

After 12 years as president of the North Carolina NAACP, Reverend Barber is retiring to lead a new campaign—a national call for a moral revival. This new coalition of spiritual leaders will push beyond politics to guide our Nation toward a path of increased equality and social justice.

Reverend Barber's leadership of the NAACP will be sorely missed, but I look forward to witnessing the many ways in which he will continue to impact lives and make America a more just and fair place.

Thank you, Reverend Barber. God-speed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DAVE SHAUL

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of one of Illinois' great journalists, Dave Shaul, who passed away this month at age 75.

For decades, Dave provided countless central Illinois residents with their local news as an anchor, producer, and news director at WCIA in Champaign, Illinois. During his storied television and radio broadcast career, Dave covered the biggest local, State, and national news, including covering every Presidential election from 1964 through 2016. Dave was known for his honest and trustworthy coverage of local and national politics.

Dave won a number of awards during his career as a journalist. In 1980, he won the UPI Best Television Sports Play-by-Play Award for his coverage of Illinois basketball. And in 1999, he was honored with the Associated Press Mark Twain Lifetime Achievement Award, was named to the Eastern Illinois University Hall of Fame, and was designated a lifetime member of the Illinois News Broadcasters Association. Dave also received an Emmy Award for his career accomplishments in 2011.

Dave leaves a long legacy as a trusted figure on the news and in the Champaign-Urbana community. His family and friends continue to be in my thoughts and prayers.

MEDIA TARGET PRESIDENT TRUMP

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, from a recent Investor's Business Daily editorial, a Harvard University study found that "During the first 100 days of Trump's Presidency, TV networks CNN, NBC, and CBS provided negative coverage 93 percent, 93 percent, and 91 percent of the time."

Meanwhile, "The New York Times delivered 87 percent negative coverage, while The Washington Post 83 percent

and The Wall Street Journal 70 percent were only a bit less negative."

"Trump's overall score of 80 percent negative coverage during the start of his Presidency compares with Obama's 41 percent, Bush's 57 percent, and Bill Clinton's 60 percent."

"Both the Post and the Times, for instance, have used unnamed sources and even the supposed content of documents that they have never viewed as the basis for major revelations about Trump in recent days. They have let their raw hatred get the better of them.

"Such a media environment is dangerous for American democracy."

Expecting basic professionalism from the media, sadly, seems to be too much.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 24, 2017.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 24, 2017, at 9:04 a.m.:

Appointments:
Election Assistance Board of Advisors.
With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1973, PROTECTING YOUNG VICTIMS FROM SEXUAL ABUSE ACT OF 2017; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1761, PROTECTING AGAINST CHILD EXPLOITATION ACT OF 2017; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY 26, 2017, THROUGH JUNE 5, 2017

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 352 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 352

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. 1973) to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-20. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1761) to amend title 18, United States Code, to criminalize the knowing consent of the visual depiction, or live transmission, of a minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-19 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further 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 the Judiciary; (2) the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from May 26, 2017, through June 5, 2017—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time,

within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 4. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

□ 1230

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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. BUCK. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. This rule provides a structured process for debate. I want to highlight that this rule makes in order all amendments submitted to the Rules Committee, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in this Chamber today support the goals of this legislation. We can and we must do more to protect children from the plague of sexual assault and the prevalence of child pornography permeating society today.

I am particularly glad to see such bipartisan support for H.R. 1761. The young athletes that represent the United States on the world's stage at the Olympics must not be taken advantage of by predatory coaches and doctors who should be mentoring them. In fact, no child anywhere should be taken advantage of; but this bill makes some commonsense changes that strengthen the reporting of abuse and puts in place policies that prevent future violations, and I am hopeful it will become law.

It staggers the mind to believe that this assault on those children had gone on for 20 years, and some 400 children were victimized for it, and not a single adult anywhere around ever brought attention to it. In fact, we owe a great newspaper in Indiana for telling us about it, so be sure to read a good newspaper every day.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of agreement about the goals of the bills before us today, but that wasn't the case 20 days ago when the majority rushed through its partisan, slapdash healthcare bill repeal to rip away healthcare from millions of people.

They passed the bill without holding a single hearing, listening to any experts, or, most importantly, waiting for a score from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

The Congressional Budget Office tells us what the bill will cost, how many people it will help, how many people it would hurt, something that, with healthcare, would have been vitally important.

But while the lack of a score didn't prohibit them from holding a vote, it did, apparently, prevent the majority from sending the bill over to the Senate. Mr. Speaker, this process is completely backwards and a major breakdown of the integrity of the legislative process.

Most schoolchildren know that, when a bill passes the House, you send it to the Senate. You don't hide it in a drawer for weeks until you finally get the information from the Congressional Budget Office that you should have had before you brought the bill to the floor for a vote.

This is no way to develop a plan that will impact one-sixth of the Nation's gross domestic product, and the process has finally laid bare one of the biggest political hoaxes in recent memory: that notion of repeal and replace. How often did we hear that over the last 7 years?

For the last 7 years, the majority voted more than 60 times to undermine the Affordable Care Act without having a thing in the world to replace it with, and now they are pushing the false notion that the Affordable Care Act is collapsing. The reality is that some States dealing with limited insurers never implemented the full benefits of the law or enacted the exchange under the Affordable Care Act, which would have cut their costs.

Mr. Speaker, one of my proudest moments as a Member of Congress was chairing the House Rules Committee and bringing the Affordable Care Act to the House floor. Almost every President since Theodore Roosevelt had attempted to give healthcare to the American people. Millions of people are now waking up to the benefits of this healthcare, and our Nation's uninsured rate is at its lowest level in more than 50 years. Why would you rip that away?

For the first time in a generation, we are actually slowing the yearly growth of healthcare costs. A poll released just this last month found that 61 percent of the public supports keeping and improving the Affordable Care Act. That is in stark contrast to the 17 percent approval rating for the repeal bill that was voted on here several weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the majority would stop turning a deaf ear to the people it represents. The American people have been marching and calling and writing against this bill in numbers none of us have ever seen before. A bad process led to a bad product.

Mr. Speaker, none of us believe that the ACA was perfect. I urge the majority to take the bill out of the drawer

and shred it. Let's get together, strengthen our healthcare system and the Affordable Care Act. It is exactly what our constituents deserve.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time, and I am grateful to be here with the gentleman. I want to speak to both of these bills rather than speaking to a different bill that was considered in this body.

With regard to H.R. 1761, this bill became necessary because of the court-imposed misinterpretation of a congressional statute with regard to the visual depiction, or live transmission, of a victim of child abuse, or sexually explicit conduct. This is important because it closes a loophole that otherwise would allow a perpetrator to walk free because of a lack of specific intent when recording images of the victim that they are victimizing.

This bill is important because it closes the loophole and gets back to what the intent of Congress was when they passed legislation intended to protect children and criminalized the production of images of child sexual abuse. This bill does all we can at this point to protect our children from sexual predators.

It is a moral necessity that we close this shameful loophole, created by a judicial opinion, to provide the appropriate punishment to those who look to harm minors. It won't protect all of our children, but it will provide a significant deterrent to protect more of our children, and that makes this bill important, crucial, and necessary.

With regard to H.R. 1773, Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse Act of 2017, this broadens the coverage of current laws that require reporting of child abuse, specifically with regard to those children who are participating in organizations that are organized for the purpose of helping—ostensibly helping—young athletes train for international competition.

When you are a parent of an athlete, just like your child, you trust these coaches who are mentoring and working and interacting with your children not just for training these children and preparing them to be the best athlete they possibly can be, but you also entrust, many times, your children's keeping to them.

Gone are the days where kids were playing in Little League and saw their coaches for brief periods of time. In many instances, the children that will be protected by this bill are those elite young athletes who spend quite a bit of time actually away from their parents and in the care and custody of coaches, trainers, and other people associated with the program.

As a father of athletes, it is important that I be able to trust that, if someone has been convicted or has had to report that, that information is available. And due to this particular

legislation, the government will now be able to pursue cases that it would not otherwise be able to prosecute.

This legislation specifies that national governing bodies are authorized to develop training oversight practices, policies, and procedures to prevent sexual abuse of amateur athletes. And then what is critical, it requires that it is necessary to assure child abuse is being reported by those who work with amateur athletes. Those reporting requirements are essential protective deterrents and provide assurances to all surrounding that young child and that athlete that they have the opportunity for safekeeping.

Organizations must be taking action against coaches or other members when allegations are made against them to assure young athletes are kept safe. The safety of these young athletes must trump, in many cases, perhaps, their ability to develop their unique gifts and talents.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that these bills are brought forward, and I support them.

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

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

Nearly 30 years ago, I held my son, Cody, for the first time. A couple of years later, I held my daughter, Kaitlin. I knew right then that these two children were the most important and cherished things in my life. They deserve the happiest childhood and the brightest future and the safest world.

I imagine anyone who holds their child for the first time has the same thought. Until you become a parent, it is hard to describe the love you have for your children.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, that someone would hurt a child simply perplexes me. Children are the most vulnerable, the most innocent in our society. They, most of all, don't deserve the trauma and pain that accompany abuse. They don't deserve to have their trust in adults or their trust in the world shattered at such a young age. They don't deserve the ghosts of suffering that accompany abuse victims for the rest of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, to commit a crime against children is to engage in the greatest of evils. It is to violate our moral order in the most egregious of ways. Our job in Congress is to debate and maintain that moral order. Thankfully, everyone in this Chamber can agree on the moral imperative to protect children.

Our job today is to uphold our values through well-crafted legislation. We are here today to pass laws that uphold our belief in the sanctity of innocence. We are here today for our children.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1973, the first bill in this rule resolution, strengthens the laws protecting child athletes. The bill requires coaches and adults involved with amateur sports organizations overseen by the U.S. Olympic Com-

mittee to report suspected child abuse to local and Federal authorities.

Unfortunately, reporting isn't always the standard under current law. Over the past 20 years, around 368 individuals affiliated with USA Gymnastics faced sexual abuse by adults affiliated with the organization, according to *The Indianapolis Star*. Sadly, some of the victims never saw justice. Their allegations remained unresolved, sometimes because coaches moved from State to State to avoid investigation.

H.R. 1973 pulls additional adults into the mandatory reporting category, ensuring that those adults working with minors under the U.S. Olympic Committee's jurisdiction must report instances of child abuse to local and Federal authorities.

It further clarifies the sexual abuse reporting duties of national governing bodies, or NGBs. These organizations, supervised by the U.S. Olympic Committee, manage amateur athletic competitions.

We need to promote a culture of reporting sexual assault among youth athletes. That culture needs to overflow into all parts of our society.

We are not suggesting we toss out due process for the accused. The legislation at hand only requires the reporting and investigation of sexual abuse of children. Additionally, H.R. 1973 makes stronger the civil remedies that victims of sexual abuse may pursue.

Mr. Speaker, the other legislation under this rule, H.R. 1761, goes after those who create child pornography. Just to utter those words is unbearable, but our job in Congress is to stop the unbearable.

Under current law and due to the impact of the court ruling in *United States v. Palomino-Coronado*, perpetrators of child pornography can sometimes evade prosecution for child pornography under a loophole. Under the precedent set in the case, even if perpetrators memorialize the sexual abuse of a child through images and video, they do not necessarily possess the intent or purpose to sexually abuse children in order to take a picture. In other words, they didn't intend to violate title 18 of the U.S. Code, section 2251, which prohibits child pornography.

We need to close this loophole. If evildoers are sexually abusing our children and photographing or filming it, they should be going to prison for a long time. This loophole was carved out by the judicial branch. It is time for the legislative branch to step in and tighten the statutory language to prevent the exploitation of this loophole and to prevent the exploitation of our children.

The bills under consideration today serve two purposes. First and foremost, they provide a deterrent to criminals who would consider harming a child.

We can't preemptively stop everyone who plans to commit a crime against a child, which is why we must deter them with the threat of discovery, conviction, and jail time.

These bills very practically make the exploitation of a child harder to get away with. They commission more well-meaning adults to be on guard against the occurrence of sexual abuse. They allow victims to pursue even stronger civil penalties that will, hopefully, deter future criminals, and they strengthen the law itself to ensure that child pornographers face prosecution and appropriate punishment for their heinous crimes.

The second purpose achieved today is to send a message. These bills signal to all of America that our society is serious about protecting children and that we are serious about catching child predators.

H.R. 1973 specifically directs coaches and others to report sexual abuse. But these bills send a broader message: everyone in this Nation should join the fight against child exploitation.

We have too many examples of well-meaning adults remaining silent in the face of child abuse. This legislation is meant to push Americans to do what is right, even if it is not easy.

We are all the guardians of our Nation's youth. We all are responsible for their childhood. We are all proponents of their future. These are our children, our pride and joy. We must offer them the same vigilance and protection we offer our own children. The rule before us gives this House a chance to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the majority of Americans want us to work together to improve upon the successes of the Affordable Care Act. We should be expanding access to care and implementing the kind of reforms that will keep American families healthy, not kicking millions of Americans off their insurance to fulfill a deceptive campaign promise, as the Republican healthcare repeal bill will do. Expanding paid sick leave to the 45 percent of American workers who don't have access to it would be a great start.

Each week, up to 3 million employees go to work sick, infecting their co-workers and customers and delaying their own recovery. The benefits of allowing working Americans to earn paid sick leave are undeniable. It slows the spread of disease, lowers healthcare costs, and increases productivity.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would allow us to also bring up Representative DELAURO's bill, H.R. 1516, which would allow Americans to have paid sick time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, it is clear after The Indianapolis Star uncovered the widespread abuse scandal that Congress must act to implement consistent, stricter laws governing the reporting of abuses to our Nation's athletes and to all our children. Once again, The Indianapolis Star has shown us the importance of investigative journalism and a free press.

Many of these athletes are too young and are not empowered to speak out against authority figures when they are hurt or abused by them. But each of us as Members of Congress is in a position to do something about it, and we must.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to listen to the voices of the American people before hurling our Nation further toward disaster with this dangerous healthcare bill.

The majority hasn't held any hearings or gotten input from experts, advocates, or patients. They are ignoring the opposition from groups like AARP, American Medical Association, March of Dimes, and American Hospital Association.

The score later today from the Congressional Budget Office won't change the underlying facts of this bill. It will gut protections for people with pre-existing conditions. It will gut essential health benefits, kick millions of people off of health insurance, and place a crushing age tax on those aged 50 to 64 whose premiums will go up. It will also cut billions from Medicaid to pay for a major tax cut for the wealthy. That is \$880 billion that they want to take away from Medicaid to give to the rich and corporations. This is so unAmerican, I stumbled over saying it.

Mr. Speaker, a bad process has led to a bad bill. We should be doing what the American people want and improving the Affordable Care Act.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today for the children.

In voting for the bill and the underlying bills, we are sending a message to the abuser of children: If you harm one of these little ones, you will be met with the full fury of the American justice system. You will be discovered and reported by your peers. You will face the threat of appropriately harsh demands. You will face the full force of the law if you visually depict child exploitation.

We are sending a message to the bystanders: You have a solemn duty to protect these children. You have a duty to be their hope and happiness and their future when you step in and stop abuse. You have a duty to report the heinous acts committed by monsters.

Lately, we don't have many moments in Washington where both political parties can come together and reach a consensus, but the legislation we are

considering today provides the perfect opportunity.

These bills should not be controversial. They should draw the support of both sides, because protecting our children is a moral necessity for every American. That is, after all, the message these bills send.

I thank Representative BROOKS and Representative JOHNSON for the hard work they have done on these bills, and I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for shepherding these bills through the Judiciary Committee and spending so much time in committee working on legislation to protect our children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members to vote "yes" on the resolution, vote "yes" on the underlying bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 352 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

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

SEC. 5. 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. 1516) to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families. 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 Education and the Workforce. 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. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1516.

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 de-

mand 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. BUCK. 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.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer a resolution previously noticed.