

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

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

Adopting House Resolution 770;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 771; and

Adopting House Resolution 771, if ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 5278, PUERTO RICO OVER-  
SIGHT, MANAGEMENT, AND ECO-  
NOMIC STABILITY ACT

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

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

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

[Roll No. 284]

YEAS—241

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

Cooper Jones  
Costa Jordan  
Costello (PA) Joyce  
Cramer Katko  
Crawford Kelly (MS)  
Crenshaw Kelly (PA)  
Culberson King (IA)  
Curbelo (FL) King (NY)  
Davis, Rodney Kinzinger (IL)  
Denham Kline  
Dent Knight  
DeSantis Labrador  
DesJarlais LaHood  
Diaz-Balart LaMalfa  
Dold Lamborn  
Donovan Lance  
Duffy Latta  
Duncan (SC) LoBiondo  
Duncan (TN) Long  
Ellmers (NC) Loudermilk  
Emmer (MN) Love  
Farenthold Lucas  
Fitzpatrick Lummis  
Fleischmann MacArthur  
Fleming Marchant  
Flores Marino  
Forbes Massie  
Fortenberry McCarthy  
Foxy McCaul  
Franks (AZ) McClintock  
Frelinghuysen McHenry  
Garrett McKinley  
Gibbs McMorris  
Gibson Rodgers  
Gohmert McSally  
Goodlatte Meadows  
Gosar Meehan  
Gowdy Messer  
Granger Mica  
Graves (GA) Miller (FL)  
Graves (LA) Miller (MI)  
Graves (MO) Moolenaar  
Griffith Mooney (WV)  
Grothman Mullin  
Guinta Mulvaney  
Guthrie Murphy (PA)  
Hanna Neugebauer  
Harper Newhouse  
Harris Noem  
Hartzler Nugent  
Heck (NV) Nunes  
Hensarling Olson  
Hice, Jody B. Palazzo  
Hill Palmer  
Holding Paulsen  
Hudson Pearce  
Huelskamp Perry  
Huizenga (MI) Pittenger  
Hultgren Pitts  
Hunter Poe (TX)  
Hurd (TX) Poliquin  
Hurt (VA) Pompeo  
Issa Posey  
Jenkins (KS) Price, Tom  
Jenkins (WV) Ratcliffe  
Johnson (OH) Reed  
Johnson, Sam Reichert  
Jolly Renacci

## NAYS—178

Adams Clarke (NY)  
Aguilar Clay  
Amash Cleaver  
Ashford Clyburn  
Bass Cohen  
Beatty Connolly  
Beckerra Conyers  
Bera Courtney  
Beyer Crowley  
Bishop (GA) Cuellar  
Blumenauer Cummings  
Bonamici Davis (CA)  
Boyle, Brendan Davis, Danny  
F. DeFazio  
Brady (PA) DeGette  
Brown (FL) Delaney  
Brownley (CA) DeLauro  
Bustos DelBene  
Capps DeSaulnier  
Capuano Deutch  
Cárdenas Dingell  
Carney Doggett  
Carson (IN) Doyle, Michael  
Cartwright F.  
Castor (FL) Duckworth  
Castro (TX) Edwards  
Chu, Judy Ellison  
Cicilline Engel  
Clark (MA) Eshoo

Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCaul  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks

Barletta  
Butterfield  
Farr  
Fincher  
Hardy

Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nader  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky

## NOT VOTING—14

Herrera Beutler  
Hinojosa  
Lieu, Ted  
Luettkemeyer  
Payne

□ 1515

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

Mr. SHUSTER changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 284, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

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

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

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

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,  
*Clerk.*

OHIO SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Columbus, Ohio, June 8, 2016.

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

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

Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

PATRICIA WOLFE,  
*Elections Administrator.*

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

## WELCOMING THE HONORABLE WARREN DAVIDSON TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

There was no objection.

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

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