

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.

Ms. FOXX. 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1937, NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 481 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 481

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. 1937) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness. 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.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the good 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. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1330

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, just yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for House Resolution 481, providing for the consideration of an important piece of legislation—H.R. 1937, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2015.

This rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 1937 under a structured rule, with five amendments made in

order, four of which, I might point out, were offered by Democratic Members of this body. Therefore, this rule provides for a balanced, deliberative, and open debate if we focus our remarks on the merits of the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act and don't go off on unnecessary tangents.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support both House Resolution 481 and the underlying bill, H.R. 1937. I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI) for sponsoring this legislation, and I would also like to thank the gentleman from Utah, Chairman ROB BISHOP, for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow us to consider the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act, an important bill that will streamline our country's mine permitting processes to remove unnecessary and burdensome bureaucratic hurdles, which can delay some mining activities and projects by up to a decade—10 years—which is an outrageous amount of time that is indicative of the problem we seek to address here today.

The permitting system the Federal Government currently uses to provide for the extraction of rare earth minerals in the U.S. is outdated, unproductive, and, more often than not, hinders our ability to extract these critical resources. This red tape has a devastating impact on communities across the country and in the West, particularly, that rely on the ability to obtain and develop these minerals for economic growth and our Nation's security.

Our country is blessed with a myriad of rare earth minerals that are increasingly used to manufacture high-tech equipment as well as many other everyday applications and products. Many countries around the world are already working to improve their infrastructure, providing the United States with an exceptional opportunity to play a major role in the growing minerals marketplace by supplying foreign countries and businesses, as well as domestic companies, with the resources necessary to remain competitive in the international economy. However, a lack of communication between local, State, and Federal permitting agencies exists, and it creates a bureaucratic backlog of applications that delays mining activity by approximately, like I said, 7 to 10 years, which, if not addressed, will impede the ability of U.S. mineral companies to increase their share of the global marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, due to onerous government red tape, the frivolous lawsuits that result, and a burdensome permitting process, good-paying jobs in the United States mining industry have moved overseas and have put domestic manufacturing jobs at the mercy of our foreign competitors. H.R. 1937 would fix

our outdated and uncertain bureaucratic permitting system, which negatively impacts investment in our economy by discouraging domestic companies from extracting and developing these critical minerals.

This is especially unfortunate given that we have only begun to scratch the surface of what we can potentially develop from our abundant natural resources, which have played such a critical role in making the U.S. a leading world economy and industrial power. Our Nation has vast energy potential from sources such as coal, oil shale, and natural gas, as well as numerous critical minerals that we should be developing. Yet the development of our domestic minerals resources has been obstructed time and time again under this administration, which, unfortunately, places the political goals of special interests over the welfare and well-being of hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, the Federal Government should promote investments in the U.S. and in American companies by creating a regulatory framework that encourages the safe development of domestic resources. If we are going to address the growing mineral trade imbalance—with more U.S. mining jobs moving overseas and higher energy and commodity prices here at home—we must first put a stop to the bureaucratic delays that are at the root of the problem.

This legislation does just that by telling Federal agencies to make a decision about whether a project should move forward or not—a simple “yes” or “no”—and do it in a timely manner. Give people certainty. We have streamlined and improved this process for other domestic industries, and it is now time to do it for our rare earth minerals sector, which is responsible for some of the highest paying middle class jobs across the country. It is illogical and irrational that red tape and delayed permit approvals can lead to 10 years of deliberation over whether or not to approve a mining permit or project. Actually, it borders on insanity.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, straightforward rule, allowing for the consideration of an important piece of legislation that will provide the U.S. with a unique opportunity to tap into the growing global marketplace for rare earth minerals by supplying both foreign and domestic companies with the resources they need to remain competitive.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule's adoption, and I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill—the so-called Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act.

My colleague from Washington mentioned what is not being discussed here today. Again, to be clear, it feels like we are at Groundhog Day here. We have 8 legislative days until we hit the debt limit and default on our Nation's debt. In 6 legislative days, the Federal transportation authorization will expire. In 22 legislative days, we will be on the brink of yet another government shutdown. To a certain extent, I feel like we are fiddling while Rome burns. Here we are, talking about an issue which, I am sure, deserves its day in the Sun. I will talk about some of the deficiencies in this bill, but we are tackling a recycled bill that in similar form has already passed this body and that doesn't address any of these urgent deadline items that we are actually facing.

In fact, as I travel across my district in Colorado, I don't hear a lot of my constituents crying out for access to sand and clay. I do hear them saying, “Don't default on the national debt.” “Do something about the budget.” “Make sure that we prevent another government shutdown.” Yet all of those deadlines are looming while we are fiddling here with other bills that aren't going anywhere and aren't becoming law and have already passed this body in similar form. So, for the fourth time in three Congresses, we are going to consider a nearly identical measure that the Republicans have brought to the floor despite the Senate's unwillingness to pick it up and the President's opposition.

The so-called Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act promotes industry interests over the American people's health and welfare. The biggest conceptual problem with it is the definition that it gives of “strategic and critical minerals.” The bill not only expands the mining companies' ability to mine on public lands for minerals like gold and copper, but also materials that one would think, by no stretch of common sense, are rare, like sand and clay.

If we include sand from the beach or from my kids' sandbox as a mineral of critical development and if we include the gravel from my driveway as a mineral of critical development, I am not sure what we are excluding. I think this applies to almost everything. In fact, I am not even sure how we are even saying the term “critical and strategic” can even apply here when we are talking about sand and gravel and some of the most common natural resources that we have.

This bill permits nearly all mining operations to circumvent the important public health and environmental review processes that are required under the National Environmental Policy Act.

Instead of maintaining a reasonable threshold to ensure that we focus on resources and developing resources that are actually critical for our defense or for our economy, this bill expands our definition of “strategic and

critical,” effectively making it worthless. By including everything and by saying everything is strategic and critical, you are effectively saying that nothing is strategic and critical. That is what this bill does while we are 8 days from hitting the debt limit, while we are 6 days from expiring on the Federal transportation authorization.

By the way, I have to talk about how these “days” work because we are 8 days from the debt limit and 6 days from the transportation authorization. Those aren't real days that Americans know. That is because the Republicans always send this Congress on vacation nearly every week. So it might be 6 legislative days. I think it is, actually, 15 or 20 days, but Congress isn't working for most of those. While these deadlines tick, Members of Congress are actually at home most of the time because the Republican leadership won't let us work. They won't let us come here. They are adjourning the session. That is why, when something is 20 days off, we are sounding alarm bells, saying it is 6 days off—because they are only letting us work 6 of those 20 days. I would be happy to show up for the other 14, Mr. Speaker, but you wouldn't be here to gavel us into session.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. POLIS. What would happen if I showed up and you were not here to gavel us down into session?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not respond to a hypothetical question.

Mr. POLIS. Maybe we will just have to try that sometime when we are 2 or 3 days from the expiration of our transportation funding or from defaulting on our national debt. I will be happy to come here to an empty Chamber.

I recall one time, Mr. Speaker, when you and the Republican majority accidentally left the cameras on, and our Democratic whip, STENY HOYER, was on the floor, demanding why we couldn't bring up a bill. Maybe, if I am here and if you are not here, Mr. Speaker, we can get those C-SPAN cameras turned on when we are 2 or 3 days from a deadline so that the American people understand this funny math, where somehow 20 days is only 6 legislative days because you don't let us work the other 14, when hardworking Americans have to go to work every day to support their families.

This bill's impacts are far reaching. As drafted, it makes the term “critical and strategic” meaningless. The legislation would increase the pollution of our water resources for States dealing with extreme drought conditions and deadly blazes. The last thing we need is to jeopardize our already scarce sources of water. We can't afford to do any more harm to the quality of our limited water supplies and to risk the jobs that are created across the West

through outdoor recreation, leisure, and agriculture.

Why the House Republicans see a need for legislation to further promote mining interests at the expense of public health continues to be mystifying. The industry already has free rein to extract mineral resources. Under the antiquated 1872 mining law, Federal land managers are actually barred from denying hard rock mining proposals. The Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service have almost never denied a large mining process. Why exempt them further from all environmental review for sand and gravel, which aren't even rare elements?

This bill fails to update the antiquated legal framework. It fails to address the reforms needed. It fails to protect our environment. It doesn't change the fact that mining companies currently enjoy—guess what, Mr. Speaker. What do you think—a 3 percent royalty rate? What do they pay—a 2 percent royalty rate? Do they pay a 1 percent royalty rate? No. They pay a zero percent royalty rate on Federal land. This bill fails to address that. It doesn't change the fact that mining companies have left an estimated half a million mines. That is nearly one for every person in my district, Mr. Speaker. Half a million mines all across the country have been abandoned, most of which are in dire need of cleanup or restoration, which this bill fails to address.

I had the opportunity to introduce a bill with Ranking Member GRIJALVA earlier this year that would have addressed many of these ongoing failures in mining accountability, but it hasn't been brought up before the committee. Instead, legislation like this, the so-called Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act, is rocketed to the floor even though it has passed four times in the last three sessions.

Instead of confronting real challenges facing our economy, facing American families, we continue to line the pockets of the mining industry, which already has one of the fattest profit margins of any, while risking the health of the American people and exploiting our natural resources without adequate return and royalties to the taxpayers, who own our public lands.

I oppose the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that would permanently authorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The Land and Water Conservation

Fund supports the protection of public lands and waters, such as natural parks, forests, and recreation areas.

Many conservation organizations from my district and nationally have been in to meet with me on this important topic, and I know they have reached out to other Members on the Hill as well.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with 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, the Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act—again, it is hard to say that name with a straight face when they are defining strategic and critical minerals in such a broad way that it involves basically the dirt under our feet, the sand under our feet, the gravel in our drive. When you define something like that and try to mean everything, you wind up meaning nothing.

Rather than actually doing something to protect minerals that are critical for our defense, for our economy, this bill waters that down by expanding this access to sand and dirt and gravel, maximizing mining companies' profits at the expense of our health, our water, our land, and our natural resources.

Furthermore, the underlying bill would damage our economy by placing the use of the mining industry above the many other important economic uses of our public lands. I will give you some examples. How about hunting? angling? hiking? biking? These are the economic drivers in my district, Mr. Speaker.

If we didn't have an environmental review process and large gravel pits and silver mines were put in place with wild abandon, we would lose jobs. We would lose most jobs in Eagle and Summit Counties which relate to the tourism industry. The beautiful, pristine, outdoor public lands that attract visitors from across the country—probably from your district, Mr. Speaker—Vail, Breckenridge, Winter Park, and Rocky Mountain National Park, we would love to have you; but you better come quickly before this bill becomes law, because there won't be much to see if it does.

When visiting my constituents in Colorado this summer, expanding mining access was not one of the issues that they brought up. In fact, they asked me to ensure that mining companies are held accountable to greater levels of accountability and transparency. They asked me to develop environmental safeguards to make sure that disasters and tragedies don't occur and that abandoned mines are cleaned up and that our extraction industry can be done in a thoughtful way, and to make sure it doesn't destroy jobs by conflicting with other

higher and better economic uses of some parcels of public land.

Look, Members on both sides of the aisle support the development of rare earth and critical mineral policy. There is no disagreement about that. I would be happy to work with my colleague, Mr. Speaker, from Washington State and others on putting together a commonsense bill that defines rare earth and critical minerals in a commonsense way. Not the dirt beneath our feet, not the sand in my kid's sandbox, but in a commonsense way where we look at the needs of industry, our supply, we define it, and we come up with a targeted access plan, including access to our public lands in appropriate ways, that is expedited for national priority items. That is not what this bill does.

We could work together, Mr. Speaker. And this body needs to work together, not just on this bill, but to avoid defaulting on our national debt, to continue to fund our highways and infrastructure, in fact, to keep government open. We might only have 11 legislative days to try to keep government open.

By the way, I think that is 30-some actual days for most Americans, Mr. Speaker. As we talked about, you won't be here, Mr. Speaker. If there is a way that I can be here and advance an agenda of keeping government open, I would be happy to, but I am afraid it requires a Speaker to gavel us in.

Now, there are bills that seek to balance the challenges of mining with its impact on surrounding communities, but, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues weren't interested in discussing those. Instead we are discussing a recycled bill for the fourth time that would eliminate environmental review, allow for the unfettered mining of public lands, define critical minerals in such a way that it means the dirt between your toes and the sand in your kid's sandbox. It would likely not be brought up by the Senate and dead on arrival at the President's desk.

This is a job-destroying bill that the American people are not even asking Congress to take up. It takes a simple concept—preserving access to critical resources, which would have strong bipartisan support—and contorts it into a divisive job-destroying, health-destroying, commonsense-defying issue that doesn't appear anywhere on the priority list of struggling families across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question and to vote "no" on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 481 is a fair rule allowing for balanced, deliberative, and open debate, just as my colleague is asking, as well as numerous amendment opportunities from both parties.

It provides for the consideration of a bill that is critical to the economic

well-being of mining communities across the country, which are reeling from the continual impacts of Federal regulation and the bureaucratic permitting process we have in place.

This regulatory environment has led to lost jobs and wages in the mining industry, ultimately hurting the middle class families that many of these rules and regulations claim they are intended to protect.

H.R. 1937 streamlines our country's mine permitting process by removing unnecessary and onerous hurdles, which can lead to decades-long delays for mining activities and projects. The current Federal permitting system for the extraction of rare earth minerals is outdated, unproductive, and often impedes our ability to extract these critical minerals.

You know, our country is blessed with a myriad of rare earth minerals, but this Federal red tape has had a devastating impact on the mining communities in our country whose livelihoods depend on the ability to obtain and develop these resources.

We must stop punishing middle class Americans with these heavyhanded and poorly considered regulations that more often than not have unintended consequences and serious negative economic impacts.

Mr. Speaker, already many countries around the world are looking to improve their infrastructure, which provides the U.S. with the unique opportunity to tap into this growing global market. Due to strong international demand for rare earth minerals, allowing for greater development of domestic resources also creates a unique opportunity to further American trade relationships and decrease our trade deficit.

Additionally, by increasing the available supply of these rare earth minerals, manufacturing companies will be able to more efficiently produce their products, which could reduce consumer costs and open the door to greater innovation. Further, our outdated permitting system negatively impacts investment in our economy that hinders our ability to take on this expanded role in the global marketplace for these mineral resources.

The Federal Government should be promoting investment in the U.S. by creating a regulatory framework that encourages the safe development of domestic resources. If we want to address the growing minerals trade imbalance, as we see more and more U.S. mining jobs moving overseas and higher energy and commodity prices here at home, then we must fix these delays which are at the root of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, this rule allows for consideration of an important piece of legislation that will address the burdensome permitting and regulatory hurdles that are harmful to this vital industry. Yet, while this legislation allows for greater utilization of domestic resources, it also maintains important environmental safeguards designed to

ensure the health of our constituents and ecosystems, striking an important balance that has been absent far too long.

While my colleague from Colorado and I may have a few differences of opinion, I firmly believe this rule and the underlying bill are strong measures that are critically important to our country's future, both for my State as well as his and many, many others in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule's adoption, and I urge my colleague to support House Resolution 481, and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 481 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 2. 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. 1814) to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund. 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. 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 recommit 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1814.

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. NEWHOUSE. 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.

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 H. Res. 480;