

discontinue coverage for its 25 full-time employees because President Obama's health care law made it so unaffordable for them to continue—another broken promise of President Obama's oversold health care law.

It is past time for President Obama and his unelected Federal elites to change course and begin pursuing policies that help people and not his out-of-touch and out-of-control Washington, D.C.

□ 0915

NIGERIA

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to implore this country and the world to direct our attention to the kidnappings of more than 300 young Nigerian women in May and of another eight girls just yesterday.

The leader of the Nigerian Islamist group, Boko Haram, who claims responsibility for the kidnappings, has referred to these young women as "slaves" and has threatened to sell them like chattel.

These deplorable actions can only be stopped by bringing the full weight of international condemnation and law enforcement to bear on those responsible and the ideology that they exploit. We must find the perpetrators and combat their backward ideas in the court of public opinion.

Every child has an absolute right to receive an education in a safe and protected environment. We must redouble our efforts to better the lives of people around the world who may be too poor and too isolated to protect themselves. These girls could have been our daughters, our sisters, our nieces, or our friends.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4719, FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 670 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 670

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory. 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 113-51 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 amend-

ed, 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). 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, House Resolution 670 provides for the consideration of a package of tax deductions for charitable contributions to organizations in the form of excess food inventory and conservation easements, as well as authorizing tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts, lowering the excise tax on private foundations, and extending the date by which taxpayers can make charitable contributions to be considered for a tax deduction. This is a package of policies, each of which has been supported by the overwhelming majorities of both parties.

The rule before us today provides for a closed rule for H.R. 4719, which is the standard rule for tax bills. Of course, the minority will have its customary motion to recommit. This is a straightforward rule.

H.R. 4719, the America Gives More Act of 2014, will benefit the countless numbers of Americans who rely on and utilize charitable organizations in communities throughout the country. A great incentive for many Americans to contribute to those organizations or to contribute in a greater capacity than they otherwise might are the tax deductions that have been made available by the Federal Government. Congress, long ago, decided it was sound public policy to incentivize charitable giving, encouraging citizens to open their pocketbooks and lend a hand to those less fortunate—and Americans are a generous people. Moreover and importantly, today's bill makes these tax provisions permanent so that Americans will not have to worry from year to year whether the tax deductions on which they have come to rely will be available to them that year.

Recently, the House passed a permanent tax credit for corporate research and development. There were 62 Democrats who voted against the measure. Their reasoning, as far as I can tell, was not against the policy but of main-

taining that the measure was not paid for. However, pay-fors are something in Congress that we need when we are creating new programs or are allocating money not previously appropriated, essentially making the American people pay more in taxes. The offsets are unnecessary and not needed when we are actually shielding the American people from having their money taken in the first place in the form of a tax.

Moreover, we heard on Tuesday night while in the Rules Committee markup of today's rule—and I suspect we will hear some about it today—the fact that the two tax-related bills before us today in the rule are not paid for. Congress only needs to pay for a tax credit if one subscribes to the belief that all money in our country belongs first to the government, then to the people. I reject this mindset. Congress does not need to justify or pay for not taking more money from the American people. Congress needs to justify and, thus, pay for policies that take money from the American people.

Mr. Speaker, even if you did subscribe to the notion that all money in this country, first and foremost, belongs to the government and that the government has to pay for allowing Americans to keep their money, the exact provisions contained in the America Gives More Act have traditionally not been offset, and Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee, on the Rules Committee, and Democratic leadership have often voted in favor of these same provisions in un-offset legislation in previous years.

In the absence of a larger, comprehensive tax reform package, permanent extenders like these make sense. They bring back stability and certainty to businesses that are constantly having to wait to see if Congress will, in fact, act. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule. The legislation consists of a package of five bills previously reported by the Ways and Means Committee, which would add an estimated \$16 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years.

Like every Member of this body, I strongly support charitable giving. I tout the fact in the Rules Committee frequently that I am proud of the fact that I work directly with three food pantries—one that I am extremely proud of that works with grandmothers and grandfathers who are taking care of their children's children and who find great needs. I might add that that

particular charity has seen a diminution, a diminishing, of charitable giving. I might add additionally to that, when I look across the board in my community, I find that charitable giving is down, and I think that is commensurate with the kind of economy that we are in.

I applaud Americans who donate what they can to the causes they care about. I would go as far as to say that I support many of the measures that are in this bill. However, in its present form, I cannot support it. The Republican majority has divided what used to be a complete extenders package into smaller parts, some of which will be debated here today and some of which, I predict, will never reach the floor for debate, certainly not a vote. My friends have managed to make a traditionally nonpartisan and noncontroversial issue both partisan and controversial. The provisions we are debating are not paid for and, yet, are made permanent.

I am afraid that this bill is part and parcel in a pattern of what I perceive as reckless, irresponsible behavior on the part of the majority. Republican inconsistency on fiscal responsibility and the deficit is stunning. Whenever we are considering a bill they like, they are happy to ignore the deficit and waive all of the rules that enforce fiscal discipline; but whenever Republicans don't like a proposal, they hide behind budget rules to block it. On the one hand, they have blocked or delayed everything from extending unemployment insurance, to an SGR doc fix, to emergency hurricane relief, demanding that they are fully offset. Yet, when it comes to tax credits, they waive their own budgeting rules, as they are doing here, and run up the deficit as they are doing here. This bill alone will add an additional \$16 billion to the deficit over 10 years. These are the people who continuously decry the fact that we have deficits, and these are the people who continue to say that they are spend-thrifts in the sense that they are taking care of the budget. That is just the beginning.

Today, the Ways and Means Committee has reported 12 unpaid-for tax extenders at a cost of \$614 billion over 10 years. The House has passed five at a cost of \$518 billion over 10 years. I might add this is budget hocus-pocus. It was referred to as "voodoo economics" at another point in time. For example, you take something like we did with the highway trust bill earlier, and you pay for it. You spend the money in 6 months, and then you pay for it over a 10-year period of time, which substantially mitigates against what their intent is rather than to do what is needed, and that is a highway infrastructure bill that will give our Nation reassurance with reference to construction measures and make sure our bridges are not falling down and that our roads are safe to drive on.

Look at the bill that we were dealing with last week. My friends threw away another \$287 billion, or at least they

proposed to. Much of this stuff isn't going anywhere, but they proposed to throw away another \$287 billion on an extenders package just like this one. Let me repeat: \$287 billion. Now we are going to add another \$16 billion to that number. It is as if we are looking for new ways to be dysfunctional.

Instead of creating a stable economy, they are picking and choosing their favorite provisions and are extending them piece by piece. Rather than reforming our Tax Code, they are making it up as they go along. Assuredly, all of us have great respect for our colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have that awesome responsibility of finding the ways and the means to fund this government, and I for one—and I am sure I speak for many—have great respect for DAVE CAMP, the chairman of that committee.

At the beginning of this session, Chairman CAMP proposed tax reform. I might have agreed or disagreed with an awful lot of it, but inside his own Conference, he could not get people who would support meaningful tax reform. Instead, now, in refutation to much of what he had put forward by denying some of these 60-plus extensions—he had said that many of them should not be in the measure—they come and cherry-pick and get the ones that they want and put them here rather than reform this Tax Code.

Is there anybody in this country, in this Congress, in the House, or in the Senate who believes that the Tax Code is fair and simple for everybody—business and/or Americans? No. They are making it up as they go along—a tax extender here, a tax extender there, something I like here, and I don't like that over there.

Let me tell you what we should be doing. We should be passing bills that create jobs in this country.

□ 0930

We should be repairing our infrastructure, and all of us know this.

When I came to Congress in 1992, then-President Bill Clinton identified—and we agreed—that there were 14,000 bridges in America that were in need of repair, but now, what we find is that there are substantially more bridges, and some have fallen down in that period of time, and yet, we are piecemealing the transportation issue, kicking the can down the road.

I commented in the Rules Committee some time back, this kicking the can down the road concept, if it were an Olympic sport, then Congress would not only get gold and bronze and silver, they would also get aluminum because they are real good at kicking the can.

We should be passing bills that tackle comprehensive immigration reform. Is there anybody, including all of the don't come here people that are out there shouting at children—in many instances—and mothers and people who don't speak our language, that have undertaken the most unreasonable, for any of us, journey to try to get to a

better life for themselves—and people standing there, shouting at them, rather than collecting ourselves as a sensible country—of immigrants, I might add—and allow, among other things that we try to do, not just comprehensive immigration reform, indeed, we should do border security.

We have to have clarity, not only for those who may seek to come here, but for all of us. We need clarity as it pertains to immigration.

Will they put it on the floor just for a vote? No. It will not happen, and yet, we will see this piecemeal, and we will see this back and forth some time next week.

The President proposes \$3.7 billion. Someone on the other side said that is too much money. The President says we need more judges and more lawyers, and we need lawyers on both sides I maintain, and yet, we find ourselves in the position of not being able to do anything and not doing it hurriedly enough.

We have this crisis on our border, which doesn't even come close to rivaling the many issues that are developing in the world, from Ukraine to Israel to Yemen, back across the board to Syria, and countless other places, our relationships are in jeopardy, and all of it is placed at the hands, if you let these people tell it, of Barack Obama.

Many of the issues that are developing developed over periods of time, and they largely did so because this Congress does not have the courage to stand up and do the things that are vitally necessary for all of America, Republican and Democrat, conservative and liberal. The needs are great, and we are doing very little of anything at all.

We have 10 more days until we go on recess to campaign, and when we do go on recess to campaign, that will be for the whole month of August. Then we will come back here a few weeks in September, and we will be gone the whole month of October.

What in the world would stop us then from having the time and the necessity to sit down together in a bipartisan way and come up with what is needed for immigration reform in this country?

We have 3.3 million people—after the expiration of the unemployment insurance measures in this country in the month of December, we now number 3.3 million people out of work, in the cold, and that has cost the economy more than \$10 billion.

Of those 3.3 million people, I remind my friends who stand up here with their patriotic notions that they espouse, and I believe they believe in our troops. We are fond of saying that around here.

I believe they believe that we should be secure, as do I, with reference to our military, but 300,000 of those people that are unemployed are veterans, not to mention all of the problems at the veterans hospitals that we need to attend to, rather than finger-pointing

and trying to find measures to beat each other down, rather than try to lift America up.

House Republicans have found time to sue President Obama for doing his job, but we haven't found time to pass these important bills.

I said humorously, before I began to hear it often, that if President Obama is going to be sued by the Speaker for doing something, then I want to participate in the lawsuit against the Speaker for doing nothing.

We can try to appease the most extreme end of the Republican Party, but we can't pass the laws that address the challenges facing Americans all across this Nation, and for this dereliction of duty, maybe somebody should consider when we are talking about a lawsuit—what I said humorously—really considering suing this institution and its Speaker for not doing those things that are a few that I have identified.

In yesterday's hearing in the Rules Committee, I ended my remarks—and we had outstanding witnesses, experts in this area, ranging from Elizabeth Foley, from Florida International University; to Jonathan Turley, from George Washington University; Simon Lazarus, from the Constitutional group; and Walter Dellinger—all of them—at least three of them being extremely experienced in the subject matter and each of them addressing the subject of standing, as I did, in asking them questions at different times.

Most of us know that this lawsuit is not likely to go anywhere, and at some point, all of the witnesses agreed that there are challenges ahead with reference to this lawsuit, and all of them knew and know that there is absolutely no precedent for this action, none.

There is a case, *McClure v. Carter*, that has some similarities, but even that one did not cross the threshold that is needed. I did end my comments by saying that I was being partisan, and I will end this portion of my comments by saying I am being partisan.

These are the people that for the 52 years, nearly, that I am a lawyer, that have argued against frivolous lawsuits. If there was ever a frivolous lawsuit, then the one that is proposed to be filed by the Speaker of this House gives frivolous new meaning. It is indeed just that.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on this matter, the administration, as it is wont to do, filed administration policy. We refer to them in our committees and around the House as a SAP.

What the administration said is the following:

The administration supports measures that enhance nonprofits, philanthropic organizations, and faith-based and other community organizations in their many roles, including as a safety net for those most in

need, an economic engine for job creation, a tool for environmental conservation that encourages land protections for current and future generations, and an incubator of innovation to foster solutions to some of the Nation's toughest challenges. The President's budget includes a number of proposals that would enhance and simplify charitable giving incentives for many individuals.

I am going to come back to this, but before we go forward, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would give Members a second opportunity this week to consider reversing the damage done by the recent Hobby Lobby Supreme Court decision.

No employer should have the right to limit the health choices of its employees, male or female. It is pure discrimination when 99 percent of women in this country have used some form of birth control during their lifetime, but to now have to literally go through unreasonable measures to simply secure the fundamental health care they need.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Justice Sonia Sotomayor, Justice Elena Kagan, our three women Justices stood unanimously against the Court's decision in the Hobby Lobby case.

They sit on the highest court in the Nation, and by no coincidence, the three women's dissent is representative of what I heard from the women I talked to in my district.

I asked women at home to send me in three words how they feel about the Court's decision. This is what they shared with me: Jennifer from Melrose, sad, disappointing, disturbing; Anna from Framingham, backwards, scary, hurtful; Jeanine from Waltham, disgusted, wrong, outraged; Susan from Cambridge, need more Ginsburgs.

The Court's decision to strike down women's access to basic health care is only the latest in systemic efforts to unwind the progress women have made.

Why aren't we demanding equal pay for women from our employers, rather than giving a woman's boss the right to make the most personal health care decisions for her and her family?

Congress has an obligation to correct this course. The amendment and the Protect Women's Health From Corporate Interference Act makes certain that a woman's boss does not interfere in her basic health care. It simply affirms that when the law provides for insurance companies to cover basic health care for all, all people are entitled to that health care, period.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERA), a good friend who serves on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to this body about

the outrageous Supreme Court decision, the Hobby Lobby case.

I look at this, not as a Member of Congress, but as a doctor. Now, in my training, we took an oath. That oath was to put our patients first, to do good.

My core job as a doctor is to sit with my patients, answer her questions, talk about the risks and benefits and the various options that are available, but then to empower my patients to make the decisions that best fit their lives.

To women, there is no greater decision than when to start a family, when to become a mother, and that is why protecting those reproductive rights and reproductive options are so important. That is core to our oath as physicians, and that is why the Supreme Court's decision on Hobby Lobby was so outrageous.

We have got to fight against this encroachment of the government or the Justices in the Supreme Court coming into my exam room and getting between me and my patients. That is outrageous. It is an affront to individual liberties. It is an affront to what we do as doctors.

It is not just me speaking. This is doctors all across America. The American Congress of OB/GYNs calls this ruling outrageous.

□ 0945

We need to have all options available. But what am I to do now if a Hobby Lobby employee comes to me as a patient, sits down and says: You know, I am not ready to start a family at this juncture. I would like to know what my contraceptive options are; I would like to know what some of the safest methods are.

Well, IUDs often are 20 times more effective and are extremely safe, but the Supreme Court has now made that option unavailable for me. They didn't go to medical school. I did. As a doctor, it is my oath to provide all those options.

Now, others might say, well, that patient can still choose to get it. The reason people have health insurance is because they want to have health care available when it is necessary. What if that patient can't afford that health care option? For many patients, hourly workers, often contraception can cost up to \$600 a year. They are not able to afford it. That is why this is such an outrageous decision. We have got to keep the government and the Supreme Court out of our exam room.

And it is even more personal than that. I am a husband and I am a father. I want my daughter to grow up in a country where she is in control of her health care decisions, where she is in control of her body.

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

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

Mr. BERA of California. So as a doctor, as a father of a daughter, I am

proud to support the not my boss' business act because it puts patients back in charge of their health care decisions. We, as a country, prize individual liberties and individual freedoms above all. So this gives those decisions back to the patients.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), my classmate and good friend.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question in order to bring the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act to the floor.

In 1993, I was a leader in passing the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, or RFRA. If you had told me then that RFRA would one day be used to allow employers to dictate to employees what preventive health care they can or cannot use, if you had told me then that I would stand on the House floor in 2014 fighting to ensure that women have the ability to make their own most basic health care decisions regardless of their boss' religious beliefs, I would never have believed it.

We wrote that bill to be a shield to protect an individual's personal exercise of religious beliefs, not a sword to enable employers to impose their religious beliefs on their employees.

No matter how sincerely held a religious belief might be, for-profit employers, like Hobby Lobby or Conestoga Wood, must not be allowed to impose their beliefs or that belief on their employees as a means of denying their employees access to critical preventive health care services.

I was proud to work with the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) to introduce this simple legislation to ensure that, notwithstanding the Supreme Court's mangling of RFRA, employers cannot deny their employees access to federally mandated health services.

Every woman must have the right to follow her own beliefs and guidance when making health care choices. This bill simply guarantees that the boss' beliefs cannot supersede that right.

I was disappointed to see that none of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted earlier this week to bring this bill to the floor. I urge them to stand with us today or else, when they go home this weekend, to tell the men and women of their districts that their health care decisions are now going to be made for them by their bosses, regardless of their own choices, regardless of their own religious beliefs or the doctor's recommendations; and tell them that you believe that their boss' religious beliefs must be imposed on them, notwithstanding their own religious beliefs, which don't count; and tell them you did nothing to stop this.

This country will not stand for that. We have fought for too long to preserve the right of all Americans to make their own health care choices and, I must add, to make their own religious decisions to refuse to act now.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, allow this bill to come to the floor, and send a strong message that health care choices are not your boss' business and that your religious beliefs trump your boss' religious beliefs.

Your boss has a right to his beliefs. You have a right to your beliefs. Government must not allow him to impose his beliefs on you.

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.

I am a proud cosponsor of the measure that was just spoken to, and I am very pleased that my colleague came here to speak on it.

Rather than read the entirety of the Statement of Administration Policy at this time, I will submit that statement for the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 4719—AMERICA GIVES MORE ACT OF 2014

(Rep. Reed, R-New York, and 9 cosponsors, July 17, 2014)

The Administration supports measures that enhance non-profits, philanthropic organizations, and faith-based and other community organizations in their many roles, including as a safety net for those most in need, an economic engine for job creation, a tool for environmental conservation that encourages land protections for current and future generations, and an incubator of innovation to foster solutions to some of the Nation's toughest challenges. The President's Budget includes a number of proposals that would enhance and simplify charitable giving incentives for many individuals.

However, the Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 4719, which would permanently extend three current provisions that offer enhanced tax breaks for certain donations and add another two similar provisions without offsetting the cost. If this same, unprecedented approach of making certain traditional tax extenders permanent without offsets were followed for the other traditional tax extenders, it would add \$500 billion or more to deficits over the next ten years, wiping out most of the deficit reduction achieved through the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2013. Just two months ago, House Republicans themselves passed a budget resolution that required offsetting any tax extenders that were made permanent with other revenue measures.

As with other similar proposals, Republicans are imposing a double standard by adding to the deficit to continue and create tax breaks that primarily benefit higher-income individuals, while insisting on offsetting the proposed extension of emergency unemployment benefits and the discretionary funding increases for defense and non-defense priorities such as research and development in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. House Republicans also are making clear their priorities by rushing to make these tax cuts permanent without offsets even as the House Republican budget resolution calls for raising taxes on 26 million working families and students by letting important improvements to the Earned Income

Tax Credit, Child Tax Credit, and education tax credits expire.

The Administration wants to work with Congress to make progress on measures that strengthen America's social sector. However, H.R. 4719 represents the wrong approach.

If the President were presented with H.R. 4719, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Now, there is something else we need to discuss about this rule. Once again, we are debating a closed rule.

When I came to Congress, I was listening on the radio. I didn't know very much about rules. And a part of why Democrats in the majority lost, in my opinion, was the harangue that was going on on the radio about closed rules.

Well, I came here, and I wound up on the Rules Committee, and now I know a little bit about closed rules. I also know that we have set an all-time record in the history of the United States Congress, for now, in this particular rule that is before the House of Representatives, the 65th time this session, we are going to have a closed rule. What that means, America, is that your Representative on either side will not have an opportunity to offer an amendment to this measure with reference to tax extenders. This is the most closed rules that this Congress has considered ever, and I expect we are not finished yet and that the number of closed rules will continue to grow.

We started the 113th session with a pledge of transparency and openness from the Speaker of the House, but that has fallen by the wayside, and it has done so in historic proportion. Enough already. The majority should do the responsible thing and bring up bills that actually matter, bills that will address the many challenges facing this country, challenges, as I have pointed out before, about our crumbling infrastructure and, most importantly, creating jobs, even as it pertains to immigration reform.

Everyone who looks at that measure that says, if we had clear immigration policy, whether it was dealing with H-1B visas, whether it was dealing with farmworkers, whatever the measure, that it would increase our revenue in this country and enhance our overall economic circumstances.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" to defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on this 65th closed rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me try to take some of these points in order that we have heard over the last 45 minutes.

The gentleman talks about tax reform. I hope that means that he is prepared to join me on H.R. 1040, a measure that would provide a flat tax to the citizens of the United States. There is no more egregious function that most of us have to deal with every year than dealing with the IRS.

Unfortunately, because of the actions of the administration, the IRS now stands in ill favor with a majority of Americans. The President, himself, promised in 2013 that he would get to the bottom of the problems in the IRS and that he would get them corrected. I believe that he should. This is the agency with which we all have to deal every year. No one likes the taxman, but it is imperative that the American people have the confidence in the agency that is tasked with collecting their taxes.

On the issue of the VA, it is in conference. We will hear from them. Is the VA going to require a higher appropriation than we gave a few weeks ago? Perhaps. But I would also like to see the new administrator, the new Secretary of the VA be able to discharge people from his employment if they have, in fact, acted in bad faith.

I must have missed the firings that have occurred at the VA amongst the Senior Executive Service. I am not even talking about political appointees. I am talking about people who are lifers within the VA who seem perfectly content to continue business as usual. You are not going to fix that problem if you just pump more taxpayer money into the system. I wouldn't disagree that more money may be necessary at the VA, but we do have to fix the problem that is endemic in the agency if we don't expect the same result to be clearly evident in 2 or 3 years' time.

Let me just talk briefly about the issue that came up about the Supreme Court decision. Unlike Mr. NADLER, I was not here in 1993 and 1994. I was not part of the Congress that passed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, but many of the same people who wrote and voted for and defended the Affordable Care Act, the cast of characters is remarkably similar. In fact, the gentleman from New York, Senator SCHUMER, when he was a Member of the House, was, I believe, the lead sponsor of that, and he is now in the Senate. The majority leader in the Senate was a "yes" vote on the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

So this is a law that was written by Democratic sponsors in a Democratic-controlled House, signed by a Democratic President. How could they not know? How could they not know of its existence when they were writing the Affordable Care Act?

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. Let me continue with this thought, and if there is time, I will

consider yielding to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Now, while they were crafting the Affordable Care Act, they were fully cognizant of the same restrictions they had written into law in the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. The Supreme Court simply looked at the facts and said that a Federal agency—in this case, the Department of Health and Human Services—in a rulemaking activity cannot negate a law that was passed by the people's representatives in the Congress. I think that is as it should be.

If there was anything, there were drafting errors in the Affordable Care Act. I have spoken about that time and again. But why weren't the same people who were tasked with writing the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, why weren't they watchful while they were writing their own health care law?

Now, let's talk for just a minute about the Hobby Lobby decision. The first thing—and it is important to stress this—no FDA-approved contraceptive that was available to women before the decision is unavailable after the decision. The Court simply said that the government cannot force a citizen to violate his or her religious beliefs paying for medicine that a citizen believes takes a life. No employer before or after Hobby Lobby can prevent a woman from purchasing any contraceptive that is currently available.

We also heard criticism from the minority that the House was doing other things than doing its work. I would just point out that the House is doing its work. Forty jobs bills have passed this House and are sitting, waiting for activity over in the Senate. And we saw how quickly the SKILLS Act, after the Senate renamed it and it came back to the House, how quickly it got to the President's desk. So the fact that the bills are over there waiting is a problem of the other body. It is not a problem of the House. The House has been doing its work.

Yesterday we passed the Financial Services Appropriations bill. Mr. Speaker, I would ask rhetorically: When was the last time that the House passed the Financial Services Appropriations bill? It was 2007, the first year that the Democrats had taken over the majority. We haven't seen an appropriations bill for Financial Services in—what?—5 years' time. This was a landmark achievement yesterday.

Let's look for just a moment at the number of amendments that have been heard under open rules. On appropriations bills this year, we are through seven appropriations bills as we sit here in the middle of July. That is a significant achievement in and of itself. There have been 395 amendments heard to appropriations bills. That hardly sounds like a closed process. There have been 210 Republican amendments, 185 Democratic amendments, and that was exclusive of yesterday's passed appropriations bill.

So I don't think you can rationally make the argument that the House is not doing its work and that, as we go through the appropriations process, it is not open.

□ 1000

I have some other things that I want to say about the deficit, but I will be happy to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding for just a moment because this is a colleague from Texas, and there are many issues that we have agreed on with respect to Texas.

I might say to you that I am a strong proponent of religious liberty. You had mentioned Hobby Lobby in terms of some of the issues you were discussing. I think I have stood fast on that question. I only raise the point, and you made the point that anything that was approved pre-Hobby Lobby by the FDA, but in actuality we know that, just from the religious liberty point of view, this is a slippery slope because it pits the large entity against the individual rights, and we know under our Constitution that the very premise of religious freedom is the idea that there is no pronounced, structured religious plan in place that denies me my freedom. And that is what you have done to women as it relates—when I say "you," excuse me—that is what the decision has done. It has made the boss in charge of an individual.

I would just make the argument we can stand for religious liberty, but we must stand for it not only for corporations but for individuals such as women who use contraception for health care, Doctor. And you know that that happens. You are certainly very much an experienced medical professional. I would just make the argument that I can't imagine in the course of your medical history that you have not seen women who need contraception for health care.

The other point that I would just finish on is that, as I indicated on the question of a slippery slope, how else can a corporation suggest that I am, because of my needs, infringing upon their religious liberty? I am obviously going to be disadvantaged because, in essence, I am a minority of one. I am an employee. I am scared for my job. But I need to be able to express my religious freedom, and it may infringe upon someone else's. Let us be careful about this. And I frankly hope—

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I need to reclaim my time. Mr. Speaker, slippery slopes work both ways, and those people who are worried about laws that would require the ending of life are worried about that slippery slope as well.

I would just reiterate the point: no contraceptive that was previously available is now unavailable because of the Hobby Lobby decision. If there are problems in the way the law was written, I would remind people it was a Democratic Congress and a Democratic

President who signed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, and it was a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President that signed the Affordable Care Act. They perhaps should have taken better care in writing their law.

We had the hearing yesterday in the Rules Committee about the President taking care that the laws are faithfully executed. Perhaps we ought to have a faithful writing of the laws, as well.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of the America Gives More Act of 2014, making permanent the tax deductions for charitable contributions to food banks and conservation easements, and allowing for tax-free IRA deductions. It is a sound public policy, and I am certainly grateful to my colleague from New York (Mr. REED) for writing this legislation, which will have a positive impact on the countless charities in this country which provide such critical services to our neighbors in need.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 670 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 2. 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. 5051) to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions. 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, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5051.

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 yeas 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 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 670, if ordered, and adopting the motion to instruct on H.R. 3230.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 186, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

YEAS—226

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

NAYS—186

Barber	Bera (CA)	Brady (PA)
Barrow (GA)	Bishop (GA)	Braley (IA)
Bass	Bishop (NY)	Brown (FL)
Beatty	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Becerra	Bonamici	Bustos

Butterfield Himes Pascarell
Capps Hinojosa Pastor (AZ)
Capuano Holt Payne
Cárdenas Honda Pelosi
Carson (IN) Horsford Perlmutter
Cartwright Hoyer Peters (CA)
Castor (FL) Huffman Peters (MI)
Castro (TX) Israel Pingree (ME)
Chu Jackson Lee Poca
Cicilline Jeffries Polis
Clark (MA) Johnson (GA) Price (NC)
Clay Johnson, E. B. Quigley
Cleaver Kaptur Rangel
Clyburn Keating Richmond
Cohen Kelly (IL) Roybal-Allard
Connolly Kennedy Ruiz
Cooper Kildee Ruppertsberger
Costa Kilmer Rush
Courtney Kind Ryan (OH)
Crowley Kirkpatrick Sanchez, Loretta
Cuellar Kuster Schakowsky
Cummings Langevin Schiff
Davis (CA) Larsen (WA) Schneider
Davis, Danny Larson (CT) Schrader
DeFazio Lee (CA) Schwartz
DeGette Levin Scott (VA)
Delaney Lewis Scott, David
DeLauro Loebach Serrano
DelBene Lofgren Sewell (AL)
Deutch Lowenthal Shea-Porter
Dingell Lowey Sherman
Doggett Lynch Sinema
Doyle Maffei Slaughter
Duckworth Maloney, Carolyn Smith (WA)
Edwards Eshoo McCarthy (NY) Speier
Ellison Engle Matheson Swallow (CA)
Engel Matsui Takano
Enyart Eshoo McCarthy (NY) Thompson (CA)
Eshoo Eshoo McCarthy (NY) Thompson (MS)
Esty McCollum Tierney
Farr McDermott Titus
Fattah McGovern Tonko
Foster McNerney Tsongas
Frankel (FL) Meeks Van Hollen
Fudge Meng Vargus
Gabbard Michaud Veasey
Gallo Miller, George Vela
Garamendi Moore Velázquez
Garcia Moran Visclosky
Grayson Murphy (FL) Walz
Green, Al Nadler Wasserman
Green, Gene Napolitano Young (AK)
Grijalva Neal Schultz
Gutiérrez Negrete McLeod Waters
Hahn Nolan Waxman
Hastings (FL) O'Rourke Welch
Heck (WA) Owens Wilson (FL)
Higgins Pallone Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Byrne Labrador Sánchez, Linda
Campbell Lujan Grisham T.
Carney (NM) Sarbanes
Clarke (NY) Luján, Ben Ray Simpson
Conyers (NM) Sires
DesJarlais Miller, Gary Stivers
Hanabusa Nunnelee Whitfield
Kingston

□ 1031

Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. PELOSI changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. KINZINGER, FORBES, PETERSON, ADERHOLT, and Mrs. HARTZLER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

Stated against:

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 428 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

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 230, noes 183, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

AYES—230

Aderholt Graves (MO) Pearce
Amash Griffin (AR) Perry
Amodei Griffith (VA) Petri
Bachmann Grimm Pittenger
Bachus Pitts
Barber Hall Poe (TX)
Bartletta Hanna Pompeo
Barr Harper Posey
Barton Harris Price (GA)
Benishek Hartzler Rahall
Bentivolio Hastings (WA) Reed
Bilirakis Heck (NV) Reichert
Bishop (UT) Hensarling Renacci
Black Herrera Beutler Ribble
Blackburn Holding Rice (SC)
Boustany Hudson Rigell
Brady (TX) Huelskamp Roby
Bridenstine Huizenga (MI) Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL) Hultgren Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN) Hunter Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA) Hurt Rogers (MI)
Buchanan Issa Rohrabacher
Bucshon Jenkins Rokita
Burgess Johnson (OH) Rooney
Calvert Johnson, Sam Ros-Lehtinen
Camp Jolly Roskam
Cantor Jones Ross
Capito Jordan Rothfus
Carter Joyce Gutierrez
Cassidy Kelly (PA) Hahn
Chabot King (IA) Rush
Chaffetz King (NY) Ryan (WI)
Clawson (FL) Kinzinger (IL) Salmon
Coble Kline Sanford
Coffman Labrador Scalise
Cole LaMalfa Schock
Collins (GA) Lamborn Schweikert
Collins (NY) Lance Scott, Austin
Conaway Lankford Sensenbrenner
Cook Latham Sessions
Cotton Latta Shimkus
Cramer LoBiondo Shuster
Crawford Long Sinema
Crenshaw Lucas Smith (MO)
Culberson Luetkemeyer Smith (NE)
Daines Lummis Smith (NJ)
Davis, Rodney Marchant Smith (TX)
Denham Marino Southerland
Dent Massie Stewart
DeSantis McAllister Stockman
Diaz-Balart McCarthy (CA) Stutzman
Duffy McCaul Terry
Duncan (SC) McClintock Thompson (PA)
Ellmers McHenry Thornberry
Farenthold McIntyre Tiberi
Fincher McKeon Tipton
Fitzpatrick McKinley Turner
Fleischmann McMorris Upton
Fleming Rodgers Valadao
Flores Meadows Wagner
Forbes Meehan Walberg
Fortenberry Messer Walden
Fox Mica Walorski
Franks (AZ) Miller (FL) Weber (TX)
Frelinghuysen Miller (MI) Webster (FL)
Gardner Mullin Wenstrup
Garrett Mulvaney Westmoreland
Gerlach Murphy (FL) Williams
Gibbs Murphy (PA) Wilson (SC)
Gibson Neugebauer Wittman
Gingrey (GA) Noem Wolf
Gohmert Nugent Womack
Goodlatte Nunes Woodall
Gosar Olson Yoder
Gowdy Owens Yoho
Granger Palazzo Young (AK)
Graves (GA) Paulsen Young (IN)

NOES—183

Barrow (GA) Braley (IA) Castor (FL)
Bass Brown (FL) Castro (TX)
Beatty Brownley (CA) Chu
Becerra Bustos Cicilline
Bera (CA) Butterfield Clark (MA)
Bishop (GA) Capps Clarke (NY)
Bishop (NY) Capuano Clay
Blumenauer Cárdenas Cleaver
Bonamici Carson (IN) Clyburn
Brady (PA) Cartwright Cohen

Connolly Jeffries Peters (CA)
Cooper Johnson (GA) Peters (MI)
Costa Johnson, E. B. Peterson
Courtney Kaptur Pingree (ME)
Crowley Keating Pocan
Cuellar Kelly (IL) Polis
Cummings Kennedy Price (NC)
Davis (CA) Kildee Quigley
Davis, Danny Kilmer Rangel
DeFazio Kind Richmond
DeGette Kirkpatrick Roybal-Allard
Delaney Kuster Ruiz
DeLauro Langevin Ruppertsberger
DelBene Larsen (WA) Ryan (OH)
Deutch Lee (CA) Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell Levin Sarbanes
Doggett Lewis Schakowsky
Doyle Lipinski Schiff
Duckworth Loebach Schneider
Edwards Lofgren Schrader
Edwards Lowenthal Schwart
Ellison Engel Lowey
Engel Lynch Scott (VA)
Enyart Eshoo Maffei Serrano
Eshoo Eshoo McCarthy (NY) Sewell (AL)
Esty Eshoo Shea-Porter
Farr Carolyn Sherman
Fattah Maloney, Sean Slaughter
Foster Matheson Smith (WA)
Frankel (FL) Matsui Speier
Fudge McCarthy (NY) Swallow (CA)
Gabbard McCollum Takano
Gallo McDermott Thompson (CA)
Garamendi McGovern Thompson (MS)
Garcia McNerney Tierney
Grayson Meeks Titus
Green, Al Meng Tonko
Green, Gene Michaud Tsongas
Grijalva Miller, George Van Hollen
Gutiérrez Moore Vargus
Hahn Moran Veasey
Hastings (FL) Nadler Vela
Heck (WA) Napolitano Velázquez
Higgins Neal Visclosky
Himes Negrete McLeod Walz
Hinojosa Nolan Wasserman
Holt O'Rourke Schultz
Honda Pallone Waters
Horsford Pascrell Waxman
Hoyer Pastor (AZ) Welch
Huffman Payne Wilson (FL)
Israel Pelosi Yarmuth
Jackson Lee Perlmutter

NOT VOTING—19

Byrne Larson (CT) Sánchez, Linda
Campbell Lujan Grisham T.
Carney (NM) Scott, David
Conyers Luján, Ben Ray Simpson
DesJarlais (NM) Sires
Duncan (TN) Miller, Gary Stivers
Hanabusa Nunnelee Whitfield
Kingston

□ 1039

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

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.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period, offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GALLEGO) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.