

the previous question on the vote, the amendment I have offered into the RECORD will amend the rule to prohibit the House from starting our vacation tomorrow, unless we do our job and pass a budget.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule, vote “no” on the underlying bill, and, instead, work to pass a budget and find solutions to the big problems that we were sent here to face, like improving our national security, like securing our border and replacing our broken immigration system into one that reflects our values as a Nation of laws and a Nation of immigrants, one that makes prescription drugs more affordable and improves upon the Affordable Care Act, improves our schools, invests in infrastructure, and so many of the other issues that I hear about from my constituents at our town halls, on the phone, and in letters.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule and the underlying bill.

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

I always try to be positive. There is one thing I do agree on with my friend from Colorado just now, and that is that we can do better.

We can do better about explaining what is actually going on here and talking about it in derisive terms, especially about a bill in which there was—I serve on the Judiciary Committee—there was one amendment brought to committee. This bill seems to be fairly tight because there seems to be general agreement here.

There was one committee amendment brought to the committee, and it was withdrawn. Then there was an amendment process put out.

It is interesting that, from this Anti-trust Modernization Commission, there were 78 other ideas. And then, when my friend just spoke about the fact that, if we had an open rule on the floor, they might bring up 78.

I would just ask him where was he yesterday. We have talked about showing up for work. Maybe he didn’t punch in last night. He could have brought 78 amendments last night to the Rules Committee. He chose not to.

So we can do better. We can honestly discuss the procedures and the fact that right now, while he and I are on the floor discussing this rule and preparing for this rule, the rest of the 433 Members of the House of Representatives—432 now—I think we still have one open seat—are in committees right now.

They are meeting constituents. They are marking up bills. They are going through regular order, which is the Republican Congress’ way of doing the people’s business.

Also, as we have already discussed, whether the Senate signs something or not—then he brought up the fact that the President would never sign this piece of legislation.

Well, let’s just remind the people what the administration doesn’t also sign. They won’t also sign the Keystone Pipeline, which takes away jobs from Americans.

He won’t also sign a refugee bill that actually would just put an extra measure of protection for protecting the American homeland from possibly infiltration through the refugee program. They refuse to sign that.

Yet, we will have the results of the world looking at that. He won’t sign that, Mr. Speaker. The administration doesn’t seem to want to hold Iran accountable for the testing that it is doing with its missiles.

So we can discuss what this administration doesn’t want to sign. I think using that as an excuse not to move a bill is an abdication of responsibility.

So as we look forward, again, I have never thought anything that I do up here, especially when it comes to my office or in committee work, was not working.

I think, frankly, it is sort of disrespectful to the folks who come to our offices and meet with us or the committee work that we do to say that the only “work” is here before the cameras making speeches. If that is what work is about up here, maybe we have just found the problem with this Congress.

So, Mr. Speaker, parties to a merger should expect and receive the same treatment and processes, regardless of the reviewing antitrust enforcement agencies.

These parties should not be subject to attempts to extract concessions or threat of administrative litigation by the FDC simply because that is the agency reviewing the merger.

The underlying bill preserves key standards of review while removing disparities. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and H.R. 2745.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 653 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 6. It shall not be in order to consider a motion that the House adjourn on the legislative day of March 23, 2016, unless the House has adopted a concurrent resolution establishing the budget for the United States government for fiscal year 2017.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s

ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

PROMOTING WOMEN IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP ACT

Ms. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4742) to authorize the National Science Foundation to support entrepreneurial programs for women.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4742

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Promoting Women in Entrepreneurship Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) women make up almost 50 percent of the workforce, but less than 25 percent of the workforce in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) professions;

(2) women are less likely to focus on the STEM disciplines in undergraduate and graduate study;

(3) only 26 percent of women who do attain degrees in STEM fields work in STEM jobs;

(4) there is an increasing demand for individuals with STEM degrees to extend their focus beyond the laboratory so they can be leaders in discovery commercialization;

(5) studies have shown that technology and commercialization ventures are successful when women are in top management positions; and

(6) the National Science Foundation’s mission includes supporting women in STEM disciplines.

SEC. 3. SUPPORTING WOMEN’S ENTREPRENEURIAL PROGRAMS.

Section 33 of the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885a) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (10);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(12) encourage its entrepreneurial programs to recruit and support women to extend their focus beyond the laboratory and into the commercial world.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4742, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

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

I rise today to offer a bipartisan bill Ms. ESTY and I introduced, H.R. 4742, the Promoting Women in Entrepreneurship Act.

We were also joined by the chairman and ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Congressman LAMAR SMITH and Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, who are original cosponsors of this measure.

I am pleased that the consideration of this bill occurs during Women’s History Month. Our bill amends the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act to authorize the National Science Foundation to use its entrepreneurial programs to recruit women and to extend their focus beyond the laboratory and into the commercial world.

The bill also includes a number of findings regarding women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, also known as the STEM fields.

One finding in this bill notes that only 26 percent of women who attain degrees in STEM fields ultimately work in STEM jobs. We want to improve these statistics, and we believe this bill is a step in the right direction.

Again, I am happy to collaborate with my colleague, Congresswoman ESTY, on this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 4742, the Promoting Women in Entrepreneurship Act. This bill would expand the mission of the National Science Foundation to support and strengthen women entrepreneurs. I drafted this legislation because we can and we must do more for women in science, technology, engineering, and math, the so-called STEM fields, to extend their efforts beyond the laboratory and into the commercial world.

Women have the potential to be remarkable entrepreneurs, job creators, and innovators. Unfortunately, women remain an underutilized force for starting small businesses that sustain the middle class.

Women make up roughly half of the labor force. But according to the Department of Commerce, women only own 30 percent of private businesses in the United States.

Why is it that women aren’t starting their own businesses more often? The sad truth is that women still face significant barriers to entrepreneurship, including limited access to capital, a lack of women mentors in STEM fields, often difficult or unmanageable expectations for work-life balance, and a subconscious bias against women in STEM.

Now, an increasing number of women are earning STEM degrees. However,

women are still largely underrepresented in all STEM fields, including significantly the ones that have the highest entrepreneurship rates.

For example, in 2012, women earned only one in five Ph.D.’s granted by U.S. institutions in computer science. We must do better at increasing representation of women in all STEM fields.

Now, I may be biased, but my own State of Connecticut is a great example of how far women can go with a STEM background.

We have women engineers who are designing life-support packs for our astronauts at the International Space Station. We have women scientists conducting cutting-edge research in STEM cell work at Yukon and at Yale.

We have women inventors and entrepreneurs making life-changing discoveries and literally altering the course of history. We have wonderful local companies with women entrepreneurs, such as Bedoukian Research and Jonal Labs, who are not only creating quality products, but are fostering the next generation of women leaders in STEM. I think we might have had one in the gallery who was excited about our introduction of this bill.

It is not enough to promote women in STEM careers. We must also work to increase the number of women who become entrepreneurs. The benefits of encouraging and supporting women entrepreneurs could be tremendous.

According to the Department of Commerce, between 1997 and 2007, privately held women-owned businesses added 500,000 jobs. During that same period, other privately held firms lost over 2 million jobs.

Women have unique experiences and perspectives to bring to the table. We simply cannot afford in this increasingly global economy to overlook the valuable and talented resource of over half our citizens.

We must do more to promote women entrepreneurs and to better support women who are commercializing great ideas, starting small businesses, and creating jobs.

I know, when I hear from the women and the men who are part of my STEM advisory committee in Connecticut about the challenges and, yet, the great opportunities that women in the STEM fields have to create the next new exciting business, develop the next new cure to help Americans.

H.R. 4742 would help do that by supporting programs focused on helping more women, commercialize great ideas, start businesses, stimulate 21st century careers, and strengthen the middle class.

I want to thank my colleagues on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ranking Member JOHNSON, and Chairman SMITH, for working with us together on this bill.

I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to make reference to occupants of the gallery.