

per month. In September, she was told that her insurance plan was dropping her because of ObamaCare.

President Obama told every American that “if you like your healthcare plan, you can keep it.” Martha liked her healthcare plan, and she may die because she can’t keep it, another example of why ObamaCare must be repealed and replaced without broken promises and putting patients like Martha first.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 22, HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 6, 2015, THROUGH NOVEMBER 13, 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 507 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 507

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 Senate amendment to the text of the bill (H.R. 22) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. All points of order against consideration of the Senate amendment are waived. General debate shall be confined to the Senate amendment and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate, the Senate amendment shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the Senate amendment, as amended, shall be in order except for an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-32, which shall be considered as pending, shall be considered as read, shall not be debatable, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in subsection (b), and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(b) No amendment to the further amendment referred to in subsection (a) shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

(c) All points of order against amendments referred to in subsections (a) and (b) are waived.

SEC. 3. At the conclusion of consideration of the amendments referred to in section 2(b) of this resolution, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the Senate amendment, as amended, shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 4. On any legislative day during the period from November 6, 2015, through November 13, 2015—

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

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 5. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 6. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of November 5, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to a measure authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 507 is a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 22. It provides an hour of general debate, and it makes in order 29 amendments.

Now, you might say, Mr. Speaker, that 29 amendments seems like that ought to be the end of the conversation. But my friend from Massachusetts and I are not done with 29 amendments. There have been well over 250 amendments submitted for this legislation. We have included 29 in this base text, and we are going to come back and include more.

This is the very first rule to come out of PAUL RYAN, Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

When Speaker RYAN was speaking to the House last week, when he took the Speaker’s gavel into his hands, he said, “We need to let every Member contribute—not once they have earned their stripes, but right now.”

He said, “I come at this job as a two-time committee chair. The committees should retake the lead in drafting all major legislation. If you know the

issue, you should write the bill. We must open up the process. Let people participate. In other words, we need to return to regular order.”

Mr. Speaker, I won’t tell it to you any way but straight. I am not sure what folks mean when they say a return to regular order in this House.

I love a free and spirited debate process. We are going to go deep into the night tonight, deep into the night tomorrow night, and well into the late hours on Thursday. I hope my colleagues are still going to be as enthusiastic about regular order when we are done as they are before we get started.

But regular order doesn’t necessarily mean that you can use dilatory tactics to slow the House down. It doesn’t necessarily mean we need to see the same amendment 25 different times.

What my friend from Massachusetts and I are doing in the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, is going through those amendments to make sure that the ideas and the recommendations brought by individual Members of this House have a chance to be heard, but heard once, not heard six different times.

We are going to have a robust debate in the spirit of regular order over these next 3 days. But that will be from a pot of more than 260 amendments winnowed down into those issues that need to be discussed, have an opportunity to be discussed, on the floor of this House.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, the transportation system in this country is over 4 million miles, 600,000 bridges, and 270,000 public transit route miles. The scope of the transportation system in this country is vast, and its importance is even more so. There is not a mayor in this country, Mr. Speaker, who doesn’t know that as goes their education infrastructure and as goes their transportation infrastructure, so goes the economy of their community.

Now, we are working on the Elementary and Secondary Education Reauthorization Act, Mr. Speaker, but that is not for today. Today is not education day. Today is transportation day, where we are bringing forward the first 6-year transportation reauthorization that this country has seen in more than a decade. We have been trying. It is not from a lack of trying, Mr. Speaker.

The ranking member, Mr. DEFAZIO, on the Transportation Committee and the chairman, Mr. SHUSTER, on the Transportation Committee have been working diligently not for days, not for weeks, and not for months, but for years to try to bring this piece of legislation to the floor. This rule today gives us that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, there are those items in the U.S. Constitution that are put upon the United States Government as responsibilities that we must achieve together. Postal roads are among those responsibilities. There are those who say that Republicans are the party of

no government. I say nonsense. I say Republicans are the party of good government. In fact, I don't even think that should be a partisan issue. I think that should be a nonpartisan issue, something that we can all agree on, as Americans, as this body.

This bill doesn't just allocate the necessary dollars to the projects; it changes the process that allocates those dollars so that we get more value out of each and every one.

I will tell you a story from back home, Mr. Speaker. In fact, it is going on this week. This week a year ago would have been election week. I represent only two counties in the great State of Georgia. One of them is the single most conservative county in the State.

They turned out on election day last year, Mr. Speaker; and while they had rejected Federal tax increases in the past and while they had rejected State tax increases in the past, they got together a year ago this week and voted to tax themselves—this small county in the great State of Georgia—to the tune of \$200 million so they could expand the major highway going through that county. They didn't trust the government here in Washington to get a dollar's worth of value out of a dollar's worth of taxes. They didn't trust the State government to get a dollar's worth of value out of a dollar's worth of taxes. They trusted the locality to get a dollar's worth of value out of a dollar's worth of taxes. And here, this week, it will have been 1 year from election day and groundbreaking begins.

Groundbreaking begins this week, just 1 year after the decision to move forward on a project. That is unheard of in Federal circles, Mr. Speaker, but this bill takes not bipartisan steps, but nonpartisan steps to improve upon that process.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to serve on both the Rules Committee and the Transportation Committee. I am very proud of the base product that the Transportation Committee in this House reported. We didn't just consider that bill for a day or for a week. We worked on that bill for months as well. We passed it out of committee on a voice vote, Mr. Speaker. We passed it out of committee unanimously. In fact, we passed the rule out of the Rules Committee last night on a voice vote to bring this resolution to the floor.

This is an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to show the American people what is best about this House. What is best about this House is not that we all agree on everything, because we don't. What is best about this House is not that we all represent the same kinds of values and constituencies back home, because we don't. What is best about this House is that we have an opportunity to come together, express all of those issues, and let the chips fall where they may.

If you look in these 29 amendments, Mr. Speaker, you will see most of them

are bipartisan or nonpartisan amendments. But we have amendments made in order that are just brought by Republicans, and we have amendments made in order that are just brought by Democrats. The Rules Committee has the power to do whatever the Rules Committee would like to do. We are not using that power today to shut the voices out, Mr. Speaker. We are using the power today to bring the voices together.

I am very proud to bring this rule. I think it is worthy of all the Members' support.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I get into the subject matter that we are here to discuss, I do want to respond to my friend from Georgia about Speaker RYAN's call for regular order, which I think many on our side welcome. But we are not going to get too excited yet because that same pledge was made when Speaker Boehner became Speaker of the House, and that pledge was broken over and over and over again. In fact, he presided over the most closed Congress in the history of our country, more closed rules than any other Congress in history.

When my friend asked the question, "What does regular order mean?" well, it means that we don't bypass committees of jurisdiction. We let them do their work, and then we bring that bill to the Rules Committee, as opposed to having some committee staff write a bill in the back room someplace in the Capitol, present it, and then have the Rules Committee give it a closed rule. It means allowing for all sides to be heard.

The Rules Committee has routinely blocked out amendments on legitimate issues because the Republican leadership didn't want to deal with it. They didn't want to have that debate.

So it means a more open and transparent process. It means a process that is more fair and more respectful of all Members, not just Democrats, but to Republicans as well. I hope that when Speaker RYAN made that pledge, it is more than just words; that we will see, in the coming weeks and months, something different around here.

I would also just say that I don't mean to pick on Speaker Boehner because we do have people on the Rules Committee on the Republican side who have routinely voted to shut this process down. I hope that there is a change of attitude in the Rules Committee, as well, for a more open and a more transparent process.

So having said that, Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consider-

ation of the Surface Transportation Reauthorization and Reform Act, a 6-year highway bill. After 35 short-term extensions—35 short-term extensions—this is a welcome step to providing the kind of certainty that our State and our local officials need. In fact, they have been clamoring for this for a very, very long time.

Of the 284 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee for consideration, the rule we are talking about right now makes in order 29. We expect the committee to meet later today to consider the remaining amendments.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and Subcommittee on Highways and Transit Chairman SAM GRAVES and Ranking Member ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for all of their hard work to get us to this point.

This isn't the highway bill that I would have written, but the bottom line is that we need a long-term surface transportation authorization bill. States need to be able to count on Federal funding for more than a month at a time. Large-scale infrastructure projects take years to complete. States need certainty, and this bill is a step forward in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, our roads and our bridges are already in need of massive repairs. I tell my colleagues all the time that we have bridges in Massachusetts that are older than most of your States. The underlying bill provides \$325 billion in contract authority from the highway trust fund over 6 years for highway, transit, and safety programs. It would allow for automatic adjustments if more money comes into the highway trust fund.

I am pleased to see that among the provisions in this bill is a reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, which is the same language that the House passed with strong bipartisan support last week, notwithstanding the fact that we had to use a discharge petition because the way this place operates, the will of the majority was not respected. But we should vote against any amendments—any and all amendments—that would jeopardize this provision.

Not only will a long-term highway bill help our economy, but it will create and sustain thousands of American jobs, particularly in the construction and manufacturing industries that were hardest hit by the Great Recession.

In all candor, I can't say that I am enamored with everything in this bill. I wish that it provided more robust funding levels. I am sorry to see that we are continuing to use guarantee fees as a pay-for on an unrelated transportation bill. G-fees should be used to protect taxpayers from mortgage losses, not as an offset on a highway bill.

I also have serious concerns about the use of private debt collection as an offset in this bill. Instead of raising money, if history is any indication, it

is likely the use of private debt collection agencies would result in the Federal Government losing revenue. We know that because that has happened in the past.

Moving forward, I would strongly, strongly caution against loading this bill up with controversial provisions. This rule makes in order an amendment by Congressman RIBBLE of Wisconsin to permit States to allow bigger and heavier trucks on our interstate highways, and I understand that several other amendments have been offered to increase truck size and truck weights. I think passing these kinds of amendments is one of the most dangerous things that we can do, and I believe it would seriously threaten this carefully crafted compromise.

Despite what some in the trucking industry might have you believe, bigger trucks have never resulted in fewer trucks on our road. Since 1982, when Congress last increased the gross vehicle weight limit, truck registrations have increased 90 percent.

Now, some say if we allow bigger and heavier trucks on our Federal Interstate Highway System, we can somehow alleviate their presence on local roads. That is a false argument because trucks still need to make deliveries and pickups at warehouses and businesses, and local roads are the way they get there. So all the Ribble amendment would do is make more of our roads less safe.

By the way, on the Interstate Highway System, these bigger and heavier trucks can drive faster, thereby endangering more and more of the others who are driving on these highways. Bigger truck crashes kill nearly 4,000 people every year, and the reality is that most of those fatalities are those in passenger vehicles, not the trucker. Big trucks pay only a fraction of the true cost of the wear and tear they cause on our roads and bridges. State budgets are stretched to the brink as it is and can't afford to make up for the multibillion-dollar underpayments.

Mr. Speaker, Americans have said loud and clear over and over again that they don't want bigger trucks. A January 2015 nationwide survey by Harper Polling found that 76 percent of respondents oppose longer, heavier trucks, and a May 2013 public opinion poll by Lake Research Partners found that 68 percent of Americans opposed heavier trucks. That should be enough to give people who want to put bigger and heavier trucks on our roads some pause. But as I have learned serving in this Congress, usually this place does the opposite of what the American people want.

Let me remind my colleagues that in MAP-21, the most recent long-term highway bill, Congress directed the Department of Transportation to conduct a comprehensive study on truck size and weight laws. After 2 years of careful study, DOT concluded that the current data limitations were so profound that no changes in truck size and

weight laws in regulations should be considered until these data limitations could be overcome. So we asked DOT to do a study, and that is their recommendation. Yet there are all these amendments to try to get around that.

I would just say to my friends who are thinking of voting for some of these amendments to allow bigger, heavier, and more dangerous trucks on the road and on our Interstate Highway System to talk to some of the families of the victims. I have, on a regular basis, talked to people who have lost their husbands, their wives, their kids, and their best friends to these senseless crashes. Think about them before you just go along with whatever particular special interest asks you to do.

By the way, those who drive these trucks are opposed to this. They are opposed to this. Yet here we are with an attempt to try to kind of make our roads less safe.

So loading this bill up with all kinds of exemptions to truck size and weight laws I think would be a huge mistake and would jeopardize the passage of the underlying bill. I urge my colleagues to reject the Ribble amendment and all these other amendments that may be made in order to put bigger, heavier, and more dangerous trucks on the road.

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

□ 1300

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

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the return to regular order and all of the amendments that we are going to consider today, it is not lost on me that just here in the Rules Committee debate, my friend from Massachusetts was able to talk about truck size and weight for longer than regular order would have allowed the proponent of an amendment to talk about that. Under the 5-minute rule, which is what we have here to conduct these issues, it is hard to grapple with some of these big issues in an amendment process.

Some of these issues, as my friend from Massachusetts suggested, should be hashed out in committee, where there is no time limit, where we can work on these, where we can consider all of the studies, where we can go through all of the work.

There is a role for the Rules Committee to pick and choose amendments, those that have been considered enough, those that can be considered in a short period of time, and those that need to remain in committee and be hashed out there.

As we grapple with what regular order means, I hope my colleagues will come down on the side of reserving the biggest of these issues for committee work and the more minor changes for here on the floor of the House.

While I prefer to agree with my friend from Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, I have to disagree with him about the track record we put together in this body over the last 4½ years.

I came to Congress at the exact same time that John Boehner became Speaker of the House. My first experience here in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, was when John Boehner brought H.R. 1 to the floor. It turns out the Democratic Congress had not finished the budgeting process the year before.

So here we were. We were in the middle of the fiscal year. No budget had been passed. No appropriations bills had been passed. This brand-new Congress comes in, the biggest freshman class in American history. It was an exciting, exciting time, Mr. Speaker, as you will recall.

One of the first bills out of the gate was a bill to fund \$3.5 trillion worth of Federal Government. All these new Members here have all been sent with a mandate from their constituents back home.

While history would have suggested that a Speaker would have closed down that process, said this is too important to put before the entire House, what Speaker John Boehner said is: Bring the bill to the floor and we will debate it for as long as it takes.

Mr. Speaker, do you remember that? It was all night long, day in, day out, until we finished the job. Every Member on this floor had their voice.

We can't always do that, Mr. Speaker. There is not enough daylight or darkness in the year to do that with every bill that comes to the floor of the House. But I cannot let it be said that Speaker Boehner presided over the most closed Congress in history. In fact, the opposite is true.

If you track down my Democratic friends, they will tell you they offered more amendments in a John Boehner Speakership than they ever had a chance to offer in a Speaker PELOSI Speakership. I am not faulting the previous Speaker, Mr. Speaker. I am only saying that openness is something you have to believe because it is hard. It is complicated.

I listened to my friend from Massachusetts. He said: I want an open process. I just want to defeat all the amendments I don't like that come to the floor of the House.

Sometimes that is just the way it is. Sometimes you have to come down here to the floor of the House, you have to have the difficult debate, and you have to win on the merits.

Mr. Speaker, we did ask the Department of Transportation to consider truck weights. We absolutely did. And we passed it in a bipartisan way. It was signed by the President of the United States. The date the report was due back to this Congress was last year.

Last year is when this body spoke and said: You have to have this study back to us by the winter of 2014.

The Department of Transportation said: Whatever. Whatever. We are working on it. It is really hard. I know Congress told us to. I know they are the boss. But whatever. We will get there.

Here we are a year later and we still don't have the report, Mr. Speaker.

Don't let it be said that we are succeeding here at the Federal level.

What does my friend from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) do? This is radical. I want to redescribe the radical amendment that my friend from Massachusetts just spoke about. The radical idea that my friend from Wisconsin has is: Let's let the State governments decide for themselves about what the truck weights should be on Federal highways in their system.

I don't dispute for a moment that there are going to be States that say: This is too dangerous. We don't want heavier trucks on our road. I don't doubt that for a minute.

But don't you doubt for a minute, Mr. Speaker, that there will be States that say: Today we allow those heavier trucks on our small two-lane curvy roads through north Georgia.

If you really care about families that have been harmed by truck accidents, then you want those trucks off of those dangerous two-lane roads and you want them on the finest highway system known to man: the United States interstate system.

I trust States to make those decisions, Mr. Speaker. Don't think for a moment—don't think for a moment—that the collective wisdom of 435 people in this body is a good substitute for folks who sit back home in the great State of Georgia. I promise you, our judgment, the way we love on one another in Georgia is superior to anything this body could craft.

That is the radical idea from my friend from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE). Let States decide. Let the local people who have to deal with the consequences of action or inaction—let them decide.

It feels right to me, Mr. Speaker. That is what is wonderful about this body. We are going to make these amendments in order. We are going to bring them to the floor of the House. We are going to have the debate. And then, lo and behold, at the end of the process, you are going to have to stick your card in the slot and vote "yes" or "no."

Mr. Speaker, this is the way it is supposed to be. I don't want a body where we all agree on everything all the time. I want a body where we are able to talk about those things that divide us and where we are able to unite around those things that unite us.

One of those things, Mr. Speaker, is what my friend from Massachusetts said. We have been in a short-term extension process for far too long. It has been a short-term extension process that has gone through both Republican and Democratic leaderships, Mr. Speaker. This is not a partisan problem. This is an American problem.

Today the Transportation Committee has crafted an American solution that, if we pass this rule, we will be able to consider.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am now really worried about what Speaker RYAN meant when he said that we were going to return to regular order, based on what my colleague, Mr. WOODALL, just said as he defended the Boehner Congress, which, by the way, is the most closed Congress in the history of our Congress—more closed rules, over 180 closed rules. If you want to defend that process, fine.

Not only the closed rules, but on major amendments, important issues were not even allowed to be brought up. We tried to debate the war—we are at war—and the Rules Committee, with the blessing of the leadership, wouldn't even allow us to bring that to the House floor. Important issues are routinely denied here.

If your idea of regular order is still "your way or the highway," then I don't think that much is going to be changed, just maybe the same menu, a different waiter, I guess. That is about what we can expect. I hope that is not the case.

I think the record, not only how the Republicans have treated the minority with regard to important bills, but also to a lot of people on your own side, has been lousy. It has been a bad record.

I am hoping that the new Speaker understands that and believes that this place could be better served if we have a more inclusive process, more regular order, and we respected our committees.

By the way, speaking of committees, the Transportation Committee didn't see fit to put in a provision for bigger truck sizes and heavier trucks. That is the committee of jurisdiction. They didn't do that.

Mr. RIBBLE has the right to bring his amendment. These other people have the right to bring their amendment. Members will have a whole 10 minutes to debate this.

I would also say that not all amendments are created equally. Some are more important than others. I think this is an amendment that is more important than some of the sense of Congress language that we are going to be debating in terms of amendments later.

But a whole 10 minutes and we are going to let the States decide. That is the retort from my colleague from Georgia. I get it.

There are people in this House, especially on the Republican side, who think the States should control everything; that when it comes to civil rights or voting rights, let the States decide, and the Federal Government should have no role in guaranteeing that everybody in this country has their voting rights protected or their civil rights protected. I disagree with that.

On this issue, it is an issue of safety. When the gentleman says that we are just trying to take these big trucks off these side roads, that is not true. These trucks still have to go on those small roads to do their deliveries.

That is not going to change. They will still have to utilize those roads. On

those side roads, I wish there weren't these big trucks, but at least they are going slower than they will on an interstate highway.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Andrew Matthews, chairman of the National Troopers Coalition, representing 45,000 members, asking us to oppose any amendment forcing States to allow heavier and longer trucks on our Nation's highway.

Every one of us here is saying please don't do this, please don't do this. We will have a whole 5 minutes to make the case against that amendment.

NATIONAL TROOPERS COALITION,
September 23, 2015.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER AND RANKING MEMBER DEFAZIO: On behalf of the National Troopers Coalition's 45,000 members, we ask that you oppose any amendment forcing states to allow heavier and longer trucks on our nation's highways when you consider the transportation reauthorization. Specifically, we urge you to vote against any amendments allowing the operation of 91,000 pound single tractor-trailers or double 33-foot tractor-trailers, replacing the twin 28-foot trailers in operation today.

Troopers, every day, see the dangers these longer and heavier rigs pose to the motoring public and our officers. With heavier trucks, stopping distances increase threatening the motoring public and our Trooper members. And if "Twin 33s" become legal, this could ultimately replace 53-foot singles as one of the most commonly used configurations, adding a dangerous 17 feet in length to our already crowded highways.

The transportation reauthorization bill should not include such a far-reaching policy change, especially following the release of the long-awaited USDOT truck size and weight study, which largely concluded that not enough data exists to make a clear recommendation on changing any existing truck size and weight laws.

The bottom line is bigger and heavier trucks make our roads and highways are unsafe due to, among other things, greater stopping distances and higher risk of roll-over. The National Troopers Coalition opposes any changes to current truck size and weight laws and urges you to do the same. Should you have any questions or need any additional information, I can be reached.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ANDREW MATTHEWS, ESQ.,
Chairman.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the Teamsters Union, which most of these truck drivers are Teamsters, sent us a letter strongly urging us to oppose the Ribble amendment. Law enforcement, the drivers, all these safety coalitions say no; but a special interest comes in here and says they would like an exemption, and everybody Clambers to try to help them out. Know what you are voting for before you vote for this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to an important safety provision in the

Senate-passed DRIVE Act being considered by the House this week.

I am pleased the House is working in a bipartisan manner to fix our Nation's critical highway infrastructure needs. I want to bring attention to a key provision which is included in the DRIVE Act that passed the Senate earlier this year.

In 2004, two young sisters, Raechel and Jacqueline Houck, were killed just outside my district when their rented Chrysler PT Cruiser caught fire and crashed due to a defective steering component. The vehicle was not grounded or fixed before it was rented to the Houck sisters, despite having a safety recall notice issued a month before the tragic accident.

While today Federal law prohibits car dealers from selling new cars subject to a recall, there is no similar law prohibiting rental car companies from renting out vehicles under a safety recall.

That is why I am so pleased the Senate included the text of my bill, H.R. 2198, the Raechel and Jacqueline Houck Safe Rental Car Act, into the DRIVE Act.

This legislation is nothing more than a commonsense fix. It modifies existing law to prohibit rental car companies from renting a vehicle under recall until it has been fixed. Pure and simple, consumers must be protected from renting cars that are subject to a safety recall.

This key provision does not only have bipartisan support in the House, but it is also supported by the rental car industry, consumer safety groups, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, General Motors, and Honda.

Furthermore, a change.org petition calling for passage of this bill was started by Raechel and Jacqueline's mother, Cally Houck. It has received signatures from over 180,000 consumers nationwide.

I am disappointed that there may be attempts to strike this critical vehicle safety language from this final highway bill. I believe such actions are misguided and would seriously undermine the tireless effort by Cally Houck and the families who have lost loved ones due to this clear defect in our safety laws.

Therefore, as the House debates the highway bill this week, I urge my colleagues to oppose any amendments to weaken or undermine this important bipartisan language.

Let us honor the lives of Raechel and Jacqueline Houck by working together to enact a simple, yet meaningful solution that will surely save lives in the future.

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

I certainly agree with my friend from Massachusetts that folks ought to know what they are talking about before they come and vote on amendments. In fact, I think folks ought to know what they talk about when they

even come down and talk about amendments. I think that ought to be part of the thing. There is no point of order to stipulate that, but I believe it is an important provision.

I serve on the Transportation Committee, Mr. Speaker. So I have a vested interest in this. I have kind of a pride of authorship. We worked very hard on this.

In my friend from Massachusetts' opening statement, he thanked the chairman and the ranking member of the full committee and of the subcommittee. They call them the Big Four on that committee, Mr. Speaker, the Big Four.

If you can get the Big Four to have an agreement, then you feel like you can get your amendment across the finish line because being a committee chairman means something.

□ 1315

Among the many amendments that we considered in committee were truck weight amendments, Mr. Speaker. I know this because I serve on that committee.

Did you know, today, Mr. Speaker, that we have first responder vehicles—fire trucks, for example—that are prohibited from getting on Federal highways because of this system? If you are in a crisis—if you are in a first responder crisis—because of the wisdom of the Federal Government, the wisdom of this body, we have said: Do you know what? You probably shouldn't get on the fastest and most direct route to respond to the crisis. We really need you to stay on the local roads. No interstate travel for you.

That is just nonsense. That is absolute nonsense.

Good news, Mr. Speaker. We have folks here in this body who care about ferreting out the nonsense and putting a stop to it. So we considered that amendment in committee, and we passed that amendment in committee. If we pass this rule today, Mr. Speaker, we can change the law of the land to make that difference for people.

This is a new day in terms of House leadership, Mr. Speaker. It is a new day. I am going to be interested to see whether we spend more time litigating the past or planning for the future. I am about looking forward. I am optimistic about tomorrow. I know it is going to be better than yesterday no matter how good yesterday was. This is the opportunity we have here together.

Unanimous out of committee. Voiced out of the Rules Committee. This is the bill. I don't want anybody to be confused. There is no civil rights legislation in this bill today. This is a transportation bill. I don't want anybody to be confused. We are not rolling back anything for anyone here today. This is a bipartisan—even better, non-partisan—transportation funding bill. I don't want anybody to be confused today. This is something that Democrats failed to get done when they ran the show, and it is something Repub-

licans failed to get done when they ran the show. Now we are all here together, getting it done. I think that is worth celebrating.

I urge all of my colleagues to pass this rule so we can get to it and then support the underlying bill as well.

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

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

I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that will restore and strengthen the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

We need to recommit ourselves to voter equality. This legislation would require Federal approval in some States for changes to voting practices that could be discriminatory.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, you will notice many of us are wearing "Restore the Vote" pins here today because we are, quite frankly, appalled by what is going on in certain States in terms of taking away people's right to vote. We find that offensive, and we think that there is a Federal obligation to guarantee that right, that we just can't leave it up to the States. All of us in this country should have equal protections under the law when it comes to voting.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of voting rights for all Americans. I was proud to stand alongside my fellow colleagues this morning to launch the Restore the Vote legislative strategy.

This national effort will help mobilize support for H.R. 2867, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015, a bill that I sponsored with Representatives JUDY CHU and LINDA SÁNCHEZ in order to restore critical Federal oversight to jurisdictions which have a recent history of voter discrimination.

Since elections are held on Tuesdays, every Tuesday that Congress is in session, we will declare it to be "Restoration Tuesday." Members of Congress will wear a "Restore the Vote" ribbon pin and will speak on the House floor about the importance of restoring and protecting voting rights for all Americans. Today is the first Restoration Tuesday, and I am honored to speak on behalf of H.R. 2867, the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court in the Shelby case struck down the Federal preclearance. The Supreme Court issued a challenge to Congress to develop a modern-day coverage

formula that looks at current discriminatory acts by States and political jurisdiction. The Voting Rights Advancement Act answers that challenge.

The bill restores and advances the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by looking at recent voter discrimination practices since 1990. An entire State can be covered by preclearance if 15 or more voting violations occur in a State in the most recent 25-year period. This updated coverage formula ensures that 13 States, including my home State of Alabama, are required to obtain preclearance for changes in voting practices and laws. The 13 States that will be covered under this new formula include Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, Arkansas, Arizona, Texas, New York, California, and Virginia. The bill also provides greater transparency in Federal elections by ensuring that voters get notice of changes in locations and of changes in voting practices.

Put simply, the Voting Rights Advancement Act offers more voter protection to more people in more States.

Mr. Speaker, old battles have become new again. Since the Shelby decision, 33 States across this Nation have issued photo I.D. laws that have made it harder for vulnerable communities to vote, like our senior citizens, our young people, and the disabled.

As a daughter of Selma, I am painfully aware that the injustices suffered on the Edmund Pettus Bridge 50 years ago have not been fully vindicated. Just recently, my constituents were dealt a very devastating blow when Alabama closed 31 DMVs—that's right, driver's license offices—a State that had recently adopted one of the Nation's harsher photo I.D. laws. This decision is completely unacceptable. These closures render it almost impossible for so many of my constituents to get the most popular form of photo I.D., which is a driver's license.

This DMV closure decision is just one example of modern-day barriers to voting. While we no longer have to count marbles in a jar or recite the names of all of the counties, there are still laws and decisions that make it harder for people to vote. "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere," Martin Luther King once said.

On March 7, 2015, I welcomed President and Mrs. Obama as well as President Bush and Mrs. Bush, along with 100 Members of the House and the Senate, to my hometown of Selma, Alabama, to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the voting rights march from Selma to Montgomery. Mr. Speaker, it was a "kumbaya" moment when Republicans and Democrats gathered together in recognition of how far our Nation had come in living up to its ideals of justice and equality for all.

The 50th commemoration of the marches from Selma to Montgomery must be so much more than just one day of reflection, Mr. Speaker. A single moment filled with colorful language

and wonderful speeches is nice, and walking hand in hand across the Edmund Pettus Bridge is nice; but gone should be the days of "feel good" moments that, in and of themselves, lead to no clear path to action. The Voting Rights Advancement Act is that action.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we are asking our colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to join with us in supporting the Voting Rights Advancement Act as Congress must act now to protect the rights of all Americans.

The fate of our democracy depends upon its citizens having the unfettered right to vote. Our vote is our voice, and no voices should be silenced. We are asking everyone to join us in our efforts to make sure that we restore the vote to the voices of the excluded. To restrict the ability of any American to vote is an assault on all Americans' rights to participate equally in the electoral process.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2867, the Voting Rights Advancement Act.

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

It is easy on a big bill like this to get confused about what is in it and what is not in it. I would refer folks to transport.house.gov. That is not just for Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker. Anybody across the country can access that.

What you are going to find—and, again, what is an extraordinary success story that we have on the floor today—are all of these national priorities that we share. The bill refocuses funding on national priorities. It gets us back to the core of the original highway trust fund. It reforms the program, again, in a bipartisan—even nonpartisan—way to get the dollars on the ground faster to make a difference in people's lives.

Time is money, Mr. Speaker, whether you are shipping goods or whether you are sitting in traffic. It promotes innovation to bring some new ideas into the transportation infrastructure. We are getting ready for next generation roads, and that language is here: roads and bridges, public transportation, driver safety, truck and bus safety, hazardous materials. It is all in here.

There are those bills in Congress where the more you read them, the more you think: "Man, what were those guys thinking?" This is one of those bills where the more you read it, you think: "How in the world did those guys get it done?" This is a success story, Mr. Speaker. It is worthy of all of my colleagues' support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

We need to pursue this in the manner we are doing it because, again, important issues like this don't ever see the

light of day in this House. We can't talk about voting rights or vote on a bill to protect voting rights. We can't vote on immigration reform because my friends are slaves to this majority rule on their side of the aisle. These are important issues, and we shouldn't just leave them to the States in which people's voting rights are being denied.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, August 6 marked the 50th anniversary of the passage of the bipartisan Voting Rights Act of 1965, historic legislation that prevented State and local governments from denying any citizen the right to vote based on his race, ensuring equal voting rights for all.

In 2013, the Supreme Court struck down a major provision of this law, severely limiting the Federal oversight of State voting laws. My home State of North Carolina passed the most egregious voting law in the Nation immediately after that decision, which slashed early voting, implemented strict voter I.D. requirements, and ended pre voter registration programs. Other States across the country followed suit and also implemented election laws that disenfranchised voters.

All voters should be able to make their voices heard and elect leaders of their choice, and I am proud to join my colleagues today in renewing our call to repair America's broken election system.

I cosponsored the Voting Rights Advancement Act to help restore Federal oversight to jurisdictions which have a recent history of voter discrimination. This bill updates the coverage formula to ensure that States like North Carolina are required to obtain preclearance for changes to voting practices and procedures. It reaffirms our commitment to voter equality, and it creates additional pathways for voter access. Simply put, this bill protects the right to vote.

I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation because every American deserves to have his voice heard. Every American deserves equal access to the ballot box, and every American deserves the right to vote.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is election day in Ohio. Right now, my constituents are casting ballots to decide their next local, State, and judicial elected officials. Participating in our democratic process is not only a right, but it is a duty. Unfortunately, again, for many Americans, voting recently became more difficult in 2013.

As you have heard my colleagues mention, Mr. Speaker, that is when the Supreme Court struck down key provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965

in its *Shelby v. Holder* decision, making it easier for States and localities to disenfranchise voters in areas that have a history of voter suppression.

We shouldn't roll back voting rights protections. Instead, we should honor the progress our country has made to ensure equal rights and equal treatment.

Congress should immediately bring H.R. 2867, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015, to the floor so all Americans may cast ballots to choose their leaders and their public servants. I am a cosponsor—no. Let me say I am a proud cosponsor of this bill, and it enjoys bipartisan support and leadership support in both the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, voting rights restoration should happen now. On Tuesdays, I will proudly wear my pin for restoring the vote. Mr. Speaker, again, that is restoring the vote.

□ 1330

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleague if he has any further speakers remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am ready to close for our side.

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

Mr. Speaker, in a few moments, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule. It has been worked out collaboratively with the minority. I said when I began that we were making almost 30 amendments in order, but we were nowhere close to done. In fact, this amendment wants to make another 16 amendments in order right now.

We are still going to go back to the Rules Committee and meet at 3 p.m. We are still going to make even more amendments in order, but this amendment will make an additional 16 amendments in order under this rule. It will make more time available for debate, Mr. Speaker.

We want to make a technical fix to dispense with the reading of the Senate bill so that we can get directly into amendments. That is a standard procedure, but it was not in the base rule.

Mr. Speaker, this is only going to make this rule better. I look forward to offering that amendment here in just a few moments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. How much time do I have left, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by reiterating our call for Members to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can restore the vote.

Only in this Republican-controlled House of Representatives is the notion of protecting everybody's right to vote a radical idea. We see voter suppression efforts all across this country, and it is a Federal responsibility. It is a Federal responsibility, and we have got to live

up to that responsibility. So I hope that my colleagues will vote "no," so we can have this debate and we can have an up-or-down vote on this.

Quite frankly, the committees of jurisdiction should have ruled this bill to the floor, and we should be having that debate. But I guess for political reasons my colleagues don't see the benefit in moving this important legislation to the floor. We have an opportunity to do that today.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I again want to commend Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and their entire team for bringing us here today with a carefully crafted compromise, 6-year highway bill, which, I think, is absolutely imperative. Our States, our cities, and our towns have been demanding this for a long, long time, and we are very close to making some progress.

I would urge, like I did in my opening statement, we ought not to screw it up with a whole bunch of controversial amendments because some special interest PAC thinks it is a good idea.

I will again reiterate my strong opposition, not only to the Ribble amendment, but to a whole bunch of other amendments that will allow bigger and heavier trucks on our Federal Interstate Highway System. These are Federal highways. Yes, it is a Federal responsibility. It is a Federal responsibility.

I would just remind my colleagues that the people who agree with me on this include the National Troopers Association, the National Sheriffs' Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, AAA, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Towns and Townships, the American Public Works Association, The U.S. Conference of Mayors, Citizens for Reliable and Safe Highways, Road Safe America, Brain Injury Association of America, Parents Against Tired Truckers, Advocates for Auto Safety, Trucking Alliance, the Teamsters, and the AFL-CIO. I can go on and on and on.

The overwhelming opinion on this is that we should not go down the road of bigger and heavier trucks; yet we have got a special interest out there that says we should do it, and so all of a sudden Members are clamoring to do it. It would be a mistake. It would make our roads more dangerous. It will threaten the safety of passengers on our highways. It is a bad idea.

Certainly, people ought to pay attention to what they are voting on before they come here and vote for this. Unfortunately, we are not going to have the time to debate it because it is going to be 5 minutes on each side. I think it would be a threat to this bill, and I think that would be a huge mistake.

Let us respect the great work that has been done by the Transportation Committee. Let's not load it up with a bunch of controversial provisions. This

is about safety on our highways, first and foremost. If my colleagues don't believe that, they ought to talk to the families who have lost loved ones in accidents due to bigger and heavier trucks. They ought to talk to the drivers. They ought to talk to people who know what they are talking about and not rely on a particular special interest.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so we can have this debate and a vote on protecting voting rights in this country to restore the vote.

Let's respect the work that the committee of jurisdiction has done here, but let's vote "no" on these efforts to allow bigger and heavier trucks on our roads. For the sake of our constituents, for their safety, let us do the right thing and vote "no" on those amendments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is one of those days where I don't think it is a rare moment of agreement; I think it is a typical moment of agreement. There are issues that divide us, and there are issues that unite us. Focusing on America's infrastructure is one of those issues that unites us.

I agreed with my friend from Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, when he said he hoped in the new administration here in this House that we focused on fairness and respect. I think that is absolutely right. I think that is what the American people ask of us back home.

I don't particularly think that suggesting that there are folks in this body who are moving amendments to the floor based on the bidding of special interests moves us in the direction of respect. In fact, I think it moves us in the opposite direction, Mr. Speaker. I don't think suggesting there are those in this body who care about the individual safety of families in our district and those who don't moves us in the direction of fairness or respect, Mr. Speaker. I think it moves us in the opposite direction. That is the challenge that our new Speaker has. We are trying to get to regular order, trying to have all the voices heard, Mr. Speaker, but you have seen the complexity of that just here today.

On the one hand, you have heard a passionate speech for why we shouldn't be considering trucking amendments in a trucking bill; that there couldn't possibly be enough time to discuss trucking while dealing with trucks, why we shouldn't possibly have an opportunity to bring experts together who have just passed a trucking bill to deal with more trucking issues. On the other hand, you heard a very passionate plea of why we should bring a Judiciary Committee legislative bill into the transportation bill.

This bipartisan bill, this bill that has been worked out, this bill that has succeeded where Congress after Congress after Congress has failed, you have

heard a very passionate pitch to say, you know what, let's take that transportation bill and let's drop in a giant judiciary issue on top of it because that is regular order. It is not regular order.

I don't dispute that there is frustration in this body for the pace at which legislation moves. I share it. Mr. Speaker, I instigate it for Pete's sake. I came here in the class of 2010. I want to get things done. As soon as we can together and get this done, by golly, we can go back to poking or kicking or talking or whatever it is that folks need to get done, but that is not this bill.

This bill is a success. This process is a success. The openness of this process is something that we can all be proud of. It doesn't just happen because Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER come together in the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker. It happens because Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO came together in the Transportation Committee. This is one of those moments that brings us together, not as a body, but as a nation, getting about the business that our constituents sent us here to do.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOODALL

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer an amendment to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 11, insert after the period: "The first reading of the Senate amendment shall be dispensed with."

At the end of the first section, add the following: "The Senate amendment, as amended, shall be considered as read."

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

"SEC. 7. The amendments specified in Rules Committee Print 114-33 shall be considered as though printed in part B of House Report 114-325."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, that is 35 amendments now. There are 35 amendments made in order by this rule. We will still go back at 3 o'clock this afternoon to find even more. That is the collaborative process that I am representing on the floor here today.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for the amendment, I urge strong support for the rule, and I urge strong support for the underlying resolution.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 507 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 7. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2867) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the cri-

teria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2867.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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:

Adoption of the amendment to House Resolution 507, if ordered;

Adoption of House Resolution 507, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 354.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 178, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 583]

YEAS—241

Abraham	Carter (GA)	Emmer (MN)
Aderholt	Carter (TX)	Farenthold
Allen	Chabot	Fincher
Amash	Chaffetz	Fitzpatrick
Amodei	Clawson (FL)	Fleischmann
Babin	Coffman	Fleming
Barletta	Cole	Flores
Barr	Collins (GA)	Forbes
Barton	Collins (NY)	Fortenberry
Benishek	Comstock	Fox
Bilirakis	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (MI)	Cook	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (UT)	Costello (PA)	Garrett
Black	Cramer	Gibbs
Blackburn	Crawford	Gibson
Blum	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Bost	Culberson	Gosar
Boustany	Curbelo (FL)	Gowdy
Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Granger
Brat	Denham	Graves (GA)
Bridenstine	Dent	Graves (LA)
Brooks (AL)	DeSantis	Graves (MO)
Brooks (IN)	DesJarlais	Griffith
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Grothman
Buck	Dold	Guinta
Bucshon	Donovan	Guthrie
Burgess	Duffy	Hanna
Byrne	Duncan (SC)	Hardy
Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Harper

Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry

NAYS—178

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney

DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee

Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes

Brady (PA)
Conyers
Ellmers (NC)
Fattah
Gohmert

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus

NOT VOTING—14

Jackson Lee
Jones
Larson (CT)
Meeks
Richmond

□ 1410

Mrs. TORRES changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. LAMALFA and JODY B. HICE of Georgia changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 171, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 584]

YEAS—248

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishak
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Chu, Judy
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole

Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly

Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
Rogers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney

NAYS—171

Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Clark (MA)
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski

Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Posey
Price, Tom
Trott
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner

Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)

Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Swalwell (CA)
Takano

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey

Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)

Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
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
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger

Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch

Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—14

Brady (PA)
Ellmers (NC)
Fattah
Gohmert
Jackson Lee

Jones
Larson (CT)
Meeks
Neugebauer
Richmond

Speier
Takai
Yarmuth
Yoder

□ 1419

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING SAFETY AND SECURITY OF EUROPEAN JEWISH COMMUNITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 354) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the safety and security of Jewish communities in Europe, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 585]

YEAS—418

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 (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
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
DeSaunier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett

Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
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
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
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
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger

NOT VOTING—15

Brady (PA)
Ellmers (NC)
Fattah
Gohmert
Huizenga (MI)

Jackson Lee
Larson (CT)
Meeks
Neugebauer
Richmond

Smith (NE)
Speier
Takai
Yarmuth
Yoder

□ 1427

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 22.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 507 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 22.

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

□ 1429

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the Senate amendment is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

□ 1430

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today is an exciting day for me because when I became chairman almost