually take you anywhere. This kind of spinning in circles is a favorite tactic, it seems, of my friends on the other side of the aisle.

For example, this Congress has already taken 109 antienvironmental votes. Last Congress, it was 247. These were votes against clear air, against clean water, and to destroy our planet for future generations.

Under Republican leadership, we have also voted to repeal, as we did a day or so ago, the Affordable Care Act 50 different times, a law that, in many respects, has led to millions of Americans signing up for health insurance that didn't have it before.

And I will continue to ask my colleagues: If you don't like that particular measure, where is yours that would replace it? And apparently, nothing is forthcoming, at least until this time.

Based on the frequency of these quixotic votes, it is obvious that my friends across the aisle have given up or are not interested in governing or addressing any of the issues that are most pressing to this Nation.

Consider, for instance, that there are 2 million Americans relying on Congress to extend unemployment insurance, with close to 200,000 of them being unemployed veterans who have sacrificed time and again for our country.

Last week, I said the following:

> We should be spending the House's time on extending unemployment insurance, working on comprehensive immigration reform, and raising the minimum wage.

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.

We should be raising the minimum wage in order to give millions of hardworking Americans the pay they have earned. Nearly 5 years have passed since the last increase in the Federal minimum wage. 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.

My friends did not take my suggestions last week, and I doubt they will take them this week. Instead, we are considering two more pointless bills that will go nowhere. One of them, the acronym for it is RAPID. That is correct. Rapidly and fastly, it will go nowhere.

The first of today's bills, H.R. 2641, ignores the fact that, for more than 40 years, the National Environmental Policy Act has provided an effective framework for all types of proposed actions that require Federal approval pursuant to a Federal law, such as the Clean Water Act.

□ 0930

H.R. 2641 is based on the assumption that the NEPA environmental review and permitting process results in project delays.

However, when we considered this measure last Congress, the Congressional Research Service reported that delays in construction project approvals ''are more often tied to local, State, and project-specific factors.'' These factors include ''primarily local/State agency priorities, project funding levels, local opposition to a project, project complexity, or late changes in project scope,'' not to mention the litigation that goes on surrounding these measures.

CRS goes even further, reporting that even most environmental project delays are not the result of NEPA, but actually due to ''laws other than NEPA.'' The measure undermines current regulatory protections and could jeopardize public health and safety by prioritizing speed over meaningful analysis.

Now, turning to H.R. 2824, the other measure included in today's rule, which, like the 50 times that we voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act, my Republican friends have done that, they have also offered 50 rules which are not open rules in spite of the fact that we began this session by the Speaker of the House saying that this would be the most open House that we have had.

H.R. 2824 included in this rule is no more productive than the previous legislation offered. The legislation would overturn a court decision in order to block a buffer requirement designed to prevent damage to waterways from surface coal mining operations. These are protections that President Ronald Reagan put in place.

The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that over 500 mountains have been destroyed by the practice of mountaintop removal mining, more than 1.2 million acres of forest has been eliminated, and nearly 2,000 miles of streams have been buried or polluted by these mining projects. I wonder what part of knocking a mountaintop off do people not understand as destruction, and if it is to be, that it should be done carefully.

These are protections for all of us in our society. As many as 60,000 additional cases of cancer in central Appalachia are directly linked to mountaintop removal, and more than 700 additional deaths from heart disease occur each year.

Last month, West Virginia University scientists published a study confirming high air pollution levels around mountaintop removal coal mines, suggesting a link to the higher rates of cardiovascular disease, birth defects, and cancer that is seen in these communities.

Instead of addressing these issues, H.R. 2824 would reinstate a George W. Bush administration rule that essentially prohibits the United States Department of the Interior from implementing any protections for streams against mountaintop removal and coal mining.

Let me lift the comment of Judge Charles Haden in a case called Bragg v. Robertson. The judge says:

When valley fills are permitted in intermittent and perennial streams, they destroy those stream segments. The normal flow and gradient of the stream is now buried under millions of cubic yards of excess spoil waste material, an extremely adverse effect. If there are fish, they cannot migrate. If there is any life form that cannot acclimate to life deep in a rubble pile, it is eliminated. No effect on related environmental values is more adverse than obliteration. Under a valley fill, the water quality of the stream becomes zero. Because there is no stream, there is no water quality.

The Bush rule in '08 was vacated by the District of Columbia District Court on February 20, 2014. The Obama administration started to draft new stream protections upon taking office, into which the minority has conducted a long, fruitless investigation. Indeed, the years of investigation have uncovered no misconduct. The only results of the investigation are wasted time and taxpayer money, sending over 13,500 pages of documents, 25 hours of audio recordings, 19,000 staff hours, and costing the United States Department of the Interior and Office of Surface Mining approximately $1.5 million.

We saw an example yesterday in one of our committees investigating the Internal Revenue Service for something that just simply has not occurred in any partisan fashion. And I can demonstrate that because, if one believes that the IRS only went after conservative organizations within the time period that was being investigated by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, then it was not during that period that my church, Mt. Hermon AME Church in Fort Lauderdale, received the same kind of notices that are being complained about; and what we did was what everybody has every right to do, which is make the necessary appeal, and we were successful in that regard.

All of these partisan witch hunts need to stop. We are a better people than this, and we should be about the business of the people of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, today's measure exists as partisan talking points, bumper sticker talk by my Republican colleagues, rather than serious legislation to move this country forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support for this rule which will govern debate on important legislation that my colleague, DOUG LAMBORN, and I have introduced.

This legislation, the Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America, would stop the administration from destroying thousands of direct and indirect coal mining jobs and stop the price of electricity in places like Ohio from skyrocketing.

Since the early days of this administration, Mr. Speaker, the Office of Surface Mining at the Department of the Interior has been trying to rewrite a 2008 coal mining rule. This rewrite has been fraught with mismanagement, waste of taxpayer dollars, intimidation of contractors by OSM employees towards the contractors working on the rule, and even the Director of OSM demanding that the contractors change the job loss estimates because it would look bad politically for the administration. But, look, don't take my word for it. You can go out and read the Department's own inspector general's report that highlights the administration's problems rewriting this rule.

This legislation would put an end to this nonsense and implement the 2008 rule. It would save taxpayers millions of dollars that are being wasted on this frivolous rewrite. It also would protect the thousands of direct jobs that the administration admitted would be destroyed by this rule and thousands more indirect jobs that would also be lost.

In eastern and southeastern Ohio, my constituents are the ones mining the coal that powers the economic engine in the Midwest, not to mention that America gets over 40 percent of its energy from coal, the State of Ohio gets over 80 percent of its energy from coal. This rule would put not only those jobs at risk, but also cause electricity prices to skyrocket and endanger the low electricity rates that manufacturing in this country relies on to keep moving forward.

The rule from the Department must be stopped in order to protect hardworking coal miners across America and to stop the waste of taxpayer dollars by the Department of the Interior. I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule today and to support this legislation when it comes to the floor.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my good friend from Florida that I have no additional speakers at this time and would be prepared to close. So I reserve the balance of my time if you have additional speakers.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, one of the sages of America who is often quoted is Will Rogers. One of the things that I paraphrase that he said was: Buy land, because we are not making any more of that. And I use it as an analogy for mountaintop mining, knocking off the tops of these mountains. We ain't making no more mountains. Although I guess we can because in Florida we have what we call trash mountains. So I guess we can build something up, but I doubt very seriously that the quality of it will be of the kind that we see with the mountain ranges of this great America.

Mr. Speaker, these bills are about protecting special interests that happen to be near and dear to some of my friends across the aisle. We are here voting on tired, discredited, and destructive policies that have absolutely no chance of becoming law. This is a failure of leadership by my Republican colleagues and, quite frankly, a waste of time. We should not be considering measures that will help destroy this planet for our children and grandchildren. We need strong environmental protections to ensure that we have clean air, clean water, and clean food.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3546, Mr. LEVIN's bill to extend emergency unemployment insurance for the long-term unemployed across this country for whom it has run out.

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, it is a very sad thing that we continue to let people languish without fulfilling our responsibility to them with reference to unemployment insurance. It is a detriment to this Nation, and it serves us no useful purpose to continue delaying this particular effort.

While I do have the floor for a moment, I do wish to address legislation that I hope does come here with reference to our offering assistance to the people in Ukraine who should have an opportunity to make their own determination regarding their future and that we should stand with and, I am sure, are prepared to do so in an effort to assist them.

Mr. Speaker, I had the good fortune of being the president of the Parliamentary Assembly for the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. During that time, I went to Ukraine on three different occasions, and during that time, I had the good fortune to be the lead monitor after the Orange Revolution; so it is not that I don't have a clear understanding of much that is going on. But what I hope my colleagues here will do is recognize that the Baltics, the Balkans, and the near abroad of Russia and Europe are in need of clarity with reference to matters and not simpleminded, noncomplex answers to very difficult problems that Ukraine is now faced with. It is a nationwide, continuing problem for us.

Mr. Speaker, apparently, we do have some other speaker en route, so I am required to reserve the balance of my time, as I anticipated I might be.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we had someone show up, and so the gentleman from Florida has allowed the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) to speak.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank both of the gentlemen for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we just need to adopt H.R. 2824 and the rule supporting it. This is a good piece of legislation.

Unfortunately, this administration is waging what appears to many of us to be a war on coal. The stream buffer zone rule that has been proposed by OSM, the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation, is a very troubling rule. It would have adverse effects on all kinds of coal mining way beyond what the stated intention is.

□ 0945

The stated intention is to protect the quality of streams in the Appalachian area, but this rule goes way beyond that. This would have the effect of closing down much of the coal mining in that part of the country. So it is overkill. It is way beyond what is necessary.

The whole rulemaking process, Mr. Speaker, is flawed. We had a very good rewrite of the rules that was done in the last administration. That went through millions of dollars of effort, many years of rulemaking, taking comments, and the end result was a very satisfactory rewrite of the older rule. Yet, without even letting that fully take effect, this administration is throwing that rule out and wanting to go to an overly stringent and unrealistic rule. Let's go back to the last rule that was done through the proper procedures.

So H.R. 2824 is a good piece of legislation. I commend Representative JOHNSON for carrying this piece of legislation. We have looked at this in detail in our full committee and in the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, and this is a much better approach. So I urge the full House to adopt H.R. 2824 and the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and will. I will close with what I said yesterday. When I was a child, Tennessee Ernie Ford sang a song about coal mining. It was that you load 16 tons and what do you get? Another day older and deeper in debt.

I have been in Appalachia, as have many of my friends. I went to school in Tennessee, and often had an opportunity to travel to Kentucky and other areas during that period of time, and I have been in West Virginia. I have seen the conditions that many people work in.

I would only hope that they know that there are voices here who believe, just like throughout the rest of this Nation, in spite of the awesomeness of the work that they do in coal mining—and I might add as a footnote, there has been no deterioration in the job market with reference to coal mining—all that is being sought is that coal mining be done in a safe manner, and that the people living in those surroundings have the same kind of quality air, quality water, and quality food that is desperately needed by everybody.

We need look no further than West Virginia and accidents that have occurred there. Nobody wanted that to happen. Indeed, what we saw were corporate dodges of people who had taken advantage of smaller communities. That needs to stop.

I believe my colleagues here want to see to it that we have a situation where those who are working in these environments have an opportunity for safety and have an opportunity for clean air in their regions as well as water and food.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question, and to vote ''no'' on the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This rule provides for ample and open debate. It makes in order amendments from both sides of the aisle. Further, it advances bills that were favorably reported out of committee and will receive bipartisan support.

The RAPID Act is good for our infrastructure needs. It puts in place a good process that helps our agencies conduct quality and timely environmental reviews.

This bill should receive overwhelming bipartisan support. Republicans and Democrats have supported these same provisions already in this Congress.

The Florida delegation knows all too well the impact that delayed studies have on moving our critical projects forward. Port Everglades, which is in the district of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), has been under review for 17 years. That is too long. It is too much. It needs to be completed. The study of the project at Port Everglades is a prime example of Washington bureaucracy crushing America's jobs and America's future.

The RAPID Act would make it possible to move projects forward while protecting our environment. Mr. Speaker, the President has proposed a similar solution. The House passed a similar solution in the WRDA bill. We should pass this bill and give our infrastructure projects a good review process.

Our Nation's economy is sagging under an inefficient government. Our unemployed friends and neighbors are being hurt by our stagnant regulatory review system. The RAPID Act provides a better process and a better timeline. It does not change our environmental standards. It does not require agency approval of projects. It simply reforms our permitting process.

The coal jobs bill puts in place an already approved rule. It ends the regulatory limbo that has existed since 2009. It gives certainty to those who work in the coal industry.

Let's reform our review methods. Let's give our government the tools and the incentives to move America's infrastructure projects forward. When we do, we will release economic activity. We will strengthen our economy, and we will put Americans to work.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bills are good. I urge Members of this House to vote for the rule, vote for the bills, and move our country forward.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Rule for H.R. 2641, the "Responsible and Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013, or as some have termed it, the "Regrettably Another Partisan Ideological Distraction Act."

If the RAPID Act were to become law in its present form, a permit or license for project would be "deemed" approved if the reviewing agency does not issue the requested permit or license within 90–120 days.

Mr. Speaker, I share some of the frustrations expressed by many members of the House Judiciary Committee, which marked up this bill last summer, with the NEPA process.

There is something odd about a system in which it can take half a year or more to approve the siting plan for a wind farm but fracking operations regulations can be approved and conducted a few hundred feet from somebody's home with no community oversight process in just a few months.

Something is wrong with this picture.

But I strongly believe that this bill is a solution in search of a problem.

The bill in its current form is an example of a medicine that is worse than a disease.

There is a major problem with the section that my amendment addresses, namely automatic approval of projects with the need for positive agency action.

I expect to speak on my amendment shortly but suffice it-to-say, this bill goes out of its way to ensure that some projects might be prematurely approved.

That's because under H.R. 2641, if a federal agency fails to approve or disapprove the project or make the required finding of the termination within the applicable deadline, which is either 90 days or 180 days, depending on the situation, then the project is automatically deemed approved, deemed approved by such agency.

This creates a set of perverse incentives. First, as an agency is up against that deadline and legitimate work is yet to be completed, it is likely to disapprove the project simply because the issues have not been vetted.

Second, frequently there are times when it is the case that the complexity of issues that need to be resolved necessitates a longer review period, rather than an arbitrary limit.

So if H.R. 2641 were to become law the most likely outcome is that federal agencies would be required to make decisions based on incomplete information, or information that may not be available within the stringent deadlines, and to deny applications that otherwise would have been approved, but for lack of sufficient review time.

In other words, fewer projects would be approved, not more.

Mr. Speaker, the new requirements contained in H.R. 2641 amend the environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), even though the bill is drafted as an amendment to the APA.

The bill ignores the fact that NEPA has for more than 40 years provided an effective framework for all types of projects (not just construction projects) that require federal approval pursuant to a federal law, such as the Clean Air Act.

I urge my colleagues to reject this Rule and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 501 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 4. 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. 3546) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, 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 among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. 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. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3546.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. 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 219, nays 191, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—219

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
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
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)
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)
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
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
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
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
Upton
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)

NAYS—191

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
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)
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
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
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
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
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—20

Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Diaz-Balart
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
King (IA)
McAllister
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Rogers (MI)
Roskam
Ryan (WI)
Schneider
Schwartz

□ 1018

Messrs. SCHRADER and RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 99 I was not present due to unavoidable air travel delays. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 190, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

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
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
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)
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
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
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
Upton
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)

NAYS—190

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
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)
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
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
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
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
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—15

Chaffetz
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gosar
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Roskam
Schneider
Schwartz

□ 1028

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.

ELECTRICITY SECURITY AND AFFORDABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 497 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. 3826.

Will the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1030

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. 3826) to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (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, March 5, 2014, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 113–373, offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) 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 House Report 113–373 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. SMITH of Texas.

Amendment No. 2 by Mrs. CAPPS of California.

Amendment No. 6 by Ms. SCHAKOWSKY of Illinois.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. WAXMAN of California.

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