

I thank my colleagues in the House for passing this important legislation and call on those in the Senate to take swift action to reduce regulatory overreach.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, on August 6, we will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Mr. Speaker, this landmark law codified protections to guarantee every American's right to vote. For the past five decades, the Voting Rights Act has broken down barriers that discouraged or outright prohibited citizens from voting.

The VRA led to a more inclusive electoral system that increasingly reflected the diversity of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the right to vote is central to who we are as Americans and to our democracy.

But this cornerstone of American civil rights is unfortunately being threatened today. In too many places across the country, we have seen new measures that create barriers that make it harder to register or vote.

On this 50th anniversary, we must redouble our commitment to strengthening the Voting Rights Act. We can start by restoring the Voting Rights Act to ensure that the rights of all Americans that go to the ballot box and cast a ballot are protected.

HONORING ADOLPH KIEFER OF WADSWORTH

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the "Father of Swimming," Adolph Kiefer, from Wadsworth, Illinois.

At age 17, Adolph became the 100-meter gold medal winner at the 1936 Berlin Olympics. In addition to earning 17 world records, Adolph was the first man in the world to swim the 100-yard backstroke in under a minute and invented a flip turn, still used today.

In 1947, Adolph founded his own company, inventing the first plastic kickboard and the first nylon swimsuit. Yet, he has considered teaching others his greatest success.

Upon joining the Navy, Adolph was shocked to learn many of his comrades couldn't swim. He designed a program to teach millions of recruits what he dubbed the victory backstroke.

As a youth fitness advocate, he served the Red Cross for 25 years, coordinating the learn-to-swim campaign for Chicago and overseeing lessons for thousands of children.

Mr. Kiefer just celebrated his 97th birthday and still swims every day.

I have submitted a letter of support for Mr. Kiefer for the Presidential Medal of Freedom. I urge our country to honor a great man from Illinois' 14th Congressional District.

UNFINISHED WORK

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I am upset that the House is heading to August recess today with so much unfinished work in front of us.

We could be working to find a transportation bill that both we and the Senate can agree on, a bill that would begin to fix our broken roads, bridges, and highways. My district, the Virgin Islands, has been hit by nearly 6 years of substantially reduced Federal highway funding.

We could be working on an appropriations bill to fund important work for this country. In my district, the Virgin Islands, the Interior Appropriations bill is vitally important.

This funding would go toward the children in our schools. Right now the schools are not structurally sound and are decaying. In fact, a new school hasn't been built in my home district on the island of St. Croix or St. Thomas in the last two decades.

It is shameful to leave town without working on a Voting Rights Act. The ability and ease of access to voting must be expanded, not restricted. It must also be further expanded to include the 4 million Americans who do not have the right to vote for their President simply because they live in a territory.

These men and women love their country, they fight for their country, but they are excluded from the most basic democratic function.

We could be working to fix these and a myriad of other things, but, instead, we are leaving with these matters unattended. This is an embarrassment to this body and must not happen again.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1994, VA ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3236, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND VETERANS HEALTH CARE CHOICE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 388 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 388

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. 1994) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for

the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, 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 Veterans' Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. 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 committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. 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. 3236) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, to provide resource flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Ways and Means, and Veterans' Affairs; and (2) one motion to recommit.

□ 1245

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my friend, 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. SESSIONS. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we are here at the end of the work that we have done before our break home for the August recess, where we will have an opportunity to go back to the American people and talk with them as they are in our homes, our cities, our neighborhoods, our schools, our firehouses, and our places of worship; and we will have a chance to meet and talk with them about the great work that Republicans have achieved and done up here in Washington, D.C., during this first half of the year.

I am very pleased to know that today, as we are preparing to leave to go back home for our district work session, that we are going to be presenting several bills on the floor that are done to try and move forward not only thoughts and ideas that we have for the House of Representatives but, really, to work in the spirit of things with the other body, the United States Senate, so that we can make sure that the American people, their vision, their needs are before the American people. That is why I am here today.

Mr. Speaker, last year, the American people were shocked, once again, by the news that dozens of our Nation's veterans were left to die while they waited for medical care in the VA. The VA hospital, which is located in so many of our communities around this great Nation, has simply not performed well and, in several instances, has had shocking results. That is also why we are here today.

In response, Congress passed something called the Choice Act, which makes it easier to remove senior executives at the VA who had underperformed, who have not done their job properly on behalf of not just the taxpayers of this country, but on behalf of a grateful Nation who is serving the men and women who have given their very best years and lives to this country through their service to the United States military.

We believe that removing people who cannot make wise choices and decisions at the VA was the right thing to do. We were trying to put the President, his administration, the Secretary, and senior managers at the VA not only on notice that we would not tolerate bad behavior, poor decisions, and ineffective management, but that we were going to do something about it. By the way, we felt like they were underperforming to a deserving crowd, and that is our veterans.

Well, the President agreed with us, too. The bill was signed into law. We got that done last year, the Choice Act. It was a good decision by this body when we faced the times where we rec-

ognized in not only a public way, but in an outpouring of support from veterans who said this has to change. The Republican Congress did just that.

Our chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs from Florida (Mr. MILLER) very quickly and clearly went and did an investigation on a bipartisan basis, looked at the VA, and made these decisions. That was what we did a year ago.

Since then, only two VA employees have been fired for their role in what is now known as the waiting list scandal. What is this waiting list scandal? The waiting list scandal is a way by which the VA denied veterans an opportunity to come and get the health care that they needed by stringing them out and then deceiving others—including themselves in the VA—about what the waiting times were. They deceived not only these people who were given these long dates; they deceived the management. They also deceived the United States Congress.

Well, as happens many times, people find out. Well, we did find out. This meant that the deaths that were covered up, the veterans that were neglected, and the statistics that were provided to us and others were altered.

One year later, the waiting list grows longer and longer and longer for everyone. No doubt, we gave the administration the tools that they asked for that they agree with. Only two people have been fired.

Mr. Speaker, we were sincere about what we did by giving them the authority and the responsibility. We expected them to clean it up. I look to not only our chairman, JEFF MILLER, but we look to the VA also to stand up and say they disagreed with that. Not much has happened—certainly not enough.

We are back here again. Poor performances and bad actors still continue to undermine the VA. They continue to undermine not only the scheduling, they undermine the service; they undermine the quality that should be available to our veterans. As a result of this, the ability that we think we are providing to our veterans is diminished. The care for our veterans, wounded and sick veterans, continues to lag.

Republicans are back at the table. Our young chairman, JEFF MILLER, has stayed at the table. He has stayed working on this issue on a bipartisan basis with the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs by knowing what is happening all across this country, learning more about not just the facts of the case, but the stories that come from the veterans themselves, the stories that may come from people who are inside the VA. They are important to us learning what is really happening.

Because the VA has a long and well-documented history of failing to hold employees accountable, we are back here today with another bill. That is right, another bill that we are going to handle on the floor by this Republican

House with Democrats on a bipartisan basis, to make it easier to remove or demote employees who do not do their job and who need to be out of that organization.

We are going to give this organization exactly what they are asking for again. We are going to give the VA and their new Veterans Secretary the ability to clean up their mess. We are trying our best to hold them accountable yet, at the same time, expect them to do the right thing.

Yesterday, in testimony, we had our chairman say he has confidence in the Secretary; he has confidence that the Secretary can adjust and make these changes, but the law needs to be updated and changed.

That is why we are here today, to give the VA the tools that they need—just like when I was a manager in the private sector, I needed the tools to run my organization properly and effectively—the ability to move employees that were not doing their job—perhaps it is a bad fit—or to get rid of employees or even fire them if they are not only not performing their job, but deceptively trying to harm patients in the process.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would send a clear message to employees of the VA, and we intend to do that today. We are going to send a very clear message to them that they either perform properly or, if they are harming our effort to help our veterans, it is time for them to leave. If they are not up to doing the task very well, this Department will be given the opportunity, the law, and the leverage to do just that.

This bill would send another important signal also. If you choose to demonstrate the moral courage necessary to stand up for veterans and to blow the whistle on those who are not, we want to make sure that you are protected, that you can come forth inside your own organization of the VA to report and root out bad behavior. We must fix this.

Mr. Speaker, too many times, the testimony yesterday revealed that these VA facilities in location after location are deathtraps for our veterans.

These elder gentlemen, veterans who go to seek help, they know it is a deathtrap; and that is why we need to also address this, for the safety of men and women who have protected this great Nation.

Congress needs to make it clear—and we can today—that supervisors at the VA cannot retaliate against whistleblowers.

If there is somebody in the organization who is willing to tell the truth and come forward, you cannot retaliate against them because they are going to tell the truth about the poor service and responsibility toward aiding our veterans. It will not be tolerated.

Every Member of this body will have an equal opportunity today to say that is the right thing to do because this is what the Secretary is asking for.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to know that, when our veterans are treated poorly, this bill would help them; when our VA employees understand that somebody who was going to turn a blind eye before now, we will no longer do that.

We are going to give the VA the tools to root out the problems, to make this better, so that we can honestly look at our men and women and say: Thank you for your service; this grateful Nation does care about you.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for sweeping cultural changes at the VA. It is time to remove the bureaucrats who will make excuses, who will hide things, and who will make circumstances dangerous and worse for our veterans.

It is time to hold senior executives accountable when the VA underperforms, and that is why I am joining the American Legion, the VFW, and other veterans associations in supporting H.R. 1994. That is what the testimony revealed yesterday at the Committee on Rules when we heard from not only the chairman of the committee, but others about the importance of this bill.

This rule would also provide for debate for H.R. 3236, the Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015. We have two specific purposes that we are here for: first, for the VA; and, second, to make sure that we authorize an extension for the Federal surface transportation program through October 29.

It is a well-known understanding that our young chairman, BILL SHUSTER, of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has been working and working and working. We indicated last year in November and, again, in December that we would allow an extension to this date from last year; and Chairman SHUSTER said he thought he could have a deal by now.

Well, as it turned out, the United States Senate is debating that this week. They are going through a weeklong process to determine what they would like their transportation bill to be like. The bottom line is a thousand-page bill that has not yet passed, that we do not know the substance of, and we are not going to agree with sight unseen.

Our young chairman, BILL SHUSTER, has asked that we offer a very polite and reasonable option, and that is give us an opportunity to review this. They have done the hard work, the United States Senate. We will do the same, and we will get that done by October 29.

□ 1300

It would also avoid a shortfall that would keep the VA from closing hospitals across this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is the substance of what this rule and the underlying legislation is all about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me

the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills, H.R. 3236, the Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act, and H.R. 1994, the VA Accountability Act.

Yet again, we have a grab bag rule that covers multiple bills on wildly different subjects—in this case, transportation and veterans care—in one bill; and yet we have a closed rule that is pushing through a last-minute deal that kicks the can down the road yet again on highway reauthorization when there is reason to believe that, if we simply stayed in town and worked another week, we might be able to work with the Senate to get to an end point with regard to a long-term reauthorization.

The closed rule here limits the discussion of alternatives on the issue of transportation funding. Even worse, the bill has two entirely unrelated aspects. I have never heard of a crazier name than the Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act.

This is part of the problem of this body over the last several years. Republican leadership has moved towards doing more and more omnibuses and minibuses. That means combining disparate bills—transportation, veterans—into one bill, which isn't healthy for the accountability of this body among the electorate.

If you vote against this bill, for instance, because you don't like the transportation provisions, does that mean you are against veterans? If you don't like the veterans provisions and you vote against this bill, does that mean you are against transportation? How easy it would be to simply have two votes on each of these bills so Members on both sides of the aisle can vote their conscience and our constituents can hold us accountable.

Of course, it is necessary to give the VA the authority to transfer \$3.3 billion for healthcare services. There is strong agreement on both sides. We could run the bill through on suspension. We wouldn't even need to open it up for a rule. It would pass with more than a two-thirds vote. But there are problematic additions attached to that part of the bill. It is also combined with yet another temporary fix for our Nation's highway system, instead of trying to stay in town another week and work on a more permanent fix to help meet the needs of the transportation arteries of our country.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, 54 percent of our Nation's major roads and bridges are rated poor or mediocre. Forty-five percent of Americans don't have access to public transit. Congestion produced by our legislative failures here wastes valuable time and money and detracts from the growth of the American economy. It is estimated Americans will lose 8.4 billion hours and 4.45 billion gallons of gas over a decade. That

means the average consumer is wasting \$800 a year and 5 full days of their life away from their kids, away from their family, simply sitting in traffic. Mr. Speaker, that is unacceptable.

My constituents are no strangers to traffic. If you have been to Fort Collins, one of the largest cities in my district and home to one of our great universities, you will find that on highway 25 my constituents endure gridlocked traffic at rush hour, doubling or tripling their commuting times.

Expansion of highway 25 and high-speed rail along highway 70 and highway 36 have been given completion dates of decades from now—60 years, in some cases. Try to imagine being told your doctor wants to slowly break down blockages in your arteries over a period of 60 years. You won't make it that far.

Our communities need to do something about traffic now. Tourism and commerce are the lifeblood of Fort Collins, Boulder, and our mountain communities like Vail, Frisco, and Breckenridge. For these towns to survive and thrive, we need to tackle our transportation funding needs head-on.

From our other speakers, you will hear a lot about the Export-Import Bank, the one item that somehow, with this grab bag that includes veterans and transportation, there is a strong bipartisan majority for reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank. In fact, 67 Senators in the Republican-led Senate voted to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, and yet somehow that item didn't make the grab bag.

If Congress fails to act, one of the most important items is it will result concretely in the loss of tens of thousands of American jobs and make American companies less competitive for exports at a time when global competitiveness and the global economy is more important than ever, which was left out of this grab bag of bills.

I understand ideological issues with the Export-Import Bank. In a perfect world, I would agree with my colleagues who argue we shouldn't need to do this kind of effective subsidy for exporters; but if other countries are doing it and it is permissible under WTO and trade rules, we would truly be idiots to unilaterally disarm and not engage in a legal practice that facilitates the credit of American exporting businesses. Effectively, it would lead to the exporting of more jobs overseas and making American companies less competitive in selling their products.

So, by all means, let's have the discussion around multilateral adjustments to the type of credit facilities that countries can engage in with exporting countries, but let's not look at unilateral disarmament that makes America less competitive and destroys jobs.

You will hear a lot about how simple it would be, my colleagues would indicate, to simply get this done before we leave. Isn't it worth another week of our time to save tens of thousands of American jobs?

The second part of the rule, H.R. 1994, the VA Accountability Act, one of the main problems with it is it would create a culture of fear that would imperil the services our veterans need and deserve.

The tragedy in the Phoenix VA system is an example. It became known because of a few courageous whistleblowers. Had this legislation been in place, this tragedy could have been swept under the rug for many more years.

Without whistleblowers and strong whistleblower protections, the VA hospital debacle in my State of Colorado, in Aurora, could have even been a worse situation, if you can imagine that.

This legislation is not just bad for whistleblowers, it is also unconstitutional. Supreme Court case law has clearly outlined the due process that employees have before their jobs are taken away. This bill turns its back on due process and allows any VA employee to be fired on the spot for retribution.

The limited process provided in this legislation is far below the constitutional requirements, which is why the President has promised to veto this bill. All this bill is attempting to do is destroy the whistleblower and professional civil service system and, thus, the livelihood of thousands and the quality of service to our veterans.

The appropriate action is to get the VA to do their job through appropriate legislation which creates true accountability, which this bill fails to achieve, or discuss how we might reform the dollars we allocate to the VA to best serve our veterans, however possible.

We will debate an alternative today by my colleague, Mr. TAKANO of California, that would retain due process but allows the VA to immediately fire any employee who poses a health or safety risk to veterans. Additionally, it prevents employees from staying on paid administrative leave—even being bounced around the VA—by limiting the time to 2 weeks, a similarity to one of the positive aspects of the bill before us today.

Mr. TAKANO's legislation, for example, would have allowed the VA to immediately fire those responsible for the Phoenix scandal and kept in place the whistleblower protections that allowed us to find out about the Phoenix scandal.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I oppose the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I admire the gentleman very much. We work very well together. But I think it is a misstatement to say that this bill would allow people to be fired on the spot at the VA. That is certainly, I don't believe, true at all. I believe it would have to be with cause, and the VA would have to have a reason.

There is nothing in this legislation where we would empower people to do things that would not follow proper Federal law nor established rules of procedure for the employee to have the proper amount of protection. But what is stated and understood is, where an employee has been underperforming, misperforming, or has violated their oath of office, where they have a diligence to people under their care or where they have done intentional deeds and then tried to cover it up, that would be cause, and that is what this is about.

This is not about firing someone on the spot. I think it would be a misstatement to try and characterize this important legislation that has been well thought through, as well as worked out with the VA, as being from that perspective.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to allow the House to vote on reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank, as proposed by Mr. FINCHER yesterday. It is the same exact language that passed the Senate by a vote of 67-29.

Mr. Speaker, the Export-Import Bank allows American businesses to compete in global markets and supports hundreds of thousands of jobs.

I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip, to discuss our proposal.

Mr. HOYER. I thank Mr. POLIS from Colorado for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule. This is our last day in session before we leave for 5 or 6 weeks. We then will have 13 days before the end of the fiscal year. We have a number of things that the American public expects us to do that enjoys almost universal support on this floor, one of which enjoys a significant majority of support on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote the Speaker of this House, JOHN BOEHNER. "Above all else," he said as he assumed the Speakership, "we will welcome the battle of ideas, encourage it, engage in it—openly, honestly, and respectfully."

"As the Chamber," he went on to say, "closest to the people, the House works best when it is allowed to work its will." He then said, "I ask all Members of this body to join me in recognizing this common truth." Al Gore, the former Vice-President of the United States, would observe, however, that is an inconvenient truth.

It is an inconvenient truth because the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, representing the minority of this House, is opposed to the Export-Import Bank. He has been opposed to it since we adopted it in 2012, with an overwhelming majority of votes from both sides of the aisle—as a matter of fact, a unanimous vote from the Democratic side of the aisle and over 140 Members from the Republican side of the aisle—just 3 years ago.

This rule makes in order, as the gentleman noticed, two bills, one of which I vigorously oppose but won't spend a lot of time on. While the gentleman is probably correct that it is not immediate firing, it is a substantial undermining of the Civil Service Act adopted so that we would not have a patronage, politically ridden system, but a civil service system based on merit.

This bill then makes in order an extension of the highway bill, which certainly we ought to do. It is somewhat ironic that we say it is a 3-month extension. We passed a 5-month extension. I voted for the 5-month extension. Everybody ought to know that we fund it for 5 months, of course. We call it a 3-month extension. I hope that will satisfy Senator MCCONNELL so that he can then pass it.

We then provide for \$3.3 billion so that we will make sure our veterans hospitals and medical care stays in operation. Both of those could have been passed on this House floor by unanimous consent.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

We now leave for another month the Export-Import Bank, which is responsible for the creation and retaining of jobs in America.

We all talk about jobs in America, but the Speaker has said, again, that the failure to pass this bill is losing jobs right now. And yet my Republican friends, in tipping their hat to the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, say we are not going to consider that, as they did last month in July. I know we haven't gotten out of July yet, but we will go through August, and then we will go through September.

Mr. FINCHER tells me he thinks that bill will be brought to the floor in some form or another in September, but it will have cost us jobs and competitiveness overseas with the 60 countries that have an export-import bank that are making sure that the purchases of their goods made in their countries are cheaper than the goods sold in our country. That costs American jobs.

□ 1315

We ought to reject this rule, and we ought to do what the Speaker of the House said we ought to do; treat one another with respect, and let the House work its will.

There are 240-plus, maybe 250, maybe 260, maybe 270 votes. You only need 218 to pass the Export-Import Bank on this floor.

I will yield to anybody who says: No, Mr. HOYER, you are wrong; it doesn't have the majority vote.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. I will yield to anybody on this floor who will say: Mr. HOYER, you are wrong.

Apparently, there is nobody on the floor who is going to suggest that the will of this House, as represented by a majority that would vote on this bill, would not be for extending the Export-Import Bank, saving American jobs, making sure that America is competitive in the international markets.

My colleagues, reject this rule. Exercise our responsibility to the American people and to American workers, and let's pass the Export-Import Bank today before we go home.

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

I want to thank the distinguished gentleman for not only his words and the spirit of what he said, but I want him to know that, several years ago, as he approached me as I became chairman of the Rules Committee, I assured the gentleman that I would do my very best, within my ability, and he has done also, as well as his team that also sits at the Rules Committee.

I want to thank the distinguished gentleman because part of what our job is, yes, to represent our Speaker and the things that are done, but also to make sure the spirit in which we do it is done properly, and I appreciate the gentleman. I think his spirit was good today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Oversight and Government Reform committee and a former member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, two of the things a proud and confident and responsible nation will do—no matter how challenging—are, one, to invest in its future and, two, to care for its veterans. This bill pretends to do both. Actually, it does neither.

Yes, it will keep the highway bill on life support for another short-term extension. It used to be 5 months. Now, it is going to be 3 months.

Yes, it will allow the VA to make internal fund transfers to keep our hospitals open through September, but once again, in another act of serial irresponsibility, Congress is ignoring its duty to do its job of passing a long-term transportation bill.

It leaves our communities and States in suspension. It recklessly adds unnecessary construction costs to our taxpayers and lets potholes get deeper and bridges more dangerous. We need a long-term transportation bill—6 years, not 3 months.

Regarding the VA, do we meet our obligations to provide for the health care of our veterans through internal fund transfers? Our veterans and our VA need a fully funded budget. It needs funds, not fund transfers.

Veteran healthcare demand shot up 10 percent, but the budget is only up 2.8 percent, shackled by mindless and destructive sequester caps. We should end them.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not written to address problems; it is designed to deny they exist.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not an example of Congress doing its job; it is yet another example of Congress evading its responsibilities.

I will vote "no."

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Colorado, and let me thank my good friend from Texas as well. Let me use a great philosopher's statement of a couple of decades ago: "Can we all get along?"

As I stand here, on the Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 that is now with the rule before us, it is obvious that we are trying to take a divergent pathway.

I was one of the first Members of Congress to go down in front of my veterans hospital to stand and to demand quality health care for our veterans, to ask that the system be fixed. I take no backseat, along with other Members, to ensuring that our veterans get what they need, and stand in line to make sure that they are not defaulted on by the American people.

H.R. 1994 eliminates the due process rights of whistleblowers who have been key to drawing attention to any manipulation or coverups taking place. They are bringing back to the floor this bill, calling it an accountability bill; but, in essence, it is to go after hard-working employees and fire them and eliminating their opportunity to explain or to have due process. That is not the American way.

This is not a bill that helps veterans. In fact, it takes away consistent, long-working employers who see something and say something, and so I am voting "no" on the bill and this rule.

Then the surface transportation had a wonderful opportunity to do a 6-year bill, to look for pay-fors that Members could bring together and support; yet my metro, the Houston metro, will be suffering. Our highways and other surface transportation entities, safety will be suffering. Employees will not be paid.

Here we go again with a short-term opportunity. I remember doing a 6-year transportation bill, where I opened up the hike and bike trails of my community in Houston.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 10 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I would offer to say that a highway bill, 6 years, or a surface transportation bill for 6 years is a bipartisan American way to do things.

Why don't we do that for the American people and do it now? Vote "no" on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security, I rise to speak on H.R.

3236, Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015," which reauthorizes federal-aid highway and transit programs for three months—through October 29, 2015—by transferring \$8.1 billion from other federal funds to the Highway Trust Fund to cover projected trust fund shortfalls over that time period.

The bill also allows the Veterans Affairs Department (VA) to use \$3.4 billion provided last year for the Veterans Choice health care program to pay for care provided since May 1 to veteran patients by non-VA providers under VA Care in the Community programs.

The bill also is intended to give the VA the funding flexibility needed to prevent the possible closure of some VA hospitals in coming weeks.

Mr. Speaker, instead of this 90-day temporary extension, I would have strongly preferred that we were debating a comprehensive, fair, equitable, and long-term transportation reauthorization bill the nation desperately needs. We have had two years to do so.

Democrats want such a bill as does the President, but apparently our friends across the aisle do not since they have spent the last two years wasting time on advocating policies wanted by no one except for the right-wing extremists of the Tea Party.

But I reluctantly support this emergency but temporary measure because as the Department of Transportation has reported, if we do not act now highway trust fund balances by the beginning of August will reach dangerously low levels and result in a reduction of payments to states by an average of 28 percent.

Many states have already begun to cancel or delay planned construction projects, threatening 700,000 thousands of jobs, including 106,100 jobs in my home state of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, the Highway Trust Fund was created in 1956 during the Eisenhower Administration to help finance construction of the Interstate Highway System, which modernized the nation's transportation infrastructure and was instrumental in making the United States the world's dominant economic power for two generations.

Our national leaders then understood that investing in our roads and bridges strengthened our economy, created millions of good-paying jobs, and improved the quality of life for all Americans.

It is currently composed of two accounts that fund federal-aid highway and transit projects built by states. Federal funding from the trust fund accounts for a major portion of state transportation spending.

The Highway Trust Fund is financed by gasoline and diesel taxes, which until the last decade produced a steady increase in revenues sufficient to accommodate increased levels of spending on highway and transit projects.

However, those tax rates—18.4 cents/gallon federal tax on gasoline and a 24.4 cents/gallon tax on diesel fuel—have remained unchanged since 1993 and were not indexed to inflation so the value of those revenues has eroded over the years, and, combined with the fact that vehicles have been getting increasingly better mileage, the revenues deposited into the Highway Trust Fund beginning last decade have not kept pace with highway and transit spending from the trust fund.

Consequently, since 2008, Congress has periodically had to transfer at the 11th hour

general Treasury revenues into the trust fund to pay for authorized highway and transit spending levels and avoid a funding shortfall.

The total amount to date is more than \$54 billion.

Obviously, this practice is economically inefficient and injects uncertainty in the highway construction plans, projects, and schedules of state and local transportation agencies, not to mention the anxiety it causes to workers and businesses whose economic livelihood is dependent on those projects.

Mr. Speaker, the last transportation authorized by Congress for 4 years or more, SAFETEA-LU, expired on September 30, 2009, at the end of FY 2009.

Because Congress and the Administration could not agree to a new reauthorization, it was necessary to resort to stop-gap temporary extensions on no less than eight occasions spanning a period of 910 days before Congress finally enacted the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act" (MAP-21 Act) on July 6, 2012, which reauthorized highway and transportation programs through Fiscal Year 2014, a little more than two years, or until September 30, 2014.

MAP-21 was intended as a short-term measure to give Congress and the Administration breathing room to reach agreement on a long-term reauthorization bill.

Yet, as Mr. LEVIN, the Ranking Member of the Ways and Means Committee, has often pointed out, since gaining the majority in 2010, our Republican colleagues have failed to take any action to sustain the Highway Trust Fund over the long-term and shore up vital infrastructure projects and has not held even a single hearing on financing options for the Highway Trust Fund.

Instead, House Republicans have wasted the nation's time voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act at least 59 times, waging a War on Women, pursuing partisan investigations into Benghazi, the IRS, and the trying to overturn President Obama's executive actions that make our immigration enforcement laws less inhumane.

Instead of doing their job, House Republicans big new idea is to attack the President for doing his job.

Mr. Speaker, it is long past time for this Congress, and especially the House majority, to focus on the real problems and challenges facing the American people.

And one of the biggest of those challenges is ensuring that America has a transportation policy and the infrastructure needed to compete and win in the global economy of the 21st Century.

To do that we have to extend the reauthorization of current transportation programs and to authorize the transfer of the funds to the Highway Trust Fund needed to fund authorized construction projects and keep 700,000 workers, including 106,100 in Texas on the job.

But that is only a start and just a part of our job.

The real work that needs to be done in the remaining days of this Congress is to reach an agreement on a long-term highway and transportation bill that is fair, equitable, fiscally responsible, creates jobs and leads to sustained economic growth.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 13/4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the ranking member of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, 64 Senators voted to renew the Export-Import Bank's charter, which expired on June 30. More than 240 Members are on record supporting the Bank, and according to The Wall Street Journal, there are many more.

As I quote, "some Republicans estimated that as many as 300 of the 434 current House Members" would support a measure similar to the one that passed the Senate; yet despite this overwhelming support, we have been denied a vote on the House of Representatives to renew the Export-Import Bank.

Last year, Ex-Im helped underwrite over \$27 billion in U.S. exports. It supported thousands of small businesses and about 164,000 jobs across our country. Since 2009, the Bank has supported over 1.3 million jobs. The Bank does all of this at no cost—no cost—to the American taxpayer. In fact, the Ex-Im Bank sent over \$675 million to the Treasury last year—actual dollars—to help pay down the deficit.

According to a letter sent by CBO just last week, using accounting standards, reauthorizing the Ex-Im would save taxpayers \$2.3 billion over the next 5 years; yet American companies have been disadvantaged. They have been unilaterally disadvantaged of having the export assistance that over 60 different nations are providing their export-import banks.

Only 1 of the top 10 exporting countries in the world does not have an export credit agency now that can finance export deals—just one—and that is the United States of America. That is because this Congress failed to do what every other Congress has done since FDR, and that is to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

It creates jobs, creates money for the Treasury. It helps small businesses.

Vote "no" on the previous question, "no" on the rule. Let's bring it to the floor today for a vote.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 28, 2015]

SMALL BUSINESSES BEAR BURDEN OF EX-IM BANK SHUTDOWN

(By Nick Timiraos and Kristina Peterson)

WASHINGTON.—Political opponents have managed to shut the U.S. Export-Import Bank for the most of the summer by arguing it rewards politically connected corporate giants.

But the bank and its supporters say the burden of the agency's shutdown for now will hit small businesses that lack the resources of industrial titans such as Boeing Co. and General Electric Co.

"Small businesses are the ones that are going to be hurt first and the most," said Rep. Denny Heck (D., Wash.), a proponent of reauthorizing the bank's charter.

The Ex-Im Bank, a federal agency that finances exports, stopped accepting new loans

at the beginning of July after Congress allowed its charter to expire. While a majority of lawmakers in Congress support reauthorizing the 81-year-old agency in some form, conservative Republicans who control key leadership positions have so far prevented a vote in the House of Representatives.

Supporters had pinned their hopes on reopening the bank as part of a bill extending highway funding that expires Friday. But House and Senate leaders have had trouble agreeing on that transportation measure before their annual August recess that begins this week, which means they are likely to leave Washington without addressing the Ex-Im Bank.

The bank's backers have sought to rally support in recent weeks by highlighting the potential for lost sales at small businesses, a group that is both politically sympathetic and close to lawmakers in almost every congressional district.

President Barack Obama has called on Congress to reauthorize the agency, and most of the bank's supporters expect lawmakers to follow suit later this year. On Monday, 64 senators voted for an amendment to reopen the bank, and some Republicans estimated that at least 300 of the 434 current House lawmakers would vote similarly, given the chance.

"At some point we'll miss out on a business opportunity that will be of such magnitude that it will catch the attention of the public, and we'll respond," said Rep. Frank Lucas (R., Okla.), who supports the bank's reauthorization.

Additional opportunities to resuscitate the agency will arrive when Congress passes a spending measure needed to avoid a partial government shutdown by Oct. 1 or if the House and Senate negotiate a long-term highway bill in the fall.

Still, some lawmakers said the way in which the bank has missed multiple opportunities to stay open exposes the political challenges ahead. "I wouldn't hold my breath that it's going to get funded in September," said Rep. Matt Salmon, an Arizona Republican who supports the bank.

Big businesses say closing the bank for good will leave them at enough of a disadvantage against European and Asian competitors, which benefit from export-credit agencies at home, that they will move production abroad. For now, they say they are getting along fine.

"This is not something that creates near-term financial risk for Boeing," said Dennis Muilenburg, the company's chief executive, on a conference call with reporters last week.

Indeed, one risk for the bank is that its absence hasn't had any immediate shock. "The Export-Import Bank expired," said Sen. Ted Cruz (R., Texas), one of the bank's loudest critics, at a recent rally on Capitol Hill. "You notice the sky hasn't fallen?"

Critics of the bank say Washington shouldn't be picking winners and losers, and that any hardship for businesses is part of a necessary recalibration.

The bank says that view is short-sighted. "When our charter lapses, you won't read about massive layoffs in the paper. Small businesses don't put out press releases when they lose out on a sale," Fred Hochberg, chairman of the Ex-Im Bank who in the 1990s worked closely with entrepreneurs as an official at the Small Business Administration, said before the bank closed last month.

Around 90% of loans backed by Ex-Im Bank last year went to small businesses, the highest level in more than a decade. Small businesses represent a much smaller share of loans by dollar volume, around 25%, because Ex-Im backs expensive loans for aircraft and other industrial equipment makers.

Some businesses and their workers say that count overlooks firms that don't export directly but feed into supply chains. Yanke Machine Shop Inc. in Boise, Idaho, was one of 22 different U.S. companies that fulfilled an order for 150 pieces of construction equipment worth \$37 million for a 2013 engineering project in Cameroon.

"What a lapse does is it kills opportunity. You've got to have opportunity before you have work on the floor," said Dirk Christison, who works in customer support for the heavy-steel fabrication company.

At risk could be deals like one that Ray Garcia Jr., the principal of an energy consulting firm that arranges investment for infrastructure projects in Latin America, has put together to export American equipment for a \$300 million gas-to-liquid plant in Paraguay.

He said the project is one of three in South and Central America that is now in limbo. "We have spent two years developing these projects just to have the rug pulled out from under us for political reasons," said Mr. Garcia, a self-described conservative Republican from Houston.

Mr. Garcia said that without Ex-Im, the deal would go to a foreign company or large multinational, leaving his U.S. manufacturers without contracts. "Small businesses that do not have \$1 billion in capital to facilitate projects like these do benefit and can compete on a global platform armed with Ex-Im Bank," he said.

Ex-Im's Bank limbo state stands in contrast to those of a similar agency. When the Small Business Administration last week stopped accepting new loans under its flagship program, which reached its borrowing limit on Thursday, the House and Senate quickly passed an extension.

Because existing loans aren't imperiled by the Ex-Im Bank's shutdown, the lapse created a "soft landing" for most customers, said Gary Mendell, president of Meridian Finance Group in Santa Monica, Calif., which arranges financing for exporters. "We've been telling customers to see if you can stand tough until the end of July," he said.

As the prospect of Ex-Im Bank's reauthorization grows more distant, Mr. Mendell said more firms will run into difficulty as their working-capital loans or credit insurance expires. An overlooked casualty, he added, is that small businesses that have never exported have virtually no financing options right now.

"If the private sector were interested in doing this, they would be doing it by now," said Mr. Mendell.

Even the bank's critics have taken note of the potential plight of small firms. On the eve of the agency's shutdown last month, Sen. David Vitter (R., La.), expressed alarm that financing for thousands of small businesses might be at stake and said the agency should come up with a way for those companies to secure financing from the SBA.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a member of the Financial Services Committee and a leader in the effort to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the Chamber to reject the rule so that we might, indeed, offer an amendment to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank for three reasons.

One, it is the will of the United States Congress; two, it does good;

three, if we don't do it, great harm will be visited upon the American economy.

It has already been, I think, very clearly demonstrated it is the will of this body, both in the Senate and here.

I do want to remind you that, for 81 years, 16 times, Democrats and Republicans, no matter how conservative or how liberal, the United States has reauthorized the Export-Import Bank. It does good. That is why they do it.

In fact, I would respectfully suggest that the votes were there in Rules Committee yesterday to allow this amendment. The good gentleman from Texas who chairs—and he is a gentleman; he is a good gentleman—opened up his comments by saying 9,000 jobs in and around his district in the State of Texas, attributable to the Export-Import Bank, they hang in the balance.

It does good—last year, 164,000 jobs supported by the Export-Import Bank, \$675 million transferred to the Treasury. It reduces the deficit. It creates jobs. Why don't we want more of this? Call me crazy, I guess.

If we don't do it, harm will come to us. Read this morning's Wall Street Journal. Small businesses already—not prospectively—are already suffering job loss in States throughout this great country.

The fact of the matter is not reauthorizing does constitute unilateral disarmament. About 3 weeks ago, two academics, one from Canada, one from New York, concluded the big winner if we fail to reauthorize. It is China. They are rubbing their hands. They are rubbing their hands.

Listen, this isn't about software or apples or film.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. HECK of Washington. It is about our manufacturing base. Who says we don't need more good manufacturing jobs? We need more good manufacturing jobs.

Let me conclude on this note. Ominously, and without drama, hear me, from my heart to your ears. In the very near future, major manufacturers will announce that they are offshoring certain manufacturing capacity because they have to, to compete in a global economy. The global economy has increased fivefold since 1980.

Get in the game, people. Reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. Defeat the rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his kind words, not only of truth, but also I want to thank him for coming up and being with several other Members who sat through hours' worth of debate and discussion.

Mr. HECK served honorably well yesterday, and he does again today, and I thank him very much.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleague from Texas, we have so many

speakers on our side of the aisle—in fact, both sides of the aisle—folks like Mr. FINCHER and others who want to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

If he has additional time, I know that our Members would also appreciate the opportunity to talk about it, as our time is running short.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I urge a "no" vote on this rule so that we can bring up, as my colleagues have said, something that ought to be done in a bipartisan fashion, with little significant opposition, and that is the reauthorization of an entity that helps drive the American economy, put Americans to work, and helps us to compete in an increasingly competitive global environment, and that is the Export-Import Bank.

□ 1330

In 2012, Ex-Im was passed with 330 votes in the House, 78 in the Senate, 60 percent of Republicans in both bodies supporting the Export-Import Bank, joining Democrats in doing so.

There is so much partisanship that invades and infects this place. But when it comes to American jobs, supporting American manufacturers, putting hard-working Americans to work in jobs that have higher wages, we have great discussions here about the growing inequality in wages.

We don't all agree on the solutions. But one solution we ought to agree on is the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank because we know export jobs pay higher wages. This ought to be a no-brainer.

There are 59,000 jobs in my own State of Michigan as a result of the Export-Import Bank and the work that they do. In the last 6 years, there have been \$200 billion in exports.

We can have big disagreements on how we ought to deal with income inequality in this country, but we ought not have any disagreement when we see the Export-Import Bank, which delivers money to the Federal Treasury, helps us deal with that problem, puts Americans to work, and makes us more competitive. We ought to do this in a bipartisan fashion, and we ought to do it now.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to 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 Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and I appreciate the way he framed this rule debate.

Mr. Speaker, we have sort of a hodgepodge here of items that really deserve careful, sustained attention. There is no reason to lump this together. These are important items. And, sadly, the way it has been structured shuts down debate.

There is no room under this rule for the Ex-Im Bank. I appreciate person after person coming to the floor, acknowledging that there is broad bipartisan interest in the reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank and no rational reason to reject it. It is going to have serious consequences, as my friend from Washington pointed out.

But there is another area that we are discussing here today that could also make a huge difference for our economy because we are dodging again our responsibilities to deal with a country that is falling apart as it is falling behind.

My friend from Texas was too polite. The reason we don't have a 6-year reauthorization is because the House has not met its responsibility to outline how we pay for it. We are still trying to pay for 2015 infrastructure with 1993 dollars.

Now we have got legislation that actually mirrors what Ronald Reagan did in 1982, when he called upon Congress to come back, raise the user fee 125 percent, and be able to put hundreds of thousands of Americans to work, and maintain our roads and bridges and transit. We are not doing that.

We have legislation in Ways and Means that has the broadest support of any major piece of legislation in Congress—organized labor, business, contractors, truckers, AAA, engineers—all committed to raising the user fee. They say: Charge us more so that we are going to be able to thrive.

My friend from Colorado pointed out that the American public is paying now in congestion, in damage to their cars.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Work next week. Fund the transportation bill. Let the committee know what parameters they have and be able to revitalize and rebuild this country. It is time for us to step up.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues are making really, really good points about what we need to do.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, BILL SHUSTER, and the Republican majority is committed to doing exactly what they have talked about: getting our work done.

In fairness, it has taken the United States Senate until this week, and they have a 1,000-page transportation bill that we are not simply going to say: Let's just agree to that.

It is going to come over to us after they have done their work. With great respect, we are trying to make sure that we are continuing the funding. We are using mechanisms that would be available.

The right thing to do is to measure three times and saw once. We are not going to accept, by unanimous consent or another agreement, a 1,000-page bill.

On the Republican side, we read bills before we pass them.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a leader in the bipartisan efforts to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank and a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that the first, most immediate damage as a result of our failure to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank will be visited upon small businesses.

It occurs to me that a little bit of color in that regard would serve us well, giving the benefit of the doubt to those who are opposing our opposition to the rule so that we can reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Let me give you the data. The Export-Import Bank has approximately 90 percent of its transactions going to small businesses, about 90 percent.

Most of us tend to think about those as all direct loans, but they aren't. The fact of the matter is the bulk of them are what we would call accounts receivable insurance.

But there are also revolving lines of credit. There are also loan guarantees, not actual direct loans. And these, again, are small businesses.

These are businesses like Manhasset Specialty Company in Yakima, Washington, which makes music stands and has a global market. Thirty-five percent of its sales are exports, and a good portion of them are assisted by the Export-Import Bank.

In my district, Pexco in Fife, Washington, makes traffic control equipment. They are growing their export business with the assistance of the Export-Import Bank. So it is the small businesses that first will feel the damage.

But for those of you who say, yes, but the biggest share of the dollars go to big businesses, let's go back to Economics 101.

A lot of people point to Boeing. Ladies and gentlemen, Boeing does not manufacture airplanes. If that surprises you, please pay attention to what I am about to say.

Boeing does not manufacture airplanes. They design them. They assemble them with the assistance of 15,000 businesses in their supply chain, about half of whom are small businesses.

In the tiny town of Puyallup, relatively speaking, in my district, there are 17 businesses within the city limits whose principal customer is Boeing.

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

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. Small businesses will be hurt first. Over the long term, big businesses will be hurt.

I did not say earlier lightly. I did not say earlier in hyperbole that we will have major announcements causing grievous damage to the manufacturing base of America. We cannot allow that to happen.

We simply must, for the sake of small businesses and for the sake of our manufacturing base, reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. It reduces the deficit. It creates jobs.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so we can bring forward the bipartisan effort to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Now, again, I have a great deal of sympathy and respect for my colleagues who believe that these kinds of back-door subsidies have no place in a global trade regime. That is a reasonable and defensible viewpoint.

The proper avenue to advocate for that is multilaterally. There are a lot of ways that companies have and will and governments have and do try to give themselves a nationalistic advantage in international trade.

In the competition between Airbus and Boeing alone, books could be written about the efforts of both sides—whether it is our side through military contracts; whether it is their side, Europe—to give back-door allowable subsidies that put their own companies at an advantage.

If we unilaterally fail to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, we are putting American exporters at a disadvantage because the dozens of other countries that engage in these allowable kinds of credit facilities will still do so to the detriment of American jobs and American businesses.

We recently had a debate in these very Chambers about trade promotion authority. Soon there will be discussions about TPP and T-TIP.

Where was that discussion around TPA in the instructions to the President about credit facilities and Export-Import Bank and what would and wouldn't be allowable?

These kinds of discussions need to be had multilaterally. To unilaterally disarm makes no sense.

Even if one ideologically believes that we should not be engaging in these efforts, surely what is more important and what trumps that is to make sure that this is not a part of the global trade regime.

So long as it is, for America not to engage in this allowable practice of credit facilities extended through the Export-Import Bank puts American jobs at a disadvantage, will lead to further outsourcing of American jobs and hurt American businesses.

Mr. Speaker, this rule covers two significant, but wholly unrelated, bills.

We have heard arguments here in this limited time, this limited debate, about Federal highway funding, about veterans' care and VA workers, about the Export-Import Bank.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that many viewers are confused as to what we are even talking about or how is it even possible that, in 1 hour, we are covering the transportation needs of our country, the VA system, and a program allowable under trade rules that helps make American companies more competitive.

Unfortunately, rather than continuing our work next week, the majority has put several pieces of disparate legislation into a grab bag in a smoky backroom manner that, unfortunately, will continue to fail to address the most important transportation concerns or the already expiration of the Export-Import Bank before this body goes home for a month.

It is unfortunate that, under this rule, this institution is not even allowed to bring forward an amendment we know would pass to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

It is a shame that veterans' issues have somehow been combined with a highway issue and a minibus that detracts from transparency.

That is why I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. Vote "no" on the rule.

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

I want to thank not only the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), but also our colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle who I thought most generously fought this battle today.

The bottom line is that they know and we know, Mr. Speaker, that we are addressing two vitally important issues that Congress must step up to the plate on.

One is a request that comes directly from the VA, for us to fund a gap of \$3.4 billion that is necessary to fund hospitals of the VA to make sure that they are able to provide services to our veterans. It is critical. To vote against that I think is a mistake.

I think to vote for a chance where Republicans are trying to balance the needs through not only the appropriators—HAL ROGERS, our chairman, JEFF MILLER, our Veterans Committee chairman, are trying to come together, Mr. Speaker, to put together the money and the need to run the business based upon a reality discussion with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of their need to run the business, to have the money, but also to have the managerial abilities to move their employees that are not performing satisfactorily, employees who do have an oath as healthcare providers to do their very best and to be honest about the scheduling and the proper procedures necessary to our veterans.

□ 1345

What this rule is about and the underlying legislation is vital—vital—to

our Nation's veterans. That is why we are here today.

Now, secondly, we are here because Republicans want to make sure that we are faithful. We understand that, in each of our congressional districts, that we are active and involved to try and ensure that the roads and bridges and railways and ports and all these activities that deal with infrastructure and transportation are continuing down a pathway without us getting frustrated, without us throwing up our hands and giving up, but actually to work with the existing chairman, who is doing an awesome job, BILL SHUSTER, to make sure that we are putting forth the money—PAUL RYAN, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—trying to find the money necessary, lots of hard work, hours of discussion, moving towards a correct target.

In this process, we have our colleagues on the other side of this wall—who are literally there now as they are working in the Rotunda—to move legislation; we are allowing them that time because they are moving a transportation bill as we speak, but it is a 1,000-page bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in favor and I think my colleagues in here are not in favor and BILL SHUSTER is not, which is really what matters, as the chairman, to say give me a shot at looking at the bill when they finish it.

Speaker BOEHNER is saying let's make sure we deal with the things that must be dealt with before we go on our work time back home for the month, where we go back home and deal with the American people, because we plan to do this. That is what we are doing.

This is not unusual; it is perfectly normal, but I think we are doing a heck of a job and the right thing to address the issues—veterans, straight up, money, the ability to run their business right, so that we know we have done what we can do; and, secondly, to move transportation.

I think every single Member of this body, Democrat and Republican, should support these because they are worthy ideas about moving us forward, our country. We can look at the American people straight on and say we have addressed two of the issues that were on our plate.

I urge adoption of the rule. I know that our colleagues want to get moving today, so I am going to look forward to debate that will follow. I urge support of the underlying legislation in the bills.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule and support the gentleman's motion to defeat the previous question—in order to allow for a vote on the Export-Import Bank reauthorization.

Re-authorizing the Export-Import Bank is an economic imperative and letting it lapse before Congress goes on Recess is completely irresponsible and inexcusable.

The bank is an unbridled, market-driven success story which has broad bipartisan support in both Houses of this Congress as well as support from the majority of Americans.

The bank supports hundreds of thousands of good paying jobs in this country. If we fail to act, we will shut off a lifeline for many of our small businesses and exporters.

In my District alone, the Bank has supported thousands of small business and manufacturing jobs. These are good jobs in a very high-need area that would not have been possible without the Bank, and which now are in danger.

Mr. Speaker, we should let the will of the people work its way and allow a vote on the Reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 388 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

Strike section 2 of the resolution and insert:

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3236) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, to provide resource flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Ways and Means, and Veterans' Affairs; (2) the amendment specified in section 3 of this resolution, which shall be considered as pending following the conclusion of such debate, shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 of this resolution is as follows:

Page 3, after the table of contents, insert the following:

TITLE V—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Sec. 5001. Short title.

Subtitle A—Taxpayer Protection Provisions and Increased Accountability

Sec. 5101. Reduction in authorized amount of outstanding loans, guarantees, and insurance.

Sec. 5102. Increase in loss reserves.

Sec. 5103. Review of fraud controls.

Sec. 5104. Office of Ethics.

Sec. 5105. Chief Risk Officer.

Sec. 5106. Risk Management Committee.

Sec. 5107. Independent audit of bank portfolio.

Sec. 5108. Pilot program for reinsurance.

Subtitle B—Promotion of Small Business Exports

Sec. 5201. Increase in small business lending requirements.

Sec. 5202. Report on programs for small and medium-sized businesses.

Subtitle C—Modernization of Operations

Sec. 5301. Electronic payments and documents.

Sec. 5302. Reauthorization of information technology updating.

Subtitle D—General Provisions

Sec. 5401. Extension of authority.
Sec. 5402. Certain updated loan terms and amounts.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Sec. 5501. Prohibition on discrimination based on industry.
Sec. 5502. Negotiations to end export credit financing.
Sec. 5503. Study of financing for information and communications technology systems.

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE V—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

SECTION 5001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

Subtitle A—Taxpayer Protection Provisions and Increased Accountability

SEC. 5101. REDUCTION IN AUTHORIZED AMOUNT OF OUTSTANDING LOANS, GUARANTEES, AND INSURANCE.

Section 6(a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635e(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and
(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **APPLICABLE AMOUNT DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term ‘applicable amount’, for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019, means \$135,000,000,000.

“(3) **FREEZING OF LENDING CAP IF DEFAULT RATE IS 2 PERCENT OR MORE.**—If the rate calculated under section 8(g)(1) is 2 percent or more for a quarter, the Bank may not exceed the amount of loans, guarantees, and insurance outstanding on the last day of that quarter until the rate calculated under section 8(g)(1) is less than 2 percent.”.

SEC. 5102. INCREASE IN LOSS RESERVES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 6 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635e) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and
(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) **RESERVE REQUIREMENT.**—The Bank shall build to and hold in reserve, to protect against future losses, an amount that is not less than 5 percent of the aggregate amount of disbursed and outstanding loans, guarantees, and insurance of the Bank.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5103. REVIEW OF FRAUD CONTROLS.

Section 17(b) of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a-6(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **REVIEW OF FRAUD CONTROLS.**—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, and every 4 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

“(1) review the adequacy of the design and effectiveness of the controls used by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to prevent, detect, and investigate fraudulent applications for loans and guarantees and the compliance by the Bank with the controls, including by auditing a sample of Bank transactions; and

“(2) submit a written report regarding the findings of the review and providing such recommendations with respect to the controls described in paragraph (1) as the Comptroller General deems appropriate to—

“(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.”.

SEC. 5104. OFFICE OF ETHICS.

Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) **OFFICE OF ETHICS.**—

“(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established an Office of Ethics within the Bank, which shall oversee all ethics issues within the Bank.

“(2) **HEAD OF OFFICE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of the Office of Ethics shall be the Chief Ethics Officer, who shall report to the Board of Directors.

“(B) **APPOINTMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Chief Ethics Officer shall be—

“(i) appointed by the President of the Bank from among persons—

“(I) with a background in law who have experience in the fields of law and ethics; and

“(II) who are not serving in a position requiring appointment by the President of the United States before being appointed to be Chief Ethics Officer; and

“(ii) approved by the Board.

“(C) **DESIGNATED AGENCY ETHICS OFFICIAL.**—The Chief Ethics Officer shall serve as the designated agency ethics official for the Bank pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 101 et seq.).

“(3) **DUTIES.**—The Office of Ethics has jurisdiction over all employees of, and ethics matters relating to, the Bank. With respect to employees of the Bank, the Office of Ethics shall—

“(A) recommend administrative actions to establish or enforce standards of official conduct;

“(B) refer to the Office of the Inspector General of the Bank alleged violations of—

“(i) the standards of ethical conduct applicable to employees of the Bank under parts 2635 and 6201 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(ii) the standards of ethical conduct established by the Chief Ethics Officer; and

“(iii) any other laws, rules, or regulations governing the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities that are applicable to employees of the Bank;

“(C) report to appropriate Federal or State authorities substantial evidence of a violation of any law applicable to the performance of official duties that may have been disclosed to the Office of Ethics; and

“(D) render advisory opinions regarding the propriety of any current or proposed conduct of an employee or contractor of the Bank, and issue general guidance on such matters as necessary.”.

SEC. 5105. CHIEF RISK OFFICER.

Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a), as amended by section 5104, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) **CHIEF RISK OFFICER.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There shall be a Chief Risk Officer of the Bank, who shall—

“(A) oversee all issues relating to risk within the Bank; and

“(B) report to the President of the Bank.

“(2) **APPOINTMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Chief Risk Officer shall be—

“(A) appointed by the President of the Bank from among persons—

“(i) with a demonstrated ability in the general management of, and knowledge of and extensive practical experience in, finan-

cial risk evaluation practices in large governmental or business entities; and

“(ii) who are not serving in a position requiring appointment by the President of the United States before being appointed to be Chief Risk Officer; and

“(B) approved by the Board.

“(3) **DUTIES.**—The duties of the Chief Risk Officer are—

“(A) to be responsible for all matters related to managing and mitigating all risk to which the Bank is exposed, including the programs and operations of the Bank;

“(B) to establish policies and processes for risk oversight, the monitoring of management compliance with risk limits, and the management of risk exposures and risk controls across the Bank;

“(C) to be responsible for the planning and execution of all Bank risk management activities, including policies, reporting, and systems to achieve strategic risk objectives;

“(D) to develop an integrated risk management program that includes identifying, prioritizing, measuring, monitoring, and managing internal control and operating risks and other identified risks;

“(E) to ensure that the process for risk assessment and underwriting for individual transactions considers how each such transaction considers the effect of the transaction on the concentration of exposure in the overall portfolio of the Bank, taking into account fees, collateralization, and historic default rates; and

“(F) to review the adequacy of the use by the Bank of qualitative metrics to assess the risk of default under various scenarios.”.

SEC. 5106. RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a), as amended by sections 5104 and 5105, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) **RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.**—

“(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established a management committee to be known as the ‘Risk Management Committee’.

“(2) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The membership of the Risk Management Committee shall be the members of the Board of Directors, with the President and First Vice President of the Bank serving as ex officio members.

“(3) **DUTIES.**—The duties of the Risk Management Committee shall be—

“(A) to oversee, in conjunction with the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the Bank—

“(i) periodic stress testing on the entire Bank portfolio, reflecting different market, industry, and macroeconomic scenarios, and consistent with common practices of commercial and multilateral development banks; and

“(ii) the monitoring of industry, geographic, and obligor exposure levels; and

“(B) to review all required reports on the default rate of the Bank before submission to Congress under section 8(g).”.

(b) **TERMINATION OF AUDIT COMMITTEE.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall revise the bylaws of the Bank to terminate the Audit Committee established by section 7 of the bylaws.

SEC. 5107. INDEPENDENT AUDIT OF BANK PORTFOLIO.

(a) **AUDIT.**—The Inspector General of the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall conduct an audit or evaluation of the portfolio risk management procedures of the Bank, including a review of the implementation by the Bank of the duties assigned to the Chief Risk Officer under section 3(1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended by section 5105.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

not less frequently than every 3 years thereafter, the Inspector General shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a written report containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out subsection (a).

SEC. 5108. PILOT PROGRAM FOR REINSURANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635 et seq.), the Export-Import Bank of the United States (in this section referred to as the “Bank”) may establish a pilot program under which the Bank may enter into contracts and other arrangements to share risks associated with the provision of guarantees, insurance, or credit, or the participation in the extension of credit, by the Bank under that Act.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF RISK-SHARING.—

(1) PER CONTRACT OR OTHER ARRANGEMENT.—The aggregate amount of liability the Bank may transfer through risk-sharing pursuant to a contract or other arrangement entered into under subsection (a) may not exceed \$1,000,000,000.

(2) PER YEAR.—The aggregate amount of liability the Bank may transfer through risk-sharing during a fiscal year pursuant to contracts or other arrangements entered into under subsection (a) during that fiscal year may not exceed \$10,000,000,000.

(c) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through 2019, the Bank shall submit to Congress a written report that contains a detailed analysis of the use of the pilot program carried out under subsection (a) during the year preceding the submission of the report.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect, impede, or revoke any authority of the Bank.

(e) TERMINATION.—The pilot program carried out under subsection (a) shall terminate on September 30, 2019.

Subtitle B—Promotion of Small Business Exports

SEC. 5201. INCREASE IN SMALL BUSINESS LENDING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(b)(1)(E)(v) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(1)(E)(v)) is amended by striking “20 percent” and inserting “25 percent”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 5202. REPORT ON PROGRAMS FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED BUSINESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) REPORT ON PROGRAMS FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED BUSINESSES.—The Bank shall include in its annual report to Congress under subsection (a) a report on the programs of the Bank for United States businesses with less than \$250,000,000 in annual sales.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the report of the Export-Import Bank of the United States submitted to Congress under section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635g) for the first year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle C—Modernization of Operations

SEC. 5301. ELECTRONIC PAYMENTS AND DOCUMENTS.

Section 2(b)(1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(M) Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Bank shall implement policies—

“(i) to accept electronic documents with respect to transactions whenever possible, including copies of bills of lading, certifications, and compliance documents, in such manner so as not to undermine any potential civil or criminal enforcement related to the transactions; and

“(ii) to accept electronic payments in all of its programs.”.

SEC. 5302. REAUTHORIZATION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY UPDATING.

Section 3(j) of the Export-Import Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “2012, 2013, and 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2019”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “(I) the funds” and inserting “(i) the funds”; and (3) in paragraph (3), by striking “2012, 2013, and 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2019”.

Subtitle D—General Provisions

SEC. 5401. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2019”.

(b) DUAL-USE EXPORTS.—Section 1(c) of Public Law 103-428 (12 U.S.C. 635 note) is amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “the date on which the authority of the Export-Import Bank of the United States expires under section of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f)”.

(c) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 2(b)(9)(B)(iii) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(9)(B)(iii)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “the date on which the authority of the Bank expires under section 7”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of the enactment of this Act or June 30, 2015.

SEC. 5402. CERTAIN UPDATED LOAN TERMS AND AMOUNTS.

(a) LOAN TERMS FOR MEDIUM-TERM FINANCING.—

Section 2(a)(2)(A) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) with principal amounts of not more than \$25,000,000; and”.

(b) COMPETITIVE OPPORTUNITIES RELATING TO INSURANCE.—Section 2(d)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(d)(2)) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$25,000,000”.

(c) EXPORT AMOUNTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS LOANS.—Section 3(g)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(g)(3)) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$25,000,000”.

(d) CONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.—Section (a)(1)(A) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635i-5(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000 or more” and inserting the following: “\$25,000,000 (or, if less than \$25,000,000, the threshold established pursuant to international agreements, including the Common Approaches for Officially Supported Export Credits and Environmental and Social Due Diligence, as adopted by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Council on June 28, 2012, and the risk-management framework adopted by financial institutions for determining, assessing, and managing environmental and social risk in

projects (commonly referred to as the ‘Equator Principles’)) or more”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 5501. PROHIBITION ON DISCRIMINATION BASED ON INDUSTRY.

Section 2 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (6 U.S.C. 635 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) PROHIBITION ON DISCRIMINATION BASED ON INDUSTRY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this Act, the Bank may not—

“(A) deny an application for financing based solely on the industry, sector, or business that the application concerns; or

“(B) promulgate or implement policies that discriminate against an application based solely on the industry, sector, or business that the application concerns.

“(2) APPLICABILITY.—The prohibitions under paragraph (1) apply only to applications for financing by the Bank for projects concerning the exploration, development, production, or export of energy sources and the generation or transmission of electrical power, or combined heat and power, regardless of the energy source involved.”.

SEC. 5502. NEGOTIATIONS TO END EXPORT CREDIT FINANCING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 11 of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a-5) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Secretary of the Treasury (in this section referred to as the ‘Secretary’)” and inserting “President”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “(OECD)” and inserting “(in this section referred to as the ‘OECD’)”; and

(ii) by striking “ultimate goal of eliminating” and inserting “possible goal of eliminating, before the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “Secretary” each place it appears and inserting “President”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) REPORT ON STRATEGY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the President shall submit to Congress a proposal, and a strategy for achieving the proposal, that the United States Government will pursue with other major exporting countries, including OECD members and non-OECD members, to eliminate over a period of not more than 10 years subsidized export-financing programs, tied aid, export credits, and all other forms of government-supported export subsidies.

“(d) NEGOTIATIONS WITH NON-OECD MEMBERS.—The President shall initiate and pursue negotiations with countries that are not OECD members to bring those countries into a multilateral agreement establishing rules 3 and limitations on officially supported export credits.

“(e) ANNUAL REPORTS ON PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, and annually thereafter through calendar year 2019, the President shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the progress of any negotiations described in subsection (d).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection

(a) shall apply with respect to reports required to be submitted under section 11(b) of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a-5(b)) after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5503. STUDY OF FINANCING FOR INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.

(a) ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY USE OF BANK PRODUCTS.—The Export-Import Bank of the United States (in this section referred to as the “Bank”) shall conduct a study of the extent to which the products offered by the Bank are available and used by companies that export information and communications technology services and related goods.

(b) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the study required by subsection (a), the Bank shall examine the following:

(1) The number of jobs in the United States that are supported by the export of information and communications technology services and related goods, and the degree to which access to financing will increase exports of such services and related goods.

(2) The reduction in the financing by the Bank of exports of information and communications technology services from 2003 through 2014.

(3) The activities of foreign export credit agencies to facilitate the export of information and communications technology services and related goods.

(4) Specific proposals for how the Bank could provide additional financing for the export of information and communications technology services and related goods through risk-sharing with other export credit agencies and other third parties.

(5) Proposals for new products the Bank could offer to provide financing for exports of information and communications technology services and related goods, including—

(A) the extent to which the Bank is authorized to offer new products;

(B) the extent to which the Bank would need additional authority to offer new products to meet the needs of the information and communications technology industry;

(C) specific proposals for changes in law that would enable the Bank to provide increased financing for exports of information and communications technology services and related goods in compliance with the credit and risk standards of the Bank;

(D) specific proposals that would enable the Bank to provide increased outreach to the information and communications technology industry about the products the Bank offers; and

(E) specific proposals for changes in law that would enable the Bank to provide the financing to build information and communications technology infrastructure, in compliance with the credit and risk standards of the Bank, to allow for market access opportunities for United States information and communications technology companies to provide services on the infrastructure being financed by the Bank.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Bank shall submit to Congress a report that contains the results of the study required by subsection (a).

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

(21) 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. SESSIONS. 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 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1300.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 180, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 483]

YEAS—242

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

NAYS—180

Adams	Gabbard	Neal
Aguilar	Gallego	Nolan
Ashford	Garamendi	Norcross
Bass	Graham	O'Rourke
Beatty	Grayson	Pallone
Becerra	Green, Al	Pascarell
Bera	Green, Gene	Payne
Beyer	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Peters
Blumenauer	Hahn	Peterson
Bonamici	Hastings	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan	Heck (WA)	Pocan
F.	Higgins	Polis
Brady (PA)	Himes	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Rangel
Bustos	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Huffman	Richmond
Capps	Israel	Roibal-Allard
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX)	Keating	T.
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schrader
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kuster	Scott, David
Cohen	Langevin	Serrano
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cooper	Lawrence	Sinema
Courtney	Lee	Sires
Crowley	Lewis	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lipinski	Speier
Davis (CA)	Loebach	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Takai
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Takano
DeGette	Lowe	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	(NM)	Titus
DelBene	Lynch	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Torres
Deutch	Carolyn	Tsongas
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Van Hollen
Doggett	Matsui	Vargas
Doyle, Michael	McCollum	Veasey
F.	McDermott	Vela
Duckworth	McGovern	Velázquez
Edwards	McNerney	Visclosky
Ellison	Meeks	Walz
Esty	Meng	Wasserman
Farr	Moore	Schultz
Fattah	Moulton	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Welch
Fudge	Napolitano	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Carney	Eshoo
Carter (TX)	Levin
Clawson (FL)	Lujan Grisham
Costa	(NM)
Engel	Pelosi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1416

Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. KELLY of Illinois changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BARTON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during rollcall vote No. 483. I would like to reflect that on rollcall vote No. 483 I would have voted “no.”

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DENT was allowed to speak out of order.)

WASHINGTON KASTLES CHARITY CLASSIC

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am gathered here today with some of my colleagues because we participated in the Washington Kastles Charity Classic. We had a wonderful time for charity.

I just wanted to mention this. The Washington Kastles, who were founded in 2008 and is the tennis team for the city of Washington, have made more than \$1 million in charitable donations.

The Charity Classic is an extension of those efforts, with 100 percent of the ticket proceeds benefiting Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors, or TAPS, the DC Public Education Fund, and Food & Friends.

Fans can choose which organization they support. It is a great cause.

We had a tennis match, Stars v. Stripes. I am sorry to report that the Stars defeated the Stripes, having been in the Stripes the last 3 years. They finally won one, but we are very excited for them. It is nice to be talking about something other than golf on the House floor.

I also wanted to acknowledge one person with us here today, Martina Hingis, who is in the audience. She is up there in the gallery. She just won Wimbledon Doubles Championship, women's and mixed doubles. She won both the women's doubles title and the mixed doubles title. She is on the Washington Kastles.

We just wanted to acknowledge all the folks who played: Representatives SCOTT, DOLD, YODER, BUSTOS and BEATTY. Where is JARED HUFFMAN with the big serve? He is back there.

We had a wonderful time. Senator FLAKE, Senator MERKLEY, and the rest of the Kastles could not be with us today. They are traveling. But we just wanted to thank them all for this wonderful effort. We need more tennis.

At this time we would like to present this trophy, this cup, from the Stripes to the Stars, who defeated us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). 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. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 183, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 484]

AYES—243

Abraham	Barton	Bost
Aderholt	Benishak	Boustany
Allen	Billirakis	Brady (TX)
Amash	Bishop (MI)	Brat
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Bridenstine
Babin	Black	Brooks (AL)
Barletta	Blackburn	Brooks (IN)
Barr	Blum	Buchanan

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

NOES—183

Adams	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Aguilar	Castro (TX)	DelBene
Ashford	Chu, Judy	DeSaulnier
Bass	Cicilline	Deutch
Beatty	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Becerra	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Bera	Clay	Doyle, Michael
Beyer	Cleaver	F.
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Duckworth
Blumenauer	Cohen	Edwards
Bonamici	Connolly	Ellison
Boyle, Brendan	Conyers	Eshoo
F.	Cooper	Esty
Brady (PA)	Costa	Farr
Brown (FL)	Courtney	Fattah
Brownley (CA)	Crowley	Foster
Bustos	Cuellar	Frankel (FL)
Butterfield	Cummings	Fudge
Capps	Davis (CA)	Gabbard
Capuano	Davis, Danny	Gallego
Cárdenas	DeFazio	Garamendi
Carson (IN)	DeGette	Graham
Cartwright	Delaney	Grayson

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)

NOT VOTING—7

Carney
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)

□ 1427

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.

FIRST RESPONDER ANTHRAX PREPAREDNESS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1300) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to make anthrax vaccines and antimicrobials available to emergency response providers, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 485]

YEAS—424

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodel
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr

Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)

Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)

Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzer
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk

Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascarell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam

NOT VOTING—9

Carney
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Engel

□ 1435

Mr. SANFORD changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VA ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 1994, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 388 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1994.

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

□ 1538

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1994) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or