This legislation is a great first step in further protecting the thousands of servicemen and -women who are survivors of military sexual violence. I urge its swift passage.

□ 1230

HONORING ANDY CREWS

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a constituent and friend who was recently named the 2015 Time Magazine Dealer of the Year. Andy Crews, president and CEO of AutoFair, is one of the Nation's most successful auto dealers, with seven stores and 600 employees in the Granite State and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Not only is Andy a natural business leader, he is also an outstanding public servant. He has served in the United States Marine Corps and constantly gives back to the future leaders of our communities.

In addition to donating proceeds of auto sales to help feed the needy around Thanksgivingtime, Andy has spearheaded a program to motivate high school seniors in Manchester, New Hampshire, to excel in their classes for a chance to win a car.

Andy also works closely with the New Hampshire community technical colleges to ensure students are receiving the best education and training to become the next generation of trained auto technicians.

It is people like Andy Crews who make me beyond proud to call myself a Granite Stater. His commitment and passion to the auto industry and our communities are beyond deserving of the 2015 Time Magazine Dealer of the Year award, and I wish him continued success.

WE MUST NOT NEGLECT BOKO HARAM

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last April I was horrified when hundreds of girls were kidnapped by Boko Haram in Nigeria because they attended school.

To this day, Boko Haram continues their reign of terror. In early January, thousands of Nigerians were slaughtered by these terrorists; and these attacks continue, with thousands and thousands of civilians killed since then as well.

With all of the attention focused on ISIS and al Qaeda, do not continue to neglect this issue. Mr. Speaker, we can not and must not forget about the unspeakable horrors being perpetuated by Boko Haram.

Mr. Speaker, Black lives matter. That is why I am supporting the Jubilee Campaign's Education After Escape initiative, which provides scholarships to the young girls that escaped Boko Haram.

I am working to support these brave young girls who, despite the horrors they witnessed, maintain dreams of success. They still want and deserve an education.

Mr. Speaker, we have to support the victims of Boko Haram just like we support the victims of other terrorist groups.

Mr. Speaker, we have to continue to tweet so that the world will know and understand that we are supporting those victims. Tweet #BringBackOurGirls and #JoinRepWilson. Tweet, tweet, tweet.

HONORING CAROL MANNING

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, the Orange County Alzheimer's Association will honor four individuals for their extraordinary contributions to advancing research and providing care for this debilitating disease. One of them is Carol Manning, and I would like to add my voice to the chorus of praise for her philanthropic work.

I first met Carol 35 years ago. She and Everett were struggling to raise a family and make ends meet, and yet she still made time to volunteer for many civic endeavors. Today, Carol is president and CEO of TMS, Inc., Print Systems, a $30 million enterprise. And, yes, she and Everett did build that business from scratch with a lot of long hours and hard work and personal sacrifice.

Carol still puts in those long hours, and yet she still makes time for so many worthy causes, Alzheimer's research being just one. On behalf of all of the people whose lives she has made better, I am honored to say thank you, Carol Manning.

MILLIONS OF AMERICANS WAIT PATIENTLY FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has had 4 years to bring an immigration bill—any immigration bill—to a vote and yet has failed to do so.

Oregon businesses, labor, farmers, farmworkers, faith-based groups, and human rights advocates have all patiently waited for comprehensive immigration reform. So have millions of Americans and people all across this Nation as they wait for their legal status to catch up with the realities of their lives as good and productive members of our society. Without comprehensive reforms, Oregon businesses are in peril and Oregon families live in constant fear.

Many of us in the House have offered a bipartisan bill similar to the Senate's with better border enforcement provisions, but hard-line, rightwing extreme provisions have hamstrung any action on these bills.

As a result of the intolerable congressional inaction, the President has issued executive orders to protect folks who have immigrated to this country and been productive members of society and the economy. This executive action merely prioritizes deportations for individuals who harm or pose a threat to our society.

My hope had been that this action would spur comprehensive immigration reform. Instead, House Republicans now play games with the Department of Homeland Security's appropriations and put us all at risk.

It is time to act.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, now is the time for immigration reform. Our Nation is already beginning to see some of the great economic benefits of the DACA and DAPA programs, which I vow to do my best to protect here as we go through the Department of Homeland Security appropriations process.

The true benefits of immigration reform—which, according to the Congressional Budget Office, are over $200 billion in deficit reduction, finally securing and establishing security on our border, implementing mandatory workplace enforcement to prevent people who are here illegally from undermining the job market for Americans, and creating over 150,000 jobs for American citizens—can only be recognized if this body takes action and passes immigration reform.

We had a bill last session that would have passed the floor of the House, and it already passed the Senate. We begin anew. Rather than living in this Groundhog Day of repetitious repeals of ObamaCare, let's move forward on something that creates economic growth, jobs for Americans, and reduces our deficit. It is called immigration reform.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 527, SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 50, UNFUNDED MANDATES INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2015

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 78 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 78

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. 527) to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, 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, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-3. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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. 50) 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 amendments specified in this section 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. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-4, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such further 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 further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment 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 Colorado (Mr. POLIS), 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 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, House Resolution 78 provides for a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, and H.R. 527, the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements 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. 50, 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 cost of compliance might make it harder for family businesses to meet payroll and stay afloat.

H.R. 50 will force Washington to think carefully about regulatory costs before it passes them on to Americans. This bill is about transparency and accountability and is something Democrats and Republicans can all support.

In 1995, Congress passed the bipartisan 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 cost 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 purposes.

□ 1245

UMRA was a good bill, but over time, some shortcomings became apparent such that the Clinton and, later, Obama administrations issued executive orders to fix the loopholes within it.

H.R. 50 has bipartisan DNA, Mr. Speaker. 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 two of my Democratic colleagues here in the House, Representatives COLLIN PETERSON and LORETTA SANCHEZ. I owe them a debt of gratitude for their efforts in promoting this commonsense bill.

The text of H.R. 50 has passed the House on a bipartisan basis three times in the 112th and 113th Congresses. The bill most recently was favorably reported by the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

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 I am proud of the process by which it has been advanced in the House. I have had the pleasure of working with colleagues from both sides of the aisle on this measure, and I appreciate their support and counsel.

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 was a model for bipartisanship, and my hope is that this bill leaves a similar legacy. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of this aisle to support the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, Dr. FOXX, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I also express through you my wishes for her recovery, and I also appreciate her patriotism in doing her duty to God and country here today despite her respiratory duress. I hope that goes

noted, that she is doing a great job representing her party on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act and the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act.

The titles of these bills, while lengthy, seem to suggest that somehow these efforts are designed to increase transparency or help small business. Their actual impact is quite frankly the opposite.

By allowing rules to be written behind closed doors by big businesses and effectively preventing Federal agencies from promoting the national interests as they are supposed to and adding additional bureaucratic red tape and paperwork, these bills represent an assault on the health and safety of our Nation's families and threaten to drown our government in mountains and mountains of unnecessary paperwork.

I think that the release of the President's budget this week shows a contrast between the priorities of both parties' agendas. The President's budget focused on Main Street, offering new ideas for how we can meet the infrastructure needs of our country and reform our corporate tax system to make American businesses more competitive.

Unfortunately, what we continue to see here in this body from the Republicans is a ''Groundhog Day'' scenario where every day, every week—it is like the movie—we are talking about the same thing over and over again.

We have acted on repealing the Affordable Care Act 56 times in this body. Here, we are back with another set of bills that echo other bills again and again and again.

Now, I understand why many people want to do this once and go through it. People ran on repealing ObamaCare, and people ran on passing these bills. Once they are done, we will see what the other body does.

But to keep coming back, rather than dealing with the critical national priorities, I think simply shows a detachment from reality. That is one of the reasons the public holds this body in such low regard.

The bill that we considered 2 weeks ago added 65 new analytical requirements to the process of rulemaking—more red tape, more hurdles. I think what we are seeing here today is maybe that is not enough red tape. We are now looking at bills that allow big business to weigh in before the public, creating even more hurdles before regulations become public and are implemented.

H.R. 50 would effectively require agencies to consult with the private sector before the public is even made aware of the bill, let alone engaged in the rulemaking. This blocks transparency and handicaps public input.

I agree we want to make sure that business has the opportunity to weigh in, but we want to make sure that every stakeholder in a rulemaking process has the opportunity to weigh in equally.

In my State of Colorado, I would be concerned about the erosion of our protection of our great natural areas like Rocky Mountain National Park which is a protected site. We celebrated its 100th anniversary as a national park just last week.

In those 100 years, the Rocky Mountains have been thriving. If you visit the park today, you can find streams, elk, bighorn sheep, and fields of wildflowers; but if we hadn't designated the park a national treasure and created a comprehensive management plan for its protection, we might very well have lost not only something that relates to our national pride and is beautiful but, frankly, is the economic driver in Estes Park and Grand County for much of the economic activity in and around the National Park.

H.R. 50 would threaten the ability of the National Park Service to create the kind of management plan that the economy has thrived under in my home State of Colorado and in my district. It would essentially create a veto power for legislators and interests that don't believe in the protection of public lands or are willing to threaten the health of our families for enhancement of their bottom line. There is always going to be somebody that objects.

Again, we have a thriving tourism economy relating to Rocky Mountain National Park, but I am sure there is some company somewhere that would have some interest that is countervailing to the interests of job creation in our community, and that is why we need to have a transparent and accessible process of listening to stakeholders in as expeditious a way as possible.

We need a system that allows the Fort Collins native who hikes through the Rockies every weekend or the New Yorker who visits the snowcapped mountains every spring the ability to participate in protecting those natural resources and the protection of our public health.

We need to listen to the small businesses, the hospitality sector, and the restaurants and lodges that serve our tourism communities, but by allowing an unfair advantage to out-of-State corporate interests, we threaten the very principle that makes us American, the ability to participate in our decisions of government at the level closest to where we are affected.

H.R. 50 is a dangerous precedent for policy. It allows additional red tape to be thrown at government agencies, representing unnecessary delays and costs that prevent us from creating jobs and growing our economy.

We need to move forward with a middle class agenda for our country rather than continuing to live in this Groundhog Day scenario of repetitious bills that don't discuss how to grow our economy or grow the middle class.

Yesterday, this body attempted to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 56th time. Today, the Republicans are making two attempts at what I consider to be a very similar thing, damage the regulatory process at all costs, which we already did and we are doing again.

They want to see additional red tape and bureaucracy added—whether it is clean air, whether it is clean water, whether it is consumers, whether it is protecting our children—regardless of the particular area with which we operate.

Instead of having a cumulative look at regulations, we should have a look at cumulative impacts of all the legislation that has been brought before this body and how that impacts small businesses and regulations.

Earlier this year, the House passed the Regulatory Accountability Act. That bill alone added 65 new checkpoints to the regulatory process. This bill would prevent transparency and allow big business to weigh in on regulations—before small businesses, before consumers, before other stakeholders—and add an additional tier and red tape to the regulatory process.

We need to move forward with improving our regulatory structure. I don't think there is any disagreement about that. Some of that can be done through executive action and some in a collaborative, bipartisan way to streamline the regulatory process to reduce hurdles for small businesses while meeting the goals of protecting the American public. Unfortunately, these bills do neither of those.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank my colleague from Colorado for his kind comments about me and my health. I appreciate all condolences.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution also provides for consideration of H.R. 527, the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act of 2015, which is important legislation to improve the Federal Government's treatment of small businesses.

Ensuring we are providing the best environment possible to small businesses is vital to support a sector which employs nearly half of America's private sector workers and generates 63 percent of new private sector jobs.

As a former owner of a nursery, I know well the joys and trials of running a small business, and I am pleased that the House is considering these vital provisions.

Small businesses do not have the staff or background to identify and comply with ever-growing piles of red tape. Federal regulations disproportionately impact small businesses which led Congress to enact the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act requires agencies to account better for

the impacts of proposed regulations on small businesses and other small entities and to tailor regulations to minimize adverse impacts on these entities.

Unsurprisingly, agencies have failed to comply with these requirements in full. They have taken advantage of loopholes, failed to acknowledge the entirety of impacts for proposed rules, and issued rules that continue to harm small businesses. That failure necessitates our actions this week to consider H.R. 527, the Small Business Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act.

This legislation requires Federal agencies to consider the potential ''economic impact'' of proposed rules on small businesses and nonprofits. It also mandates a 10-year plan to review all rules determined to have ''a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.''

That will ensure past regulations will not remain on the books unexamined and able to burden small businesses for decades.

The legislation also expands ''regulatory flexibility analysis'' requirements which are currently used to explain the reasoning behind a proposed rule, identify duplicative rules, and explain any recordkeeping or other requirements that may be imposed on small businesses or other small entities.

It also requires the Small Business Administration's chief counsel for advocacy to develop interagency rules for conducting flexibility analyses.

These changes will ensure that future regulations are tailored to minimize their impact on small businesses. This will allow small businesses to spend more of their investments and time hiring new employees and growing their businesses rather than complying with unnecessary burdens from Federal regulations.

H.R. 527 is a simple, commonsense mandate for the executive branch to work together with small businesses and design smarter, less burdensome rules that work for the American people, and I commend it to my colleagues for their support.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for consideration of legislation that would help veterans make it in America by establishing a pilot program to encourage the hiring of veterans in manufacturing jobs.

To discuss our thoughtful proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a leader on veterans issues.

Ms. DELBENE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that we can consider my proposal to boost education and job training for our veterans.

Everyone in this Chamber can agree that we have an obligation to care for those who risk their lives and make sacrifices for our freedoms.

Unfortunately, there are too many veterans struggling to find work today, and we are not doing enough to help. Last year, the unemployment rate for post-9/11 veterans stood at more than 7 percent, substantially higher than the national rate; and across all age groups, there were more than 500,000 veterans out of work in 2014.

This is unacceptable. Congress must do more to meet its commitment to these brave men and women. That is why I encourage my colleagues to join me and more than 40 of my colleagues in supporting the Manufacturing Jobs for Veterans Act.

My bill will establish State-based manufacturing employment programs to provide skills training in manufacturing jobs for veterans and servicemembers who are reentering the workforce.

These pilot programs would support on-the-job training opportunities, apprenticeships, and certification classes for unemployed veterans; and it will encourage manufacturers to recruit, hire, and train our Nation's heroes.

With as many as 600,000 unfilled manufacturing jobs, we have an opportunity to connect employers with a pipeline of skilled, capable workers.

□ 1300

Instead of voting on yet another partisan bill, we should be focused on real solutions that help the American people, grow our economy, and strengthen the middle class. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can take up this important bill and put our veterans back to work.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that, and I thank my good friend from North Carolina, who, as has already been stated on the floor, is powering through today, standing strong for the values that I think really would not be expressed any differently except to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is critical national interest here.

There is probably today, on the floor, as we talk about these bills—and yes, it is sort of a Groundhog Day, and I will get to that in a moment, because it seems like every time we, from the Republican side of the aisle, want to talk about jobs and kitchen tables and making better improvements for life and getting rid of regulatory burdens that would help or putting controls on government, we are accused of wanting to spoil the environment, kill trees, make flowers not bloom, I mean, whatever it may be, but the issue, that is Groundhog Day.

So if people want a true Groundhog Day analogy, here is the Groundhog Day analogy. The analogy is, when we want to put constraints on government from interfering and getting in the way of its proper role of helping business and helping our country do what it is supposed to do, or we are wanting to control, through government, this process and do so in a way that is detrimental to those moms and dads who get up every day and families and single moms and grandparents and aunts and uncles, all these folks who just simply say, we are not really as overly concerned about what you are doing in Washington, D.C., as I am concerned about what you are doing in Hometown, USA, where I get up every morning.

It has been said many times, Mr. Speaker, already this afternoon, and the issue is, we are putting more burden and red tape on America.

No. What this bill does—and these two bills that I speak in favor of in this rule, these two bills that we are doing, H.R. 50 and H.R. 527—is actually controlling government. Instead of letting it get in the way and put unnecessary or quicker burdens on those again, we are simply saying, Whoa. There is a proper place. There is a proper place for regulation. There is a proper place for a limited government role that our Founders made.

However, when that role steps over and begins to not only burden business but instead the man or woman who wants to get up in the morning and chase a dream of starting a new business, as I once did, when we started a scrapbook store, you know, just to get a little bit of money, we were able to do so.

But others who want to go get a loan, they have to go through the bureaucratic red tape that is now keeping them from starting the small business jobs that employ people on a day-to-day level. We are simply saying, Government, it is time to take a breath. It is time to step back and see the impact that you are having.

Granted, some regulation is good. I will give that to my Democratic colleagues. But overregulation and burdensome regulation tears down our economy.

So if that is the Groundhog Day argument for this week we want to have, I will have it every day of the week. The Members and people who watch this floor can see you have a party that wants to restrict business and jobs and government in such a way that it throttles the economy or a party which is putting forth solutions and will put forward as many times as we have to to remind the American people that it is people and small business and jobs, the everyday Americans who create the jobs in this country, not government.

A business owner that I just recently spoke to had 10 employees, and he said he was getting ready to hire another employee. I said, Well, great. That is great. 10 percent growth. One more employee.

He said, But you have got to understand. I am having to hire somebody, and all they are going to be doing is filling out government paperwork.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this is not someone who can go out and sell

their widget or perform their service. This is someone who will sit in an office and simply make sure that they are complying with the Big Brother overreach of government. That is not job creation. That is burdensome on business.

Let's get them where they can create jobs and go out and sell their product, do their services.

We have a bank in my area. You are talking about unfunded mandates, regulatory rulemaking. A bank in my area, on their regular regulatory inspection, they were waiting for the bank examiners to come, the folks to come in and do their audit.

The problem they had was this: when the government showed up, they had more people coming to inspect their books than they had employed in their main office. And the government agency complained that they did not have enough room for them to do their job.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. It is not up to small business to make sure government can do its job. It is up to government to provide the atmosphere so small business can do its job, and that is what we are here about today.

So when we look at this, I urge my colleagues, don't get sidetracked on other issues. Look at it for what it is. It is government getting the constraint, not the American people. It is protecting the American people from not good legislation, good litigation. It is the stuff that we need to work on.

So, Mr. Speaker, I state these are good bills. Let's state it clearly. Groundhog Day is exactly what it is: for government, or let's let the people live.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our colleague from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding this time and for her good work on this legislation.

I came to the floor today just to tell you a little bit about why I think this legislation is so very important.

When I first came to Congress many years ago, we had a Democratic Governor of Tennessee, Ned Ray McWherter, and he was a fine Governor. He would have the Tennessee congressional delegation to the Governor's mansion once a year. And he would always start those meetings off—every single year he would say: Please, no more unfunded mandates. Please, no more unfunded mandates.

He said that most of what the State was having to do now were things that were required by the Federal Government, and it was causing the States great financial difficulties, and it was turning what was supposed to be a Federal system that our Founding Fathers envisioned, it was turning it totally upside down.

This bill is a very reasonable, moderate, commonsense effort to make good on the original Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995. All it is trying to do is ensure that Congress and Federal agencies are fully informed about the impact of these Federal mandates.

I urge my colleagues to support this very fine effort to make our system better.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

When you hear the gentleman from Georgia or the gentlewoman from North Carolina talk about the intent behind these bills, they sound great. We all want a streamlined regulatory process and to help make it more efficient.

Unfortunately, when you look at what these bills do, they do the opposite. They add another tier to regulation, with Big Business having a new say in and above what small businesses and community members can do. They add red tape and legal requirements to regulation that don't exist now under statute.

It, again, seems to me like the opposite of trying to get input so our regulations best affect the needs of each community, and we have diverse needs across this country.

My district is 62 percent Federal land, so when decisions are made on Federal land, like a travel management plan, and on where people can bike and where they can hunt and fish, we want to have our say. The last thing we want is some out-of-state corporate interest determining in some process before we even get our say on how these Federal lands are used.

It is absolutely critical that we empower our communities, and this bill does the opposite in the name of adding more bureaucracy and red tape to the regulatory process, presumably, in an attempt to delay or make it less effective than it is.

Now, we value, as Americans, the work that the Clean Water Act does, the Clean Air Act, the EPA, our essential protections around public health. They are very, very important. And I think our colleagues agree that they don't want to take those on head on.

But this bill would prevent some of those very agencies from doing the work that we have charged them to do, keeping our air clean, our water clean, and they need to be able to do that work and involve local impact in making sure that they do it in a way that protects American health and helps grow our economy and create jobs.

We need to make sure that we don't have dumping of industrial waste in the Colorado River, poisoning millions of recreational users. We want to make sure that drilling sites don't use chemical compounds that are toxic or cause birth defects.

We can and we must do better. The march of science moves forward. If there are thoughtful improvements to the regulatory process that will help reduce costs and reduce red tape, rather than add red tape, we are happy to have those discussions. But, unfortunately, these bills fall short of that mark. That is why I oppose the rule and the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. My colleague, Ms. DELBENE, has offered a concept around a pilot program to encourage the hiring of veterans in manufacturing jobs, the type of middle class agenda that the American public wants this Congress to work on, rather than one that cuts them out of the very rulemaking that is designed to protect us Americans from our health hazards and protect our public lands.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' defeat the previous question, vote ''no'' on the rule and the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that Republicans are not opposed to regulations. We just want regulations to be done right.

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.

Mr. Speaker, as proud as I am of this legislation, I realize its passage today won't be front-page news. I understand that ''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, and I understand that. There are real, substantive disagreements between the two parties and among the American people.

But Congress must do the hard things. Every now and then, we get an opportunity to do something easy. This should be easy. Reforms in this bill are low-hanging fruit.

Some of my colleagues have suggestions for improvement and have offered amendments to these bills. Great. I welcome their suggestions.

Those amendments will be discussed in an open and transparent process. Not a single proposed amendment to either bill, Democrat or Republican, has been excluded by this rule.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will join me in supporting these sensible bills that will enhance transparency, accountability, and awareness of Federal mandates and improve the Federal Government's treatment of small businesses.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and the underlying bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 78 OFFERED BY MR. POLLS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 344) to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in manufacturing positions. 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. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 344.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This 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 noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. 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 242, nays 174, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—174

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
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
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley

Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—17

Chu (CA)
Curbelo (FL)
Duckworth
Frankel (FL)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Huffman
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lofgren
Lowey
Nolan
Nunnelee
Rangel
Roe (TN)
Young (AK)

□ 1339

Mr. SCHIFF changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 59 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted yes.

Stated against:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 59 had I been present, I would have voted No.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for roll call vote 59. If I had been present for this vote, I would have voted: Nay on roll call vote 59.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent earlier today during roll call vote 59. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on roll call vote 59, the motion on ordering the previous question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 50 and H.R. 527.

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. POLIS. 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 243, noes 179, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

AYES—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—179

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
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
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
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)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Benishek
Chu (CA)
Duckworth
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Lee
Lofgren
Nunnelee
Poe (TX)
Roe (TN)
Young (AK)

□ 1348

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 60 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted Yes.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 59, ordering the previous question, I inadvertently voted ''yes.'' I would like the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted, appropriately and properly, ''no.''

UNFUNDED MANDATES INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 50.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEWART). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 78 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. 50.

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