

The anniversary is especially important to me because of the men and women I represent at Tyndall Air Force Base in Panama City.

Since my election to Congress, I have gotten to know a great many of them, from three star generals to newly enlisted airmen, and I could not be prouder of their service to our Nation.

Today, the F-22 Raptor from Tyndall's 95th Fighter Squadron are deployed in Europe, supporting the NATO Baltic air patrol mission.

On this momentous anniversary, our grateful Nation says thank you to the 95th Fighter Squadron and all the men and women serving in the United States Air Force around the world.

Aim high. Fly, fight, win.

□ 1230

HONORING DELIGHT BREIDEGAM,
JR.

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague Mr. DENT to thank and honor a Berks County innovator for his leadership and dedication to the community.

Mr. Speaker, DeLight Breidegam, Jr., passed away last week at the age of 88. He was cofounder and chairman emeritus of East Penn Manufacturing. Under his leadership, East Penn grew to be Berks County's second largest employer.

The company is nothing short of an American success story. East Penn began as a dream of the Breidegam family following World War II. DeLight frequently cited the shortage of batteries during the war as the spark to start the business. Along with his father, they soon started their battery business in a small, one-room creamery. Since then, the Breidegam family has been committed to producing batteries.

I had the good fortune to meet with DeLight about a month ago. The value that he placed on his employees was palpable in speaking with him. I must say that it is a very, very special thing when you hear someone speak about their employees in the way that he spoke so lovingly of his, still calling and speaking with them every single day.

He will be missed. He is a tremendous, tremendous asset, as is his company, to the Berks County community; and while we are sad for his passing, Mr. DENT and I wish to recognize him for all his great and positive accomplishments in the community.

LET'S WORK ON KEEPING THE
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OPEN

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we are 2 weeks away from a shutdown of the Federal Government. What does that mean for communities like the one I represent in Colorado? Our Federal labs funding Federal research, funding for our universities, our national parks.

When you hear about something like our national parks closing, many people think, okay, maybe it means I delay our vacation. What does it mean to the thousands of people who live in Estes Park and our communities in Grand County, supported almost entirely by Rocky Mountain National Park, which millions of Americans enjoy every year? If they curtail their season by several weeks, they can't afford the rent for their store and can't afford to put their kids through college.

I also want to draw attention to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. After 50 years as one of our country's most successful recreation and conservation programs, funding needs to be reauthorized by September 30 or it could be lost forever.

There are so many things we could be discussing with only 14 days until a government shutdown. Instead, this body is about to go into debating two bills which the President will veto which don't fund a single thing with regards to keeping the Federal Government open.

Let's focus on what we need to do. Let's get to work. Let's make sure we can grow our economy and keep the Federal Government open.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 17, 2015.
Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 17, 2015 at 9:05 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 70.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 73.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 74.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 348, RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 758, LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 420 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 420

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. 348) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, 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. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-26. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 758) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, 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 and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of September 24, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Resolution 420 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? The question resonates throughout our Nation. It is the driving force behind every solution the Republican majority has offered to this body and every solution this administration has rejected.

I am pleased to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Committee on Rules. This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 348, the RAPID Act, and H.R. 758, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015.

The Committee on Rules met on this measure yesterday evening and heard testimony from a Republican member of the Committee on the Judiciary and two Democratic members of the Committee on the Judiciary. The Committee on Rules solicited amendments for both these measures, but no amendments were submitted for the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, making the rule closed. There were 11 amendments submitted for the RAPID Act by both Republican and Democratic Members. This rule makes 10 of those in order. Let me repeat that: 11 amendments submitted, and 10 of those amendments are on the floor. Both the RAPID Act and the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act went through regular order in the Committee on the Judiciary, including robust amendment debate.

This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary for each piece of legislation.

I appreciate the hard work of the Committee on the Judiciary chairman,

Mr. BOB GOODLATTE, and his full committee and subcommittee staffs in bringing forward these key reforms. It would take more than 60 minutes to list all the ways Republicans have worked to encourage economic growth and create jobs in the 114th Congress. We have worked tirelessly to pass litigation reforms that would promote access to court and ensure the cost of litigation isn't being used to force settlements.

I am a proud cosponsor of the RAPID Act because men and women across the Nation are ready to go back to work. Republicans are committed to giving job creators the confidence to take projects off the drawing board and onto the worksite.

A 2012 U.S. Chamber of Commerce study of proposed projects in just one sector of the economy, the energy sector, found that if a modest number of these projects were allowed to move forward and begin construction, the direct and indirect economic benefits would be tremendous—hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars annually.

Hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars are in the pipeline, and Republicans believe we should streamline the approval process so that these projects are either approved or denied, not left languishing year after year.

Americans need jobs now. They have bills to pay and families to feed. The RAPID Act is one of a number of solutions offered by House Republicans that would break down unnecessary Federal barriers and allow employers to break ground on the projects that offer Americans jobs and economic growth.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, NEPA, was designed for an important purpose, one that should be preserved. The Committee on the Judiciary has done important work exploring the original goals of NEPA and hearing from experts in the field and academic scholars. The facts are clear: The NEPA process we have today is far removed from what the authors intended. It is normal for the review process to take years and years, and in some cases over a decade. Imagine how the world has changed in the past 10 years. It is absolutely mind-boggling that a review process for any project would take a decade.

We live in a world where technology has made the impossible possible. There is no excuse for relying on old methods or overly complex regulatory frameworks. It is time for Federal regulators to stop tying up capital and prioritizing endless paper pushing over job creation.

We can do better as a nation. Our economy and our families depend on us doing better.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 348, the RAPID Act, is an attempt to limit flexibility and eliminate the public's role in environmental review and decisionmaking processes. H.R. 758 would force judges to impose sanctions against any claim that appears to lack support or involve a novel legal theory.

These are no doubt important issues to debate and discuss, and we will have that time on the floor, but I want to address what this body is failing to address. Though the subject matter of these two bills couldn't be different, neither one of them relates to the fact that we are 6 legislative days before a job-killing, money-wasting shutdown of government.

Now, when we hear 6 legislative days, let me translate that for normal days that Americans have. That is actually 14 days. We are 14 days until we risk the government shutting down. Of the next 14 days, Congress is only scheduled to work 6. Now, by the way, we should thank Pope Francis for that, because before Pope Francis scheduled his visit, Congress was scheduled to work 4 of the next 14 days.

Now, if everything were going wonderfully and this body was a model of keeping the government open and fulfilling its responsibilities, I think the American people would say: "Well, guess what, Congress. You deserve a vacation." But that is not what I hear from my constituents. They are not saying that we should be on vacation 8 out of the next 14 days when we are facing a government shutdown.

Not only are we facing a government shutdown now, but we are 76 days after the expiration of the Export-Import Bank, which already has lost at least 500 jobs here in our country. We are 41 days until authorizing legislation to maintain our Federal highway systems expire. We have already passed that deadline twice and done short-term extensions.

In my August townhall meetings—and I had a number of them across the district—I do not recall any of my constituents telling me their family's top concerns are we start eliminating environmental reviews and public health standards.

While we are wasting unconscionable time on issues when we are only 6 legislative days or 14 real days from a shutdown, we wonder why this body is losing popularity every day among the American public and will continue to.

To my friends across the aisle, I want to work with you. My Democratic colleagues want to work with you. We want to work to avoid a government shutdown. We want to work with you to reauthorize the Federal highway bill.

These are not Democratic or Republican principles. Both parties believe in a Federal Government; both parties believe in highways and investment in infrastructure. So let's do that. I think we should do that all 14 days, or at

least 12 of the next 14 days rather than 6, but at least let's get to work and do it.

I think we share many of the same domestic and foreign policy interests, and hopefully we can agree upon our priorities. The average American family in my district and across our country has no interest in grandstanding on display. They have no desire to send their hard-earned dollars in taxes to a body that continues to govern crisis by crisis, sometimes after the fact.

□ 1245

So I implore my colleagues to use the next 14 days—or, if they want to take 8 of them off, 6 days—to consider the threat we are facing and the hardship a shutdown would cause in districts like mine that rely on two major universities to receive Federal funding; Federal labs; national parks that support countless local businesses that would close if the Federal Government is closed; the Centers for Disease Control, with a strong presence in Fort Collins; and the many other secondary and tertiary effects that a Federal shutdown would have.

Let's find a way to avert it. There is still time. Let's not wait until it is 2 days or 1 day or zero days or negative 1 day or just hours remaining on the countdown clock. Let's pass a bipartisan bill to fund government. Let's reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. Let's make a long-term commitment to our Federal highway system and infrastructure to keep our economy growing.

After we fulfill these basic needs, these self-created crises that Congress is presented, then let's have a discussion about limitation of irregular lawsuits or eradication of environmental reviews on public projects. We can have our disagreements. We can debate them. But let's get our priorities right.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we just got back after spending time in our districts, and I know, in my case, one of the reasons that we are back today dealing with regulatory issues is just a couple of examples that just continue to come up in conversations.

There were always questions about, frankly, what are we doing in Washington, what are we not doing in Washington, but there was a common theme when I went to small business, factories, and when we do roundtables. The common theme was: Why is Washington constantly keeping me from doing what I can do or need to do in my business? Why are we continuing to get regulation after regulation after regulation that keep us from expanding our business?

I had a businessowner tell us in a roundtable that right now there were several businesses he knew that would be willing to hire upwards of 20, 30, 40 folks, but right now they are bound by

the caps that they find under the healthcare law. They don't want to go over a certain number—that magic 49. They don't want to get involved in other areas that are keeping them constricted to this point.

So when we look at these packages of bills that we are looking at, frankly, we are looking at everyday moms and dads; we are looking at businessowners; we are looking at the folks who are the economic engines of the United States; and we are saying the government should not be the inhibitor of your company. The government should not be the part that is stopping you from creating jobs, from getting that next big idea, from having that next product that hits the market that takes us to that different level or hiring that next person who has that spark, that creative energy to say: "Here's the next idea that changes even how we are here today."

So when we deal with this and we look at it, the question really is: What drives jobs? The House majority, the Republican majority, constantly has looked at what it means to be an entrepreneur and to have people that you employ. What does it mean? It means giving someone a chance.

This summer, I had the awesome fun or joy, if you will, of watching my son get his first job. He started to work at a grocery store, and I can remember at first he was all excited. He went through all the process and he got that job. The best day was when he actually came home after working and he was tired, but yet it was payday. He came in and he looked at me and he said: "Dad, I got my paycheck."

And for a moment, regardless of how much that check was—this is not a story about seeing taxes for the first time; my son has lived in my house and he understands the burden of taxes, so it was not any of that—it was just the joy in his eyes that someone had given him a job and that he went to work. It was that pride of having money that he could spend. There is a new person in the economic engine.

That is why we continue to bring these bills forward, so that government can be out of the way and be its proper role, not the roadblock to job creation. When we do that, then the people of the United States can look at this House Republican majority and know our best interests are with those who get up every day looking to make life just a little bit better.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado for the time to speak on this important issue.

I rise today in opposition to the previous question in order to give House Members an opportunity to vote on reauthorizing the charter of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, it is well past time to end the ideologically driven shutdown of the Export-Import Bank that has prohibited this critical agency from continuing to support United States businesses and their workers.

For almost 2 years, Democrats have been sounding the alarm that a shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank would be devastating for American businesses and their workers. Since Republicans in Congress let the Bank's charter expire in June, companies around the country have been preparing to lay off employees, and many have stopped expansion plans because they now lack the critical financing tools that Ex-Im provides.

In fact, just last week, General Electric announced that, due to the GOP shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank, more than 500 jobs will be shipped to places like France and China. Last month, Boeing told its workers that it expected to cut as many as several hundred jobs at its southern California-based satellite factory after a multimillion-dollar contract was scuttled due to uncertainty about the future of the Export-Import Bank.

Republican obstructionism is also having a direct impact on countless small businesses around this country, many of which are set to lose their Ex-Im-backed insurance policies in the coming weeks.

Mr. Speaker, a majority of this House supports reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank, but if we don't give Members the opportunity to vote up or down on reopening the Bank's doors today, the self-inflicted shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank may continue for months on end.

If that scenario plays out, the damage to our businesses, their workers, and our economy will only get worse. The consequences for average taxpayers would get worse as well. Because the Bank generates income through fees it charges for its services, failure to reauthorize the Bank means throwing away billions of dollars that would otherwise be transferred to hard-working American taxpayers. Accordingly, we should reauthorize the Bank. If we did, we could raise billions of dollars in profit for U.S. taxpayers over the coming years. The House should take a position.

Mr. Speaker and Members, we have too many Republicans, our friends on

the opposite side of the aisle, claim they support small businesses. They want to do everything that they can to get rid of the regulatory obstacles to small businesses being able to grow and expand. They talk about this with community banks. They talk about this with all kinds of businesses. But look what they are doing.

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

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. They have absolutely stood in the way of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

And where does that place this country? It places us in a position where we cannot compete with other countries who fully support the export opportunity. So I would ask my colleagues to please vote on this bill at this time.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a leader in the effort to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we might indeed take up legislation to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. Because I think the gentleman from Georgia has it exactly right, the question before this Chamber, before this Congress, before the President, before the American people is: Where are the jobs?

Now we know where the jobs, in part, have come from over the last 8 years. In fact, about 1.5 million of them have come through the activity of the Export-Import Bank, where they supported \$200 billion in exports spread out across 7,300 companies. And we know where the jobs have not come from since July 1, when the charter of the Export-Import Bank expired, at which time there were 116 deals frozen, constituting \$9.3 billion in activity.

Who were they?

Norwest Ingredients is a company in my home State that sells mint flavoring for the manufacturers of candy and oral care. The company currently employs about a dozen employees. It is a small business.

Without Ex-Im, many small businesses like Norwest aren't going to be able to extend terms to foreign buyers, and they will have to ask for cash in advance. When they do, they will lose their business to other countries who have export credit authorities.

By way of reminder, every single developed nation on the face of the Earth has an export credit authority right now, except the United States of America.

Combustion Associates in California, they spent 3 years closing a deal for a new power project in Nigeria that would generate \$39 million in revenue and create 30 new American jobs. The deal is on hold, along with two other projects that would have been worth

nearly \$50 million in revenue and 100 jobs.

GE, the gentlewoman from California shared the sad news of the 500 jobs that are leaving these shores as a consequence of our failure to reauthorize the Ex-Im.

Digital Check, an Illinois company, sells check scanning equipment to clients in nearly 100 countries. Tom Anderson is the family-run company's chief executive. He says: We're losing now a quarter million in sales in British markets and around \$300,000 in India. And that half-million-dollar hit is causing the company to reevaluate whether they will suspend, altogether, their scanner leasing services.

FirmGreen—Steve Wilburn, president of FirmGreen and, I might add, a proud and highly decorated marine—laid off 10 of its 17 employees last year because the company lost \$60 million in contracts during our latest period of uncertainty.

They are now, right as we speak, right as we are attempting to answer the question of where are the jobs, competing for a \$300 million project in the Philippines, and it hinges on securing export credit financing from the Ex-Im. Without it, that business is going to likely go to a South Korean rival and, with it, the 400 jobs he would have added.

Boeing, again, the gentlewoman made mention of layoffs in El Segundo, California. That was not the first but the second satellite sale to a foreign company and country that we lost as a consequence of the uncertainty surrounding the Export-Import Bank.

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. The outgoing CEO, Mr. MCNERNEY, said: "We never would have considered that before this craziness on Ex-Im. We love making and designing airplanes in the U.S. We are now forced to think about doing it differently."

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, we have now moved beyond the theoretical and the abstract. We are now in the phase of this debate where real people with real jobs and real families are losing their livelihood. The question is right: Where are the jobs? The answer is: In reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

Defeat the previous question so that we might do what a majority of this body wants to do, which is continue to compete in a global economy.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the will of the majority is being thwarted in this House, the people's House. Mr. BOEHNER, our Speaker, said when he took his office as Speaker that the House

worked best when the House was allowed to work its will. Mr. Speaker, let the House work its will.

□ 1300

We are about to take a vote on whether this House should move to reopen the Export-Import Bank and save thousands—thousands—of jobs that Speaker BOEHNER has admitted will be lost without our action.

The Export-Import Bank is a critical tool that supports job creation here in America by helping American businesses compete in foreign markets—in other words, making goods here with American workers and selling them abroad. That is what we need to be doing. The Export-Import Bank facilitates that happening. It has over 300 votes out of 435 on this floor, but we cannot vote if it is not brought to the floor.

When the Speaker and majority leader allowed the Bank's authorization to expire in June, they did so with the full knowledge that a reauthorization has the votes to pass and will pass with strong, bipartisan support if brought to the floor. Now, we have a chance to defeat the previous question and bring that bill to the floor today.

Now, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to some of my colleagues who may be new, that voting down this rule, defeating the previous question is a vote to open the Export-Import Bank.

Now, I know some of you will say: Well, it is a procedural vote. My party makes me do this.

Well, if you have that answer, look in the eye those who are losing their jobs and say: I had to do this for my party, not my country, not the competitiveness of America, not for American jobs, not for American businesses, but I voted for the previous question for my party.

Sometimes, my friends, party demands too much. When you raise your hand, it is to defend the Constitution and laws thereof, but in a real sense, it is to defend and make America better.

Let's refuse to engage in what Chamber of Commerce CEO Tom Donohue today called a "unilateral disarmament in the face of other governments' far more aggressive export credit agencies."

Let me repeat that. That is Tom Donohue, president of the Chamber of Commerce. The Republican Party used to be a party of business, the party that wanted to grow jobs. We talk about that all the time.

Well, my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, you have an opportunity to do that on this upcoming vote. Don't do as Tom Donohue today said you might do, a "unilateral disarmament in the face of other governments' far more aggressive export credit agencies."

Last week, General Electric announced it would be moving 500 jobs from New York, Texas, South Carolina, and Maine to Europe and China because of the failure of this Congress to

pass the Export-Import Bank reauthorization. There are over 300 votes for that on this floor.

The American people think we are dysfunctional. They are right. They don't trust us because they don't think their board of directors is doing the job they sent us here to do. They are right. They are angry. They are anxious.

Let us for once, this day—we haven't funded the government yet; hopefully, we will get that done—but at least this day, given the opportunity on this previous question, say that we are going to make America competitive and we are not going to unilaterally disarm.

This is something the Business Roundtable wants us to do. It is something the Chamber of Commerce wants us to do. It is something the National Association of Manufacturers wants us to do. It is something that organized labor wants us to do.

In the face of unity of purpose, in the face of a majority of votes on this floor, party regularity still says: Tough. Tough. Yes, there may be 300 votes on this bill, but we are not going to allow it to come to the floor.

Ladies and gentlemen in your offices or on this floor, America expects you to do better. America expects you to be responsible. America does not want you to be simply partisan. America does not want you to be cowed by a small minority of this House and by radical groups outside this House who threaten Members they will spend a million or \$2 million or \$3 million to defeat them in a primary.

America wants us to do the right thing. America wants us to have the courage of our convictions. America expects this House to reflect the majority opinion, not be dictated to by a small minority.

Mr. Speaker, allow your Members to vote against the previous question. If you do so, we will bring to this floor the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank; and, ladies and gentlemen of this House—and all Americans ought to know as well—it will pass.

Bring the Export-Import Bank bill reauthorization to this floor so America can continue to be competitive and create jobs here in America. That is what our constituents want us to do.

Vote against the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to take a vote on whether this house should move to reopen the Export-Import Bank and save thousands of jobs that even Speaker BOEHNER has admitted will be lost without our action.

The Export-Import Bank is a critical tool that supports job creation here in America by helping American businesses compete in foreign markets.

When the speaker and majority leader allowed the bank's authorization to expire in June, they did so with the full knowledge that a reauthorization has the votes to pass—and will pass with strong bipartisan support—if brought to the floor.

Now we have a chance to defeat the previous question and bring that bill to the floor today.

Let's end the uncertainty that has already caused businesses to hold back investment in

job creation and to move American jobs overseas.

Let's refuse to engage in what Chamber of Commerce CEO Tom Donohue today called a "unilateral disarmament in the face of other governments' far more aggressive export credit agencies."

Last week, general electric announced that it would be moving 500 jobs from New York, Texas, South Carolina, and Maine to Europe and China because of the failure to keep the export-import bank open.

Congress has a responsibility to help grow jobs here—not send them overseas.

It's time to reopen the export-import bank.

Defeat this previous question.

Bring the export-import bank up for a vote.

And let's complete the task that America's workers and their employers have asked us to do for months.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of my friend: Do you have any more speakers? Or are you prepared to close?

Mr. POLIS. We have a lot of Democrats that want to talk about keeping government open. I hear no Republicans here.

With good respect to my friend from Georgia, where are the Republican ideas to keep government open?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Well, I am trying to get an answer to a question. That means you do not have any more speakers on this. Are you ready to close?

Mr. POLIS. We are ready to use all of our time.

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

Mr. POLIS. May I inquire of the Speaker how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 23 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. May I inquire of the gentleman from Georgia if he plans to use his 23 minutes?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. That is why I was asking the gentleman from Colorado if he is prepared to close. I have no other speakers.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I will use our 9 minutes. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, shortly, I will be offering an amendment to the rule. The amendment will waive the two-thirds requirement to consider a rule on the same day as reported from the Rules Committee on the legislative days of September 24 and September 25, 2015.

This will provide the flexibility necessary during the Pope's visit to ensure the House completes its business on behalf of the American people.

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

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

Again, I think it is clear. We have had many Democrats coming to the floor talking about what we should be doing. I think the gentleman from Georgia might be the only Republican

in the Chamber. Maybe there is one other in the back. I don't have my glasses on.

We have a lot of ideas for keeping government open. Mainly, let's pass a continuing resolution to do it now. Let's work more than 6 days out of the next 14. Let's stay here until we can keep government open, until we can reauthorize the transportation and infrastructure bill.

It sounds obvious to me; yet there just didn't seem to be any interest from the other side. No Republicans have approached me about keeping government open. I hope you do, Mr. Speaker. I hope you encourage your colleagues to. There is no one here in the Chamber talking about what we can do to avoid a job-crushing government shutdown, which we are 14 days away from.

Instead, we are talking about unrelated bills. Now, I don't deny that these bills deserve their day in the sun. I just question whether, when we are 6 legislative days from a job-crushing shutdown, it is the time to discuss whether we should amend requirements set out by the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, that would reduce the role of public input and turn the idea of NEPA on its head by eliminating any illusion of objective or scientific analysis by allowing private sponsors to write parts of their own environmental reviews.

Now, look, we can discuss that. I am strongly for reforming the NEPA process. As an example, if we can make it easier to site renewable energy projects, I am a sponsor of a bill to expedite the NEPA process for solar and wind infrastructure projects.

Look, there are people who support this terrible bill in its current form; I completely understand that, but this bill does nothing to avert a job-destroying government shutdown that we are only 6 legislative days from reaching.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia mentioned this, what we call a martial law amendment. With this amendment that he is proposing with this rule—we just got notice of it last minute here on the floor—he is offering an amendment that will allow any bill to be brought up under martial law next week.

Now, in honor of Pope Francis' visit, I hope that they have a bill that they plan to bring to the floor under martial law to reduce our carbon emissions and finally do something to impact climate change, which I hope that Pope Francis will be addressing.

I also hope that, under martial law, they will bring forward a bill to replace our broken immigration system with a humane system, with a pathway to citizenship that replaces the chaos we have, with the rule of law, border security, and a pathway to normalization and citizenship for hard-working, aspiring Americans who are already here.

Now, I am not going to bet the ship that that is what they are going to do

with this martial law, but the fact of the matter is, from a process perspective, we—myself, my colleagues, and I think most of the Republican rank and file—simply don't know what they are going to do with that authority.

This is going around the normal rules of the House to establish a mechanism to avoid the normal process, avoid the normal process through Rules Committee and, through martial law, bring some sort of bill. I hope it is an immigration reform bill. I hope it is a climate change bill. I don't think it is.

Based on what we are seeing this week, it will probably be some NEPA bill or some—I don't know—some other bill that doesn't avoid a government shutdown to the floor of the House.

Maybe it will be a bill that is a Republican funding bill that will have a Presidential veto threat over it. That doesn't avoid a shutdown. Remember, the only way we can avoid a shutdown is the House, the Senate, and the President of the United States are on the same page for legislation to avoid a government shutdown.

Let's give them the benefit of the doubt, and we will be back next week, and I will hold my criticism. I hope it is an immigration reform bill. I hope it is a climate change bill.

I hope we honor Pope Francis by bringing forward two of his top priorities in a week that is appropriate, and if that is the case, I will support martial law for those two efforts, and I hope that that is what we will do.

I will withhold judgment until we see what the Republicans attempt to do with this procedural bypass of our normal mechanisms that they have scheduled for next week.

Look, these are bad bills under this rule. They are bad bills today. They would be bad bills if they were appropriate to consider. I believe they are inappropriate to consider in light of a job-crushing government shutdown occurring in 6 legislative days.

The RAPID Act, which would turn the idea of NEPA on its head, is a one-size-fits-all approach. It is not the right approach to NEPA reform.

There are thoughtful, bipartisan ideas that we could put together after we avoid a government shutdown. I am happy to do that.

The LARA Act is even worse. Our country tried a similar framework to LARA in the eighties and early nineties, and there is broad consensus that the experiment failed. Instead of reducing lawsuits, there was an explosion of litigation, causing delays and wasting judicial resources. Why on earth are we giving these failed ideas a second try?

The LARA Act would have prevented landmark decisions like the Brown v. Board of Education, which desegregated schools; *Griswold v. Connecticut*, which established constitutional protections for right to privacy; and *Loving v. Virginia*, which ended bans on interracial marriage.

Rather than "preventing abuse," this bill would actually promote civil rights

abuses and weaken the courts' ability to crack down on people who seek to discriminate illegally at work or school or at the voting booth, and Congress should not pass this bill, now or ever.

I think it is particularly offensive, when a job-crushing government shutdown is looming, to even be talking about these other items rather than discussing how we can avoid a job-crushing government shutdown.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure I am clear. These issues we should discuss. Natural resources. The World Health Organization estimates that 2 million people a year are killed because of air pollution. But putting forth these bills now does nothing to eliminate or deal with a job-crushing government shutdown.

Over just 16 days in 2013, our country lost \$24 billion in economic growth, hundreds of thousands of Federal workers were furloughed, contractors and subcontractors were not paid. It is an avoidable scenario. It is a crisis created by Congress. We wonder why people don't like Congress. It is a crisis of our own making.

Why are we threatening the critical, everyday services Americans rely on, the millions of people that work for contractors and subcontractors of the Federal Government?

A small-R republic is a system of governance in which people exert influence over their elected officials, and those representatives are supposed to listen and act upon those requests.

We need to listen to the American people and take the responsible course, Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to join me on this commonsense mission before it is too late.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying legislation. We need to reinstate a legislative agenda that aligns with the desires and wills and aspirations of the American people and American businesses.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear, just to clear up a couple of things here. One, let me be clear that nothing in this rule or the amendment waives the normal Rules Committee hearing process.

It simply provides us with the flexibility to consider bills on the floor sooner while the Pope is here. It does nothing to waive the normal committee process for bills that should go to Rules, just to clear up that.

I do appreciate the gentleman from Colorado's concern about our speakers and the fact that he was counting today. I was glad to see that he had three people come to speak on the rule that had nothing to do with the bills in the underlying rule. So that was pretty impressive.

I will stand with one person speaking on the rules and the truth of the fact that regulatory burden has a crushing

role on business. I will stand, one, by myself all day.

And then in just a few hours, when we discuss this in the debate process, we will have plenty of people to discuss the actual bills themselves.

So let me close up by talking about what we are here for. My friends across the aisle want to portray House Republicans as being against things and against people.

Yes, it is true we have said "no" to bad policies and priorities of the administration. We have refused to turn a blind eye to those who exploit our legal system.

We have said "no" to the Federal regulators who are indefinitely delaying projects that would put Americans back to work.

We have said "no" to the tax more, spend more, save less, Big Government, job-killing machine that is crushing the American spirit and our economic growth.

But this majority says "yes" to solid, principled legislation that protects Americans' personal and economic liberties. Later today, we will say "yes" to life.

We will vote to protect the babies born alive despite the efforts to abort them. Regardless of the circumstances in which a baby is born alive, they are a person just like you or I. To fail to recognize their humanity is to deny our own.

This House majority says "yes" to fiscal responsibility, "yes" to the commonsense principle that our Nation should have a budget and actually stick to it.

We say "yes" to responsible oversight efforts because we understand, as our Founding Fathers did, that Americans' rights and liberties are only safe while the Federal Government is held within the bounds of the Constitution.

We say "yes" to free market principles because we recognize that economic growth is rooted in the ingenuity of America's entrepreneurs, not government programs.

We have replaced government with growth and regulations with reform. We have restored transparency and trust. We have given our Nation reason to believe that one day our children won't be looking for a job because government has crushed them. They will be creating jobs.

House Republicans have heard the cries of the American people, and today, tomorrow, and every day to come we will continue to fight for them. We will fight so that they can realize their hopes, their dreams, and their ambitions.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF GEORGIA

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end the following:
SEC. 4. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a

report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of September 24, 2015, or September 25, 2015.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, does this amendment to the rule mean that Members of this body will have less than 24 hours to review any bill we consider next week?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the meaning of the pending proposition.

Mr. POLIS. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the meaning is very straightforward. That is exactly what it means.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 420 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 4. 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. 1031) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, 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 Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1031.

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. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and 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. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3134, DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3504, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 421 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 421

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3134) to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) 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. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion. 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 and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon passage of H.R. 3134 the House shall be considered to have: (1) stricken all after the enacting clause of S. 764 and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 3134, as passed by the House; and (2) passed the Senate bill as so amended.

SEC. 4. Upon passage of H.R. 3504 the House shall be considered to have: (1) stricken all after the enacting clause of S. 1603 and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 3504, as passed by the House; and (2) passed the Senate bill as so amended.

SEC. 5. House Resolution 408 is laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ROBY). The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman 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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members