

Jeffrey flew air cover missions during D-day. In December 1944, he was awarded the Silver Star for his "courage, combat skills, and gallant leadership" while thwarting an enemy mission.

Colonel Jeffrey ended his tour as commander of the 434th Fighter Squadron. His service was recognized at the time with the Distinguished Flying Cross, with one oakleaf cluster, and the Air Medal, with 16 oakleaf clusters.

Colonel Jeffrey passed away this April in Yakima, Washington, at the age of 95, regrettably before this honor was bestowed.

Please join me in honoring the memory of Colonel Arthur Jeffrey, a remarkable American, for his outstanding service defending our Nation.

HEAD START 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 50th anniversary of Head Start, a wonderful success story that empowered 32 million children in America.

Unfortunately, the future of Head Start today stands in grave peril due to the misplaced priorities of the Republican budget which cuts \$759 billion from nondefense discretionary funds and will result in 35,000 fewer children participating in Head Start.

House Democrats want to embrace the future by investing in early childhood education and enacting universal prekindergarten. Democrats strongly support President Obama's initiative to fully fund Head Start and expand the Early Head Start-Childcare Partnerships. Research shows that high-quality early education is a great investment in a child's life and our Nation's future.

Mr. Speaker, our children are our future. As Head Starters across the country plant rose bushes this week to commemorate President Johnson's Rose Garden launching of Head Start, this Congress must reject the misplaced priorities of the Republican budget and embrace a brighter future for our children.

HONORING WARRIORS WEEKEND

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to pay tribute to our veterans and to the men and women of our Armed Forces who wake up every day, put on our Nation's uniform, and don't know if they are going to be home that evening safely with their families.

Last weekend, volunteers came together in Port O'Connor, Texas, to honor more than 900 veterans and current members of the Armed Forces for the ninth annual Warriors Weekend.

Warriors Weekend brings together military members who have been wounded during combat in the global war on terror—and not just those who are wounded physically, but also those with invisible scars, like PTSD and depression.

Mr. Speaker, many of these current and former military members are still in recovery and physical rehabilitation, but the weekend event gives them the chance to build a support network and have a great time enjoying the Texas outdoors.

Warriors Weekend was created in part by veterans who served during Vietnam. They knew all too well how it felt to return home from war and be looked down on. They wanted to make sure every member of the military is welcomed home properly, and they knew that our wounded veterans oftentimes have needs that are overlooked.

I urge Members to support Warriors Weekend again next year.

PASS A LONG-TERM PLAN TO FIX OUR NATION'S TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the House voted yesterday to approve a 2-month extension of the highway trust fund. I am pleased we were able to pass a short-term fix, but it is time to stop kicking the can down the road.

I urge my colleagues to use the next 60 days to come up with a long-term plan to invest in our Nation's transportation infrastructure, a plan that will create jobs, strengthen American competitiveness, and lay the groundwork for future economic growth.

I asked the Joint Economic Committee staff to analyze the costs of U.S. underinvestment in infrastructure, and this map tells an important part of the story.

Across the country, one in four bridges are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete. That is scary, and it is a matter of public safety. Americans are taking tens of millions of trips every day over bridges that are in need of repair.

As you can see on the map, in some States, over one-third of the bridges are failing. Here in the Nation's Capital, 70 percent of our bridges are failing. We should fix our crumbling infrastructure as a matter of public safety and as a matter of national pride.

To see how your State is doing, you can download the map and the raw data behind it from the JEC, jec.senate.gov.

I urge my colleagues to support infrastructure. It is time to move beyond a 2-month extension and, instead, work on a long-term solution to this critical and important and economic development challenge.

NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

(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, as we celebrate National Foster Care Month, first recognized by President Ronald Reagan in 1988, I would like to thank the dedicated foster families, social workers, and service providers for their commitment to help children.

May is also a time to shed light on the plight of nearly 400,000 children and youth who are currently in our country's foster care system, and we call for safe and nurturing environments for these vulnerable members of our society.

In an effort to give qualified adoptive and foster parents an opportunity to make a lasting difference in the lives of these children, I will be introducing bipartisan, bicameral legislation that would help ensure that more children have the opportunity to be raised in a loving and supportive home that they can call their own.

The Every Child Deserves a Family Act would ensure that prejudices plays no part in adoption and foster care placements. A parent's ability to care for a child should not be determined by any parent's sexual orientation or gender identity, but by their love.

□ 1245

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2262, SPURRING PRIVATE AEROSPACE COMPETITIVENESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 880, AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY 22, 2015, THROUGH MAY 29, 2015

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 273 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 273

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. 2262) to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered

for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology now printed in the bill, 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 114-17. 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. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 880) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of May 21, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 4. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Wednesday, May 27, 2015, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016.

SEC. 5. On any legislative day during the period from May 22, 2015, through May 29, 2015—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, arti-

cle I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 6. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 5 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for two bills—H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015, and H.R. 880, the American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2015. House Resolution 273 provides for a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 2262 and a closed rule for the consideration of H.R. 880.

The resolution provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for H.R. 2262, and 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, for H.R. 880.

The resolution also provides for the consideration of seven amendments to H.R. 2262, and it provides for a motion to recommit for each bill. In addition, the rule provides for the normal recess authorities to allow the chair to manage pro forma sessions; it provides for the Committee on Appropriations to have the opportunity to file reports during the district work period; and it provides for suspension authority for Thursday to provide flexibility on the last day prior to the district work period.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution and the underlying legislation.

Both of these bills represent critical investments in science and technological innovation. On the floor this week, we have debated and passed several pieces of legislation to encourage the research and development of new technologies and ideas, moving our economy and our country forward and cementing our place in the world as the leader in scientific discovery.

These discoveries and the research they require will promote and create high-tech, high-paying jobs that can have untold benefits to our economy, benefiting all Americans. The rule and

the underlying legislation we have under consideration today continues that objective, and I look forward to discussing these critical issues with our colleagues here in the House.

H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015, is a package of four bills that will update the Commercial Space Launch Act. H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act, as introduced by the majority leader, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), will facilitate a progrowth environment for the commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and by creating a more stable and predictable regulatory environment.

H.R. 1508, the Space Resource Exploration and Utilization Act, introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY), will promote the development of a United States commercial space resource exploration and utilization industry, and it will increase the exploration and utilization of resources in outer space.

H.R. 2261, the Commercial Remote Sensing Act, introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), will facilitate the continued development of the commercial remote sensing industry and protect our national security.

Finally, H.R. 2263, the Office of Space Commerce Act, proposed by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), will rename the Office of Space Commercialization to the Office of Space Commerce, and it will seek to foster the conditions for the economic and technological growth of the United States space commerce industry.

This package of bills will ensure American leadership in space by fostering a strong and vibrant commercial space industry. Without this legislation, the commercial space industry may face a myriad of regulatory hurdles that would threaten America's continued exceptionalism in space exploration.

The other underlying bill in this rule, H.R. 880, addresses the research and development tax credit. In 1981, President Reagan signed into law a critical research and development tax credit, but Washington has let it expire and then has renewed it over a dozen times since then.

As we discussed last month as to our tax credits, Mr. Speaker, the R&D tax credit was included in the package of retroactive bills and extenders that was signed by the President on December 19 of last year, providing just 7 business days of certainty for businesses seeking to utilize this provision of our Tax Code. It, along with all of the others that expired again on December 31 of last year, currently remain expired. The temporary nature of the now expired research credit limits its effectiveness, which prevents some businesses from having certainty on long-term investments in U.S.-based research and development.

More research and development means more innovation, greater economic growth, and more American

jobs. In 2012, American companies invested \$302 billion in research and development. As of 2011, 1.47 million Americans worked directly in research and development. Increased certainty, combined with the simplification of our Tax Code, would lead to more research and more American jobs.

Investment in research and development is the key to America remaining the world's leader in innovation. The percentage of patents awarded by the U.S. Patent Office has increased each year, but the share awarded to U.S. innovators has declined. In the year 2000, 54 percent of the patents awarded were of American origin. By 2014, the number fell to 48 percent. From 2001 to 2011, America's share of global research and development declined from 37 percent to just 30 percent.

By making the research credit permanent, researchers can stop worrying about whether Congress is going to extend the tax credit and can, instead, focus on new discoveries that will help fuel our economy and grow jobs.

I look forward to debating these bills with our House colleagues, and I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills.

Before I proceed, I did not speak during the 1 minutes, and I want to also take cognizance of this being the 50th anniversary of Head Start and, additionally, this month of May as being Foster Care Month. Like many Members, I have a young person who has a more than compelling story about foster care—Ke'Onda Johnson from Royal Palm, Florida—who is shadowing me today, and I am delighted that she and other youngsters have this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 880, the American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2015, and H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015—two separate bills, wholly unrelated in content and purpose.

As a first order of business, I believe it is critical that I take a moment to highlight the manner in which we are debating this rule today. The deliberation of multiple, unrelated bills under a single rule is a disturbing trend that has ballooned under Republican leadership and is one that threatens the very foundation of the democratic process. Forcing several pieces of legislation into a single rule not only prevents Members of this Chamber from making informed judgments about the proper floor procedure for each measure, but it also leads to disjointed and often perplexing debates about an assortment of unconnected issues.

□ 1300

Votes on the House floor should reflect where Members stand on the specific questions at issue, not on a set of complex and unrelated procedures, some of which they support and others which they oppose.

Indeed, just yesterday, the House considered H. Res. 271, a rule providing for consideration of three measures: the Highway and Transportation Funding Act, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, and the America COMPETES Reauthorization bill.

The debate on that rule vacillated from surface transportation projects, to funding for the legislative branch, to the prioritization of science research development. Such debate erodes the integrity of House proceedings by creating confusing alternations in subject matter that eliminate the ability to reinforce a line of reasoning or respond to opposing arguments.

The grab-bag approach has skyrocketed since Republicans assumed control of the House in 2011, with a record 49 grab-bag rules reported out during the 113th Congress. Even more disheartening, we are on schedule to shatter this record during the 114th Congress, having already approved an unconscionable 14 of these rules in less than 5 months.

In fairness, the chairman of the Committee on Rules did say, in response to one of my colleagues and myself the day before, that this practice is not likely to continue at its present pace, and I await the opportunity for him to fulfill his view with reference to that matter.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today for consideration of yet another grab-bag rule governing two bills of significant importance that, as a result of this rule, will undoubtedly escape the due consideration each deserves.

H.R. 880, the American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2015, would make permanent a tax credit for qualified research expenses that expired at the end of last year. It is my strong belief that Democrats and Republicans, alike, support a tax credit that will help facilitate innovation and foster advancements in research, enabling American companies to grow and prosper. Technological innovation stemming from research and development serves as an important engine to our Nation's economic growth.

My opposition to this piece of legislation, therefore, comes in first part from my Republican colleagues' decision to make this tax credit permanent in what I view as a fiscally irresponsible way.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican friends have long touted themselves as the party of fiscal responsibility. For this reason, I find it a bit insincere that they now seek to implement a tax credit with no offsets for lost revenue. As a result, the Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that this bill would add almost \$182 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years. I have stated

time and time again that we cannot continue to provide tax cuts and credits without a mechanism to pay for them. It is comical to me that my Republican friends claim to be the party of fiscal responsibility while they, in the same breath, advocate a measure that would add nearly \$200 billion to the Federal deficit.

In addition to this legislation's reckless budgetary impact, I disagree with the piecemeal approach the majority has taken in making these tax credits permanent. More than 50 tax provisions expired at the end of last year, many of them critical to the middle and working class and, yes, poor families. And yet, instead of addressing the issues facing our Tax Code in a comprehensive, bipartisan way, the majority has decided to leave certain tax credits—ones that would directly improve the lives of hard-working American families, such as the work opportunity tax credit, the new markets tax credit, and renewable energy tax credit—to an uncertain fate.

The American people expect, and I am sure that they deserve, a Tax Code that supports our shared priorities. Cherry-picking tax credits to extend, and then allowing those credits to dramatically increase the deficit, is, in my view, a step in the wrong direction. It is an unacceptable step away from bipartisan, comprehensive tax reform.

I agree, as most of my colleagues likely do as well, that the research tax credit is critical for American innovation. That is why I am truly disappointed, although not surprised, that my Republican friends have again chosen to place partisan politicking above the needs of our constituents.

This rule also provides for consideration of the SPACE Act of 2015, another piece of once bipartisan legislation that has been distorted into an unrecognizable measure that panders to industry giants without regard for the safety of the American public or of spaceflight passengers.

While the enticement of space travel hovers over the objectives of this legislation, we must address the reality of what this bill seeks to accomplish. First, this bill reads like a laundry list of commercial space launch industry requests, exempting it from needed safety regulations and providing essentially complete immunity for civil lawsuits by removing claims related to commercial space launches from State court and mandating that they be heard in Federal Court, where few appropriate legal remedies exist. In practice, this measure will immunize commercial space companies from legal liability, even in cases of recklessness or intentional misconduct.

Also troubling, this bill provides tremendous subsidies for insurance coverage—and that is kind of interesting—to protect wealthy recreational spacecraft passengers. Why on earth, and there is no pun intended here, are we spending taxpayer dollars on individuals wealthy enough to travel into space for sport?

While it is uncontested that the issues these bills seek to address are important, the partisan way in which they have been presented prevents a robust deliberation, and I therefore oppose both the rule and the underlying bills.

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

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to some of the comments of the gentleman from Florida and remind him that each bill will be separately debated and that, obviously, this combined rule is a floor time management technique that the chairman of the Committee on Rules yesterday said was an aberration. I take him at his word; and I think it is important to note that, during Democratic majorities, this was certainly not an unheard-of practice, either.

I do want to make sure that I reiterate that every bill will be separately debated; and I would remind the gentleman that, during the time we have to debate the rule, if we actually stick to the topics related to the bills and the rules, it will help us manage our floor time even better.

With that, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

Mr. POSEY. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Despite some of the comments we have heard from across the aisle this morning, I remember my first 2 years, my first term here, and not one time was I allowed to even file a single amendment to a single bill here. All the rules were closed, and it was run like a king would run a kingdom, not a democratic republic. Here, today, I think the other side has already filed seven amendments on one of these bills. That is seven times more than I ever got to dream about filing when you ran this place.

Another great thing about this bill, you actually get to read it before we pass it. We have done all our bills like that since we have taken control. You actually get to read the bills before they are passed. When you all were in the majority, we had to pass them before you read them. I think you remember the famous quote.

You refer to this as a grab bag. The only grab bag I see here is the litany of totally unrelated subjects rattled off, as if they somehow related to this bill. I mean, that doesn't pass the straight face test.

Now to the bill. I would like to thank the majority leader, KEVIN MCCARTHY, and Chairman LAMAR SMITH for their hard work on the SPACE Act. The SPACE Act will help ensure American leadership in space, facilitating the growth and stability of the commercial space industry. This is an important, historic, and exciting piece of legislation.

This legislation includes many important provisions to update our laws

and the oversight of the commercial space industry, including title 2 of the Space Resource Exploration and Utilization Act—historic, bipartisan, bicameral legislation introduced with my colleague from the State of Washington, DEREK KILMER.

I appreciate the support H.R. 1508, incorporated herein, has received from many members of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the thorough work and research of Senators PATTY MURRAY and MARCO RUBIO, who introduced identical legislation in the United States Senate.

The SPACE Act also includes a provision which would streamline regulations and encourage cooperation between government agencies' commercial space activities to eliminate red tape and bureaucracy that are impeding development of America's commercial space industry.

The Federal Aviation Administration, the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and other agencies are all involved in overseeing many commercial space launches, and sometimes there are duplicative measures that could be streamlined, cutting costs to both the Federal Government and commercial companies and making the United States companies more competitive in the global marketplace.

Let me add that this bill includes a provision requiring the FAA to provide direction for space support vehicles, also known as experimental aircraft. Unfortunately, for too long, the FAA has held off providing direction by means of a regulatory framework for these endeavors to safely support the United States commercial space endeavors. In Florida, there is such an entity, approved by NASA and operating out of the Kennedy Space Center, which the FAA grounded because they use experimental aircraft. This is a testament that FAA needs serious reform and needs to be brought into the 21st century.

In short, the SPACE Act is a critical piece of legislation to the future of our commercial space industry, and it is important to our space exploration efforts as well.

I thank my colleagues again for their work on the SPACE Act and urge all Members to support the rule today and passage of this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), who is the ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means and a good friend of mine.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. I thank Mr. HASTINGS for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not about support for the R&D credit. Democrats

have a long track record of supporting the R&D tax credit. Indeed, I have often been the author of legislation to strengthen it.

This debate, purely and simply, is about fiscal responsibility, about taking one tax provision and making it permanent without paying one dime for it.

When former Chairman Camp unveiled a tax reform proposal last year, he undertook a comprehensive consideration of the more than 50 tax provisions that expired at the end of last year, but in a fiscally responsible manner.

□ 1315

This bill does just the opposite. It continues a helter-skelter approach toward tax extenders, without any regard whatsoever for paying the hundreds of billions of dollars they cost to make them permanent.

Last year, Ways and Means Republicans passed 14 permanent extensions at a cost of \$825 billion. They went nowhere because the President has made clear his opposition to this approach.

With this bill, this year's price tag has reached \$586.3 billion. It is particularly glaring that the majority is passing unpaid-for tax cuts the very same week that they once again put off a long-term extension of highway funding because they are unable to find a revenue stream.

There is no lack of support for the R&D credit among us Democrats. It is the approach Republicans are taking that we oppose and strongly so. It is fiscally irresponsible indeed, and it would leave behind vital provisions that help hard-working American families, like the expansion of the earned income tax credit, the child tax credit, and the American opportunity tax credit.

We stand ready to work with the majority on tax reform and on a long-term extension of highway funding. Today's R&D bill is tax reform in reverse. It makes talk of fiscal responsibility hypocrisy and creates another big financial pothole standing in the way of long-term highway funding.

Vote "no" on this rule, and vote "no" on the bill relating to R&D tax credits.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I stand steadfastly against not only the way in which we have been conducting business with regard to the way we report out rules, but also to both underlying bills for their partisan posturing and failure to address the important issues facing the middle class in this country.

We cannot continue to provide tax credits without establishing a revenue offset, enact tax policies that favor a partisan agenda and push us further away from needed comprehensive tax reform, or offer legislative gifts to industry giants at the expense of the American public.

Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day is next Monday. If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative BROWNLEY's Help Hire Our Heroes Act, H.R. 607.

H.R. 607 would reauthorize the Veterans Retraining Assistance Program, which expired in March 2014. That program paid for veterans to get training for high-demand occupations, and during its 3 years in existence, it helped more than 76,000 veterans.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question; vote "no" on the underlying bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Florida, but I would like to respond to a few of the comments.

The R&D tax credit has been overwhelmingly supported for the last 16 extensions, the last time garnering 378 votes. Only 46 Members voted against the R&D tax credit.

The R&D tax credit will be passed again. In fact, the gentleman from Michigan admitted, Mr. Speaker, that the vast majority of Democrats will vote to extend the R&D tax credit. In fact, they will do it every year for the next 10 years, like they have the last few years. When it is done every year, they don't insist it is paid for.

If you will do it for 10 years in a row without paying for it—the entire budget window—why don't we just all create some certainty for our businesses so we can invest in high-tech jobs and growing our economy, Mr. Speaker?

Let's create certainty for the American people. Let's pass the bill. Let's pass the rule. Let's pass the previous question.

I think, unfortunately, the arguments from the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Speaker, really encourage cliff politics—high-stakes, expiring legislation that the American people don't want. The American people want us to create certainty. They want us to support jobs. They want us to support our technological innovation in this country, Mr. Speaker.

I would urge my colleagues to support the rule and support the underlying bills, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support the Rule on H.R. 2262, the Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act of 2015 (the SPACE Act of 2015). And I thank Majority Leader McCARTHY for sponsoring this important legislation. The space community is well served having Leader McCARTHY as a champion.

This bill is the product of over three years of work. Congress solicited input from nearly

every stakeholder group. That is reflected in the broad support that this bill has received.

From industry, to education groups, to grassroots citizen advocacy groups, this bill has been praised by virtually every interested party.

The process to getting here was inclusive and exhaustive. The Science, Space, and Technology Committee held numerous hearings on the topic over the last three years.

On November 19, 2013, the Committee held a hearing on the commercial space industry. On February 14, 2014, the Committee held a hearing on updates to the Commercial Space Launch Act. On April 29, 2014, the Committee held a hearing on the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) space traffic management proposal and orbital debris. On February 27, 2015, the Committee held a hearing on the Commercial Crew program.

Last October, staff formally submitted a draft to the minority. Within the last two months, the majority and minority have worked to write many of the provisions in the underlying bill.

For instance, Section 101, which deals with Consensus Standards, is the result of bipartisan negotiations. The same can be said for Section 102, which calls for an update to the maximum probable loss calculation under indemnification.

Section 103, which pertains to Launch Vehicle Flexibility, is identical to the bipartisan provision sponsored by Senators HEINRICH and RUBIO that easily passed the Senate Commerce Committee last year by voice vote.

Section 104 clarifies the role of Government Astronauts and is almost identical to the provision requested by the FAA and NASA.

The minority also played a role in writing Section 108 on Orbital Traffic Management. Section 109 on State Commercial Spaceports also addressed bipartisan requests.

Section 111 on the Streamlining of Commercial Space Launch Activities is similar to language already in the Senate's bill, and Section 112 was the result of an amendment in Committee that earned bipartisan support.

Title 2 of the bill focuses on Space Resource Exploration and Utilization. As a stand-alone bill, it was the subject of a hearing last September and it is cosponsored by both Republicans and Democrats. It even has a Democratic champion on the Senate side, Senator MURRAY.

Title 3 of the bill addresses Commercial Remote Sensing and also benefits from bipartisan co-sponsorship. When it was marked up in Committee last week, it enjoyed unanimous support. The same can be said of Title 4 of the bill that pertains to the Office of Space Commerce.

At the Committee's recent markup, eight amendments to the provisions we are considering today were adopted—three of which were amendments offered by Democrats.

The Rule before us today allows for consideration of five Democratic amendments and two Republican amendments. The majority has gone out of its way to include the minority in this process.

In fact, the Administration said in a statement that it, "does not oppose House passage of the bill"—a rarity for bills considered under a Rule.

This bill facilitates a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment, creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and improving safety.

The Act ensures American leadership in space and fosters the development of advanced technologies. I urge my colleagues to support this Rule as well as the underlying bill, and I thank the Majority Leader once again for his initiative on this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the rule for H.R. 2262, the SPACE Act of 2015.

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution states that "The Congress shall have Power to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries . . ."

It does not say that the Congress shall have the right to ignore.

The United States space program has existed for over half a century and my commitment to providing NASA with the resources to carry the agency forward with its ambitious agenda of research, exploration, and discovery is unwavering.

NASA continues to push the boundaries of what is possible, keeping our Nation on the forefront of innovation and exploration.

It is the responsibility of this Congress to ensure that the future of space exploration remains a part of our national destiny.

It inspires our children to look to the stars and dream of what they too, one day, may achieve.

The Jackson Lee Amendments made in order by the Rules Committee are intended to improve the Space Act.

My amendments are simple and will improve the bill.

1. Jackson Lee Amendments to H.R. 2262

This Jackson Lee Amendment Number 8, would facilitate the participation of HBCU, Hispanic Serving Institutions, National Indian institutions, in fellowships, work-study and employment opportunities in the emerging commercial space industry.

My amendment would increase awareness among underrepresented groups in STEM employment and education opportunities in the commercial space industry.

One of the most enduring difficulties faced by underrepresented populations in the STEM field is a lack of awareness and understanding of the connection between STEM and employment opportunities.

In 2012, a survey found that despite the nation's growing demand for more workers in science, technology, engineering, and math, the skills gap among the largest ethnic and racial minorities groups remains stubbornly wide.

Blacks and Latinos account for only 7 percent, of the STEM workforce despite representing 28 percent of the U.S. population.

2. Jackson Lee Amendment on Minority and Women Owned Businesses

The Jackson Lee Amendment requires that provisions of the bill that address future legislation also lay the foundation for the commercial space industry include work on how to effectively conduct outreach to small business concerns owned and controlled by women and minorities.

I have worked hard to help small business owners to fully realize their potential.

That is why I support entrepreneurial development programs, including the Small Business Development Center and Women's Business Center programs.

These initiatives provide counseling in a variety of critical areas, including business plan development, finance, and marketing.

Outreach is key to developing healthy and diverse small businesses.

There are approximately 6 million minority owned businesses in the United States, representing a significant aspect of our economy.

According to the most recent available Census data, minority owned businesses employ nearly 6 million Americans and generate \$1 trillion dollars in economic output.

Women owned businesses have increased 20% between 2002 and 2007, and currently total close to 8 million.

My home city of Houston, Texas, the home of the Johnson Space Center, is also home to more than 60,000 women owned businesses, and more than 60,000 African American owned businesses.

Final Jackson Lee Amendment Seeks Funding To Continue Space Exploration R&D

The taxpayer has invested in space exploration for decades.

This investment is reaping benefits for the commercial space industry today.

3. The Jackson Lee Amendment not included in the Rule would have provided revenue for research and development work to continue on challenges that hinder manned and unmanned space flight.

Many of the startup companies entering the space industry have few resources to dedicate to basic research.

There are still critical areas of research that must be done to make space flight as safe as commercial transportation systems are today.

Although commercial transportation is not 100 percent without risk, it is much safer than it would have been without dedicated and focused basic and applied research to address safety issues.

While the government supports the aspirations of companies large and small to become part of the commercial space industry, it should still be the responsibility of NASA to pursue research that can save lives and improve space travel.

If the future we envision is one where thousands of businesses will benefit from commercial and government space exploration and investment efforts then investing today in tomorrow's economy makes good sense.

Although I believe the Jackson Lee Amendments will improve the Bill, there exist troubling aspects of the bill:

First, it is regrettable that the SPACE Act will restrict the "learning period" of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulation of spacecraft.

This learning period should be extended for a shorter period than the ten-year extension through 2025 included in the bill.

Second, a voluntary industry consensus standard would provide a strategy that improves the overall safety of the industry as opposed to performance-based regulations.

Finally, I have concerns about the ability of U.S. companies to move forward with innovative space initiatives without authority to ensure continuing supervision of these initiatives as delineated in the Outer Space Treaty.

Thus, I hope we can all work together in addressing these troubling aspects of the bill.

I ask my colleagues to vote for the Jackson Lee Amendments.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 273 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 7. 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. 607) to amend the VOW to Hire Heroes Act of 2011 to extend the Veterans Retraining Assistant Program, and for other purposes. 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 Veterans' Affairs. 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 recommend 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. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 607.

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 pre-

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS. 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 241, nays 183, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 250]

YEAS—241

Abraham	Cole	Garrett
Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Gibbs
Allen	Collins (NY)	Gibson
Amash	Comstock	Gohmert
Amodei	Conaway	Goodlatte
Babin	Cook	Gosar
Barletta	Costello (PA)	Gowdy
Barr	Cramer	Granger
Barton	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Benishek	Crenshaw	Graves (LA)
Billirakis	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Bishop (MI)	Davis, Rodney	Griffith
Bishop (UT)	Denham	Grothman
Black	Dent	Guinta
Blackburn	DeSantis	Guthrie
Blum	DesJarlais	Hanna
Bost	Diaz-Balart	Hardy
Boustany	Dold	Harper
Brady (TX)	Duffy	Harris
Brat	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler
Bridenstine	Duncan (TN)	Heck (NV)
Brooks (AL)	Ellmers (NC)	Hensarling
Brooks (IN)	Emmer (MN)	Herrera Beutler
Buchanan	Farenthold	Hice, Jody B.
Buck	Fincher	Hill
Bucshon	Fitzpatrick	Holding
Burgess	Fleischmann	Hudson
Byrne	Fleming	Huelskamp
Calvert	Flores	Hultgren (MI)
Carter (GA)	Forbes	Hultgren
Carter (TX)	Fortenberry	Hunter
Chabot	Fox	Hurd (TX)
Clawson (FL)	Franks (AZ)	Hurt (VA)
Coffman	Frelinghuysen	Issa

Jenkins (KS) Mullin
 Jenkins (WV) Mulvaney
 Johnson (OH) Murphy (PA)
 Johnson, Sam Neugebauer
 Jolly Newhouse
 Jones Noem
 Jordan Nugent
 Joyce Nunes
 Katko Olson
 Kelly (PA) Palazzo
 King (IA) Palmer
 King (NY) Paulsen
 Kinzinger (IL) Pearce
 Kline Perry
 Knight Pittenger
 Labrador Pitts
 LaMalfa Poe (TX)
 Lamborn Poliquin
 Lance Pompeo
 Latta Posey
 LoBiondo Price, Tom
 Long Ratcliffe
 Loudermilk Reed
 Love Reichert
 Lucas Renacci
 Luetkemeyer Ribble
 Lummis Rice (SC)
 MacArthur Rigell
 Marchant Roby
 Marino Roe (TN)
 Massie Rogers (AL)
 McCarthy Rogers (KY)
 McCaul Rohrabacher
 McClintock Rokita
 McHenry Rooney (FL)
 McKinley Ros-Lehtinen
 McMorris Roskam
 Rodgers Ross
 McSally Rothfus
 Meadows Rouzer
 Meehan Royce
 Messer Russell
 Mica Ryan (WI)
 Miller (FL) Salmon
 Miller (MI) Sanford
 Moolenaar Scalise
 Mooney (WV) Schweikert

NAYS—183

Adams Dingell
 Aguilar Doggett
 Ashford Doyle, Michael
 Bass F.
 Beatty Duckworth
 Becerra Edwards
 Bera Ellison
 Beyer Engel
 Bishop (GA) Eshoo
 Blumenauer Esty
 Bonamici Farr
 Boyle, Brendan Fattah
 F. Foster
 Brady (PA) Fudge
 Brown (FL) Gabbard
 Brownley (CA) Gallego
 Bustos Garamendi
 Butterfield Graham
 Capuano Grayson
 Cárdenas Green, Al
 Carney Green, Gene
 Carson (IN) Grijalva
 Cartwright Gutiérrez
 Castor (FL) Hahn
 Castro (TX) Hastings
 Chu, Judy Heck (WA)
 Cicilline Higgins
 Clark (MA) Himes
 Clarke (NY) Hinojosa
 Clay Honda
 Cleaver Hoyer
 Clyburn Huffman
 Cohen Israel
 Connolly Jackson Lee
 Conyers Jeffries
 Cooper Johnson (GA)
 Costa Johnson, E. B.
 Courtney Kaptur
 Crowley Keating
 Cuellar Kelly (IL)
 Cummings Kennedy
 Davis (CA) Kildee
 Davis, Danny Kilmer
 DeFazio Kind
 DeGette Kirkpatrick
 Delaney Kuster
 DeLauro Langevin
 DelBene Larson (CT)
 DeSaulnier Lawrence
 Deutch Lee

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 (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

Rush Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Linda T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)

NOT VOTING—8
 Capps
 Poe (FL)
 Curbelo (FL)
 Donovan
 Frankel (FL)
 Larsen (WA)
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takai
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko

Torres
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

□ 1349

Messrs. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, TAKAI, and RUSH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”
 So the previous question was ordered.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 Stated against:
 Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 250, I was not present because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”
 (By unanimous consent, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR THOSE LOST IN THE PHILADELPHIA TRAIN DERAILMENT

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 12, we had a horrific train derailment crash in the city of Philadelphia. So first off, our thoughts and prayers are with the eight men and women who lost their lives and the over 200 who were injured.

I have never been more proud of the men and women who live and work in the city of Philadelphia, the city of brotherly love and sisterly affection. We had this major catastrophe at 9:15 at night. Within 4 minutes, our first responders—our police, our fire, Police Commissioner Ramsey, Fire Commissioner Sawyer—were on the scene.

The scene was in total darkness, and we had volunteers from the neighborhood who even joined in. Imagine, total darkness. The only light was flashlights flashing back and forth.

I stand here as proud as I could be of the mayor of the city of Philadelphia, Michael Nutter, who, from Tuesday until Sunday, was on that scene constantly, orchestrating the administration people, moving them around, consoling families, making sure that all were accounted for, and even making sure that their belongings were given back to them.

I can't be more proud of our hospitals and our universities. Universities opened their doors for loved ones to come. And our hospitals, the doctors, nurses, all the men and women who worked there—there were doctors who worked 30 hours and went back home and couldn't sleep and came back to work another 12 hours.

But most importantly, two things really struck me. Temple University Hospital in the city of Philadelphia had a lot of the injured people admitted to their hospital. The students who go to Temple University heard about it,

jumped on their bicycles, and rode down to assist all those in the hospital, whether it be by pushing a gurney or whether it would be consoling a family member or putting a family member with a loved one.

And the neighbors, the neighbors ran out—again, in total darkness. There were 200 people-plus injured. Neighbors ran through, helping out through all the soot, picking them up, pulling them out of the trains, bringing them into their house, bringing out water, going to a local store and buying water, bringing towels, wiping them down.

One person said:
 I am sorry I am in your home. I am full of soot, and I am dirtying your rug and your couch.

And in response, the lady said:
 That is okay. We can buy more couches, and we can buy more things, more whatever we need to buy. But you can't buy your health back. So we want to be here to be able to help you in the best way we can.

I am honored to be standing here with my colleagues from Pennsylvania and some others from throughout the country. Some lost a loved one.

I am extremely proud to recognize Chairman JEFF DENHAM and Ranking Member MIKE CAPUANO, who assisted me and toured the site with me. I appreciate their concern, and I appreciate them being there.

So, Mr. Speaker, the best way we can honor these men and women is to make sure this accident never again happens in the United States of America.

With that, I ask for a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. 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 240, noes 185, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 251]

AYES—240

Abraham	Bridenstine	Cook
Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Costello (PA)
Allen	Brooks (IN)	Cramer
Amodei	Buchanan	Crawford
Babin	Buck	Crenshaw
Barletta	Bucshon	Culberson
Barr	Burgess	Curbelo (FL)
Barton	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Benishek	Calvert	Denham
Bilirakis	Carter (GA)	Dent
Bishop (MI)	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	DesJarlais
Black	Clawson (FL)	Diaz-Balart
Blackburn	Coffman	Dold
Blum	Cole	Duffy
Bost	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Boustany	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Brady (TX)	Comstock	Ellmers (NC)
Brat	Conaway	Emmer (MN)

Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
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, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa

Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moonenar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulyaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratchliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
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 (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke

NOT VOTING—7
Capps
Chaffetz
Deutch
Donovan
Hastings
Tsongas
Wasserman
Schultz

□ 1402

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.

AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 273, I call up the bill (H.R. 880) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Pursuant to House Resolution 273, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, modified by the amendment printed in part B of House Report 114-127, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 880

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Research and Competitiveness Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. RESEARCH CREDIT SIMPLIFIED AND MADE PERMANENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 41(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 38, the research credit determined under this section for the taxable year shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"(1) 20 percent of so much of the qualified research expenses for the taxable year as exceeds 50 percent of the average qualified research expenses for the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined,

"(2) 20 percent of so much of the basic research payments for the taxable year as ex-

ceeds 50 percent of the average basic research payments for the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined, plus

"(3) 20 percent of the amounts paid or incurred by the taxpayer in carrying on any trade or business of the taxpayer during the taxable year (including as contributions) to an energy research consortium for energy research."

(b) REPEAL OF TERMINATION.—Section 41 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (h).

(c) CREDIT ALLOWED AGAINST ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX IN CASE OF ELIGIBLE SMALL BUSINESS.—Section 38(c)(4)(B) of such Code is amended by redesignating clauses (ii) through (ix) as clauses (iii) through (x), respectively, and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

"(ii) the credit determined under section 41 for the taxable year with respect to an eligible small business (as defined in paragraph (5)(C), after application of rules similar to the rules of paragraph (5)(D))."

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 41(c) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(c) DETERMINATION OF AVERAGE RESEARCH EXPENSES FOR PRIOR YEARS.—

"(1) SPECIAL RULE IN CASE OF NO QUALIFIED RESEARCH EXPENDITURES IN ANY OF 3 PRECEDING TAXABLE YEARS.—In any case in which the taxpayer has no qualified research expenses in any one of the 3 taxable years preceding the taxable year for which the credit is being determined, the amount determined under subsection (a)(1) for such taxable year shall be equal to 10 percent of the qualified research expenses for the taxable year.

"(2) CONSISTENT TREATMENT OF EXPENSES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding whether the period for filing a claim for credit or refund has expired for any taxable year taken into account in determining the average qualified research expenses, or average basic research payments, taken into account under subsection (a), the qualified research expenses and basic research payments taken into account in determining such averages shall be determined on a basis consistent with the determination of qualified research expenses and basic research payments, respectively, for the credit year.

"(B) PREVENTION OF DISTORTIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe regulations to prevent distortions in calculating a taxpayer's qualified research expenses or basic research payments caused by a change in accounting methods used by such taxpayer between the current year and a year taken into account in determining the average qualified research expenses or average basic research payments taken into account under subsection (a)."

(2) Section 41(e) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking all that precedes paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

"(e) BASIC RESEARCH PAYMENTS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'basic research payment' means, with respect to any taxable year, any amount paid in cash during such taxable year by a corporation to any qualified organization for basic research but only if—

"(A) such payment is pursuant to a written agreement between such corporation and such qualified organization, and

"(B) such basic research is to be performed by such qualified organization.

"(2) EXCEPTION TO REQUIREMENT THAT RESEARCH BE PERFORMED BY THE ORGANIZATION.—In the case of a qualified organization described in subparagraph (C) or (D) of paragraph (3), subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) shall not apply."

NOES—185

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly

Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski