

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The rule we have considered today provides for consideration of an important and badly needed bill. This legislation funds critical activities, such as wildfire mitigation and response, PILT payments for counties with large amounts of Federal lands, fish hatcheries that are helping to meet salmon recovery goals, the \$12 billion maintenance backlog on our National Park Service lands, and the need to address the problem of lead in drinking water across our country.

This is also a fiscally responsible bill that reflects House Republicans' priorities in tackling our out-of-control national debt. This is accomplished by striking a smart balance between funding essential programs and making responsible reductions to lower priority activities to ensure we meet our tight budget guidelines. This bill includes provisions that will roll back and prevent many harmful Federal regulations that have had a chilling effect on business development and economic activity at a time when we can ill afford either.

The measure protects the rights of law-abiding Americans by prohibiting Federal agencies from issuing new closures of public lands to hunting and recreational shooting as well as from regulating the lead content of ammunition and fishing tackle.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation recognizes and respects the current fiscal landscape, lowers overall funding in the bill by \$64 million below current levels and \$1 billion below the President's request, yet it still provides the means necessary to fund the Department of the Interior and environmental programs that protect and promote our natural resources with a responsible, yet sustainable, budget.

Additionally, the measure provides critically needed funds to ensure forest health and combat wildfires, a priority for many living in the West who have seen devastating wildfires destroy homes, businesses, and millions of acres of land over the last few years.

This is a strong rule that provides for the consideration of a very important bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule's adoption and invest in a prosperous future for our country by passing the FY 2017 Interior and environment appropriations bill.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 820 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

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

SEC. 15. 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. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist.

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. 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. 16. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

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 amend-

ment 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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 4992, UNITED STATES FI-
NANCIAL SYSTEM PROTECTION
ACT OF 2016; PROVIDING FOR
CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5119, NO
2H2O FROM IRAN ACT; AND PRO-
VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF
H.R. 5631, IRAN ACCOUNTABILITY
ACT OF 2016

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 819 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 819

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4992) to codify regulations relating to transfers of funds involving Iran, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5119) to prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds available to any Federal department or agency for any fiscal year to purchase or issue a license for the purchase of heavy water produced in Iran. All

points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5631) to hold Iran accountable for its state sponsorship of terrorism and other threatening activities and for its human rights abuses, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. BYRNE. 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. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 819 allows for consideration of three very important bills relating to the national security of the United States of America. Each of these bills deals with Iran, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism.

The conduct of the Iranian Government continues to be very concerning. Iran has a clear record of human rights violations and mistreatment of its citizens. Iran also has continued aggressive behavior, including testing intercontinental ballistic missiles, which can be used to attack our allies in the Middle East, like Israel, as well as the potential to strike us here at home.

Director of National Intelligence James Clapper wrote in testimony to the Senate Committee on Armed Services earlier this year: "The Islamic Republic of Iran presents an enduring threat to U.S. national interests because of its support to regional terrorist and militant groups and the Asad regime, as well as its development of advanced military capabilities."

Iran is not becoming a better partner or neighbor. Just look no further than the capture at gunpoint and detention of 10 U.S. sailors earlier this year. A Navy investigation released a few

weeks ago found that Iran violated international law and violated sovereign immunity during that episode. Clearly, they are no friend of the United States.

So these bills address three different areas where the United States can stand up to Iran and encourage them to stop with their rogue actions and putting lives at risk. First, the resolution allows for consideration of H.R. 4992, the United States Financial System Protection Act. This legislation will codify existing requirements that prohibit the Obama administration from allowing the U.S. dollar to be used to facilitate trade transactions with Iran. These requirements will remain in place until the President certifies that Iran is no longer supporting terrorism, developing ballistic missiles, abusing human rights, or laundering money in support of dishonest activity.

Iran's financial sector poses a clear risk to financial markets around the world, given their track record of corruption and support for terrorism. In fact, the Financial Action Task Force, an organization created by the G7 to set standards regarding money laundering, has labeled Iran as a Non-Cooperative Country or Territory. If Iran doesn't want to be subject to these restrictions, then it is simple: they just need to stop supporting terrorism and conducting other illicit activities. I don't think that is too much to ask.

The bill also allows for consideration of H.R. 5119, the No 2H2O from Iran Act. This straightforward bill prohibits the United States from purchasing heavy water from Iran.

For those who do not know—and until I learned about this, I would have been one of those—heavy water is essential to the production of weapons-grade plutonium. News reports from just yesterday indicate the Obama administration has officially purchased 32 metric tons of heavy water from Iran for \$8.6 million. That is \$8.6 million in U.S. taxpayer money that will be going to the largest state sponsor of terrorism. That is simply absurd.

If Iran isn't producing nuclear weapons, then why do they need such large amounts of heavy water to begin with? Iran needs to stop with their production of heavy water altogether. The last thing the United States should do is continue to support and condone their illicit activities.

Finally, the bill also provides for consideration of H.R. 5631, the Iran Accountability Act. This bill will ensure strong sanctions remain in place against Iran for their support of terrorism as well as their human rights violations and continued ballistic missile program.

Holding Iran accountable is critically important, and it is clear that our sanctions against Iran work. Robust economic sanctions will force Iran to back down from their rogue activities and stop supporting terrorism.

□ 1400

Just consider the serious threats posed by Iran's ballistic missile pro-

gram. Mr. Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence, has also written in testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee that "Iran's ballistic missiles are inherently capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, and Tehran already has the largest inventory of ballistic missiles in the Middle East."

The United States cannot stand by and become complicit with these actions by Iran. We must stand up for freedom, justice, and good around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quickly make one other point. I know Members of this House have different opinions about the Iran nuclear agreement. Personally, I was and am strongly opposed, because I think it makes the world less safe.

But regardless of your views on the Iran deal, can we not all agree that Iran should stop supporting terrorism? Can we not all agree that Iran should face consequences for the continued violation of human rights? Can we not all agree that Iran should stop producing ballistic missiles that can be used to attack U.S. servicemembers and our allies and us here at home?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand up to Iran. Support House Resolution 819 and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman for yielding the customary time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule that provides for consideration of three bills: H.R. 5631, H.R. 5119, H.R. 4992.

Mr. Speaker, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is an agreement which was the culmination of 2 years of negotiations between the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia, China, Germany, and Iran. It was really a turning point in the history of nuclear disarmament and prevention of nuclear proliferation.

We have certifiable assurance from Iran that it will cease to develop its nuclear weapons program. It was an historic diplomatic effort. Obviously, the jury is still out on whether it works. But at this point, we need to move forward on the rigid implementation of this agreement.

While any multilateral agreement, by its very nature, is far from perfect, many believe that this deal represented the best shot at preventing a nuclear-armed Iran. So far, it is too early to say whether the agreement is working.

There is no doubt—and I think there is agreement—that Iran is a destabilizing force in the region. It is a hostile regime. The regular regime and their theocracy and the Ayatollah regularly spout anti-American, anti-Israel, anti-Semitic, anti-gay statements. They have a track record of supporting terrorist activities and have a horrible domestic record on human

rights. But as many renowned experts, including military officials and non-proliferation experts and nuclear physicists have recognized, there weren't any better options on the table than the JCPOA to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

The deal is not based on blind trust. It is predicated on third-party verification and strong international monitoring provisions that need to be fully implemented so that we will know if the Iranians cheat. The deal mandates that if Iran violates any aspect of the deal, there are tough snapback sanctions that would be employed against the Iranians.

Keep in mind that there are a number of sanctions that are not related to nuclear deterrence. Those are still in place with regard to Iran, and will remain in place with regard to terrorist activity and human rights. The bill does not remove the military option from the table if today's Iranian regime or future Iranian regimes fail to abide by the agreement.

In contrast, the three bills under consideration today are an effort to undermine the direction that America and Israel are going with regard to rigid implementation of the JCPOA.

Let's start with the flawed process. None of these bills have had a chance to be considered by committee. They just sort of appeared here in the Rules Committee. They didn't go through the Foreign Affairs Committee or the Armed Services Committee or any other committee. They skipped a markup. They skipped bipartisan negotiations. As far as I know, I certainly didn't see them. I don't think any Members on my side of the aisle saw them—if the gentleman has other information, let us know—until earlier this week.

So I am not aware of any bipartisan negotiations. Certainly, that normally occurs in the committee. This leapt over the committee and went right to the Rules Committee and, of course, will be considered under a closed rule, which means Members of this body, Democratic and Republicans, had no chance to amend these bills that mysteriously appeared on Monday. They didn't have a chance in committee. It went through committee. They don't have a chance here because the Rules Committee actually blocked every amendment by having a closed process.

We have an amendment process for a reason, under regular order. It provides Members of this body, the majority and minority party, the opportunity for input and debate. It often leads to a better work product. Unfortunately, under this rule, it is not being allowed on those bills.

These bills short-circuited the process. They are bad bills. It is only through continued engagement and rigid implementation that we can continue to make sure that Iran does not develop nuclear weapons, by keeping our voice and the conversation at the table. If we don't do that, it would be a critical miscalculation.

We can agree that the Iranian regime can be untrustworthy, and that is why we need rigid implementation of the JCPOA. Getting Iran to the negotiating table reduces the risk of adding another nuclear state to a secure world. We need to verify, verify. And, of course, all options remain on the table.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I was listening to the gentleman's comments. The reason why I know amendments were made in order is that only one amendment was received by the committee. It was received after we had finished having the testimony before the committee and shortly before the committee was going to take up the rule.

So there really wasn't any reasonable way to consider that particular amendment. And since no other Member of the House had offered any amendments, there really weren't any amendments to make in order.

The second point he said is that we are proceeding on the assurance that Iran is going to comply with the agreement—the assurance of Iran, when we have recent news reports that people in other countries that are working on this, particularly in Germany, have found that there have already been violations of this agreement by Iran. So there is every reason to believe that an assurance from Iran means nothing. Nothing.

He says we need to move forward with implementation. Well, there is nothing in the underlying bills that would stop implementation of this agreement that the President agreed to and that, unfortunately, not enough of us were against to stop. So the agreement is going forward, much to my chagrin.

These three bills deal with specific threats from Iran that have nothing to do with the agreement. They deal with the production of heavy water. There is no reason for us to buy heavy water. There is no reason for them to produce heavy water unless they are producing weapons-grade plutonium. And there is no reason for them to produce weapons-grade plutonium unless they are producing weapons, which is a violation of the agreement.

They should not be able to use American currency to effect their transactions. And we should put very heavy sanctions on them while they continue to support terrorism around the world and while they continue to support ever bigger, ever longer-range ballistic missiles.

Let's make no mistake about it. Long-range ballistic missiles are not needed to hit Israel. Long-range ballistic missiles are needed to hit Europe and the United States of America.

So these three bills don't get at the agreement that the President has already agreed to and that people on the other side of the aisle and some others

said were okay. These get to the remaining threats against the people of the United States.

I would suggest to the gentleman that these three bills are very much important to what we need to do to protect the American people.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, one year ago, America made a momentous decision concerning the best way to deal with Iran, a dangerous, authoritarian regime with a history of promoting terrorism. We made a choice between war and peace. We learned something from the colossal failure of the Bush-Cheney go-it-alone, war-of-choice in Iraq. We wisely chose the path of diplomacy.

Now, one year after these very difficult negotiations with Iran, we should recognize that success has been achieved. And even though we have not limited every danger from Iran, we have limited the most significant danger, the development of a nuclear weapon. Whereas before, Iran could have developed a nuclear weapon within a few months, it now would take a year or more, if Iran made that horrible decision to produce a nuclear weapon.

Before the agreement, Iran's nuclear program was cloaked in secrecy. Now we have inspectors and the opportunity for rigorous examination of their sites on a regular basis.

Tomorrow, if Iran were to decide to produce a nuclear weapon, not only would it take four to six times longer than before, we would quickly be aware of it and would be able to take appropriate action.

Iran has shipped over 8.5 tons of enriched uranium to Russia. It has disabled more than 12,000 centrifuges and poured concrete into the core of a reactor at Arak designed to produce plutonium. Now, it is the United States that is acquiring some of Iran's heavy water that might have gone to nuclear production.

Each of these steps carries us further on a long and important road toward eliminating Iran's short-term uranium and plutonium pathways to a nuclear weapon. That is progress, by every measure. America and our key allies are safer today than we were a year ago, and before that—safer than if we had followed their path of confrontation and war. Continuous, intrusive monitoring is the key to keeping our families safe and avoiding war.

An impressive bipartisan group of some 75 high-profile signatories—Nobel laureates, generals, diplomats, and legislators—have approved this accord, advising the President and Congress yesterday that this agreement is “providing greater security to our friends and partners in the region and to the world,” noting that “all pathways to an Iranian nuclear weapon have been blocked.”

After doing everything they possibly could think of to subvert and undermine the negotiations while they were underway with Iran—even an outrageous letter from a Republican group of Senators telling the Iranians to believe them and not the President of the United States—the Republicans today continue to interfere with and refuse to accept peace as the better course to safeguard our families.

Through today's debate, they launched yet one more partisan attack on this agreement. In all, they have authored more than 20 pieces of legislation attempting to undermine this agreement.

While the administration properly focuses our energy on enhanced verification, Republicans focus theirs instead on how to destroy the agreement. It is much like the debate we had over the Affordable Care Act. All they are concerned with is one vote of repeal after another, and they offer no viable alternatives. That is the case here. Instead of focusing on how to make us safer, their goal is to undermine the President of the United States and destroy this agreement.

As usual, my colleagues are choosing inaction over a Plan of Action. They know the President has issued a veto threat. In the unlikely event that this regressive legislation were to be approved in Congress, it would never become law.

Today they are adopting a procedural rule so that this House will waste a full day discussing how to destroy the Iran nuclear agreement. It will not address gun violence. It will not address the failure to fund research for a vaccine to prepare and prevent the Zika virus from spreading. It will not do anything about voting rights or a host of other issues this Congress should be considering. Instead, it is raising three bills going the wrong direction.

Some of those that reject diplomacy today are the same people that were backing the go-it-alone invasion of Iraq, a debacle second to none in the history of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. One country, more than any other, benefited from their wrong-headed decision, and was empowered. That country was Iran. Today, diplomacy, the opposite of war, is hard to start and easy to end. Let us continue on that path.

The path ahead remains difficult. Iran will be challenging. We must watch it like a hawk and monitor it, but we need not yield to the hawks who reject peace.

□ 1415

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said that the decision made last year was a momentous decision. I agree with him. It was a momentous decision and I fear it is a decision that our chil-

dren, our grandchildren and great grandchildren will come to regret, a decision that will give us not only a nuclearized Iran, but a nuclearized Middle East.

He said there was a choice between war and peace. That was a false choice. There was a choice between keeping the sanctions in place to get a better deal or giving in, and we gave in. So the truth of the matter is that we had a real option out there, and that was to stick to our guns and get a better deal. We didn't do that.

We could sit back and watch what is happening, or we can do something. These bills do something that don't undermine the agreement that has already been reached and already been basically approved by a number of people in this House.

What we are looking at is a nuclearized Middle East, unless we take some steps now, and these underlying bills do that. We are not safer today because of what we did. The world is far more dangerous.

I sit on the Armed Services Committee. I can tell you that that decision last summer has destabilized further the Middle East, not further stabilized it.

Finally, the gentleman brought up the Zika virus. We passed a responsible bill through this House that dealt with the Zika virus and sent it to the Senate and Democrats in the Senate are blocking that bill from coming up.

So who is being responsible about Zika? The Republicans are being responsible about Zika and the Democrats are being irresponsible.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any additional speakers.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I do not, and I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will be offering a motion in a moment that, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to bring up the bipartisan "No Fly No Buy" legislation, so this will give Members of this body another opportunity to vote on bringing up the bill that would bar the sale of explosives and firearms to terrorists, and help make sure that terrorists don't assemble arsenals in our country to commit terrorist acts against our country. The time to act is now.

To discuss our previous question, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I think the previous question is extremely important because Republicans, just as they fled in the middle of the night from discussing gun violence before the July 4 break, have now decided not to consider a gun bill at all, even an NRA-backed proposal they have rejected.

But I want to ask the gentleman specifically about the comments that were

just made about the Zika virus and the possibility of an epidemic, because it is so important. Am I correct that that proposal that he says they passed is the first one in the history of my time here, and perhaps in the history of this body, where they prohibited even one minute of debate of the way that they were funding Zika by taking the funds away from Ebola and threatening our public health system?

It is not a question of Democrats having blocked something. It has been their refusal to deal with and recognize the public health challenge, denying \$4 of \$5 asked for by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to deal with Zika, even threatening the possibility of developing a vaccine.

Is that correct, this has been the history of their failure to come to terms with a major public health crisis and listen to the scientists and the physicians and the public health experts and, instead, pursuing this ideological crusade to take away money from public health?

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman from Texas is correct. Effectively, rather than actually find resources to develop a vaccine against Zika, they basically said, we are going to be taking the money from Ebola, which, by the way, still exists, still is a threat. We need to be ready for the next threat of an Ebola or Ebola-like danger to our citizens from a public health perspective.

In addition, the initial Republican attempts included things that they long wanted to do, like remove dangerous insecticides from the list of insecticides that are prohibited, due to their harm to human health as well as ecosystems and animal health.

The solution is straightforward. We need to develop a vaccine. We need to increase our public health infrastructure around this menace, and the bill fell short on that account because, effectively, it said, we might be able to not deal with Ebola and deal with this instead.

The truth is, the American people want a public health infrastructure that keeps them safe from Ebola and Zika and every other potential biological threat that is out there. The American people want to be safe. It is a dynamic world with increased travel, increased commerce. There are biological threats from all quarters, and we need the public health infrastructure to keep up with that.

Mr. DOGGETT. Those Texas-size mosquitos that are beginning to spread around my part of the country, they can't tell a Republican from a Democrat. Young women desirous of having a family, people of all ages and genders, are threatened by Zika.

It is just a matter of time before the Continental United States faces some of the problems that Puerto Rico already faces, and what we need is to

come together and have a bipartisan solution, not something offered in the middle of the night on which all debate is denied, a totally partisan approach.

So just as I am pleased that we have strong bipartisan support for the Iran Nuclear Agreement, coming together with this major letter that was sent to us yesterday, that is the kind of bipartisan approach I hope we can work to eventually, perhaps when we come back after this long Republican recess, one of the longest in the history of the Congress, to address Zika, and address these other problems that they refuse to deal with today.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, the time to act is now. If we can defeat this particular previous question, we will bring up the bill that prevents terrorists from assembling arsenals of weapons.

We also, of course, want to be part of a constructive discussion around combating the Zika menace. I am hopeful that the House will find time to do that in the next few days.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my 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, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" to defeat the previous question so that we can keep our country safer. Vote "no" on the rule. Vote "no" on the underlying bills because they interfere with our efforts to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons in the rigid implementation of the JCPOA.

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

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

As frequently happens around here, the House passed one version of the Zika bill, the Senate passed another version. The Senate version contained \$1.1 billion in spending. The House, in our agreement to the conference committee, agreed with the \$1.1 billion, so we, essentially, agreed to what the Senate wanted to have in terms of the dollar amount.

So we brought that conference report to the floor of this House so that we could go ahead and move that before we went out for Fourth of July recess. But, instead of helping us to pass that, my friends from the other side of the aisle blocked the well, tried to stop us from bringing it up.

And I would say this: There was some talk about amendments. We don't normally have amendments to conference reports. That is not typical procedure around here.

Perhaps more to the point, we couldn't get to an amendment debate because of the way we had behavior on the floor of the House that evening

which, by the way, was in violation of the House rules.

So it has been the Republicans that have tried to get something that would help with this Zika virus problem, and we have been blocked, almost completely blocked here on the floor of the House by the Democrats, and then blocked completely over in the Senate by the Democrats in the Senate.

The Republicans are taking a responsible, constructive approach, and the Democrats, they just want to block things to try to make some political points and raise money or whatever it is they are trying to do.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 819 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

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

SEC. 4. 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. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. 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. 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. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

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. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 819 and the underlying bill.

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, the Chair will postpone further proceedings