

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 OVER-
SIGHT, MANAGEMENT, AND ECO-
NOMIC 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)
Amodel	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Babin	Brat	Chaffetz
Barr	Bridenstine	Clawson (FL)
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Coffman
Benishek	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Billirakis	Buchanan	Collins (GA)
Bishop (MI)	Buck	Collins (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Bucshon	Comstock
Black	Burgess	Conaway
Blackburn	Byrne	Cook