

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.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 524) providing for consideration of the bill (H. Res. 1459) to ensure that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies to the declaration of national monuments, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 187, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—230

Aderholt	Forbes	Lucas
Amash	Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer
Amodei	Fox	Lummis
Bachmann	Franks (AZ)	Marchant
Bachus	Frelinghuysen	Marino
Barletta	Gardner	Massie
Barr	Garrett	McAllister
Barton	Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)
Benishek	Gibbs	McCauley
Bentivolio	Gibson	McClintock
Billirakis	Gingrey (GA)	McHenry
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	McIntyre
Black	Goodlatte	McKeon
Blackburn	Gosar	McKinley
Boustany	Gowdy	McMorris
Brady (TX)	Granger	Rodgers
Bridenstine	Graves (GA)	Meadows
Brooks (AL)	Graves (MO)	Meehan
Brooks (IN)	Griffin (AR)	Messer
Broun (GA)	Griffith (VA)	Mica
Buchanan	Grimm	Miller (FL)
Bucshon	Guthrie	Miller (MI)
Burgess	Hall	Mullin
Byrne	Hanna	Mulvaney
Calvert	Harper	Murphy (PA)
Camp	Harris	Neugebauer
Cantor	Hartzler	Noem
Capito	Hastings (WA)	Nugent
Carter	Heck (NV)	Nunes
Cassidy	Hensarling	Nunnelee
Chabot	Herrera Beutler	Olson
Chaffetz	Holding	Palazzo
Coble	Hudson	Paulsen
Coffman	Huelskamp	Pearce
Cole	Huizenga (MI)	Perry
Collins (GA)	Hultgren	Petri
Collins (NY)	Hunter	Pittenger
Conaway	Hurt	Pitts
Cook	Issa	Poe (TX)
Cotton	Jenkins	Pompeo
Cramer	Johnson (OH)	Posey
Crawford	Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)
Crenshaw	Jolly	Reed
Culberson	Jones	Reichert
Daines	Jordan	Renacci
Davis, Rodney	Joyce	Ribble
Denham	Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)
Dent	King (IA)	Rigell
DeSantis	King (NY)	Roby
DesJarlais	Kingston	Roe (TN)
Diaz-Balart	Kinzing (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Duffy	Kline	Rogers (KY)
Duncan (SC)	Labrador	Rogers (MI)
Duncan (TN)	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher
Ellmers	Lamborn	Rokita
Farenthold	Lance	Rooney
Fincher	Lankford	Ros-Lehtinen
Fitzpatrick	Latham	Roskam
Fleischmann	Latta	Ross
Fleming	LoBiondo	Rothfus
Flores	Long	Royce

Runyan	Smith (TX)
Ryan (WI)	Southerland
Salmon	Stewart
Sanford	Stivers
Scalise	Stockman
Schock	Stutzman
Schweikert	Terry
Scott, Austin	Thompson (PA)
Sensenbrenner	Thornberry
Sessions	Tiberi
Shimkus	Tipton
Shuster	Turner
Simpson	Upton
Smith (MO)	Valadao
Smith (NE)	Vela
Smith (NJ)	Wagner

NAYS—187

Barber	Green, Gene	Negrete McLeod
Barrow (GA)	Grijalva	Nolan
Bass	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Beatty	Hahn	Owens
Becerra	Hanabusa	Pallone
Bera (CA)	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Payne
Bonamici	Himes	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Holt	Perlmutter
Braley (IA)	Honda	Peters (CA)
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Peters (MI)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Peterson
Bustos	Huffman	Pingree (ME)
Butterfield	Israel	Pocan
Capps	Jackson Lee	Polis
Capuano	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Carney	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Richmond
Cartwright	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Chu	Kildee	Rush
Ciavarella	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda
Clark (MA)	Kind	T.
Clarke (NY)	Kirkpatrick	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kuster	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Langevin	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Connolly	Lee (CA)	Schrader
Conyers	Levin	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Lewis	Scott, David
Costa	Lipinski	Serrano
Courtney	Loebach	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Lofgren	Shea-Porter
Cuellar	Lowenthal	Sherman
Cummings	Lowe	Sinema
Davis (CA)	Lujan Grisham	Sires
Davis, Danny	(NM)	Slaughter
DeFazio	Luján, Ben Ray	Smith (WA)
DeGette	(NM)	Speier
Delaney	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Maffei	Takano
Deutsch	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Tierney
Doyle	Matheson	Titus
Edwards	Matsui	Tonko
Ellison	McCollum	Tsongas
Engel	McDermott	Van Hollen
Enyart	McGovern	Vargas
Eshoo	McNerney	Veasey
Esty	Meeks	Velázquez
Farr	Meng	Visclosky
Fattah	Michaud	Walz
Foster	Miller, George	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Schultz
Fudge	Moran	Waters
Garamendi	Murphy (FL)	Waxman
Garcia	Nadler	Welch
Grayson	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Green, Al	Neal	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Blumenauer	Gallego	Ryan (OH)
Campbell	Hinojosa	Schwartz
DelBene	McCarthy (NY)	Wolf
Duckworth	Miller, Gary	Young (AK)
Gabbard	Rangel	

□ 1425

Messrs. SCHRADER, MCNERNEY, Ms. ESHOO, Messrs. CONYERS, NADLER, and GUTIÉRREZ changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. TURNER and GRAVES of Missouri changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 142 I was unavoidably detained en route to the House floor. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 2014, I was unavoidably detained and was unable to record my vote for rollcall No. 142. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on ordering the previous question.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 190, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

AYES—227

Aderholt	Fleischmann	Lamborn
Amash	Fleming	Lance
Amodei	Flores	Lankford
Bachmann	Forbes	Latham
Bachus	Fortenberry	Latta
Barletta	Fox	LoBiondo
Barr	Franks (AZ)	Long
Benishek	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Bentivolio	Gardner	Luetkemeyer
Billirakis	Garrett	Lummis
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	Marchant
Black	Gibbs	Marino
Blackburn	Gibson	Massie
Boustany	Gingrey (GA)	McAllister
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)
Bridenstine	Goodlatte	McCauley
Brooks (AL)	Gosar	McClintock
Brooks (IN)	Gowdy	McHenry
Broun (GA)	Granger	McKeon
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	McKinley
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	McMorris
Burgess	Griffin (AR)	Rodgers
Byrne	Griffith (VA)	Meadows
Calvert	Guthrie	Meehan
Camp	Hall	Messer
Cantor	Hanna	Mica
Capito	Harper	Miller (FL)
Cassidy	Harris	Miller (MI)
Chabot	Hartzler	Mullin
Chaffetz	Hastings (WA)	Mulvaney
Coble	Heck (NV)	Murphy (PA)
Coffman	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Noem
Collins (GA)	Holding	Nugent
Collins (NY)	Hudson	Nunes
Conaway	Huelskamp	Nunnelee
Cook	Huizenga (MI)	Olson
Cotton	Hultgren	Palazzo
Cramer	Hunter	Paulsen
Crawford	Hurt	Pearce
Crenshaw	Issa	Perry
Culberson	Jenkins	Petri
Daines	Johnson (OH)	Pittenger
Davis, Rodney	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
Denham	Jolly	Poe (TX)
Dent	Jones	Pompeo
DeSantis	Jordan	Posey
DesJarlais	Joyce	Price (GA)
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Reed
Duffy	King (IA)	Reichert
Duncan (SC)	King (NY)	Renacci
Duncan (TN)	Kingston	Ribble
Ellmers	Kinzing (IL)	Rice (SC)
Farenthold	Kline	Rigell
Fincher	Labrador	Roby
Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa	Roe (TN)
		Rogers (AL)