

Americans can't keep their plans even if they like them. Families are being forced to pay more for their health care insurance. Women are unable to stay with their doctors despite the President's promise. Seniors are facing cuts to their hard-earned Medicare benefits. Businesses are afraid to hire more workers.

House Republicans have a plan to get Washington out of the way—to create an America that works—and addressing these problems is a great place to start.

WOMEN'S ECONOMIC AGENDA

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, I was proud to host a women's economic agenda event at the Young Women's Leadership Academy in San Antonio, Texas. It was a great way to celebrate Women's History Month by having a conversation about what we can all do to ensure that women in our Nation are empowered. There were three specific issues that we spoke of that concern our Nation greatly.

The first one was fair pay, making sure that when women put in a full day's work they make the same amount of money as men do. The second was family leave, the ability to be able to take time off to be with sick parents or when you have a child. That is extremely important for working women. Also, there is child care. Many women are unable to take and keep jobs because they simply don't have the child care resources they need to make sure their children are safe so they can go on to work.

It is imperative that the United States Congress takes up these issues and continues to make sure that there is parity in our society and that women are able to enjoy the same benefits as men.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to demand action on comprehensive immigration reform.

For over a year, we have experienced nothing but broken promises from our Republican leadership. The Senate did its job in passing a bipartisan bill by a vote of 68–32, but Speaker BOEHNER and House Republicans have refused to consider this responsible proposal even though it has the votes to pass right now.

The reason for this is clear: Republicans would rather protect themselves from a primary challenge than address the challenges that face our Nation. That is why House Democrats have re-

sorted to introducing a discharge petition this week to demand a vote on immigration reform.

This is supposed to be a democracy. Comprehensive reform is backed by a majority of the American public, including the business community, labor unions, and religious organizations. Comprehensive reform would grow our economy, strengthen families and open doors of opportunity for millions of Americans who want to embrace the American Dream.

America has always been a nation of immigrants, continuously revitalized by those who come to our shores to make better lives for themselves and their families. Now is the time to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH AND WOMEN'S ECONOMIC AGENDA

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Women's History Month.

March is the time to honor our foremothers by recommitting to the fight for complete equality between the sexes. Democrats know that the biggest challenge to attaining complete equality is through economic justice. My daughters are growing up in an America where women still make just 77 cents to every man's dollar. This wage discrimination is compounded even further when you consider that women also represent nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers and that they often have jobs with no sick leave. If women have to choose between their jobs and their families, clearly, we still have a lot of work to do.

First, we must extend unemployment benefits. Women struggling to find work need that bridge to help pay the bills while they look for work. We must also increase the minimum wage, fight wage discrimination by passing the Paycheck Fairness Act, and extend paid family and medical leave to all women by passing the FAMILY Act.

This agenda is the perfect way to celebrate Women's History Month and to honor all Americans who have fought for equality and fairness. As President Obama said, "When women succeed, America succeeds."

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH AND WOMEN'S ECONOMIC AGENDA

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, March is Women's History Month, and I rise in memory of a trailblazer, Georgia Lee Lusk, the first woman to ever represent New Mexico in the House of Representatives.

Georgia was elected in 1946 and served Congressional District One, my district. Georgia is in our history books as a woman who wasn't afraid of a fight. She grew up on a farm in Carlsbad and went to Highlands University in Las Vegas, New Mexico. Georgia went to Washington to fight for better education and better care for veterans. As a school administrator, she had seen the effects of book shortages and overcrowded classrooms on young students. As a mother of three boys who all fought in the Second World War, she knew all too well the challenges faced by those returning from war. Georgia served on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and worked across the aisle to make sure that veterans received the benefits provided to them in the GI Bill of Rights. She fought for Federal aid to education, hot meals for students, and helped establish what we now know as the Department of Education, and she did so much more.

Mr. Speaker, as only the third Congresswoman in New Mexico's history, I am determined to carry on Georgia's fight—a fight for better care for our veterans and a better education for our students. When women succeed, America succeeds.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1459, ENSURING PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE CREATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 524 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 524

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 1459) to ensure that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies to the declaration of national monuments, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. 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 and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the

Whole. All points of order against such amendments 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.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of March 27, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the following: (a) a measure addressing the Medicare payment system for physicians; and (b) a measure addressing Ukraine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), 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. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which they may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 1459, Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act.

It provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule makes in order three amendments, two of which are Democrat amendments, in addition to a manager's amendment. The rule also wisely provides for same-day authority for the legislative day of Thursday to consider the so-called "doc fix" bipartisan proposal, which may come forward for our consideration, as well as for the consideration of measures aimed at supporting the people of Ukraine against Russian aggression and expansionism. So this is an important rule. Therefore, it deserves our strong support.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand before the House today in support of the rule as well as of the underlying legislation primarily because it is my bill. I appreciate the hard work and support of the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), in forwarding this important bill to the floor of the House for our consideration.

I have to admit, Mr. Speaker—perhaps because the underlying bill is my bill—that I have had a closer consideration of the discussion, of the comments, that have been made about it,

and I have taken some of them rather personally. To be honest, I am, quite frankly, amazed at some of the inaccuracies and the misinformation that has taken place by some outside groups in blogs, in Internet descriptions by special interests groups, and, actually, even by some Members of the floor.

□ 1245

When I originally saw some of the reports that said this bill would stop the creation of any more national parks, nothing could be further from the truth, because actually the President can't create national parks; only Congress can. It has nothing to do with national parks.

Eventually, they changed it to say this will stop creation of national monuments. Again, that charge is simply ridiculous.

The essence of this bill is very simple. What it says is the President should be treated like everyone else. Congress, if they are going to make any kind of land decisions, must have an open process where they have hearings and markups and bring things for an open vote.

If an agency of the government is going to make some sort of land designation, they have to go through NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, the process which provides for input—public discussion and public advice—about it. The only one who cannot do that is the President.

When the administration testified about this bill in committee, I was amazed, because they said the President should not have to go through the open process of obtaining public input on his decisions because even though the entire Federal branch has to, he is only the head of the Federal branch, he is not the Federal branch.

That just does not make sense to me. The idea is that everyone, including the President, should ask for public input.

One of the groups, the National Resources Defense Council, wrote on their blog that NEPA was the Magna Carta of environmental laws. They wrote:

Much like the Magna Carta protected people from dangers of monarchical rule, NEPA protects people by providing transparency in Federal projects. Both the Magna Carta and NEPA espouse the ideas of public participation in democracy by giving citizens a voice in government decisions.

Yesterday, in a different bill in a different committee, the administration testified against the bill, saying it would stop public comments about this particular issue. I am sorry, but that is why I get so confused about the rhetoric about this particular bill.

What we are asking is that before the President uses this authority, it go through NEPA to provide for public comment and concepts.

If NEPA is the Magna Carta and it provides for citizen voices in democratic decisions, how can you then say that this bill, which provides for NEPA and that kind of policy, would evis-

cerate one of America's bedrock conservation laws?

This is simply intellectual gymnastics at the highest level. Either getting public input is good, in which case we should pass this bill, or getting public input is bad, in which case there are a lot of things that we should change around here. I happen to think that getting public input is good. Because it does one thing: it solves problems before they develop.

In our State, we have had a National Monument that has been designated by Presidential proclamation for almost 20 years now. We are still dealing with issues of what kind of grazing rights were or were not included in that proclamation, what kind of roads were or were not open. Even though we tried to solve the problem, because the President had no concept of what School Trust Lands were in that area, and we have tried to exchange those out, not all of those exchanges have yet to be consummated.

Another of the monuments that the President recently proposed, they have already come to us and said there are problems within the boundaries of that monument. We have found private property we didn't know existed. We don't know whether there are provisions in there to allow duck hunting to go on, but we are not quite sure how you accomplish that. We are really not quite sure which land agency is responsible for the administration.

Those issues are all the issues that could be settled before you make the designation. And if, indeed, the NEPA process was required, those would become the issues that would be brought up, they would be understood, and they would be dealt with before you make the initiative.

So I have had people tell me that this is actually the "No More National Monuments" bill. It would stop national monuments. It is patently false. It is a false premise. It is a scare tactic, not an argument. And it is incredibly wrong.

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

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

I am here with my good friend from the Rules Committee, Mr. BISHOP, and he made a passionate case. He cares deeply, as do many of us, about issues affecting our public lands under the Antiquities Act. But the real antique here is our outdated immigration system. That is the antique.

When I have my town hall meetings in my district across Colorado, and join my friends across the country, what I hear from my constituents is not, Let's alter the process whereby a President might designate something as a National Monument. That is not the number one issue. That is not the number five issue. It is not the number 10 issue.

What my constituents demand, what Colorado demands, what our Nation demands, is we replace our antiquated, out-of-date, ill-conceived, completely

dysfunctional immigration system with one that works for our country, with the principle of securing our borders, with the principle of creating jobs for Americans, reducing our deficit, ensuring that people who work here pay taxes, ensuring that companies have a responsibility to authenticate and verify that their employees are here legally. That is what the country needs. It is what more than 75 percent of the American people support.

I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have a bipartisan immigration reform bill, H.R. 15. If we were to advance that bill to the floor of the House, it would pass tomorrow. It would pass the next day.

But instead of that bill being even presented in the Rules Committee for a vote and despite my repeated desires to the chair of that committee, to the chair of the committee of jurisdiction, Mr. GOODLATTE, as Mr. BISHOP has witnessed over a period of months, saying, When will you bring forward this bill, when will you bring forward this bill, when will you fix our broken immigration system, we have not advanced one single immigration-related bill that addresses any one of the flaws in the immigration system to the floor of the House this entire legislative session.

So our patience is wearing thin, Mr. Speaker. And I have great respect for you, Mr. Speaker, and for the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR. Great respect. And I understand it is the prerogative of the majority party to control the bills that are being debated on the floor. But in the absence of leadership, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of you bringing a bill forward that allows us to fix our broken immigration system, we the Members of this body, Democratic and Republican, have no choice but to take it upon ourselves to bring this issue forward to the floor of the House.

I am going to tell you a little bit about, Mr. Speaker, the way we can do that.

These are the rules of the House. I strongly recommend them as a bedtime read, Mr. Speaker. Fortunately, they have a provision called the discharge petition that provides a way that the Members of this body, 218 out of 435, meaning a majority of the Members of this body, can sign a discharge petition for a bill. That means that despite a Speaker or majority leader that refused to schedule that bill for debate, if a majority of Members sign the discharge petition, it goes right to the floor for a straight up-or-down vote.

That is all we are asking for, Mr. Speaker: a straight up-or-down vote. I am confident H.R. 15 would pass tomorrow if we had that opportunity. I call upon my colleagues, Democratic and Republican, to sign the discharge petition. Mr. Speaker, I call upon my friends across the country to inform their Members of Congress that they want to see action on this important issue.

In no way, shape, or form should this detract from the passion Mr. BISHOP

has for obscure provisions of the Antiquities Act and the NEPA process surrounding the establishment of public monuments, but this simply isn't the issue that galvanizes our country. This simply isn't the issue that reduces our deficit by \$900 billion over two decades.

Whatever we do to the Antiquities Act does not create 150,000 jobs for American citizens, does not boost GDP, and is not backed by an unprecedented coalition of labor and business, farmworkers and agricultural companies, the faith-based community, police and law enforcement, and the business sector.

We have the opportunity to do something great for our country, Mr. Speaker—the opportunity to show real leadership by, of course, encouraging you, Mr. Speaker, to bring forward immigration reform. And if you prefer to bring forward several components, we will work with you to ensure that we can address some, if not all, of the issues within our broken immigration system.

But failing your leadership, Mr. Speaker, the membership of this body, under the rules of the House, has asserted itself under a discharge petition to bring comprehensive immigration reform, H.R. 15, immediately to the floor of the House for an up-or-down vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Is a discharge petition the process provided in the House rules to allow a majority of the House, without the support of the Speaker or the Rules Committee, to bring a measure to the floor that has not been reported by committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The discharge process is addressed in clause 2 of rule XV.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, is it correct that any House Member can file a discharge petition if a committee has failed to act on a bill after 30 legislative days?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Member is free to consult the standing rules of the House. The pending business on the floor debate is House Resolution 524.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, are there any provisions in the current rule that would allow for an up-or-down vote on immigration reform?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not construe the pending resolution.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, is it true that H.R. 15, the bipartisan immigration reform bill, has been pending before several committees and has not even faced a vote in committee since it was introduced in October?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the American people will determine what is relevant and what is not.

Mr. Speaker, I think what is relevant here is the fact that this body, which wasn't even in session last week, which is working 9½ hours this week, is simply not addressing the issues that the American people are demanding that we address.

Mr. Speaker, one wonders why perhaps only 8 or 12 percent of the American people approve of the institution of Congress. It is precisely because of the issues that people care about and they want us to solve. And it is not a partisan thing. These are the issues that my Democratic and Republican and Independent constituents all want us to solve. They all want to make sure that we reduce the deficit, secure our borders, and implement mandatory workplace authentication of workers. These are commonsense provisions that are supported across the ideological spectrum.

There has not been a committee vote on H.R. 15. There has not been a floor vote on any legislative proposal to address any dimension of our broken immigration system.

That is why I join my colleagues in signing a discharge petition under the rules of the House to bring forward this bill for immediate consideration on the floor so that this body can work its will to finally replace our broken immigration system with one that works.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to see the passionate fervor of the gentleman from Colorado on this issue. I wish that that passion and fervor had been there a couple of years ago when I had an immigration bill on the floor that dealt with many of these issues.

Unfortunately, today, we have an issue that is extremely important to those of us who live in the West. I think my county commissioners, all of whom see this as a very, very critical issue, will take some kind of umbrage to saying that this is not a significant thing, especially if you are one of the county commissioners that lives in the West and the Federal Government has control of your land—the entire county. Take Wayne County, for example: 3 percent of its county is private property, and that is not a small county. The rest is controlled by the Federal Government.

There is the constant fear by these people that the President, by a stroke of a pen or picking up a telephone, can make a ruling or a proclamation that will change their lives significantly; that will make their economy turn upside down. And there is not a thing they can do about it. This is the reason we have asked for this bill—to at least give these county commissioners the chance of having public input before the decision is made. That is why this becomes so significant.

These county commissioners want to be treated fairly, as all people want to be treated fairly, and one of the problems they have in being treated fairly is simply this particular archaic act.

The original Antiquities Act was passed in 1906. Think about that for a minute. What kind of environmental laws were there in 1906? Also consider the state of the Nation in 1906. In 1906, the States of Alaska, Hawaii, Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma were not part of the Nation.

□ 1300

Even my State of Utah was less than a decade old as a State in this particular Nation.

A lot is made often about how the Grand Canyon was created by using the Antiquities Act. Actually, it was. Unfortunately, it was a monument using the Antiquities Act, but the Grand Canyon had actually been a national forest before it was created as a monument; and when it was created as Grand Canyon National Park, that was done by Congress because only Congress has the ability to create national parks.

So one of the situations we have is the situation is extremely different from 1906 till today; and one of the things that also is different is that the Antiquities Act has been used in the past, but it has basically been abused in the current time.

There are three criteria for which the Antiquities Act is supposed to be able to be used to create a national monument. One is it has to have a specific element that needs to be protected: archaeological, historical, geographical.

Secondly, it has to be in imminent danger of being destroyed.

Third, it has to be in the smallest footprint possible, which meant, when they were debating it in 1906 on the floor, the debate was very clear they were talking about 2 to 300 acres.

President Bush created thousands of acres of a national monument. Fortunately, it was in water, but he created one because it had a lot of fish without ever deciding what the significant factor was.

The President has created a couple of national monuments, our current one, for structures that were already under preservation status. There was no imminent danger.

When President Clinton did the Grand Staircase-Escalante, that was not 200 acres. That was 1.9 million acres, which is larger than a couple of our small States combined. So the criteria for the use of the Presidential authority has changed radically.

Also, the way it has been used has changed radically. Look, from the Depression era to the beginning of 1976, let us say, roughly a half century, the Antiquities Act was only used nine times.

President Roosevelt, in his four terms, only used it three times, and one of those was reversed by Congress.

When President Carter came into office, he then used it 15 times in his 4 years.

President Clinton then used it 22 times, all of which were in his last 4 years.

President Obama has already used it eight times, and is counting.

It is very clear that we are doing it differently than it was in the past. All those other uses of the Antiquities Act were done, actually, to designate a specific topic and try to preserve it. What we are finding now is it is being used as a political weapon, a "gotcha" effort, a power play, without letting anyone know about it.

In the case of the Grand Staircase-Escalante, the Governor, the morning, at 2:00 in the morning, was explaining what public trust lands were to the White House. At 12, the President then designated the Grand Staircase-Escalante monument without ever dealing with the issue of school trust lands in those particular areas.

What I am saying is, we need to change something now because we are starting to use the Antiquities Act as a political bludgeon, and it shouldn't be that way. The most mellow way, the most moderate way of doing that is simply doing this bill that says, okay, we are not going to take the power away from the President. All we are going to do is, before you use it—you can't surprise people with it—you have to go through the NEPA process, which requires public comment, public input, which is what every other agency in the Federal Government has to use. Congress has to go through that same process.

The only one who is exempt from public comments is the President. That is why this is important. That is why this is vital, especially to people who live in high rural areas that have a lot of Federal land in which they are frightened that the President could upend everything simply by a stroke of a pen, and they don't have an avenue to give input. This bill gives them input. It is easily the most moderate approach that will ever come about the Antiquities Act on this floor, and I think it is worthy of supporting the rule and bringing it to the floor for a final vote.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, let's replace the antiquity that is our broken immigration system with one that reflects our values as a country. The hole in our border security is wider than the Grand Canyon the gentleman from Utah mentions. Let's fix that.

The hole in our values is wider than the Grand Canyon. Let's fix that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that honors our American values.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that provides an earned pathway to citizenship.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Utah yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield for this purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA), the chief sponsor of the bipartisan immigration reform bill, for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that unites our families and moves our country forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Utah yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield for this purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD), a champion of immigration reform, for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that unites our families, keeps our families together, moves our country forward.

We demand a vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Utah yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. May I ask an inquiry?

Was that for a vote on Tule Springs or something else? Apparently, it was something else.

Mr. POLIS. Was your inquiry through the Speaker?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate my earlier announcement that all time is yielded for the purpose of debate only. I am not prepared to yield for any other purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue to try until the gentleman from Utah allows our consent request.

I am proud to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a true leader on immigration

reform, for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that unites our families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Would the Chair inquire of the gentleman from Utah if he does accept the request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah indicated he will not yield for any request for unanimous consent.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, does the RECORD show a response for the gentleman from Utah to the request from the gentlewoman from Illinois?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understood that that is the feeling of the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. POLIS. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. How does the Speaker know the "feelings" of the gentleman from Utah?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman stated that he will not yield to any more unanimous consent requests of this type.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN), a leader in the fight for immigration reform, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to bring up H.R. 15.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that honors our American values.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the chair of the Democratic Caucus, for a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair first asks the gentleman from California to please remove the badge from his lapel.

The gentleman from California may now proceed.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that has been held up for more than 733 days to honor our Amer-

ican values so that I can wear this tag later on in the future with great pride.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY), a leader on the fight for immigration reform, for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that unites families and moves our country forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear a response on the last four inquiries from the gentleman from Utah. I was hoping the Speaker could pose the question to him, if he would accede to our request for a unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair the gentleman from Utah would not yield for any more unanimous consent requests, and therefore, they will not be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. I would ask the gentleman from Utah—and I will be happy to yield him a moment for an answer—how many of us need to come forward and ask for a vote on replacing the antiquity that is our broken immigration system until you will accede to a simple request for an up-or-down vote?

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman for giving me his time, which I would be happy to talk about the bill that is actually before us and will be here because it is a wonderful bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Utah chose not to answer the simple question of how many people we need to have to bring up this bill. I know that we can get more people to come down because, guess what? We stand ready to solve the issue of our broken immigration system. We also stand ready, as Americans, as Democrats, as Representatives, to work with our friends on the other side of the aisle to fashion a solution that works for our country.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 15, the bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill introduced by Mr. GARCIA that is nearly identical to the measure already passed by the Senate.

We need comprehensive immigration reform. And if the leadership of this

body, Mr. Speaker, yourself, and the leader, Mr. CANTOR, are serious about wanting to pass a jobs bill, are serious about wanting to reduce the deficit, they will act on this bill, because the Congressional Budget Office estimates that enacting this bill reduces our deficit by \$900 billion over 20 years. It boosts economic output, raises capital investment in our country, and increases the productivity of both labor and capital.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with the 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, what we have here and what we are doing under the rules of this body is we are using another method called the previous question where we, in the minority party, can actually get a vote where, if we defeat the previous question, we can then bring forward immigration reform, H.R. 15, the bipartisan bill. That is all we ask, Mr. Speaker, is that we ask our friends on both sides of the aisle to join us in a procedural motion to defeat the previous question.

Since the gentleman from Utah has thus far refused to allow a unanimous consent request—although I certainly am hopeful that he will as more Members of this body request that, out of courtesy, at least to have an up-or-down vote on immigration reform—we do have another outlet, and that is the previous question, which will be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, another leader in the fight to replace our broken immigration with one that works.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that provides an earned pathway to citizenship.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request so that this House can address replacing the real antiquity that is our broken immigration system.

Mr. COHEN. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that reduces our deficit by \$900 billion over the next 2 years, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, and \$200 billion in

the first year, and gives people an opportunity to participate out of the shadows of government and yet, be tax-paying citizens out in the front of society and be Americans who contribute to our economy and provide workers that we need to be a 21st century economy that is effective in keeping us as the world's number one economic power.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

As the Chair advised on January 15, 2014, even though a unanimous consent request to consider a measure is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such request constitute debate and will become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, with due respect, our desire that we are placing before you is to have a debate about immigration.

Mr. Speaker, not 1 hour, not half an hour, not 10 minutes, not 1 minute of floor time for the last entire year and a half has been scheduled for debate on this important topic: replacing our immigration system with one that works. There is no desire to embellish or debate through motions. There is an earnest desire to debate the merits of the bill. We can accomplish that in three ways here, Mr. Speaker:

We can defeat the previous question and bring up immigration reform; the continued enthusiasm from my colleagues can convince Mr. BISHOP to allow for the unanimous consent request to bring up H.R. 15; or, third, my colleagues can sign the discharge petition now at the desk, and once that petition receives 218 votes, it will advance immediately to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that unites our families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), a leader in the fight to replace our broken immigration system with one that works, for the purpose of a unanimous-consent request.

□ 1315

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that provides an earned pathway to citizenship.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman

from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Utah how many more of my colleagues need to urgently request that this bill come forward before he would kindly consider our unanimous consent request to allow this bill to be debated on, even recognizing you may be opposed to it and others may support it, at least allowing us to have this debate?

How many more Members need to come forward and request that for him, as a courtesy, to consider that?

I am happy to yield for an answer.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I, again, appreciate the gentleman from Colorado giving me the opportunity to speak about the issue that is at hand. I would even be happy if he would give me the opportunity to speak about a good immigration bill, which is mine, but since that is not the case, let me go, once more, to the issue that is at hand.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Utah is immersed in the arcane aspects of antiquities law. I certainly understand his passion for that. I truly do.

The gentleman from Utah and I have had a many great discussions on managing our public lands, which is a big part of his district and is certainly a big part of the district that I represent, but the true antiquity in the room is our broken immigration system.

The gentleman from Utah has the ability to allow us, through unanimous consent, to bring H.R. 15, comprehensive immigration reform, to the floor of the House to solve this issue.

Every Member of this body, Democratic and Republican, has the ability to sign a discharge petition. Once it reaches 218 signatures, no Member—not the Speaker and not the majority leader—can prevent that bill from being voted on in a straight up-or-down vote. It is time to simply demand a debate, demand a vote on comprehensive immigration reform.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we have a chance to act on legislation that has already passed the Senate with more than a two-thirds majority, including support from the home State of the gentleman from Utah, the senior Senator.

We passed a bill that the President would sign. We have a chance to pass bipartisan legislation that reduces our deficit, that secures our borders, that requires workplace authentication.

I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that just this morning, Congressman GARCIA filed a discharge petition on H.R. 15, finally allowing the membership of this body to go around a Speaker or a majority leader that is unwilling to address the issue of immigration, to bring forward our solution, our bipartisan solution, H.R. 15.

Now, again, I and many Members of this body are happy to consider other proposals. The gentleman from Utah has mentioned that he has a proposal.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle have a number of proposals.

Some have even passed through the Judiciary Committee, but not one immigration bill has been debated or voted on in the entire year and a half of this legislative session.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), a leader in the fight for immigration reform, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for allowing me to ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that reduces our deficit by \$900 billion. This is an American values reform bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think reducing our deficit by \$900 billion is a good idea. I really do. I think the American people agree that reducing our deficit by \$900 billion is a good idea; and if all that stands in the way of us reducing our deficit by \$900 billion is allowing this request to move through, I would certainly urge my friend from Utah to reconsider.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I reserve the balance of my time for the moment.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the majority of the American people, regardless of where they stand in the ideological spectrum or their party—Democrats, Republicans, Independents, Greens, Libertarians—all agree that the time is now to pass immigration reform. A recent CNN poll showed 81 percent support for immigration reform.

Another poll showed that 72 percent of Republicans support the package of reforms that are included in the Senate bipartisan package and the House bipartisan package.

So what are we debating here, Mr. Speaker? Are we simply refusing to discuss any solutions? Mr. Speaker, we have offered unanimous consent request after unanimous consent request, which the gentleman from Utah has not agreed to one of those; and, Mr. Speaker, on others, you have read his mind and assumed that he hasn't agreed, although we haven't heard from him on each of those.

We filed the discharge petition. I hope that that soon has 218 votes, but very soon, Mr. Speaker, there will actually be a vote right here in this body on the previous question; and if we defeat that motion on the previous question, we will bring forward H.R. 15, the bipartisan immigration reform bill.

A similar version passed the Senate with more than two-thirds' support, and I am optimistic that that bill will pass the House today.

Let's have some debate on immigration reform. Rather than working 9½ hours this week, the American people

want to see a Congress that tackles problems and works towards solutions.

They want to see a Congress that creates jobs for Americans, makes sure that we have workplace enforcement of our immigration laws, and secure borders. It doesn't happen by itself.

Absent this body taking action, the hole in our border security will continue to be as wide as the Grand Canyon, as the gentleman from Utah has mentioned.

The hole in our national spirit and our identity and our values will be just as wide if we continue to refuse to act to unite families and bring together Americans and to finally reflect our history as a nation of immigrants and as a nation of laws.

It is not inconsistent to be a nation of immigrants and a nation of laws, but under the current chaos and disorder that is our immigration dysfunction, we appease no one.

It is not good for our security when we don't know who is here. It is not good for American business when they don't know who is here legally and who is not, nor when companies that hire people under the table for cash are rewarded.

It doesn't reflect our values, as a country, to tear an American child from their parent and, at taxpayer expense, sending a parent back to another country away from their child.

It doesn't reflect our values to, at taxpayer expense, keep people detained for months or even years who have committed no criminal act in our country.

These should all be addressed, Mr. Speaker, through a bill with broad bipartisan buy-in, with support from across the ideological spectrum that would pass tomorrow if we can simply defeat the previous question or if the gentleman from Utah will entertain one of my colleagues' unanimous consent requests or if 218 of us sign where I have signed on demand a vote, the discharge petition now at the desk on immigration reform.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am actually prepared to close and will reserve the balance of my time until that time.

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

We have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, an opportunity in this body to address an issue that is in the hearts and in the minds of people across our country, of businesses across our country, of faith leaders across our country, and that is reconciling our immigration system with our values and with our economic needs, as a country.

We can do it, Mr. Speaker. We can, with one bill, reduce our deficit by \$900 billion. We can, Mr. Speaker, secure our borders and prevent people from entering this country illegally. We can, Mr. Speaker, ensure that every company verifies the people that work for it are legally here through a national database.

We can, Mr. Speaker, create 151,000 jobs for Americans. We can, Mr. Speak-

er, grow our economy by an additional 4.8 percent over a 20-year period. We can, Mr. Speaker, unite an American child with their parents, so they can grow into the great Americans that they will become, if only we let them.

There are millions of aspiring Americans throughout our country—in my district, in my State of Colorado, and across the country—people who want nothing more than to play by our rules, to speak our language, to pay taxes, and to spend money in our stores, generating jobs for our economy, if only we will let them.

We need immigration reform, Mr. Speaker, which is why an unprecedented alliance has come together from across the spectrum in support of immigration reform. In the faith-based community, leaders in the evangelical movement, the Catholic Church, the Jewish faith, and many others have joined arm-in-arm saying: demand action, the time is now.

The business community—from the tech community to the farmers to agriculture—are united around replacing our broken immigration system with one that works, so we have the pipeline of talent we need, so that America remains competitive and to prevent the offshoring of jobs overseas.

Workers across the country are united, in organized labor, in saying: we want to replace our broken immigration system with one that works because, when we have a large illegal workforce in our country, it undermines wages for American workers.

We need to prevent the undermining of wages for American workers by replacing our immigration system with one that works and one that requires workplace authentication of all people that are employed.

At this time, I will move down to the well, where I have a sign that will be displayed with me, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 and demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that unites our families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Utah if he has changed his mind and will yield for that purpose?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have not.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we will not give up. The American people will not give up. American companies will not give up, whether they are Fortune 400 companies, whether they are tomorrow's start-ups, which contains an entrepreneurship visa bill within immigration reform. We will not give up.

This issue gets larger and larger, bigger and bigger the longer we wait. There may be 10 million people here illegally today. If this body takes no action, Mr. Speaker, there might be 15 million people here illegally in 10 years.

The problem does not solve itself. We need to have enforcement of the law and border security and a rational way to deal with the issue within our country.

I encourage my friends, Mr. Speaker, on social media, on Twitter, on Facebook, to demand a vote and join me in simply allowing this body, Congress, the only body that can solve this bill—I know, Mr. Speaker, many of our State legislatures have debated around the edges and discussed whether instate tuition works or what benefits might be denied to people who aren't here legally.

But our State legislators across the aisle—Democratic and Republican—know that only Congress can secure our borders and replace our broken immigration system with one that works.

□ 1330

That is why I encourage you, Mr. Speaker, to join me in demanding a vote, demanding a debate, and bringing to the floor comprehensive immigration reform, or, if you prefer, Mr. Speaker, a series of bills designed to address issues within immigration reform to see how we can move forward to get on the same page with the Senate and fundamentally address this issue in a way that creates jobs for Americans, secures our borders, restores the rule of law, and reduces our deficit by \$900 billion.

I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform that reduces our deficit by \$900 billion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. The longer we delay in passing immigration reform, the greater costs of inaction. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office shows that H.R. 15 would reduce our deficit by \$900 billion. Imagine including that, \$200 billion in the first decade, in the baseline budget for the House of Representatives being worked on by Mr. RYAN and his associates on the Budget Committee.

What could that \$200 billion do? Could we reduce the marginal rate? Could we reduce tax rates for corporations that keep jobs here rather than outsource them overseas? Could we reduce our deficit with that \$200 billion? Could we invest it in tomorrow's infrastructure to help America remain competitive?

The answer is yes. \$200 billion is generated from fixing our immigration system in a commonsense way that more than 80 percent of the American people support. Immigration reform means that housing units would be increasingly in demand and residential construction spending would increase by \$68 billion per year over a 20-year period. Under immigration reform, over \$100 billion more in additional taxes would be paid, allowing, again,

tax reductions to others or investments in education and infrastructure, including revenues to State and local government.

I hope the majority is listening to former Speaker Hastert who said in an op-ed recently:

Immigration reform will make us safer, and it will make us economically stronger. It is politically smart and morally right.

And when we look at ourselves at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, we do need to stand for what in our own faith traditions and in our own conscience is morally right. And I know, Mr. Speaker, that what is morally right is an immigration system that reflects our values as Americans, one that honors our ancestors, one that honors my great-grandparents who came to this country from foreign shores at a young age and had their families here and allowed their great-grandson to serve here in the United States Congress.

Today's immigrants are no different from my great-grandmother who came in 1905 to this country from Eastern Europe. If only we will provide them the opportunity and a pathway for them to be and become the good Americans that they already are and contribute to make our country stronger, we will be strengthened as a nation; jobs will be created for Americans; we will prevent foreign workers from undermining wages for American workers; we will secure our borders to prevent people from sneaking across and working in this country illegally; and we will require that companies authenticate the legal status of all workers.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my plea has not fallen upon deaf ears.

I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to demand a vote on the bipartisan immigration reform bill that unites our families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Utah has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, every day we fail to act, the economic and human toll increases. Every day we fail to act, we sacrifice significant levels of investment in our country as well as lose out on talented and entrepreneurial potential Americans to overseas corporations.

I represent a district that contains the Colorado State University and the University of Colorado at Boulder. Like a lot of great schools across our country, many of our graduate students in computer science and engineering are from other countries. They are here on student visas. And when they receive their master's or their Ph.D., rather than allow them to stay here, work here, and make our country stronger, we force many of them to return overseas where the jobs follow them to make another country stronger. In some cases, countries that have differences of opinion with us on a geopolitical landscape, like Russia and China, allow these students to make

their countries stronger rather than ours.

Our economy, our faith leaders, our businesses, our workforce, and our families are all crying out for the House to debate this bill and to demand a vote now. I urge House leadership to heed their calls and put H.R. 15 on the floor for an immediate vote. It will pass; it has the votes. It will become the law, and it will solve this issue. The time is now. Our country and our families demand a vote.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. In all due respect, I have been called very sarcastic in the past, and I probably am. So as I speak to you now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be considered flippant in anything I say, but in all due respect, the speaker was not just divining what I was thinking at the time. I clearly said at the very beginning of what my purpose was and for what I would yield, and you did that very well.

The continuous requests for unanimous consent were for immediate consideration of a bill which, in my humble opinion, I think is a poorly written bill. There are better bills out there. I have one of those. In fact, a couple of years ago, I had one of those that I would have liked the support of the other side, as well.

Perhaps if we had talked about some of those that I think actually go to the point of the issue and are properly written, it may have been somewhat different. But, instead, I am going to come back to the issue that is at hand which deals with the Antiquities Act and how the Antiquities Act has been abused.

Congress has recognized that in the past. It is kind of ironic, and I don't think many people realize this, but not every State allows the Antiquities Act to be used in their State. Congress, in 1944, withdrew the use of the Antiquities Act in the State of Wyoming. Responding to an abuse later on, the State of Alaska was withdrawn from that consideration. Even the ranking member of our committee has introduced legislation and voted for it, and it passed this House, which would limit the use of the Antiquities Act in his district.

So people are recognizing that there is a reason—a reason—that the use of the Antiquities Act has changed over the years, and not necessarily for the better. The best way of solving that problem is not necessarily taking that act away or that power away, but simply making sure that the President of the United States gets public input before he actually pulls the trigger.

Now, you may ask why I consider this such a significant issue. Well, to be honest, it is for two reasons: one, I am from the West; and number two, I am a schoolteacher.

You see, when the Antiquities Act is used without public input, it has the

potential—and has in the past and could in the future and I think will in the future—to destroy economic patterns that take place, especially in rural counties. When that happens and that disruption takes place, then the ability of raising revenue for local needs becomes significant. And it is more difficult in the West than it is in the rest of the Nation. Let me try to illustrate why.

The States that are in red are the States that are considered public land States. Those are the ones that have the greatest potential of having abuse of the Antiquities Act foisted upon them. The States that are in yellow have very little public lands. In fact, two-thirds of everything the Federal Government owns is found in the red States.

What I am holding up here is the ability of these States to generate funds for their education system. As you can look over the past two decades, those States in the eastern portion of this country—the yellow States—have increased their education funding at twice the rate of those of us who live in the West. And the simple question has to be: Why do you think this takes place?

There is a distinct correlation to the amount of Federal land and the inability of States who have all that Federal land to raise money for their education systems. That is one of the continuous complaints that we have.

When monuments are made without getting the input of local citizens, the chance of making this even worse is a reality. It has happened in the past, and it will happen in the future. So I am not saying do away with the act altogether. What I am simply saying is make sure that the people who live in these red States who have a more difficult time funding their education system have the ability of making a statement before final action takes place, before simply a pen is signed to a proclamation that can change the dynamics of everything. It has happened in the past.

So that is why this is not simply a procedural bill for me. This is a bill that impacts my kids. It impacts my profession. It impacts the future of education in the West and should not be dismissed as insignificant. That is why this issue becomes so vital to those of us who live in the West because it has a direct impact on the way we live.

The gentleman from Colorado did say one thing in which I agree. He said that at some time we should all play by the same rules. That is the purpose of the underlying bill. The President should play by the same rules Congress has to use and as every agency of the Federal Government has to use, which is simply to come up with the concept that before decisions are made you get public input. And that is why all the discussion I have seen in blogs and from special interest groups are so confusing to me, because at one time we say, yes,

it is important that we get public input, except for this particular bill in which public input is bad. That does not make sense. That is mental gymnastics of the worst variety.

If this bill were to pass, it would not change the Antiquities Act, it would not prohibit the President from making national monuments, and it would not prohibit Congress from establishing national parks. All it would do is simply say you have got to go through the NEPA process which requires public input, especially from those who are going to be directly impacted.

And we have seen that if you mandate that ahead of time, you solve problems before they develop. We have practice, we have proof, and we have examples of where the monument was created without getting the input and problems developed which still have not been solved.

Don't do that. Do it the right way. We can do that, and we can make this effort happen. And, once again, of all the concepts of how to deal with the Antiquities Act and the problems it presents for those of us who live in the West, this is easily the most moderate approach, a simple approach which simply says, look, before you do it, listen to us. Let us have the chance to say something.

That is the way it ought to be and the way it should be. This bill is actually a vast improvement on a 100-plus-year-old bill that has outlived its usefulness and has changed not necessarily for the better over that course of time.

So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the comments that had been made. I would have appreciated it if people would also recognize the significance of this bill to those of us who live in the West. I wish they would also look at the bill as it is written. It is a very positive approach. It is something which we can all support, and it is a very good bill. I am biased because it is my bill, but it still is a very, very good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to close to reiterate the fairness of not only the bill but also of the rule, the other parts of the rule, the appropriateness of the underlying pieces of legislation, the potential of putting up other issues that are significant that must be addressed this particular week.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 524 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That 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. 15) to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. 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 and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. 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 recommend 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. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 15.

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. BISHOP of Utah. 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, 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 2 p.m.

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:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 524;

Adopting House Resolution 524, if ordered;

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1228.

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