

and water bill that she spoke of, in the name of passing those bills that are essential to the functioning of the country, in the name of doing that responsibility that the Constitution places squarely on our shoulders, we have folks who pass amendments to bills only to let those bills fail.

I would tell you, as someone who believes in an open process, who believes in an open process, that if we can have that festival of democracy that is an open rule on an appropriations bill, let's have it. Let's let the votes fall where they may, and then send that bill to the Senate and on to the White House and make it the law of the land.

But if in the name of making a point, we prevent this institution from doing its constitutionally mandated business, if in the process of making a political point, we prevent this institution from providing the money for that fundamental research, from providing the money for that flood relief, from providing the money for essential justice reform, I tell you, we have not honored this Nation with an open process; we have failed it.

And the question then falls to us: Are we going to have an open process that allows every Member to speak out on behalf of their constituency to fight for what may be best for this Nation that we all love? Or are we going to have election-year politics, decide that being able to produce that press release is more important than getting our work done?

I happen to know the answer, Mr. Speaker. I happen to know the answer because I happen to know each one of these Members on a personal level. There is not one of them who wouldn't turn in their voting card tomorrow if they could take a vote on the biggest issue that matters to them today. There is not one of them that wouldn't turn in their voting card tomorrow if they could make a difference for this generation and the next generation today, and I love that about them. I love it about each and every one of them.

Passing this bill lets those folks come to work and get this job done. Passing this bill allows us to get to work doing those things that I believe will honor the men and women who sent us here. Passing this rule allows us to get to the underlying bill that will keep the lights on not just for constituent service back in every district in this land, but the lights on in what I would argue is the greatest deliberative body, the greatest embodiment of self-governance that this world has ever known.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 771 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 769)

Terminating a Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Rules.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 769.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adopting House Resolution 770;
Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 771; and
Adopting House Resolution 771, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5278, PUERTO RICO OVERSIGHT, MANAGEMENT, AND ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 770) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5278) to establish an Oversight Board to assist the Government of Puerto Rico, including instrumentalities, in managing its public finances, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 178, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

YEAS—241

Abraham	Blum	Calvert
Aderholt	Bost	Carter (GA)
Allen	Boustany	Carter (TX)
Amodei	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Babin	Brat	Chaffetz
Barr	Bridenstine	Clawson (FL)
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Coffman
Benishek	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Bilirakis	Buchanan	Collins (GA)
Bishop (MI)	Buck	Collins (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Bucshon	Comstock
Black	Burgess	Conaway
Blackburn	Byrne	Cook

Cooper	Jones	Ribble
Costa	Jordan	Rice (SC)
Costello (PA)	Joyce	Rigell
Cramer	Katko	Roby
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Roe (TN)
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Culberson	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Curbelo (FL)	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Davis, Rodney	Kinzinger (IL)	Rokita
Denham	Kline	Rooney (FL)
Dent	Knight	Ros-Lehtinen
DeSantis	Labrador	Roskam
DesJarlais	LaHood	Ross
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Rothfus
Dold	Lamborn	Rouzer
Donovan	Lance	Royce
Duffy	Latta	Russell
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Salmon
Duncan (TN)	Long	Sanford
Ellmers (NC)	Loudermilk	Scalise
Emmer (MN)	Love	Schweikert
Farenthold	Lucas	Scott, Austin
Fitzpatrick	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Fleischmann	MacArthur	Sessions
Fleming	Marchant	Shimkus
Flores	Marino	Shuster
Forbes	Massie	Simpson
Fortenberry	McCarthy	Sinema
Fox	McCaul	Smith (MO)
Franks (AZ)	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Frelinghuysen	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Garrett	McKinley	Smith (TX)
Gibbs	McMorris	Stefanik
Gibson	Rodgers	Stewart
Gohmert	McSally	Stivers
Goodlatte	Meadows	Stutzman
Gosar	Meehan	Thompson (PA)
Gowdy	Messer	Thornberry
Granger	Mica	Tiberi
Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)	Tipton
Graves (LA)	Miller (MI)	Trott
Graves (MO)	Moolenaar	Turner
Griffith	Mooney (WV)	Upton
Grothman	Mullin	Valadao
Guinta	Mulvaney	Wagner
Guthrie	Murphy (PA)	Walberg
Hanna	Neugebauer	Walden
Harper	Newhouse	Walker
Harris	Noem	Walorski
Hartzler	Nugent	Walters, Mimi
Heck (NV)	Nunes	Weber (TX)
Hensarling	Olson	Webster (FL)
Hice, Jody B.	Palazzo	Wenstrup
Hill	Palmer	Westerman
Holding	Paulsen	Westmoreland
Hudson	Pearce	Whitfield
Huelskamp	Perry	Williams
Huizenga (MI)	Pittenger	Wilson (SC)
Hultgren	Pitts	Wittman
Hunter	Poe (TX)	Womack
Hurd (TX)	Poliquin	Woodall
Hurt (VA)	Pompeo	Yoder
Issa	Posey	Yoho
Jenkins (KS)	Price, Tom	Young (AK)
Jenkins (WV)	Ratcliffe	Young (IA)
Johnson (OH)	Reed	Zeldin
Johnson, Sam	Reichert	Zinke
Jolly	Renacci	

NAYS—178

Adams	Clarke (NY)	Esty
Aguilar	Clay	Fattah
Amash	Cleaver	Foster
Ashford	Clyburn	Frankel (FL)
Bass	Cohen	Fudge
Beatty	Connolly	Gabbard
Becerra	Conyers	Gallego
Bera	Courtney	Garamendi
Beyer	Crowley	Graham
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Grayson
Blumenauer	Cummings	Green, Al
Bonamici	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Boyle, Brendan F.	Davis, Danny	Grijalva
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Gutiérrez
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Hahn
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Hastings
Bustos	DeLauro	Heck (WA)
Capps	DelBene	Higgins
Capuano	DeSaulnier	Himes
Cárdenas	Deutch	Honda
Carney	Dingell	Hoyer
Carson (IN)	Doggett	Huffman
Cartwright	Doyle, Michael F.	Israel
Castor (FL)	Duckworth	Jackson Lee
Castro (TX)	Edwards	Jeffries
Chu, Judy	Ellison	Johnson (GA)
Ciilline	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Clark (MA)	Eshoo	Kaptur
		Keating

Kelly (IL)	Meng	Schiff
Kennedy	Moore	Schrader
Kildee	Moulton	Scott (VA)
Kilmer	Murphy (FL)	Scott, David
Kind	Nader	Serrano
Kirkpatrick	Napolitano	Sewell (AL)
Kuster	Neal	Sherman
Langevin	Nolan	Slaughter
Larsen (WA)	Norcross	Smith (WA)
Larson (CT)	O'Rourke	Speier
Lawrence	Pallone	Swalwell (CA)
Lee	Pascrell	Takano
Levin	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Lewis	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Lipinski	Peters	Titus
Loeb sack	Peterson	Tonko
Lofgren	Pingree	Torres
Lowenthal	Pocan	Tsongas
Lowe	Polis	Van Hollen
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Price (NC)	Vargas
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Quigley	Veasey
Maloney, Carolyn	Rangel	Vela
Maloney, Sean	Rice (NY)	Velázquez
Matsui	Richmond	Visclosky
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Walz
McDermott	Ruiz	Wasserman
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Schultz
McNerney	Rush	Waters, Maxine
Meeks	Sánchez, Linda T.	Watson Coleman
	Sanchez, Loretta	Welch
	Sarbanes	Wilson (FL)
	Schakowsky	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Barletta	Herrera Beutler	Ryan (OH)
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Sires
Farr	Lieu, Ted	Takai
Fincher	Luetkemeyer	Young (IN)
Hardy	Payne	

□ 1515

Mr. SHERMAN and Ms. SPEIER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

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.

Stated for:
Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 284, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 8, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Ms. Patricia Wolfe, Elections Administrator, State of Ohio, indicating that, according to the preliminary results of the Special Election held June 7, 2016, the Honorable Warren Davidson was elected Representative to Congress for the Eighth Congressional District, State of Ohio. With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,
KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.
OHIO SECRETARY OF STATE,
Columbus, Ohio, June 8, 2016.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR Ms. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election

held on Tuesday, June 7, 2016, for Representative in Congress from the Eighth Congressional District of Ohio, show that Warren Davidson received 21,537 or 76.79% of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Warren Davidson was elected as Representative in Congress from the Eighth Congressional District of Ohio.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all Eighth Congressional District of Ohio boards of elections involved, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,
PATRICIA WOLFE,
Elections Administrator.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE WARREN DAVIDSON, OF OHIO, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable WARREN DAVIDSON, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect DAVIDSON and the members of the Ohio delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. DAVIDSON appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 114th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE WARREN DAVIDSON TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker and Members, it is my privilege to welcome Congressman WARREN DAVIDSON, his wife, Lisa; and their two beautiful children, Rachel and Zach, to Washington, D.C.

To the Davidsons, their extended family, and their friends who are here to support them, we all wish you hearty congratulations. To Congressman DAVIDSON, on behalf of a grateful