

the 74th shooting at a school on American soil since a lone gunman's attack on Sandy Hook Elementary in Newtown, Connecticut, in December, 2012.

The list of shootings, which includes 13 school shootings in the first 6 weeks of this year, was compiled and is on the Web site of Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America. Earlier, my colleague, TED DEUTCH, recited all 74 of them.

Yesterday and two other times in the last 2 weeks, the House rightly held moments of silence. I and two of my colleagues did not stand, not because of disrespect for those who lost their lives; we abhor the loss of life, and we abhor the House of Representatives taking moments of silence and then returning to business as usual and doing absolutely nothing about gun violence.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 11, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, 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 June 11, 2014 at 9:28 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment. H. Con. Res. 100.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4800, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4457, AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2014; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4453, S CORPORATION PERMANENT TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 616 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 616

Resolved, That (a) 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. 4800) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, 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 Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

(b) During consideration of the bill for amendment—

(1) each amendment, other than amendments provided for in paragraph (2), shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment except as provided in paragraph (2);

(2) no pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate; and

(3) the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read.

(c) When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, 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. 4457) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in 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 amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4453) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the reduced recognition period for built-in gains of S corporations. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-46 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1230

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 616 provides for consideration of three important bills. The first, H.R. 4800, the Agriculture Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015, will ensure continued operations for those Federal agencies responsible for monitoring the health and safety of our food and drug supplies. H.R. 4457, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2014, and H.R. 4453, the Permanent S Corporation Built-in Gains Recognition Period Act of 2014, are two critical pieces of tax legislation that will give certainty to the small business community, making permanent two pieces of our Tax Code which Congress has had to continually renew annually for decades. Making these tax credits permanent will allow businesses to look out for more than a year ahead and to actually evaluate their economic situations, allowing for those businesses to make staffing and investment decisions for the long term rather than just the short term.

The rule before us today provides for a modified open rule for H.R. 4800. This allows all Members to offer any amendments to the bill that they may choose. The Speaker is committed to completing as many appropriations bills under regular order as possible.

The rule before us formalizes the same unanimous consent agreement that was entered into during the consideration of the CJS appropriations bill, which streamlines the debate, providing for 10 minutes of debate on every amendment offered on the bill. However, in no way does this rule restrict Members from offering any and all amendments to the underlying bill.

The rule further provides for the consideration of both H.R. 4457, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2014, and H.R. 4453, the Permanent S Corporation Built-in Gains Recognition Period Act of 2014, both under a closed rule. By bringing these two bills here today, Members will be allowed to debate the policy of each of these tax provisions individually rather than as a single omnibus tax extender legislation hurriedly passed at the end of the year that would not allow Members to weigh in on each separate extender as this process does.

H.R. 4800, the Agriculture and Related Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015, provides almost \$21 billion for the department agencies funded in the bill. This is funded at the same level as fiscal year 2014 and \$457 million above the President's request. The bill provides critical funding for agricultural research; animal and plant health; conservation programs; the Farm Service Agency; rural development, including infrastructure and food safety inspection; the Food and Drug Administration; the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; and the food and nutrition programs, including child nutrition, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and WIC, the program for women, infants, and children.

Of particular importance to the work I have been involved with on the Energy and Commerce Committee, the agriculture appropriations bill provides over \$2.5 billion in funding to the Food and Drug Administration. In addition, the bill allows for the collection of user fees cumulatively, amounting to overall discretionary funding of \$4.5 billion in the FDA.

These dollars serve an important mission. From drug and device approval to food safety, the Food and Drug Administration is at the regulatory forefront of protecting the Nation's health, but it also acts as the doorway for new treatments and cures. From basic research to cutting-edge treatments, America has led the way in opening new fields of discovery and taking medicine to boundaries that I could not have imagined during my medical training or career, yet we have barely scratched the surface of medical breakthroughs that are over the horizon. And believe it or not, there are only hundreds of treatments for diseases that afflict us and thousands still without any treatment at all, let alone a cure.

Will the United States continue to be the home for the latest inventions? If the answer to that is yes, the Food and Drug Administration will be a key part of the future.

Patients and innovators are on the front lines in the fight against diseases like Alzheimer's and cancer, yet their voices are not always heard. Bureaucratic rules have stood in the way of innovation. Some estimates show that medical devices may be approved almost 4 years earlier in Europe than in the U.S.

In 2012, the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology recommended "encouraging innovation" as part of the FDA's mission statement in order to ensure that the FDA understood its role in helping new innovative treatments reach patients.

However, the true impact of the medical device, pharmaceutical, biologic, and generic drug industries in the United States is that they are partners in providing our physicians and practitioners with the tools that they need to prevent disease and alleviate human suffering.

The Food and Drug Administration must have the infrastructure and programs in place to ensure all innovations are dealt with in a fashion that ensures safety for the patient, as well as a straightforward and predictable and streamlined approval process. The Food and Drug Administration can continue to streamline the approval process of single-molecule drugs with which they have the most regulatory experience, but if we can't handle the fundamentals, then we have got a big problem.

Congress has taken several bipartisan actions in the last few years to break down the barriers to health innovation, and the Food and Drug Administration will and has seen changes as a result. The funding provided will continue to move these reforms along, but as report language notes, there is a great deal of work that remains to be done.

For the good of patients and to retain our global leadership and the economic benefits that come with it, it is time to breathe new life into the life sciences sector. As a physician, I understand the importance of ensuring that the government has the resources to lead to the next generation of treatments in the 21st century while also ensuring that those treatments are safe and effective. The bill will ensure that the Food and Drug Administration has the scientific and medical expertise that they need when reviewing products utilizing emerging science by providing adequate resources in a challenging fiscal environment.

After the successful passage of the farm bill this year, the next step in that process is to fund those programs. H.R. 4800 achieves that goal.

And I will add, I was disappointed to see that the Healthy Food Financing Initiative, to bring grocery stores and fresh food to underserved communities, was not funded in this appropriations bill even after the House resoundingly defeated an amendment to strip the program from the farm bill, showing that this body overwhelmingly supports this initiative. I understand that an amendment to fix this oversight will be offered during consideration of the bill, and I hope that something can be worked out.

The two tax bills before us today are, again, critical to give small businesses stability and the ability to look beyond the end of each calendar year in making decisions for their companies. Extending these provisions today will be a boost to our economy.

H.R. 4457, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2014, would make permanent a provision within the Tax Code that allows annual investments of depreciable business property up to \$500,000 to be expensed. Further, computer software and rules for the expensing of qualified real property—leasehold improvement, restaurant and retail improvement property—can also be written off as well.

The present tax system harms investment in many ways. One of the most

important is that, unlike other expenses, businesses must deduct capital expenses—such as for business equipment—over many years rather than the year the expense is incurred. This raises the cost of capital and reduces investment. H.R. 4457 would go a long way to reverse this trend.

Likewise, the other two tax extenders that we are voting on today deal with S corporations or pass-through corporations. These corporations elect not to pay any Federal corporate taxes and, instead, pass corporate income, losses, and deductions and credits through to their shareholders.

H.R. 4453, the Permanent S Corporation Built-in Gains Recognition Period Act of 2014, makes permanent an expired tax break that would enable businesses set up S corporations to shrink the window that they have to hold built-in gains from 10 years to 5.

H.R. 4454, the Permanent S Corporation Charitable Contributions Act of 2014, would make permanent the tax rule requiring an adjustment to the basis of a shareholder's stock in an S corporation if the corporation makes tax-deductible charitable donations.

Recently, the House passed a permanent tax credit for corporate research and development. Sixty-two Democrats voted against the measure. Their reasoning, as far as I can tell, was not against the policy, but it was the fact that the measure was not offset. However, offsets are something in Congress that we need when we are creating new programs or allocating money not previously appropriated, essentially making the American people pay more in taxes. Offsets are unnecessary and not needed when, in fact, we are shielding the American people from being taxed.

Moreover, we heard last night in the Rules Committee, and I suspect we will hear it again today on the floor, about the fact that the two tax-related bills before us today in this rule are not offset. Congress only needs to pay for tax credits if one subscribes to the belief that all money in the country—all money in the country—belongs first to the government rather than the people. I reject this mind-set. Congress does not need to justify or offset not taking more money from the American people; Congress needs to justify and pay for policies that take money from the American people.

Indeed, every member of the Rules Committee on the minority side has voted at least three times to extend these very provisions without having any sort of offset. President Obama, himself, signed those three extensions of these provisions into law, all done without offsets. Senator WYDEN, who has been working on a larger tax extender bill in the Senate has included the same PAYGO language that is included in these bills before us in this legislation. To make hay about this issue, which is truly much ado about nothing, is to play politics with taxpayers and our economy, and the Republican majority in this House will not play along.

In the absence of a larger, comprehensive tax reform package, permanent extenders like these are common sense. They bring back stability and certainty to businesses that are constantly waiting at the end of every calendar year to see if Congress will retroactively act to provide that tax relief.

I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” on the rule and “yes” on the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

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

Mr. Speaker, today, the House will adopt yet another closed rule for these two tax extender measures, which will cross a new Rubicon, a new threshold. We are going to break the record for the most closed rules considered by a Congress ever, and we still have 7 months to go.

The graphic that I am holding illustrates that—that we have the most closed Congress ever, which allows, among other things, that we don’t deal with immigration reform, we don’t deal with the minimum wage, we don’t deal with unemployment insurance, we don’t deal with universal gun background checks, we don’t deal with dealing with banning assault weapons. This is a closed Congress.

This may sound like inside baseball, but it is much more than just a procedural agreement. I have seen a lot of rules serving nearly 10 years now on the Rules Committee, but this is a new one. This rule limits debate during the appropriations process. It deems passage of a provision to ignore the deficit that this legislation will create, and it sets an all-time record, as I have shown, for closed rules. We managed to do this yesterday and now have it on the floor all in one rule.

Congress has, as I have said, many important issues it needs to take up, including the things I have shown and reiterate now: immigration reform, raising the minimum wage, and extending unemployment insurance.

2.5 million people in this country are without unemployment insurance. If we were to pass it, it would create 200,000 jobs, and we stand around here and talk about creating jobs all the time.

Closed rules prevent the House from working its will on these measures. That is the way it appears that leadership, what is left of it, wants it to be.

My friends do make some Democratic amendments in order at times. Both parties have used closed rules when they have been in control, and that is true. That is the prerogative of the party controlling the House.

But you can read these closed rules like a roadmap of my friends’ priorities. In general, the only amendments made in order are those that are expected either to pass or fail along party

lines. Over 30 House Republicans and 64 percent of Republican voters polled support immigration reform, but we can’t get a vote. Where is the immigration reform bill? Where is the measure that will allow for us to answer many of the problems that this country is confronted with in reference to immigration reform?

This week, as I have indicated, nearly 3 million Americans have lost emergency unemployment insurance since it expired in December, but we can’t get a vote here on the House of Representatives’ floor.

The Voting Rights Act needs to be reformed in order to protect American voters, but we can’t get a vote in the people’s House. Leadership uses closed rules to prevent the House from working its will because they are worried about undermining their message, more worried about it than actually legislating.

Today’s tax extenders are a perfect example of how these heavy-handed tactics help the chosen few, but leave everyone else without recourse. There are at least 50 other tax extenders that we could have taken into consideration, but no, we choose these six because that is your agenda. Dozens of other provisions that expire at the end of 2017 and several others scheduled to expire at the end of this year have been skipped over in favor of these six extenders favored by businesses that are pretty substantial, and not necessarily the big corporations but many of the large S corporations.

My friends across the aisle have passed up the chance—would you believe this?—to renew the work opportunity tax credit, which helps veterans get back to work, as well as the new markets tax credit, which helps revitalize communities.

How do you do that? They have chosen to ignore renewable energy tax credits and tax credits to help working parents pay for child care. How about that? They have decided there is no reason to extend deductions for teachers’ out-of-pocket expenses, qualified tuition, mortgage insurance premiums, or State and local taxes, a deduction that is critical for Floridians and the people that I represent.

These six extenders will be the only extenders that the House votes on because these are the priorities of my friends across the aisle, priorities that may solidify your message, my friends, particularly your message with your base—and evidently you are confused about that particular matter—but you are more interested in them and assuring that you do nothing to help hard-working Americans.

You are going to use the power of the closed rule to ensure that no other provisions get a vote, and you are going to become the most closed Congress ever, disallowing immigration reform, disallowing a minimum wage increase. There are States that are giving a realistic minimum wage increase to people. You tell me, how it is that people live

on \$7.35 an hour? Many of us have been to food shelters and seen people that are working, many of us have seen people that are living in shelters, working families living in shelters, and we won’t even bring a measure here. Are you afraid to just say “yes” or “no” whether or not Americans ought to have an increase in their minimum wage at the Federal level?

You let 2½ million people don’t have unemployment insurance, can’t meet their obligations, and we are not willing to help them, and you tell me that you will increase—you talk all the time about the deficit, so you are going to increase the deficit with some mumbo jumbo about money if it is not in the hands of, and disallow people that we know, if they were to receive unemployment insurance compensation, that they would spend all of that money and that it would, in fact, create jobs, and it would sustain small businesses if we were to do that.

One presenter in the House yesterday, outstanding in his presentation, a friend from the other side, pointed out that he had come from a hardscrabble life and that his father one time had been on unemployment insurance. I said to him, and I believe it to be true, that you just proved my point. And I asked him did his daddy get a job after he was on unemployment insurance. And his answer was, yes, and I knew that is what it would be. Many people who are on unemployment insurance today, if we were to give them a chance, they would get a job. Get a life, Republicans, give people a chance.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of a response.

In the 111th Congress, the final 2 years of Representative PELOSI’s time as Speaker, 2009 to 2010, this House never considered a single bill under an open rule. Let me state that again: 2009 to 2010, the 111th Congress, Speaker PELOSI was Speaker, the House never considered a single bill under an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit, that is the definition of a closed process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My friend on the other side of the aisle may try to change the subject. Do that if you like. But I ask the gentleman: Is this a new record for closed rules or not? And I answer rhetorically because it is. And I don’t deny that Democrats have used closed rules. I said it in my opening remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Judge LLOYD DOGGETT, my good friend.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, across America, for 30 million schoolchildren implementation of the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act is working. Schools are literally stepping up to the plate with a plate of healthier food. Indeed, for school lunches in Texas, 99 percent

of Texas school districts are successfully serving meals that meet strong nutritional standards. In most of the schools I visit, 99 percent is an A-plus.

First Lady Michelle Obama has provided impressive leadership in getting students, families, all of us, to pay a little more attention to food quality, to encourage kids to be more physically active, to get moving, and to grow up healthy. Active, healthy kids do better in school, and they grow up to be more productive citizens who can help in moving our country forward.

Today's bill presents the question of whether we are to wave good-bye with a waiver to healthy school lunch standards. This bill that we are about to consider is not the only place where unhealthy congressional action lurks. At the very same moment that the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee was weakening school nutrition standards with a waiver, the House Ways and Means Committee, on which I serve, approved a bill to expand a tax subsidy for "apparently wholesome food." That sounds good. The only problem is that the statutory definition of "apparently wholesome food" does not actually limit itself to the wholesome. It includes Halloween candy, Twinkies, Pop Rocks, stale potato chips, and other expired junk food, all of which receive a taxpayer subsidy. I think that is a little hard to stomach.

In a Nation where one-third of our children are overweight or obese, we should neither be subsidizing junk food nor repackaging healthy school meal standards into less healthy meals.

We are already spending in America an estimated \$245 billion every year on diabetes. Rates of dietary-related Type 2 diabetes are skyrocketing among children and young adults. Since many of our children consume up to half of their daily calories at school through the school lunch and school breakfast programs, their health depends upon the nutritional quality of the food they are served.

Today, we should not take a giant step backwards. Let's join against this push to lower standards for our Nation's children. They deserve the healthiest future possible.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Returning briefly—before I yield to my good friend—to the subject of open and/or closed rules, this is what Speaker BOEHNER promised right here in this Chamber in his own words:

I offer a commitment: Openness, once a tradition of this institution, but increasingly scarce in recent decades, will be the new standard. You will always have the right to a robust debate in an open process that allows you to represent your constituents, to make your case, offer alternatives and be heard.

It is unfortunate that my friends on the other side of the aisle campaigned

telling the country how open and transparent they were going to be, and then when they do the opposite and are called out on it, it is just more excuses.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 4582, the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act. Mr. TIERNEY, my good friend, authored that bill to help millions of people lower their student loan debt. The bill would allow borrowers to refinance Federal and private student loans to the lowest rates that are currently available to new borrowers.

To discuss this proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), a distinguished gentleman, my friend and colleague.

□ 1300

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the House to act on responsible legislation that I have introduced that would help tens of millions of college students, graduates, parents, and middle class families all across the country refinance their existing loans to the same low rate offered to new borrowers in the student loan program.

As the President said earlier this week when he voiced support for this bill, this should be a no-brainer. Homeowners and small businesses are so often able to refinance their debts, there is no reason at all that students and parents shouldn't be able to do the same.

Refinancing would be a significant financial help to these students and their parents. In fact, a recent analysis by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service showed that a middle class undergraduate student with an average loan debt would save more than \$4,000 over the life of that loan. A typical graduate student would save more than \$2,500, and a typical parent who borrowed to pay for their child's education would save \$3,500 or more.

As my colleagues know, these savings would be invested right back into the economy. Last year, the Center for American Progress estimated that refinancing of just some of these Federal loans would pump \$21 billion into the economy.

That is because these people are going to be able to save \$40 to \$100 a month—thousands over the course of their loan—and they have expenses and necessities for which they have to pay.

Our bill is a good deal for taxpayers. Last week, the Congressional Budget Office scored our bill as generating \$72.5 billion in savings over 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, more and more constituents are writing my office, emailing, posting on my Facebook page, and even stopping me on the street to talk about stories about how their children are buried in student loan debt. Two days ago, I received an email from a concerned mother in my district.

This is what she had to say: she and her husband followed the rules and have been able to own their own home and support two children up to adulthood, but she feels that her daughter would not be able to do the same, as she currently owes \$60,000 in college loans.

Her interest rates vary from 6.5 percent to 8.5 percent. She is drowning in her own debt, and she is only 24 years of age.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TIERNEY. I appreciate that from my colleague.

The reason this mother supports the bill is that she knows it is going to help her daughter pay her loans in a reasonable way, while pursuing other goals this life.

This is really, Mr. Speaker, about whose side are you on. Are we on the side of special interests and allowing them to continue tax favors, while middle class Americans end up lugging around this heavy burden of debt?

I am on the side of that concerned mother and her daughter and others in this country who are concerned about their children's future.

Let's bring this bill to the floor for a vote.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would indicate to my friend from Texas that I am prepared to close. I have no further speakers at this time, and so I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is not all doom and gloom over here. There are provisions in the agriculture appropriation measure that I support.

I appreciate the report language in support of the United States Department of Agriculture's pollinator programs. I, along with others, have been leaders in bringing the subject to the attention of Congress, something of vital interest to all of this Nation.

I have been teased an awful lot about being the "bee man" because I bring up the pollinator issue all the time, but the fact of the matter is, if we don't have bees, we are not going to have food.

I also appreciate the provisions related to citrus greening, which has been devastating to Florida citrus growers, as well as those provisions in this measure that address rural housing.

I represent Belle Glade; South Bay; Canal Point; and Pahokee, Florida; and places where rural housing is really important, but I, along with all of my colleagues—particularly JOE GARCIA, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and MARIO DIAZ-BALART—have raised the issues with reference to citrus greening. The whole south Florida delegation has been involved in that particular area.

I grew up in the citrus area. I saw the early-on stages of greening. If we don't do something about this particular problem—and this farm appropriations does deal with some of it—then we may have no citrus coming from the State of Florida.

There are a limited number of days left on our legislative calendar, and we have many miles to go before we, as a Congress, have delivered on our obligation to help all Americans.

We absolutely have an obligation to businesspeople, but we also have an obligation to help veterans get work; an obligation to ease the burden on teachers who use their own money to support their students—our students; and an obligation to address forthrightly important issues, including immigration reform and raising the minimum wage and extending unemployment insurance.

We should stop standing around here and thinking that we are doing something when we offer a moment of silence, which is right for victims who have died of gun violence and the grief that is coming through all of those families. You hear them begging for us to do something.

We know that we can't solve all of those problems, but at least we could give them some assurance that we are trying to have universal background checks and that we are willing to ban assault weapons. Why would anybody want an assault weapon, other than a police officer or military person, and why should we permit them to be in their hands?

We won't bring those measures down here to the floor, and we do so at our peril.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, vote "no" on the underlying bills, and certainly vote "no" on this record-setting rule for closed rules, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, first off, I just want to reference something on Speaker JOHN BOEHNER's Web site.

John Boehner took the Speaker's gavel in January of 2011, promising to run a more open U.S. House of Representatives than his predecessor. In the 3½ years since then, Speaker Boehner has made good on that pledge by allowing more amendments and a steady stream of "open rules," while the Democratic-controlled United States Senate, under Majority Leader Harry Reid, has gone in the other direction.

One congressional expert calls open rules, which allow Members to freely offer amendments of essentially any nature during the consideration of a given bill, "essential for

fair consideration of legislation on the House floor.

Under Boehner's leadership, Members on both sides of the aisle have been allowed to offer significantly more amendments, and the House has operated under far more open rules than were allowed under the previous Democratic-controlled House.

The final years of the Pelosi-run House were a tour de force in closed government. During the final 2 years of Representative Pelosi's time as Speaker, the House never considered a single bill under an open rule. Some Members of Congress served their entire House careers under Speaker Pelosi without ever operating under an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, on the issue of so-called immigration reform, the administration has done more to distance and set back any policy in that direction.

Why do I say that? The reason is the unintended effects of their policies to send a message worldwide to those that come here by any method possible, and we will not prosecute, we will not send you back.

As a consequence, we have got an issue on the border of our State in Texas that is, at the same time, both heartbreaking and frightening, with underage children literally being shoved across the border.

Mr. Speaker, what does it say when an 8-year-old child can cross our border illegally? Who else is getting in, if 8-year-olds are able to come across this porous border that the administration has opened up?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I share your concerns as you expressed them with reference to the unaccompanied young people coming to our country, and I don't make any quarrel with you, but I would highlight the fact that it is believed by some that many of the places they are coming from—El Salvador, Guatemala, and Central America—the kids are running because of fright.

I remind you that they already have TSP, and we did that quite some time ago for those Central American countries. We did it, rightly, then.

I just offer that for information, and I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. BURGESS. Reclaiming my time, I would just point out that those conditions the gentleman referenced that might cause a child to be frightened existed 4 years ago, existed 3 years ago, but there has been a dramatic change in the past 2 years.

I believe that change is directly attributable to the policies of the administration when they went around the United States Congress to unilaterally alter the United States immigration laws, which specifically, in the Constitution, is a legislative branch requirement.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of three important bills: H.R. 4800, the Agriculture Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015; H.R. 4457, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2014; and H.R. 4453,

the Permanent S Corporation Built-In Gains Recognition Period Act for 2014.

The rule is fair and important for us to move forward on the debate on these pieces of legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 616 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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. 4582) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, 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 among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. 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. 4582.

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

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 194, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Bentivolio	Brown (GA)
Amash	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Amodei	Black	Bucshon
Bachmann	Blackburn	Burgess
Bachus	Boustany	Byrne
Barletta	Brady (TX)	Calvert
Barr	Bridenstine	Camp
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Campbell
Benishek	Brooks (IN)	Capito

Carter	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Cassidy	Hultgren	Ribble
Chabot	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Chaffetz	Hurt	Rigell
Coble	Issa	Roby
Coffman	Jenkins	Roe (TN)
Cole	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Collins (NY)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Conaway	Jolly	Rogers (MI)
Cook	Jones	Rohrabacher
Cotton	Jordan	Rokita
Cramer	Joyce	Rooney
Crawford	Kelly (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Roskam
Culberson	King (NY)	Ross
Daines	Kingston	Rothfus
Davis, Rodney	Kinzinger (IL)	Royce
Denham	Kline	Runyan
Dent	Labrador	Ryan (WI)
DeSantis	Lamborn	Salmon
DesJarlais	Lance	Sanford
Diaz-Balart	Latham	Scalise
Duffy	Latta	Schock
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Schweikert
Duncan (TN)	Long	Scott, Austin
Ellmers	Lucas	Sensenbrenner
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Sessions
Fincher	Lummis	Shimkus
Fitzpatrick	Marchant	Shuster
Fleischmann	Marino	Simpson
Fleming	Massie	Smith (MO)
Flores	McAllister	Smith (NE)
Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Fortenberry	McCauley	Smith (TX)
Fox	McClintock	Southerland
Franks (AZ)	McKeon	Stewart
Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Stivers
Gardner	McMorris	Stockman
Garrett	Rodgers	Stutzman
Gerlach	Meadows	Terry
Gibbs	Meehan	Thompson (PA)
Gibson	Messer	Thornberry
Gingrey (GA)	Mica	Tiberi
Gohmert	Miller (FL)	Tipton
Goodlatte	Miller (MI)	Turner
Gosar	Mullin	Upton
Gowdy	Mulvaney	Valadao
Granger	Murphy (PA)	Wagner
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Walberg
Graves (MO)	Noem	Walden
Griffin (AR)	Nugent	Walorski
Griffith (VA)	Nunes	Weber (TX)
Grimm	Olson	Webster (FL)
Guthrie	Palazzo	Westmire
Hall	Paulsen	Westmoreland
Hanna	Pearce	Whitfield
Harper	Perry	Williams
Harris	Petri	Wilson (SC)
Hartzer	Pittenger	Wittman
Hastings (WA)	Pitts	Wolf
Heck (NV)	Poe (TX)	Womack
Hensarling	Pompeo	Woodall
Herrera Beutler	Posey	Yoder
Holding	Price (GA)	Yoho
Hudson	Reed	Young (AK)
Huelskamp	Reichert	Young (IN)

NAYS—194

Barber	Cohen	Fudge
Barrow (GA)	Connolly	Gabbard
Bass	Conyers	Galleo
Beatty	Cooper	Garamendi
Becerra	Costa	Garcia
Bera (CA)	Courtney	Grayson
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Green, Al
Bishop (NY)	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Blumenauer	Cummings	Grijalva
Bonamici	Davis (CA)	Gutiérrez
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Hahn
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Hanabusa
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Hastings (FL)
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Heck (WA)
Bustos	DeLauro	Higgins
Butterfield	DeBene	Himes
Capps	Deutch	Hinojosa
Capuano	Dingell	Holt
Cárdenas	Doggett	Honda
Carney	Doyle	Horsford
Carson (IN)	Duckworth	Hoyer
Cartwright	Edwards	Huffman
Castor (FL)	Ellison	Israel
Castro (TX)	Engel	Jackson Lee
Chu	Enyart	Jeffries
Cicilline	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Clark (MA)	Esty	Johnson, E. B.
Clarke (NY)	Farr	Kaptur
Clay	Fattah	Keating
Cleaver	Foster	Kelly (IL)
Clyburn	Frankel (FL)	Kennedy

Kildee	Moran	Schwartz
Kilmer	Murphy (FL)	Scott (VA)
Kind	Nadler	Scott, David
Kirkpatrick	Napolitano	Serrano
Kuster	Neal	Sewell (AL)
Langevin	Negrete McLeod	Shea-Porter
Larsen (WA)	Nolan	Sherman
Larson (CT)	O'Rourke	Sinema
Lee (CA)	Owens	Sires
Levin	Pallone	Slaughter
Lewis	Pascarell	Smith (WA)
Lipinski	Pastor (AZ)	Speier
Loeb sack	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Lofgren	Perlmutter	Takano
Lowenthal	Peters (CA)	Thompson (CA)
Lowe	Peters (MI)	Thompson (MS)
Lujan Grisham	Peterson	Tierney
(NM)	Pingree (ME)	Titus
Luján, Ben Ray	Pocan	Tonko
(NM)	Polis	Tsongas
Lynch	Price (NC)	Van Hollen
Maffei	Quigley	Vargas
Maloney	Rahall	Veasey
Carolyn	Richmond	Vela
Maloney, Sean	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez
Matsui	Ruiz	Visclosky
McCarthy (NY)	Ruppersberger	Walz
McCollum	Rush	Wasserman
McDermott	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
McIntyre	T.	Waters
McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Meeks	Sarbanes	Welch
Meng	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
Michaud	Schiff	Yarmuth
Miller, George	Schneider	
Moore	Schrader	

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (UT)	Matheson	Pelosi
Cantor	McGovern	Rangel
Collins (GA)	McHenry	Ryan (OH)
LaMalfa	Miller, Gary	
Lankford	Nunnelee	

□ 1341

Mr. HINOJOSA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. HARTZLER changed her 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 resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 189, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

AYES—227

Aderholt	Burgess	Dent
Amash	Byrne	DeSantis
Amodei	Calvert	DesJarlais
Bachmann	Camp	Diaz-Balart
Bachus	Campbell	Duffy
Barber	Capito	Duncan (SC)
Barletta	Carter	Duncan (TN)
Barr	Cassidy	Ellmers
Barton	Chabot	Farenthold
Benishek	Chaffetz	Fincher
Bentivolio	Coble	Fitzpatrick
Bilirakis	Coffman	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Fleming
Black	Collins (NY)	Flores
Blackburn	Conaway	Forbes
Boustany	Cook	Fortenberry
Brady (TX)	Cotton	Fox
Bridenstine	Cramer	Franks (AZ)
Brooks (AL)	Crawford	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (IN)	Crenshaw	Gardner
Brown (GA)	Culberson	Garrett
Buchanan	Daines	Gerlach
Bucshon	Davis, Rodney	Gibbs

Gibson	Marino	Ross
Gingrey (GA)	Massie	Rothfus
Gohmert	McAllister	Royce
Goodlatte	McCarthy (CA)	Runyan
Gosar	McCaul	Ryan (WI)
Gowdy	McClintock	Salmon
Granger	McIntyre	Sanford
Graves (GA)	McKeon	Scalise
Graves (MO)	McKinley	Schock
Griffin (AR)	McMorris	Schweikert
Griffith (VA)	Rodgers	Scott, Austin
Grimm	Meadows	Sensenbrenner
Guthrie	Meehan	Sessions
Hall	Messer	Shimkus
Hanna	Mica	Shuster
Harper	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Harris	Miller (MI)	Sinema
Hartzler	Mullin	Smith (MO)
Hastings (WA)	Mulvaney	Smith (NE)
Heck (NV)	Murphy (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Hensarling	Murphy (PA)	Smith (TX)
Herrera Beutler	Neugebauer	Southerland
Holding	Noem	Stewart
Hudson	Nugent	Stivers
Huelskamp	Nunes	Stockman
Huizenga (MI)	Olson	Stutzman
Hultgren	Palazzo	Terry
Hunter	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)
Hurt	Pearce	Thornberry
Issa	Perry	Tiberi
Jenkins	Petri	Tipton
Johnson (OH)	Pittenger	Turner
Johnson, Sam	Pitts	Upton
Jolly	Poe (TX)	Valadao
Jones	Pompeo	Wagner
Jordan	Posey	Walberg
Joyce	Price (GA)	Walden
Kelly (PA)	Reed	Walorski
King (IA)	Reichert	Weber (TX)
King (NY)	Renacci	Webster (FL)
Kingston	Ribble	Wenstrup
Kinzinger (IL)	Rice (SC)	Westmoreland
Kline	Rigell	Whitfield
Lamborn	Roby	Williams
Lance	Roe (TN)	Wilson (SC)
Latham	Rogers (AL)	Wittman
Latta	Rogers (KY)	Wolf
LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)	Womack
Long	Rohrabacher	Woodall
Lucas	Rokita	Yoder
Luetkemeyer	Rooney	Yoho
Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
Marchant	Roskam	Young (IN)

NOES—189

Barrow (GA)	DeLauro	Keating
Bass	DelBene	Kelly (IL)
Beatty	Deutch	Kennedy
Becerra	Dingell	Kildee
Bera (CA)	Doggett	Kilmer
Bishop (GA)	Doyle	Kind
Bishop (NY)	Duckworth	Kirkpatrick
Blumenauer	Edwards	Kuster
Bonamici	Ellison	Labrador
Brady (PA)	Engel	Langevin
Braley (IA)	Enyart	Larsen (WA)
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Larson (CT)
Brownley (CA)	Esty	Lee (CA)
Bustos	Farr	Levin
Butterfield	Fattah	Lewis
Capps	Foster	Lipinski
Capuano	Frankel (FL)	Loebsack
Cárdenas	Fudge	Lofgren
Carney	Gabbard	Lowenthal
Carson (IN)	Gallego	Lowey
Cartwright	Garamendi	Lujan Grisham
Castor (FL)	Garcia	(NM)
Castro (TX)	Grayson	Luján, Ben Ray
Chu	Green, Al	(NM)
Ciilline	Green, Gene	Lynch
Clark (MA)	Gutiérrez	Maffei
Clarke (NY)	Hahn	Maloney,
Clay	Hanabusa	Carolyn
Cleaver	Hastings (FL)	Maloney, Sean
Clyburn	Heck (WA)	Matsui
Cohen	Higgins	McCarthy (NY)
Connolly	Himes	McCollum
Conyers	Hinojosa	McDermott
Cooper	Holt	McNerney
Costa	Honda	Meeks
Courtney	Horsford	Meeng
Crowley	Hoyer	Michaud
Cuellar	Huffman	Miller, George
Cummings	Israel	Moore
Davis (CA)	Jackson Lee	Moran
Davis, Danny	Jeffries	Nadler
DeFazio	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano
DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Neal
Delaney	Kaptur	Negrete McLeod

Nolan	Rush	Thompson (CA)
O'Rourke	Sanchez, Linda	Thompson (MS)
Owens	T.	Tierney
Pallone	Sanchez, Loretta	Titus
Pascarell	Sarbanes	Tonko
Pastor (AZ)	Schakowsky	Tsongas
Payne	Schiff	Van Hollen
Perlmutter	Schneider	Vargas
Peters (CA)	Schrader	Veasey
Peters (MI)	Schwartz	Vela
Peterson	Scott, David	Velázquez
Pingree (ME)	Serrano	Visclosky
Pocan	Sewell (AL)	Walz
Polis	Shea-Porter	Wasserman
Price (NC)	Sherman	Schultz
Quigley	Sires	Waters
Rahall	Slaughter	Waxman
Richmond	Smith (WA)	Welch
Royal-Ballard	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Ruiz	Swalwell (CA)	Yarmuth
Ruppersberger	Takano	

NOT VOTING—15

Cantor	Lankford	Nunnelee
Collins (GA)	Matheson	Pelosi
Denham	McGovern	Rangel
Grijalva	McHenry	Ryan (OH)
LaMalfa	Miller, Gary	Scott (VA)

□ 1348

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent Resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the United States Capitol in commemoration of the Shimon Peres Congressional Gold Medal ceremony.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4800, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 616 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. 4800.

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

□ 1351

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the

consideration of the bill (H.R. 4800) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

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

I am pleased to begin consideration of H.R. 4800, making appropriations for FY 2015 for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies. The bill before us is unique in that the programs supported in this bill will impact every American every day of the year.

We support America's farmers and ranchers, who are very vital to our Nation's economy and our health and well-being. We support those at home in need with food and housing and provide rural businesses with low-interest loans and grants to help them sustain local economies. We help others around the world that face starvation and malnutrition. We support research and development in agriculture to improve productivity and stability. We support the oversight of commodity markets, providing confidence for businesses, traders, investors, and the public. We support a safe food supply and safe and effective drugs and devices. We are fortunate this Nation can and does support these vital programs.

The bill before us this afternoon reflects a delicate balance of needs and requirements. We have drafted what I consider a responsible bill for FY 2015 spending levels for the departments and agencies that are under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee. We have had to carefully prioritize the funding in this bill. We have had to make some hard choices about how to limit spending.

I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman ROGERS, for supporting us with a very fair allocation for this bill and for helping us move this bill forward.

I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), the subcommittee ranking member. He has been a valuable partner and colleague as we have moved forward with this legislation. I appreciate his commitment. I appreciate his understanding as we have moved forward on a wide variety of programs in this bill, and I sincerely thank him for his help. While I and the other subcommittee members have a wide array of agriculture in our districts, Mr. FARR represents an area sometimes referred to as the "salad bowl of the world."