Mr. Speaker, now 1 year later Mindy, this week, is helping lead a program entitled SevenDays: Make a Ripple, Change the World. It is a week full of events to encourage every citizen to be a force for goodness and kindness and unity in their community and in the world; and in doing so, it is a reminder that each of us can make a ripple and help change the world.

REMEMBERING IRVING SMOLENS

(Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Irving Smolens, a soldier, a father, a husband, an American hero. And I am very proud to call him my friend.

Irving Smolens was a World War II veteran who survived D-Day, where he served with the U.S. Army 4th Infantry Division. He came home just short of his 22nd birthday in 1945 to a country he loved deeply, and he helped build a community in Melrose, Massachusetts.

Irving took his experiences from the darkest moments of our past and advocated for a better, more peaceful world. Up until he left us on Saturday at the age of 90, you could still catch up with Irving at the Temple Beth Shalom in Melrose, and he was an avid jazz enthusiast and sports fan. He watched every one of the 19 innings of last week’s Red Sox-Yankees game.

He was quick to pen a letter to the Boston Globe and recently took to blogging in his late eighties and to social media. Not only did he comment on politics, but he helped reconnect veterans’ families with their fathers’ histories.

This past fall, 70 years after Irving stepped onto the beaches of Normandy to fight the Nazis, he returned. This time he would be met by both the American President and the French President in recognition of his valor and patriotism. He was seen by a journalist, who said after the President had delivered a long speech, he was stopped by an old soldier who gave him a piece of his mind. When the journalist caught up with Irving and asked what he had to say to President Obama, Irving replied: ‘I thanked him for keeping us out of war.’

Our thoughts and prayers are with Irving and his family, especially his wife, Edith, and daughter, Karen. We are so proud to have known him and for his service.

HONORING RACHAEL BEVILL

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

Mr. QUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an incredible young Granite Stater who had the distinct honor of being chosen to represent New Hampshire in the Cherry Blossom Princess Program.

Rachael Bevill, a senior at George Washington University in Washington, D.C., and a resident of Merrimack, New Hampshire, embodies all the qualities of a great leader.

As a student at Merrimack High School, Rachael served as class secretary and a member of her student council. Rachael also excels and competes at a state and nationwide level for public speaking and writing, placing third in both the VFW’s Americanism essay contest and the Voice of Democracy speech competition.

Currently, Rachael is studying biomedical engineering inspired by two of her siblings who have autism. Rachael aims to design nanotechnology and regenerative medicine to make the lives of future generations with similar challenges much easier.

It is ambitious, bright, and altruistic young people like Rachael that provide such great hope for our Nation’s future. I congratulate her.

ONE-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF ABDUCTION OF CHIBOK SCHOOL-GIRLS BY BOKO HARAM

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today marks 1 year since the abduction of the Chibok schoolgirls in Nigeria—1 year, 365 days, nonstop—by Boko Haram.

UNICEF is reporting that 80,000 children have been forced to flee Boko Haram’s campaign of violence in Nigeria. Their Missing Childhoods reports that most of the girls remain in captivity, scores more of their peers have since gone missing, and the number of children who are displaced is staggering. The one bright spot is many of the girls have escaped, and 10 of them are in Virginia. When I went to Nigeria and met with those girls, I said: ‘What can we do to help you?’ They said: ‘We want to go to school.’ As a school principal, that made me proud because education is the key to all of the Nation’s ills; and, in spite of their trials and tribulations, they still wanted to go to school.

Boko Haram means Western education is sin, so we must support our girls and lift them up and let them know that we love them.

Boko Haram has reached out to ISIS, and ISIS has responded. A marriage between Boko Haram and ISIS is a marriage made in hell.

ADVISORY COUNCILS

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

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, it is important we regularly meet with constituents in order to have a variety of viewpoints and experience to draw upon as we work towards the betterment of our country.

This past district work period, we held advisory council meetings with interested citizens from across North Carolina’s Seventh Congressional District. These advisory councils represent different sectors within our community throughout the district, including ag, small business, veterans and defense, law enforcement, homeland security, health care, and education.

There was one theme that continually emerged during these meetings, and the message was clear: we must reduce the burdens of an overly intrusive Federal Government while making improvements in those areas where government has a legitimate and constitutional responsibility, such as our transportation and infrastructure needs.

I look forward to working with these distinguished men and women who have agreed to serve on our advisory councils. Their insights into issues that affect our district, our State, and our Nation are invaluable; and I thank them for their desire and willingness to serve in this capacity.


Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 189 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order for the House to consider the bill (H.R. 650) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on
Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall expire. In order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 685) known as the Truth in Lending Act to improve upon the definitions provided for points and fees in connection with a mortgage transaction, all requests for points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. The House hereby (1) takes from the Speaker’s table the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; (2) adopts an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of House Concurrent Resolution 27, as adopted by the House; and (3) adopts such concurrent resolution, as amended.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern), my friend, pending which I yield myself to consider in the House the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of House Concurrent Resolution 27, as adopted by the House; and (3) adopts such concurrent resolution, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. 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. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a rule and the underlying bills that make it easier for hard-working families to purchase a home. I would like to be perfectly clear from the outset. These bills are about increasing access to affordable housing. They are about helping middle class men and women in our country gain a little bit better footing to help them along their American Dream, and that is why we are here today.

What we are trying to do is get the government out of the way so that more can purchase the homes of their choice. These bills are about achieving the American Dream of owning your own home. That brings us closer to why we are here today. We are here to help families who want to own their own home and to live the American Dream.

The administration’s Big Government regulations have made it harder for American families to own a home, so we are here to empower them, instead of rules and regulations by Washington bureaucrats.

The bill of red tape coming out of Washington grows daily, and day by day, it spreads beyond the housing market. It ties the hands of families who want to own their own home, as well as the hands of business that want to hire new employees and investors that want to fund the next new big idea to make America stronger and better and to begin to climb out of their share of the $20 trillion debt.

Modest, reasonable regulation does have its place; overregulation does not. Overregulation stifles economic growth. It gets in the way and makes it harder for families to pull themselves out of poverty. It does not keep them from gaining the footing to get into the middle class. Ultimately, unreasonable regulation destroys a shot that people have at the American Dream.

The problem with overregulation is that it is everywhere. This administration enjoys and relishes the opportunity to inflict themselves on every part of the American economy because they believe Washington knows best. Well, we just can’t live this way and have people say yea and nay and whack at the American Dream, also.

Unfortunately, overregulation is like the weeds in the backyard; they have to be removed. One by one, that is how you gain accomplishment. That is what happened yesterday when the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Chairman Jeb Hensarling from Dallas, Texas, brought some reasonable opportunities to the Rules Committee for us to consider.

What are we doing here today? We are removing just a few of the regulatory weeds that were promulgated by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, or CFPB. These mortgages that we are talking about have rules that make it harder for low- and moderate-income Americans to qualify for a mortgage—hard work.

They negatively impact consumers and community banks who offer the majority of these loans to middle class Americans, and it makes them outside of the ability that people have to get them because of the high cost of regulation.

These costs are passed on to consumers who, once again, are victims to an overzealous regulatory regime who stated that they were there to help the consumer in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because we have a bipartisan piece of legislation that has gained over the last few years more people who understand the issues—not only those in the Financial Services Committee, but across Congress—and we are here today because we want to do what is a good bill to remove a few weeds from the garden one at a time. Chairman Hensarling has given us that chance today.

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

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. Sessions, for the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What we should be doing today, Mr. Speaker, is considering legislation to strengthen financial protection for consumers, create jobs, and ensure the continuation of our economic recovery; or, in honor of Equal Pay Day, we should debate and vote on the Paycheck Fairness Act to ensure that women get paid for equal work.

A full-time working woman still earns significantly less than what a man earns for comparable work. It turns out that women earn nearly 25 cents less than a man for doing the same work. Achievement for women should be the top of our priority list, but, unfortunately, this Republican majority has denied us a vote on this critical issue.

Today, instead, we will consider two pieces of legislation under a closed process to roll back important Dodd-Frank consumer protections.

H.R. 650, the Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act, strips from manufactured homeowners critical protections enacted by Congress as part of the Dodd-Frank financial reform law.

Manufactured homes are an important affordable housing option for many low- and moderate-income families, especially families living in rural areas. It is critical that these homeowners are able to get the same consumer protections afforded to consumers with traditional mortgages.

H.R. 685, the Mortgage Choice Act, would allow mortgages with higher fees to improperly qualify for the qualified mortgage standards established by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. By removing affiliated title insurance fees from the 3 percent cap established by the CFPB, creditors could be incentivized to direct borrowers to expensive affiliated equal work.

Passage of this legislation could ultimately drive up the cost of mortgages, limit competition in the marketplace, and undo borrower protections.
regulatory environment that sparked the housing crisis."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that my friends in the majority don’t like the Dodd-Frank financial reform law. They have made countless attempts to overturn the commonsense provisions contained in that legislation. But we are going to make our case, and work to prevent another financial crisis.

But I don’t think anybody in this House should want to set the stage for another financial crisis, and I have serious concerns about the process being used by the majority to repeal Dodd-Frank. My friend, the ranking member on the Financial Services Committee, MAXINE WATERS, has worked in good faith with the majority on legislation to make technical corrections to Dodd-Frank and other bipartisan updates. In fact, just yesterday, this House passed several pieces of legislation from the Financial Services Committee with overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle.

But the two bills that we are considering today fall short of that goal. Mr. Speaker, after the passage of a clean Homeland Security bill and the SGR fix, I had hoped that bipartisan cooperation in legislating would be contagious. I was wrong.

Today, the Republicans are back to their old ways of bringing up “my way or the highway bills” that will be brought to the floor, under a closed rule and then vetoed by the President.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is going to have just his opportunity today because I am sure we are going to vote on this.

I would like to advise the gentleman that I have no speakers. We spent a couple of hours this morning in the Rules Committee fully debating this, understanding this bipartisan bill, and so I want to advise the gentleman that I will allow him to use the time. I would like to ask if he has any speakers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I do.

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

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

In honor of Equal Pay Day, if we defeat the previous question, to try to at least get a debate on this and to try to get at least some people on record as saying we ought to have an up-or-down vote on this.

But yet we can’t get this bill to the floor for the kind of up-or-down, clean vote that we have been looking for for now quite a long time. As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, this is not just a women’s issue; it is a family issue. We are all talking about how this economy is not recovering as fast as we would like it to. We all like to talk about how we wish that people would earn a little bit more in their paychecks.

Well, here is one way to do it. Make sure women get paid what they deserve, what they have earned. This should not be a controversial issue. This should not be something that requires that we can’t get a vote on the floor.

So we are now kind of relying on this procedural motion, by defeating the previous question, to try to at least get a debate on this and to try to get at least some people on record as saying what the excesses of some in the financial industry had done. Our economy almost was ruined because of those excesses, and consumer rights were routinely trampled on.

So we passed, in my opinion, a moderate and sensible kind of check on the White House for equal pay for equal work, women among their colleagues. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I don’t think we have any other speakers here.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment that I would like to offer in the record, along with extraneous materials, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Again, I will remind my colleagues that if we could defeat the previous question, we will bring up the Paycheck Fairness Act. It has been something of a puzzle to me that it has been so difficult, in this Republican-controlled House, to bring up legislation that would outlaw and end discrimination against women, and that is what this is.

When a woman is working at the same job a man is and getting paid less for that same work, that is discrimination, and there is no way around that fact. And we have the opportunity, in this House, and in the Senate, to end this.

But yet we can’t get this bill to the floor for the kind of up-or-down, clean vote that we have been looking for for now quite a long time.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, this is not just a women’s issue; it is a family issue. We are all talking about how this economy is not recovering as fast as we would like it to. We all like to talk about how we wish that people would earn a little bit more in their paychecks.

Well, here is one way to do it. Make sure women get paid what they deserve, what they have earned. This should not be a controversial issue. This should not be something that requires that we can’t get a vote on the floor.

So we are now kind of relying on this procedural motion, by defeating the previous question, to try to at least get a debate on this and to try to get at least some people on record as saying what the excesses of some in the financial industry had done. Our economy almost was ruined because of those excesses, and consumer rights were routinely trampled on.

So we passed, in my opinion, a moderate and sensible kind of check on
some of these financial institutions—that is the Dodd-Frank legislation. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and again, it is a puzzlement to me, have spent almost every waking moment that they have trying to undo that, trying to take away protections for our country to take away protections for small businesses, for homeowners. It doesn’t make any sense. It doesn’t make any sense at all.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I would urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question and “no” on the rule.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. He had to sit through the long hearing yesterday, and it was a most interesting one.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to point out that the Rules Committee asked Members and their offices to submit any ideas and amendments regarding this bill, and none were submitted. That is why we have a closed rule. That is why H.R. 655, the Mortgage Choice Act, and H.R. 650, Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act, are both under a closed rule because we tried to make it available to as many Members as chose, and no one took us up on it.

Mr. Speaker, we are here because we have two Members who have worked hard in committee, they have worked hard over the last few years as new, young members of this Republican majority, BILL HUIZENGA from Michigan and STEPHEN FINCKER from Tennessee, who worked very diligently inside the Financial Services Committee over the years and have brought these bills back to us.

This is not their first appearance. We now have a Senate, however, that we believe will take up these bills.

Republicans are committed to reducing the regulatory burden that makes it harder for families to get homes. In this case, it may be manufactured housing. It may be directly aimed at the middle class. It may help people a lot. The answer is, yes, it does. And that is why we are doing this.

We are taking our time today because the middle class of this country deserves a right for us to take action to them. And community banks, small banks back home that people walk into, see the same people, day after day, year after year, who live in these communities, community bankers are there to help grow not only the middle class but also rural America and the areas that oftentimes are in agriculture areas, perhaps in the areas where there is a lot of energy exploration.

People choose to have their own roof over their own head and need a chance to get a loan, need a chance to take care of their families.

So, look, we are willing to keep working to bring this thing out to Democrats. This is a bipartisan bill, and we are willing to do whatever it takes so that individuals and families can help realize this American Dream.

Mr. McGovern. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McGovern. I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts would be kind enough to allow me to reclaim the balance of the time I yielded back.

Mr. McGovern. I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the balance of the time I yielded back.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. Delauro).

Ms. Delauro. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask Members to defeat the previous question so that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) can offer an amendment for the House to immediately consider the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Three weeks ago, I reintroduced the Paycheck Fairness Act. My bill would finish the job started by the Equal Pay Act some 50 years ago. It would end pay secrecy across the board. It would require employers to prove that pay disparities are not based on gender, and passing the bill would give teeth to a very, very simple principle: men and women in the same job deserve the same pay.

The Paycheck Fairness Act has passed the House twice already, with bipartisan support I might add. It has come just two votes shy of passing in the other chamber.

President Obama has called on us to pass it. More crucially still, the American people know the importance of paycheck fairness.

In October, a Gallup poll asked Americans to identify the top issue facing women in the workplace. Equal pay was, by far, the most common response among men as well as women.

All across the country today, working families are in trouble. Their wages are stagnant. They are in jobs that just don’t pay enough to be able to pay their bills. They are struggling to heat their homes and to feed their children.

Equal pay is a crucial part of the solution to this problem, since women are more than half of the workforce. Two-thirds of us are breadwinners for our families. Lower pay for women means less gas in the car, less food on the table, less money in the college fund, and less spending to support our economy.

Today is yet another Equal Pay Day. What Equal Pay Day means is that it has taken 104 days for the average woman’s earnings to catch up with what the average man made last year. That is exactly 104 days too long.

Fifty-two years since the Equal Pay Act became law, a woman still only makes 78 cents, on average, for every dollar earned by a man. The gap has barely changed in over a decade.

For women of color the disparities are wider still. Their Equal Pay Day will not arrive until May or June.

Even in nursing, a profession that is more than 90 percent female, a study last month showed that men earned $5,100 more per year, on average, than women when controlling for education, experience, and other factors.

Clearly, we must do more to close the gender pay gap. President Obama and the Department of Labor have shown the way by taking action to protect women who work for Federal contractors. It is now time that we in the Congress act to extend real, enforceable pay equity protections to all women.

Equal pay for equal work is the right thing to do. It is the smart thing to do. It, in fact, would reflect what today’s economy is all about with women being in the workplace overwhelmingly. It is time to make it a reality for all Americans, and I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment for the House to immediately consider the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Today, April 14, marks the day in which women’s earnings from January 1, 2014 alone have reached men’s earnings in 2014 alone.

In one of the wealthiest, most progressive countries in the world, women still find themselves 2½ months behind men in wage distribution. That means that for every dollar earned by men in the United States, only 78 cents are earned by women. For a woman working full time over the span of her career, that means a total loss of $430,000, nearly $560,000. Non-White, disabled, and LGBT women fare even worse, with non-White women earning $5,100 more per year, on average, than their White counterparts.

Today is yet another Equal Pay Day. What Equal Pay Day means is that it has taken 104 days for the average woman’s earnings to catch up with what the average man made last year. That is exactly 104 days too long.

Fifty-two years since the Equal Pay Act became law, a woman still only makes 78 cents, on average, for every dollar earned by a man. The gap has barely changed in over a decade.

For women of color the disparities are wider still. Their Equal Pay Day will not arrive until May or June.

Even in nursing, a profession that is more than 90 percent female, a study last month showed that men earned $5,100 more per year, on average, than women when controlling for education, experience, and other factors.

Clearly, we must do more to close the gender pay gap. President Obama and the Department of Labor have shown the way by taking action to protect women who work for Federal contractors. It is now time that we in the Congress act to extend real, enforceable pay equity protections to all women.

Equal pay for equal work is the right thing to do. It is the smart thing to do. It, in fact, would reflect what today’s economy is all about with women being in the workplace overwhelmingly. It is time to make it a reality for all Americans, and I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Polis), my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. Polis. I thank both the gentleman from Texas as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Equal Pay Day.

Today, April 14, marks the day in which women’s earnings from January 1, 2014 alone have reached men’s earnings in 2014 alone.

In one of the wealthiest, most progressive countries in the world, women still find themselves 2½ months behind men in wage distribution. That means that for every dollar earned by men in the United States, only 78 cents are earned by women. For a woman working full time over the span of her career, that means a total loss of $430,000, nearly $560,000. Non-White, disabled, and LGBT women fare even worse, with non-White women earning $5,100 more per year, on average, than their White counterparts.
I am proud to join my colleagues today in recognition of the fact that this disparity is not only antiquated, but economically regressive and morally indefensible.

It has been proven time and time again that increasing pay for women has a direct and immediate impact on improving our economy and the health of American families. Fairly compensating women is not only the right thing to do, but it would increase consumer demand, create jobs, and raise the GDP.

Today, on Lilly Ledbetter's birthday, it is time for Congress to act to enable women to support America's children and families and end this crippling drag on our Nation's economic prosperity and moral stain on our country. It is time we play our part in ending the gender gap.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the gentleman was able to have these two additional bright speakers following the gentleman from the Rules Committee, Mr. POLIS. So things worked out very well.

I want to thank my dear friend from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern) who asked for this, and I believe that I have respected in kind. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me, first of all, thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for his courtesy and generosity in allowing two of my colleagues who feel very strongly about these issues to have an opportunity to speak. I am very, very grateful. So, as a reward, I am not going to say anything else other than to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and vote "no" on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, once again, the relationship that the gentleman and I share is very good. We spend hours a week with each other, and we know that occasionally we have different speakers coming, and I am delighted that I was able to give him that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, as I began closing a minute ago, let's take a step in the right direction right now, right here today. Let's take these two bills that have come directly from the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Fincher) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Huizenga) at the urging of the Financial Services Committee. I believe this is the right thing to do on, I believe, an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis of that committee. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the pending bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 189 OFFERED BY MR. McGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Skr. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1619) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes. General debate shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. In addition, the resolution 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 general debate the bill shall be resolved into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

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 stands for.

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 vote to direct or control the discussion 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 which the House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Cannon stated Mr. G. Cannon (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 procedural vote that will not yield to a 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 to the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule... When the previous question is adopted, the majority Member controlling 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."

Mr. Speaker, 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 is a vote on 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. SESSIONS. 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 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 183, not voting 9, as follows: [Roll No. 148]
The question was taken; and the result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against: Mr. HINOJOJA. Mr. Speaker, on rollover No. 148, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."  

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Speaker pro tempore announced that a recorded vote was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as recorded above.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote from the Clerk.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Speaker pro tempore announced that a recorded vote was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as recorded above.
Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Clerk recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. Van Hollem moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the concurrent resolution on the budget, S. Con. Res. 11, be instructed to insert—

(1) to reinsert in the Senate substitute for section 618 of the Senate concurrent resolution on the budget of the 114th Congress, as reported by the Senate, the section added by the House at the conference on the concurrent resolution on the budget, S. Con. Res. 11, with one change, namely—by striking '``$20,000'' and inserting in its place '``$25,000''—by closing a lot of the tax breaks that, although claimed to support research and development, in scientific research, things that are not only good for America but that are good for America and that are good for working families. They disinvest in America. They slash way below the lowest historical levels in recorded history the amount of money—invest in innovation, K-12, special education. They devastate that part of the budget that is used to invest in innovation and in scientific research, things that have helped power our economy.

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of section 210 of the Rules and Pass—''yes,'' rollcall 146—H.R. Res. 189—On Agreeing to the Resolution—''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for two roll call votes on Tuesday, April 14, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted in this manner: rollcall Vote No. 140—On the Rules and Pass—''yes,''

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Clerk recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. Van Hollem moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the concurrent resolution on the budget, S. Con. Res. 11, be instructed to insert—

(1) to reinsert in the Senate substitute for section 618 of the Senate concurrent resolution on the budget of the 114th Congress, as reported by the Senate, the section added by the House at the conference on the concurrent resolution on the budget, S. Con. Res. 11, with one change, namely—by striking '``$20,000'' and inserting in its place '``$25,000''—by closing a lot of the tax breaks that, although claimed to support research and development, in scientific research, things that are not only good for America but that are good for America and that are good for working families. They disinvest in America. They slash way below the lowest historical levels in recorded history the amount of money—invest in innovation, K-12, special education. They devastate that part of the budget that is used to invest in innovation and in scientific research, things that have helped power our economy.

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of section 210 of the Rules and Pass—''yes,'' rollcall 146—H.R. Res. 189—On Agreeing to the Resolution—''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for two roll call votes on Tuesday, April 14, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted in this manner: rollcall Vote No. 140—On the Rules and Pass—"yes," rollcall 146—H.R. 1265—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass—"yes," rollcall 147—H.R. 1480—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass—"yes," rollcall 148—H. Res. 189—On Agreeing to the Resolution—"aye.")

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for two roll call votes on Tuesday, April 14, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted in this manner: rollcall Vote No. 140—On the Rules and Pass—"yes," rollcall 146—H.R. 1265—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass—"yes," rollcall 147—H.R. 1480—On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass—"yes," rollcall 148—H. Res. 189—On Agreeing to the Resolution—"aye.").