

thoughts and prayers are with his family, friends, students, and the San Jacinto Valley community.

SUPPORTING THE 2015 SUPER HERO STEP FORWARD TO CURE TSC 5K WALK

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to support the Step Forward to Cure TSC 5K Walk taking place at Florida International University's main campus, my alma mater, on Saturday, November 14.

Tuberous sclerosis complex, or TSC, is a rare genetic disease with no known cure that causes uncontrolled tumor growth.

I know of one young man from our community, Max Lucca, who was diagnosed with TSC when he was only 2 weeks old. Because of the love and care provided by his parents, doctors, and nurses, he has thrived, in spite of constant health challenges.

The walk's theme this year is "Super Heroes," and Max Lucca is, indeed, a super hero.

I encourage all south Floridians to walk to help find a cure for TSC, to benefit young super heroes across the country just like Max Lucca.

TRIBUTE TO DR. DAN ARVIZU

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Dan Arvizu for his exceptional work as director of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Golden, Colorado.

Dr. Arvizu is retiring this year, but his legacy of leadership and innovation will endure for many, many years to come. I want to take this moment to say thank you for outstanding stewardship of our Nation's premier energy efficiency and renewable energy laboratory.

In addition to his role at NREL, Dr. Arvizu is chairman of the National Science Board, which is the governing board of the National Science Foundation. He will continue his role as chairman of the National Science Board, and he will also become a visiting professor at Stanford University.

On behalf of everyone at NREL, the people of the State of Colorado and the United States of America, let me say thank you for a job well done. We wish you all the best on the next steps of your journey.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 22, HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 512 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 512

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 further consideration of the Senate amendment to the text of the bill (H.R. 22) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the amendment referred to in section 2(a) of House Resolution 507 shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in subsection (c).

(b) Each further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered 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, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

(c) It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this subsection shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

(d) All points of order against the further amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in subsection (c) are waived.

SEC. 3. No further amendment to the Senate amendment, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment shall be considered 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, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, 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.

SEC. 4. (a) At the conclusion of consideration of the Senate amendment for amendment the Committee of the Whole shall rise and report the Senate amendment, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted.

(b) If the Committee reports the Senate amendment, as amended, back to the House with a further amendment or amendments,

the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the question of adoption of such further amendment or amendments without intervening motion. In the case of sundry further amendments reported from the Committee, the question of their adoption shall be put to the House en gros and without division of the question.

(c) If the Committee reports the Senate amendment, as amended, back to the House without further amendment or the question of adoption referred to in subsection (b) fails, no further consideration of the Senate amendments shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 5. The Chair may postpone further consideration of the Senate amendments in the House to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of the further amendment or amendments in the House pursuant to section 4(b) of this resolution —

(a) a motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the text, as amended, with such further amendment or amendments shall be considered as adopted;

(b) the Clerk shall engross the action of the House under subsection (a) as a single amendment in the nature of a substitute;

(c) a motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the title shall be considered as adopted; and

(d) it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee to move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 22 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

SEC. 7. The chair of the Committee on Armed Services may insert in the Congressional Record not later than November 16, 2015, such material as he may deem explanatory of defense authorization measures for the fiscal year 2016.

□ 1245

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend 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

Mr. WOODALL. 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I find myself with a big smile on my face. I usually do when the Reading Clerk sits down. Even if I could dispense with the reading of the rule, I wouldn't do it. I wouldn't do it. Even if there were some days where I would be tempted to do it, Mr. Speaker, this wouldn't be that day because we are down here with rule number two on the transportation bill.

You will remember we came down here yesterday—it was my friend from Massachusetts and I at that time—to bring a rule to consider the first 6-year transportation bill this country has had in over a decade. It is a bill that the Transportation and Infrastructure

Committee has worked on for not days, not weeks, not months, but years to get it ready. It is a bill that was not pushed by Republicans or pushed by Democrats. It is a bill that was pushed by all of us together to do those kinds of important things that are necessary for infrastructure planning for each and every one of our constituents back home.

It is a bill that has been moving in the Senate, which is a rarity in and of itself. It is a bill that we are moving here in the House. It is a bill that can go to the President's desk for his signature and make a difference for Americans, make a difference in our economy, and make a difference for our families.

Now, I sit on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. Speaker, and you would think that my pride of authorship and all the good work we did on that committee would have said: Do you know what? We got it right the first time. Let's just bring that bill to the floor, and let's get it done because it is important to America. Let's finish it today.

I see some of my colleagues from the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee sitting down here. There might be a little temptation to take our work product and rush it straight to the desk because we did do a pretty good job together. But in their wisdom, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the chairman of the Rules Committee, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, and our leadership team here in the House said: Do you know what? There are a lot of Members who don't sit on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. There are a lot of Members who represent some really smart and really talented folks back home in America, but their Representative doesn't sit on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. We need their ideas in this debate, too.

So we came to the floor yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and we brought a rule that made more than 20 amendments in order. We were debating that rule for an hour. We hadn't even finished debating the rule when we brought back more amendments and made another 16 in order, Mr. Speaker. We are back here today because that more than 40 was not enough. We want to make another 81 amendments in order. Mr. Speaker, this is a festival of democracy that is happening in this House today. Everyone's voice is included.

Now, I want to be clear. We had over 300 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee. Here on this floor, sometimes we have a very open process with appropriations bills, Mr. Speaker, where absolutely everyone can offer absolutely any idea at absolutely any time they want to. This process is a little more structured, and I want to stipulate that that is true. We had a lot of

duplicative amendments offered, Mr. Speaker. This is important work. We didn't want to waste the body's time. We culled those duplicative amendments.

We had a couple amendments offered, Mr. Speaker, that were not minor changes to the underlying legislation. They were major revisions to public policy that had not had committee hearings and that had not had any public discussions. We culled those as well.

But over 120 amendments, Mr. Speaker, will now be made in order on a bill, again, that was not the product of days of effort, not a product of weeks of effort, not months, but years of effort of our House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to bring together a product that this body can be proud of—a product, I might add, that Republicans in the past and Democrats in the past have failed to come together and succeed on.

This is a day of celebration, Mr. Speaker, as we offer this rule to consider even more of our colleagues' ideas. I hope that we will get unanimous support for this rule, Mr. Speaker. With the passage of this rule, we can get into debate, and we can move this bill one step closer to the President's desk, and we can move one step closer to making a difference for those families back home.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we will get to what is in the bill in a minute. With regards to process, as an example of a Member of this body, I had a number of issues in the transportation area I wanted to address in my district. Most notably, I wanted to address the sound levels of train horns in our busy downtown areas, like Fort Collins and Longmont. It is one of the biggest issues I hear about from our local downtown businesses; and, of course, to anybody who, including myself, has been downtown with the train blaring by in close proximity, it really is a major detriment to the quality of life, and there is no significant evidence that I have seen or that has been presented to me that this in any way improves safety. So I did offer an amendment that would have changed that. Unfortunately, it was blocked in Rules Committee.

Now, on that particular issue, we had a discussion with the chair and the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I hope to work with him in other ways. But to say that somehow this is an open process, that I can bring forth and other Members can bring forth amendments to improve the bill—of course, there were a few allowed. Out of 302, there were 126 allowed. That means there are more disappointed Members that had ideas than there are satisfied Members that are at least going to have the opportunity to bring their idea forward.

Again, it is 126. It is better than 50, and it is better than 30, there is no question. But it also means there are an awful lot of Republicans and Democrats, including my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY) with whom I sponsored—he as the Republican; I as the lead Democrat—a bipartisan amendment that would have dealt with train stoppages. We are dealing with this also in Fort Collins, where we have trains that do switching and delay traffic sometimes for 15, 30, and 45 minutes. We are simply saying that you can't do that in an urban zone; that delays traffic. It can impede ambulances and fire engines from reaching their destinations. It is dangerous. We simply proposed an amendment to impose a civil penalty of \$10,000 around that to deter that kind of action. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that amendment was blocked under this very rule that we are talking about here.

I have, for instance, an amendment that is very important in my district for highway 70 designation that is allowed under this rule, and I am happy that it is. Keep in mind, in perspective, there are many more ideas—good, bad, and other—that Republicans and Democrats had on both sides of the aisle that they weren't even allowed to talk about and aren't even allowed to talk about under this rule, this restrictive rule, that we have before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that I could do something and that the Rules Committee allowed me to do something about excess train noise in our downtown areas. I wish that the Rules Committee had allowed Mr. DUFFY, me, and the many others that this affects to do something about train stoppages closing traffic and endangering the public in our downtown areas. But it was not allowed under this rule, not allowed at all.

Mr. Speaker, calling this bill a 6-year reauthorization is also a bit of a misnomer. The bill only makes funding available for 2 to 3 years. So this is not, in fact, a 6-year bill. It is a 2- to 3-year bill. It is being touted for something that it doesn't have the power to do. Simply calling it a 6-year bill when you are only funding it for 2 to 3 years doesn't make it so.

Mr. Speaker, our economy is still fragile. Americans are concerned about maintaining and growing their quality of life. Affordable housing, quality education, and retirement are sometimes out of the grasp of too many Americans. Critical infrastructure on public roads and bridges is absolutely important for driving our economy forward.

My colleagues and I are charged with recognizing and offering innovative solutions to these problems. We are each selected by constituencies that have particular items that impact them. I was sent here to work on train noise, as an example, and train stoppages that delay traffic, the designation of highway 70, which we hope to be able to include in the final bill, and many other transportation issues, some of which are reflected in the bill.

I certainly commend my colleagues on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for working diligently in trying to bring up a long-term, robustly funded, and thoughtful bill.

This bill, unfortunately, is another exclusionary bill. Again, you can certainly say there could be improvement to have more amendments than prior bills have allowed, but there are many more good ideas that Republicans and Democrats have offered that are not allowed to be debated under this rule.

I commend the process and its inclusion of critical provisions regarding the Export-Import Bank. This is important to many companies in my district to ensure that U.S. businesses are competing on a level playing field. As an example, Fiberlok, located in my district in Fort Collins, is a specialty printing company. It provides heat transfer graphics. It is family owned, and about 40 percent of its business is export business.

I also visited Boulder-based Droplet Measurement Technologies, which was named Export-Import Bank's Small Business Exporter of the Year for its work in cloud and aerosol measurements.

We simply want a level playing field for American businesses.

Of course, this package has some commendable transportation-related provisions. For instance, it provides \$325 billion in Federal contract authority and allows for the direct deposit of any additional revenues Congress is able to come up with. It invests in all modes of surface transportation, highway, transit, and maintaining funding for alternatives like biking and walking that should be commended. It creates a \$4.5-billion competitive grant program allowing States to compete for geographically expansive projects that impact and can now be financed by multiple States and regions.

Unfortunately, however, this is not a 6-year authorization. From the Infrastructure 2.0 Act I recently introduced, along with my colleague Mr. DELANEY, to the President's GROW AMERICA Act, to Mr. DEFAZIO's and Representative BLUMENAUER's initiatives to re-index the gas tax, many of us have been in the forefront of offering avenues for full funding of this bill. Yet, unfortunately, time and time again, whether it is the repatriation concept or whether it is a re-indexation of the gas tax concept, all of the very reasonable offers and ideas that we have put forward have been repeatedly and inexplicably rejected, and we have seen a failure from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to bring forward ways to actually pay for what they claim is a 6-year bill.

Look, a long-term, sustainable, funded bill is what we want. If that is the bill we get, Mr. Speaker, I will personally whip that bill. But this is not that bill. This bill fails to make the commitment needed to our Nation's crumbling transportation and infrastructure, and it sets the precedent of authorizing investments without paying

for them, which has been the whole difficult part of putting a bill together, which this bill just kicks the can down the road on.

□ 1300

I oppose this overly restrictive rule and the path that we are taking to pretend that a bill is 6 years when we only pay for it for 2 to 3 years.

I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I remember when I ran for Congress 4½ years ago, I had this idea that because I had really good ideas and had the backing of 700,000 folks back home in the district who also had really good ideas that we were going to be able to come up here and share our good ideas; 435 of my colleagues were going to recognize the wisdom that I brought from the great State of Georgia, and we were just going to be able to make those things happen.

It has been harder than I had anticipated, Mr. Speaker; I will confess that to you. It has been harder than I had anticipated. It turns out there are some folks in other parts of the country who have some different ideas.

My friend from Colorado is absolutely right. He offered two amendments yesterday, and he only got one of them made in order. That has happened to me, too. That has happened to me, too.

We have got to talk about what we are going to define as success in this place. Are we going to define getting half of everything you want as failure, or are we going to define getting half of everything you want as a huge step in the right direction that we can celebrate together?

There are not that many bills in this institution, Mr. Speaker, that are worked through in the bipartisan, collaborative way that this one has happened. It is not easy. It is tremendously difficult—tremendously difficult. Why? Because we have legitimate disagreements about public policy—legitimate disagreements about public policy.

Now, I don't want to tamp down my friend's pessimism about 3-year funding instead of 6-year funding. I want 6-year funding, too. I have wanted it from day one, and I am prepared to vote for it today. I haven't found quite as much enthusiasm for that around not just this floor, but the floor right down the hall in the United States Senate. We are going to have to sort that out.

I tell you, with no small bit of optimism, that I think we are going to find that 6-year funding before we see a conference report back on this floor. I believe it. We need it. We have serious people working at it, and we have the ability to make it so.

But, Mr. Speaker, by any measure—by any measure—certainty of funding, certainty of authorization, bipartisanship, nonpartisanship, amendments made in order, length of time of the authorization, length of time of the funding, by any measure—this is the best transportation bill and the best trans-

portation rule that have come to this floor in more than a decade—more than a decade.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want us to take our toys and go home claiming victory over all that ails America. That is not where we are today. I want us to take credit for making a small step in the right direction together, a step that so many of our colleagues before us have failed to succeed at together, and engage in what is sure to be not another hour or 2 or 3 or 4, but dozens of hours to continue to improve this work product of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

This is a moment of opportunity for us, Mr. Speaker. We can spend our time grousing about what we didn't get, or we can spend our time celebrating what we did get, put this bill on the President's desk, create certainty for America, and then come right back together the day after and begin to make improvements once again. That is the way this institution has always worked when it has worked at its finest, Mr. Speaker, and that is the way I expect this institution to work today.

I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, in terms of what the gentleman from Georgia just said, I do appreciate the fact that we are debating many policy amendments. That is the way the process should work, both sides of the aisle contribute. That is great. Some were excluded that I think should have been included. I don't know why they weren't allowed. I was willing to stay here later last night and stay later tonight so everybody who wanted an amendment could have a chance.

But the biggest and most glaring omission by the Rules Committee is of not allowing any attempt by this House to fund the bill. That is pretty extraordinary. Actually, we probably don't even have 3 years of pretend funding in the bill because some of those offsets were spent last week in the big budget deal, so I don't know what we have left. But it sure as heck isn't anywhere near 6 years of funding; and it is not 6 years of funding at a more robust level, which is necessary.

Even if we funded this bill for 6 years, at the end of 6 years, our infrastructure will be more deteriorated than it is today. It is deteriorating more quickly than we are investing. That is a problem.

We need to increase the investment. We haven't raised the Federal gas tax since 1993. That is a user fee, a user fee created by President Dwight David Eisenhower, raised again by Ronald Reagan, and then finally by Bill Clinton the last time it was increased. A bipartisan idea: user fee. Fund infrastructure for transportation with a user fee.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports an increase in the user fee. The American Trucking Association supports an increase in the user fee. We

are virtually being begged by interest groups out there representing consumers and commercial users of the system to do something, vote on something.

I offered a really simple little amendment. Let's just index the existing gas tax so we don't lose more ground. If we did that, gas would go up 1.7 cents a gallon next year. I think consumers would be outraged. No, they wouldn't be outraged. They would be pleased we started filling in the potholes and doing away with the detours around the bridges that are closed.

If you indexed and you project that, you could borrow money against the future income following the budget rules of PAYGO. We could borrow \$100 billion and fill in the huge hole in this bill and then use some of those so-called pay-fors to increase spending under this bill.

Why can't we have a simple vote on revenues, a vote by the House of Representatives?

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that I can identify with the gentleman from Oregon's frustration.

The frustration you see is not from a gentleman who does not have any power over the process. He is the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. But the rules of the House prevent the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee from funding transportation. It is an incredibly powerless space to be in.

Your job on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is to come up with good transportation policy. You just can't pull any of the levers that fund it. That is the frustration you hear from my friend from Oregon, and I don't discount that in the least.

What I do discount, however, is any suggestion that what is happening today is in any way unprecedented. My friend from Oregon first began serving in this House when Ronald Reagan was President of the United States, and not one Ways and Means major funding bill has come to this House floor under an open rule in any day of the gentleman's service—not one. Not one Ways and Means bill funding this government has come to the House floor under an open rule. Not under Republicans, not under Democrats, not ever—not ever.

There are lots of reasons for that. I don't need to get into arcane budget policy. But what I do need to say is we have an opportunity in conference to solve this problem. We are grappling with openness in this institution. I am excited about it, Mr. Speaker. A lot of folks say, oh, we can't have openness on the floor because we will have to take tough votes. I say, if you don't want to take tough votes, don't run for Congress.

We have a serious challenge, however, in whether or not we allow a committee, like the Ways and Means Committee, whose sole purpose, whose sole jurisdiction, covers tax matters—no

one else covers tax matters other than the Ways and Means Committee. Do we allow them to grapple with funding issues, or do we bring an amendment to the floor, debate it for 9½ minutes, and change Federal tax policy together? We can do that.

I am glad we are not doing Federal transportation policy in a 9-minute stint. I am glad we worked on it, again, not for days, not for weeks, not for months, but for years, together, to get policy that worked.

It is very puzzling to me, again, by any measure—by any measure. This is the best transportation process and the best transportation rule that this body has seen in a decade. We can choose to recognize that and improve upon it, or we can choose to continue the self-flagellation that seems to constitute government today. I don't understand it. I am very proud to be in this body. I am very proud to work with each one of you, and I am very proud of the work that we have done together.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I need 10 minutes at least to respond to that assertion. There is no party with whom I have served over the last 35 years that has been any more into self-flagellation of the United States Government, the American Government, than his party. I will say with all due respect.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. No.

Mr. WOODALL. The gentleman is not talking about me. The gentleman is talking about my party.

Mr. HOYER. I talked about your party.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. But I will tell you that I disagree with the gentleman's basic premise. He talks about the rule. The rule is not the issue. I am against this rule. Its substance, that is what the gentleman from Oregon was talking about. He was talking about investing and making America grow, creating jobs. That is what we ought to be debating, not some rule for you to have a lot of amendments. You can have a zillion amendments. If they are all awful, it won't be a good rule.

I rise in opposition to this rule. I rise in opposition because it would make in order several amendments that undermine the will of a majority of both parties in this House, that the Export-Import Bank should be reopened immediately.

I said for a year and a half the majority of this House was for it; and for a year and a half, it was bottled up by a committee chairman in a closed process.

Since some Republicans blocked an extension of the Export-Import Bank's

charter authority and let it shut down in July, hundreds of American jobs have been shipped overseas, and exporters and their workers have been unable to compete on a level playing field in foreign markets.

Last month, in a historic effort, virtually all Democrats and a majority of Republicans came together to end the gridlock and take steps to allow the House to work its will and hold a vote on reopening the Export-Import Bank. This rule seeks to reverse that process.

When that vote was finally held, Mr. Speaker, 127 Republicans finally got the opportunity to work their will—a majority of their Conference—and joined with every Democrat, save one, to reopen the Bank and create jobs in our country.

The will of this House is clear, unequivocal. The best way to reopen the Bank is by keeping, unchanged, in this highway bill the Heitkamp-Kirk language, a bipartisan amendment from the Senate that 313 Members, otherwise known as 75 percent of this body, voted for last week on this floor. The amendments that this rule would make in order are, in effect, a last-ditch attempt by the Bank's opponents to undo the will of the majority of this House.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule; and should it be adopted, as is likely the case, I urge every one of my colleagues who voted to reopen the Export-Import Bank last week to stand together in defeating every single amendment offered on the Export-Import Bank so we can stand together to defeat all of the amendments that are offered on the Export-Import Bank.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 25 seconds.

Mr. HOYER. It is a Senate bill and a House bill that are exactly the same. If they had been passed alone, they would be on the President's desk right now.

Once again, we need to help American exporters; but more importantly than that, we need to help American workers get and keep jobs. We talk a lot about it. This is an opportunity to do it. Defeat any and every amendment, no matter how sugary it may sound, to defeat the Export-Import Bank.

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

I don't fault my friend from Maryland for not yielding. He had very limited time. I remember the days of the magic minute. Those were better yielding days.

Mr. HOYER. But I will yield to him on his time.

Mr. WOODALL. I appreciate that. The gentleman is always generous.

Mr. Speaker, while the minority whip was the majority leader of this institution, this House did a lot of big things—a lot of big things. But what they couldn't do—what they couldn't do—was a bill like the one that Ranking Member DEFAZIO and Chairman BILL SHUSTER have brought to the floor today.

□ 1315

We can cast this dye and call it anything we want to; but the fact of the matter is it is a success, and it is one that we have done together. I don't know where partisanship comes into this process, and it will be a shame if it comes in today because it sure hasn't been in in the previous days, weeks, months, and years that we have been working on this process.

I had some great ideas for this bill, Mr. Speaker, and I serve on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Where better for a fellow with great ideas on transportation to work than on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

So I knocked on my chairman's door. I said, Mr. Chairman, I bring the wisdom of the Seventh District of Georgia. I have crafted it all here in legislative language for you. Let me just go ahead and give it to you so you can include it in the base text.

Do you know what the chairman said to me?

He said, ROB, we are doing this in a collaborative manner. If your ideas are that good, you are going to find some folks on the other side of the aisle who believe in your ideas, too. You bring me back those ideas. Together, we will get it done.

He was right. That is exactly what I did. My ideas were that good. Thank you very much. I did go out and find some collegiality on the other side of the aisle, and we did include those ideas in the base text. That is what this product is.

You can't do that on every piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, as the divisions are too great; but the minority whip was right—this is about jobs. There is not a local mayor in the country who doesn't know that, as one's transportation infrastructure and education infrastructure goes, so goes one's community.

We need to solve that education piece. Today, we are going to solve the transportation piece. Not once in more than a decade has a bill come to the floor of this House with the kind of commitment to transportation and infrastructure that this bill has today. My hope is, somewhere in these 81 amendments this rule makes in order, we will be able to improve upon that bill. If nothing else, if we can't improve upon it, at least we can find out where the will of the House is by defeating those amendments.

Mr. Speaker, this is the process I ran to be a part of. This is the way I imagined the House to work. I am very proud to be here today, and I hope my colleagues will take some of that pride as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to join my Ways and Means Committee colleague, my counterpart—Mr.

RENACCI of Ohio—along with several other Members, in submitting to the Rules Committee a modified version of our bipartisan bill to provide long-term, sustainable funding for our highways and bridges, which this bill does not do.

Our proposal would have used the next 3 paid-for years to set up a task force to devise a plan to fund the remaining years of the bill. Continuity can ensure that construction projects and the jobs they provide don't come to a grinding halt when Congress fails to act.

The fact that our bipartisan amendment to save the highway trust fund was shut out from floor consideration but that the devolution crowd gets a vote on their plan to dismantle the fund speaks volumes about how this leadership views the concept of an open process and regular order, to say nothing of the place for compromise and bipartisan solutions.

Look, we have a diverse coalition of colleagues who is cosponsoring our plan. We have support from a broad coalition of business, labor, construction, engineering, and transit advocates.

Let's be frank. Be it under Democratic or Republican control, this body has been loath to make the tough decisions needed on the issue of transportation funding. It is a disgrace that our bipartisan team was not given the chance to put the trust back into the trust fund.

I urge my colleagues to send a message by opposing this bill.

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

"Disgrace" is a strong word from my friend; but I would say that, if there is disappointment in this institution, it is that the Ways and Means Committee, with the sole jurisdiction over funding transportation, has failed under both Republican and Democratic leadership to provide long-term transportation funding. The gentleman serves on that committee. I don't. I welcome his support on the steering committee if I try to make that move.

It is not easy, Mr. Speaker, to find that transportation funding, and the gentleman made a passionate pitch in the Rules Committee last night about the importance of keeping the user fee dynamic at play here.

Mr. Speaker, there was a time when the transportation bill was pushed by folks back home, not because they needed transportation certainty, as they so desperately need today, but because the local jurisdiction was only getting back about 80 cents out of every gas tax dollar they were sending in. They wanted to push that number up to 81 or to 82. It brought us all together around pushing a bill.

When we decided we didn't have the courage in the United States Congress—I was not in this institution at that time—to actually fund what it was that we had paid for, we began taking money out of general revenues and just stuffing it in the transportation

trust fund. Now, if you are a road builder, if you are in the business of getting people to work, if you are in the business of getting families out of traffic, if you are in the business of making America's economy grow, you thought that was a trade worth making. You had no idea that, now that every State is getting back more than a dollar for every dollar of taxes they send in, it is really hard to get people back to the table to fix the problem that the gentleman is speaking of.

We are at a nexus here, Mr. Speaker, between trying to solve a problem and trying to preserve our user fee system. I don't know where the division in the road is going to go. If we fail to maintain the user fee system when we find the additional year 4, year 5, and year 6 of transportation funding, we may never get it back.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a very conservative area in the great State of Georgia. We don't much care for taxes of any kind. We don't mind taking care of one another, but we feel like we do it better ourselves than do folks from far, far away. My local jurisdiction rejected Federal gas taxes. It rejected State gas taxes. It passed for themselves a \$200 million bonding initiative to build roads locally because they believed they would get it done. Users are paying for those roads.

There is not a conservative in this country, I would posit, who is unwilling to pay for what it is that he uses. It is our job to go sell that to folks—that, if you use it, you need to pay for it—and there is no shame in that. It is a constitutional responsibility that we have in this body, and it is one we ought to be proud to stand up and support.

Though, I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that we are going to have some EPA discussions in this legislation. My folks back home don't believe that, if they send a dollar to Washington, they are going to get a dollar's worth of roads back in return. They don't. They believe 10 percent is going to come off here and 10 percent is going to come off there. It is going to be wasted on regulatory compliance here, and it is going to be wasted on silly Federal mandates there; and they are going to get 50 cents of road for a dollar's worth of taxes. I don't think they are all wrong about that, Mr. Speaker. I think there is a lot of wisdom in that suspicion.

Now, this bill does a lot to correct that.

Two days ago, we had the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee in the Rules Committee, who was making that very point, which is that this bill is working to restore that trust.

I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, who worry about funding as I worry about funding, if we restore that trust, we will have access to the funding.

It is a very challenging issue, Mr. Speaker. It is our responsibility, in

having lost that trust, to restore it. This bill takes a major step in that direction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Georgia suggests that this is very complex and difficult and that we have wrapped ourselves around the axle, and we can't do this in the Rules Committee or in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

That is hogwash.

I wish that the Ways and Means Committee would have accepted the legislation that I have had for the last 5 years that is supported by the Chamber and the truckers and AAA and bicyclists and engineers—but, no, they have not done it. We could have an opportunity with this bill. There are a number of my colleagues who have proposals for finance, but they wouldn't even make in order a study, for heaven's sakes.

This year, seven Republican States, including Georgia, have raised the gas tax. They have followed the admonition of President Ronald Reagan in 1982, who called on Congress to come back after Thanksgiving recess and raise the gas tax.

The gentleman was not there when I testified, but I submitted a list of 18 organizations that support raising the gas tax, and we are not even allowed an opportunity to debate it on the floor. That is why we can't do as good a job as we want with this transportation bill.

And what are we given?—a 6-year shell with 3 years of, sort of, pay-fors—I like this—requiring the Federal Reserve dividend, which is opposed by most of my Republican friends. There are 150 people who signed a letter, saying that it is really stupid to sell the strategic oil reserve at twice what the current price is and—one of my favorites—having bill collectors hound poor people for their taxes. The last two times we tried it, it lost money.

This is a fraud. I urge rejection.

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

As a Rules Committee member—and it is called the powerful House Rules Committee for a reason—I am thrilled to see the parade of my Ways and Means colleagues on the House floor, who are saying that what Ways and Means doesn't get done we should be doing in the Rules Committee instead. I am excited about that as, I am sure, my friend from Colorado is as well. Together, we can do a lot of good tax policy.

I have a bill called the "FairTax." I haven't been able to bring it to the floor yet. With the endorsement now of two of my Ways and Means' friends that we ought to be able to make these amendments in order on major funding legislation and bring them to the floor,

I am looking forward to trying to get that delegation letter going. I don't have any Democrats on the bill right now, but I would welcome anybody. It is H.R. 25, the fundamental tax reform bill. I would love to bring that to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking as if it is over right now, as if there is no more debate left to have. That is what is nonsense. We are going to continue improving this bill throughout the afternoon and into the night and into tomorrow. We are going to take this bill to conference and improve it still.

I have said it once, but I will say it again: the opportunity for 6 years of funding is still there.

This isn't the time to turn the firing squad inward. This is the time to stand shoulder to shoulder and get out there and do this together. We believe in that, Mr. Speaker. We couldn't reach agreement with the Senate last year because they wanted 3 years of funding, and we wanted 6. We were dreaming the big dreams, not as Republicans and Democrats, but as the U.S. House of Representatives—as the people's House. Those days are still upon us. We have an environment in which to win. I hope we will seize it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Ms. TITUS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, when the new Speaker took the gavel last week, he promised us that the House would run differently in that Members on both sides of the aisle would get a chance to bring forth amendments and that the House would debate the merits of those.

Today, I am reminded of the saying, "Plus ça change, plus c'est la meme chose."

Like the gentleman admonished and as the chairman said, I worked across the aisle and brought a bipartisan amendment with my friend, Mr. DAVIS from Illinois. It made a small change about the local use of transportation dollars. Despite overwhelming support, we were denied the opportunity to bring that amendment to the floor.

In the middle of the night, in the backroom here in the Capitol, the majority decided that the will of the people simply didn't have to be heard on this important transportation issue; yet they have allowed 10 amendments to be heard on the Export-Import Bank, which have nothing to do with transportation, and the issue of which was resolved a week ago.

Indeed, I say, the more things change, the more they stay the same. So, despite all the fancy rhetoric you are hearing, I would urge you to remember that and to vote "no" on this rule.

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

With this new order that we have here, we are going to have to work

through it together, and it is not going to be easy. For the folks who think it is going to be easy, I would go ahead and turn your voting card in now and let somebody else come up here and do the work. It is not going to be easy. It is going to be hard.

□ 1330

Because what constitutes regular order for us? How do we work together?

My friend from Nevada just talked about her amendment that the Rules Committee didn't consider. She is absolutely right. That said, she offered the amendment in committee and withdrew it before we had a chance to vote on it.

We had this topic before us in the Transportation Committee and didn't do it there. Folks chose to do it on the House floor and in the Rules Committee instead. Is that the way we want this institution to work? Do we want to ignore the issues at the committees of jurisdiction and bring them to the House floor straightaway, or do we want to work through the committee process?

I don't have all the answers, Mr. Speaker. I have one vote in a body of 435. I generally side on the side of openness as opposed to being closed. I generally side on the side of voting instead of not voting.

Of all the rules I have had a chance to handle, Mr. Speaker, in the 4½ years the good people of the Seventh District have entrusted me with their voting card, this bill that we have before us, this rule that we have before us makes in order more voices than any other rule I have ever handled.

If folks don't think we have gone far enough today, fair enough. Let's talk about it again tomorrow. But I challenge you to tell me that we did it better yesterday, not "we" the Republicans yesterday, not "we" the Democrats yesterday, but "we" this House yesterday.

I have been watching this institution a long time. Not in more than 10 years have we even considered a bill of this magnitude on the floor of the House, and I am pleased that we finally came together to do it today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY).

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Georgia talks about the certainty that will be obtained by this bill. There will be certainty. There will be an absolute certainty that we will continue to underinvest in our infrastructure in the United States of America for the next 6 years.

Mr. Speaker, because of recent funding levels, we have caused the infrastructure in this country to be underinvested by a huge number. People estimate we have a \$6 trillion shortfall in our infrastructure. Well, that is a huge challenge. It is also a huge opportunity. If we could actually increase our investment in infrastructure, we

would create jobs, we would improve the lives of our constituents, and we would make our country more competitive.

Instead, we are looking at a bill that locks in infrastructure spending at current levels for another 6 years. How anyone could possibly look at the facts, look at the data, and look at the situation of the infrastructure in this country and conclude that that is the right answer is beyond my comprehension.

The only way to stop this chronic underinvestment in our infrastructure that will cause the infrastructure crisis in this country to continue to build is to reject this rule and reject the underlying bill so that this Congress can go back to the drawing board and figure out smart ways to increase our funding in infrastructure.

There are bipartisan solutions. We have heard about some of them today. One of the ones that I have worked on for years is to tie increasing our investment in infrastructure to international tax reform, where we have trillions of dollars sitting overseas trapped. If we can create pathways for that money to come back, we can allocate additional revenue towards infrastructure and increase our investment in infrastructure so we will not continue to have the problem of chronic underinvestment in our infrastructure and we can rebuild America.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my friend from Maryland he is absolutely right. We could do better in terms of certainty.

I would remind the gentleman that when Democrats ran this institution the cycle before I got here, they passed six different transportation extension bills in 2 years. That means we are averaging 4 months of certainty.

This bill, even under the most pessimistic assertions, gives us 3 years of certainty, which is more certainty than America has seen in a decade. I am not trying to stop trying, Mr. Speaker. I want us to keep fighting forward together. I just want us to recognize that this is the best we have done in a long, long time. Let's take advantage of having done the best we have done in a long, long time, and let's keep trying to do better.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), a senior member of the Transportation Committee.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time. In my 27 years in this Congress, I can think of very few Members who are better orators, greater speakers than the gentleman from Georgia; and I appreciate his giving me this time.

I rise in support of this rule.

Later today, Congressman PAULSEN of Minnesota and I will be offering an amendment that, I think, is very technical in nature; but it is designed to

help the smallest businesses in the trucking industry.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for including some provisions from a bill that I introduced in the base text that establishes hiring practices that a freight broker must follow.

My and Mr. PAULSEN's amendment clarifies the requirements that a freight broker must meet before hiring a motor carrier for the delivery of goods. This bill will require a broker to check to ensure that a motor carrier is first registered with, and authorized by, the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to operate as a licensed motor carrier; and, secondly, that it has the minimum insurance required by Federal law; and, third, it has the satisfactory safety fitness determination by the FMCSA. My amendment inserts "or be unrated" in the third requirement.

Currently, there are thousands of small trucking companies which have yet to be audited by the FMCSA. By adding the words "or be unrated," we ensure that these very small companies will not be precluded from being in the pool of eligible motor carriers that can be used for shipping goods.

Without this modest change, thousands of very small, very safe trucking companies will be eliminated from the pool of eligible motor carriers just because the FMCSA has not had time or staff levels enough to rate them. Without this amendment, thousands of small companies that have never had a wreck or a violation will be hurt.

So, without this change, we will hurt small businesses and drive up the cost of shipping goods for everyone. This is an amendment for the little guy, the mom-and-pop operators.

There is a second part to this amendment that address a fourth requirement that must be checked by the brokers. This fourth condition requires a broker to check to make sure that a motor carrier has not been issued an out-of-service order to prohibit a carrier from conducting operations.

To conclude, I will just say my and Mr. PAULSEN's amendment ensures that we have only safe trucks on the road and that thousands of small businesses are not hurt in the process. This amendment is supported by the Owner Operators Independent Drivers Association, the Transportation Intermediaries Association, various other associations, the International Warehouse Logistics Association, and on and on.

I would urge my colleagues to look into this amendment and hopefully support it later today when we bring it to the floor.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, many American workers don't have access to paid sick days, which means they can't miss work without losing a day's pay or risking their job security, sometimes even endangering the public health by spreading their flu or cold to others.

Mr. Speaker, everyone should be able to take care of themselves or their loved ones when they are sick and not have to worry about losing their job or falling behind on their bills.

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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question. Defeating the previous question will allow us to amend the rule to provide for consideration of the Healthy Families Act. It is an act that would allow workers to earn up to 7 days of job-protected sick leave every year.

Being a working parent should not mean choosing between your job and taking care of yourself and your family. But at least 43 million private sector workers, 39 percent of the workforce, must make this decision every time illness strikes. Millions more cannot earn paid sick time to care for a sick child or for a family member.

Employers ultimately suffer when workers have to make this choice. Increased turnover rates amount to greater costs. And employers can jeopardize the health of other employees when their policies force employees to come to work sick.

Paid sick days policies have been enacted successfully at the State and local levels. Nearly 20 jurisdictions across the country have adopted paid sick day laws, and there is strong public support for universal access to paid sick days. Eighty-eight percent of Americans support paid sick days legislation.

The Healthy Families Act allows working families to meet their health and financial needs while boosting businesses' productivity and retention rates.

It ultimately strengthens this Nation's economy. It is common sense, business savvy, and it is the right thing to do. Let's protect the public health, boost the economy, help hardworking families have access to paid sick days. Let's pass the Healthy Families Act.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the ranking member on the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't be bragging about this legislation today, boasting about this legislation. Let me give you the perspective of 27 years here.

This used to be the easiest legislation to pass in this institution. It created

greater cost efficiencies. It created greater investment and, just as importantly, it put people to work immediately.

There was no hearing held on the tax title portion of this bill. There was no operation or opportunity for Members to offer amendments in the Ways and Means Committee. Now, let me point out, for that 4-year period when we were in the majority, I held those hearings; and then after the loss of elections, during those 4 years, nothing ever came of it again.

We have repeatedly urged the opportunity to talk about a genuine mechanism for financing the Federal highway system, our airports, our railroads; and the opportunity has not availed itself.

To point something out here that I think is noteworthy as well, this financing is held together by bubble gum. How many times are we going to sell the oil in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve? Every time I turn around, it becomes the pay-for these days. Is there any oil left in there? That is how we are going to finance the Federal highway system?

A reminder, what I heard earlier that in some States people only want to pay for services that they use, that was the revenue mechanism, the user fee, the gas tax that allowed people to pay for the services that they used; namely, driving along on the Federal highway system. Now, how is that for a complication?

We are here today because we have not adequately addressed the Federal highway system's responsibility and that begins in this House of the Congress where all financing, according to our Constitution, is supposed to originate. If the Ways and Means Committee isn't taking it up, there is no opportunity for the House to take it up.

Don't brag about this rule today. It is a bad rule, and we should vote it down and get on with financing the Federal highway system the way it is supposed to be financed.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I just remind my friend, during the Congress before I arrived when he was chairman, four different extensions of the highway trust fund, not one of them was funded with a change in the gas tax.

Mr. NEAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, we held the hearings. We went through it. We had the Chamber of Commerce in, the American Trucking Association, and we had organized labor in. We were set to go, and then we lost the institution and that was the end of the discussion about the Federal highway system.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, as Mr. NEAL said, this transportation highway bill used to be a solid, bipartisan bill that invested in the future of this country. This Congress has set different expectations. I think if we are candid with ourselves and with the American people, we have become a low-expectations Congress. I guess it could be said that this bill meets, but certainly doesn't exceed, the low expectations that prevail in this body.

It is true that it will have a 6-year bill authorization with 3 years of bubble-gum-styled funding. That is going to give some certainty to the agency of transportation in Vermont, so it is true that this is better than when we were doing 3-month extensions and 5-month extensions on "pension smoothing."

You know what? America deserves better. America needs more, and we can provide it. We have jobs to create, work to be done, workers ready to put shovels in the ground and to get America moving again. It is within our power, both sides, to make that happen. But it can't happen if we are so fearful to even discuss revenue measures that we don't have hearings on them.

□ 1345

We have had good proposals from Mr. BLUMENAUER, a bipartisan proposal with Mr. RENACCI and Mr. PASCRELL, the Delaney proposal. There are solutions out there that are going to invest in this country, generate jobs for this economy, increase the gross domestic product, and make our economy more competitive and our highway system safer.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule precisely because it makes in order various Export-Import Bank amendments that are actually designed to kill what we just did to make sure that we could reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Nonetheless, I am grateful to Chairmen SHUSTER and GRAVES and Ranking Members DEFAZIO and NORTON and their committees and their personal staffs for their leadership in trying to move forward a 6-year reauthorization.

All of us have acknowledged that this is far from perfect, but the fact is, America is literally falling apart: by asphalt, by rebar, by cement, by steel, by rail, pothole by pothole, just falling apart. The United States now ranks 16th in infrastructure according to the World Economic Forum. According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, the overall assessment of our infrastructure ranks is, I am sad to say, a whopping D plus.

As some of you remember from The Washington Post back in February, a

constituent of mine was driving on the Suitland Parkway, just outside of D.C. She was minding her own business, running her errands. What happens? A chunk of cement falls down and hits her car. That is right, a chunk of cement falling from the beltway to hit her car on the Suitland Parkway. Fortunately, no one was injured, but this is just one example of a project that was on the Federal list and simply wasn't worked on because there was no money to do it.

I support what we are doing today in terms of a bipartisan authorization for a long-term authorization, but this is nowhere near what we need to do to repair the couple of trillion dollars in infrastructure deficit that we face in this country that is causing us not to be as competitive as we need to be and really is taking up a bunch of time for people who are stuck on roads that are going nowhere.

Let me be clear, this is not the bill that I would have written. It is not perfect, but maybe it is the best that we can do under the circumstances. Clearly, though, we shouldn't have a 6-year authorization with only a couple years of funding. There have been numerous proposals to fund our long-term infrastructure.

I am grateful that I was able to at least work on a couple of amendments regarding oversight of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, WMATA, and I look forward to continuing to work on these efforts.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, a few of my colleagues have talked about selling down the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. I think that is a great bipartisan idea to pay for something. We actually no longer need to have crude oil in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Our Nation is a net producer of crude oil, so they are actually stockpiling the same stuff that we are talking about exporting; namely, unprocessed crude oil. There is a component of the crude oil reserve that is heating oil that is processed. That is still necessary. That is not being sold down. Nobody has talked about selling that down. I think we can use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve as an additional pay-for for other items until it is successfully phased out over the next few years. I think this bill is the first step. I applaud my colleagues for including it.

Keep in mind, though, it is an accounting trick in terms of the dollar value of that. They are assuming that it will be sold at roughly twice the current price of oil. That may happen; it may not. We don't know. But at least it is being sold, and that is a good thing.

A third of our Nation's roads are rated poor or mediocre. We need to do better. We have a responsibility to address the transportation and infrastructure crisis.

If you have ever been to Fort Collins, the biggest city in my congressional district, home to Colorado State University, you have found a lot of traffic along Interstate 25.

If you have ever traveled Interstate 70 to our world-class ski resorts, like Vail or Breckenridge, you might very well have been locked in traffic as you went out there to enjoy the ski season or the summer high season.

Fort Collins, Loveland, Boulder, Vail, Frisco, Breckenridge, these are our communities that are tourism-and recreation-driven, and we need a 21st century transportation solution that provides consistency in funding levels, not a shell game to fund 2 years of a 6-year bill.

We need to open up a future for major highway improvements, like we need on Interstates 25 and 70. We need to put politics aside and not shroud a 2-year bill behind a facade of a 6-year bill. Our parents and grandparents sacrificed to build a world-class national infrastructure system, but we need the courage to maintain it and improve it for the 21st century.

I urge my colleagues to consider the responsibility of this maneuver. I urge defeat of the previous question, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on my side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 5¾ minutes remaining.

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

I appreciate my friend from Colorado working with me on this rule today. I appreciate all the folks on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure who made this possible, and the whole body that came in front of the Committee on Rules, bringing amendments to try to make the bill better.

I don't want to suggest that the differences that we have between one another here are in any way going away because of this bill. They are not. I have heard passionate speech after passionate speech about funding of this bill.

I share some of those concerns, but I represent a county of 200,000 people who just raised \$200 million in a bonding initiative to build their roads. Until my colleagues have raised the taxes on their constituents by \$1,000 on every man, woman, and child—\$4,000 on a family of four—to build roads back home in your district, please don't come and ask my constituents to pay even more.

Georgia is one of the States that has raised its gas tax, from a 7 cent sales tax to a 26 cent excise tax. When your State has taken on that same burden of responsibility, come back to me and tell me how much more Georgia needs to put in to help you.

The devolution of the transportation trust fund has long been a conversation in this body, but by holding the Fed-

eral gas tax constant over these years, that devolution has been happening naturally with the effect of inflation, and localities are picking up the tab.

You know what we are celebrating this week back home, Mr. Speaker? This is election week, of course. A year ago this week is when Forsyth County passed its \$200 million bonding initiative. You know when they broke ground on the project, Mr. Speaker? This week. This week. You tell me that time is money. It is true in transportation.

I challenge you to find that Federal project that you are working on back home in your district that you are going from conception to groundbreaking in 12 months. I want to help you find the funding to make it happen, I do, because, clearly, you are running at a heightened level of efficiency, and it deserves our support.

Mr. Speaker, the reason we need this bill is because we are not getting a dollar's worth of value out of a dollar's worth of Federal taxes. The reason we need this bill is to help make some of those bipartisan reforms to the infrastructure program that just don't make sense. They just don't make sense in the 21st century, and it is no wonder. Democratic Congresses failed to succeed in this effort. Republican Congresses failed to succeed in this effort. This Congress is succeeding in this effort.

There are 81 new amendments with this rule today, 81 new ideas with this amendment today. Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill has more certainty and more funding than any other proposal this body has considered in more than a decade. This rule has more openness, more voices, and more amendments than any other rule of this nature that I have been able to handle in 4½ years here.

We don't get it right every day. We don't get it right every day. Votes don't go the way I want them to go every day, but we have got a chance, Mr. Speaker. We have got a chance with this bill, with this process, with this new House leadership team to restore the trust that has been lost for far too long.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule and the underlying resolution.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 512 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 8. 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. 932) to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families. 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 respective chairs and ranking minor-

ity members of the Committees on Education and the Workforce, House Administration, and Oversight and Government Reform. 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. 9. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 932.

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. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1019

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor on H.R. 1019.

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

There was no objection.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 507 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 Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 22.

Will the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1356

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 Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 22) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, November

3, 2015, amendment No. 45 printed in part B of House Report 114-325 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) had been disposed of.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on my amendment to the end that the amendment stands disposed of by the voice vote thereon.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn. Accordingly, the ayes have it and the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 114-325 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 37, as modified, by Mrs. HARTZLER of Missouri.

Amendment No. 39 by Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

Amendment No. 41 by Mr. DESAULNIER of California.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 37, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MRS. HARTZLER

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 255, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 594]

AYES—172

Abraham	Burgess	Farenthold
Aderholt	Byrne	Fincher
Allen	Carter (GA)	Fleischmann
Amash	Carter (TX)	Fleming
Babin	Chabot	Flores
Barr	Chaffetz	Forbes
Barton	Clawson (FL)	Foxx
Benishek	Coffman	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Garrett
Black	Collins (NY)	Gibbs
Blackburn	Conaway	Gosar
Blum	Cook	Gowdy
Bost	Cramer	Granger
Brady (TX)	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Brat	Culberson	Graves (LA)
Bridenstine	DeSantis	Griffith
Brooks (AL)	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Hardy
Buchanan	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Buck	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Bucshon	Emmer (MN)	Heck (NV)

Hensarling	Messer	Scalise
Herrera Beutler	Mica	Schweikert
Hice, Jody B.	Miller (FL)	Scott, Austin
Holding	Moolenaar	Sensenbrenner
Hudson	Mooney (WV)	Sessions
Huelskamp	Mullin	Shinkus
Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney	Smith (MO)
Hultgren	Neugebauer	Smith (NE)
Hunter	Noem	Smith (NJ)
Hurt (VA)	Nugent	Smith (TX)
Issa	Olson	Stewart
Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo	Stivers
Johnson (OH)	Palmer	Stutzman
Johnson, Sam	Paulsen	Thornberry
Jones	Pearce	Tiberi
Jordan	Perry	Tipton
Kelly (MS)	Pittenger	Wagner
King (IA)	Pitts	Walberg
Kinzinger (IL)	Poliquin	Walker
Kline	Pompeo	Walorski
Labrador	Posey	Weber (TX)
LaHood	Price, Tom	Webster (FL)
Lamborn	Ratcliffe	Wenstrup
Latta	Reed	Westerman
Long	Renacci	Westmoreland
Loudermilk	Ribble	Whitfield
Love	Rice (SC)	Williams
Lucas	Roby	Wilson (SC)
Luetkemeyer	Rohrabacher	Wittman
Lummis	Rokita	Woodall
Marchant	Roskam	Yoder
Massie	Ross	Yoho
McCarthy	Rothfus	Young (IA)
McClintock	Rouzer	Young (IN)
McMorris	Royce	Zeldin
Rodgers	Russell	Zinke
McSally	Salmon	

NOES—255

Adams	DelBene	Kaptur
Aguilar	Denham	Katko
Amodei	Dent	Keating
Ashford	DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)
Barletta	Deuch	Kelly (PA)
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Kennedy
Beatty	Dingell	Kildee
Becerra	Doggett	Kilmer
Bera	Dold	Kind
Beyer	Donovan	King (NY)
Bilirakis	Doyle, Michael F.	Kirkpatrick
Bishop (GA)	Duckworth	Knight
Bishop (MI)	Edwards	Kuster
Blumenauer	Ellison	LaMalfa
Bonamici	Engel	Lance
Boustany	Eshoo	Langevin
Boyle, Brendan F.	Esty	Larsen (WA)
Brady (PA)	Farr	Larson (CT)
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Lawrence
Brownley (CA)	Fitzpatrick	Lee
Bustos	Fortenberry	Levin
Butterfield	Foster	Lewis
Calvert	Frankel (FL)	Lieu, Ted
Capps	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Capuano	Fudge	LoBiondo
Cárdenas	Gabbard	Loebsack
Carney	Gallego	Lofgren
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Lowenthal
Cartwright	Gibson	Lowe
Castor (FL)	Goodlatte	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Castro (TX)	Graham	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Chu, Judy	Graves (MO)	Lynch
Ciциlline	Grayson	MacArthur
Clark (MA)	Green, Al	Maloney,
Clarke (NY)	Green, Gene	Maloney, Carolyn
Clay	Grijalva	Maloney, Sean
Cleaver	Grothman	Marino
Clyburn	Guinta	Matsui
Cohen	Gutiérrez	McCaul
Cole	Hahn	McCollum
Comstock	Hanna	McDermott
Connolly	Harper	McGovern
Conyers	Hastings	McHenry
Cooper	Heck (WA)	McKinley
Costa	Higgins	McNerney
Costello (PA)	Hill	Meadows
Courtney	Himes	Meehan
Crawford	Hinojosa	Meng
Crowley	Honda	Miller (MI)
Cuellar	Hoyer	Moore
Cummings	Huffman	Moulton
Curbelo (FL)	Hurd (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Davis (CA)	Israel	Murphy (PA)
Davis, Danny	Jackson Lee	Nadler
Davis, Rodney	Jeffries	Napolitano
DeFazio	Jenkins (WV)	Neal
DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Newhouse
Delaney	Jolly	Nolan
DeLauro	Joyce	