

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

Amendment in the nature of a substitute:
Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

“That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 20) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the joint resolution equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; (2) the amendment in section 2 of this resolution if offered by Representative Walden of Oregon or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

“SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in section 1 is as follows:

Page 39, after line 24, insert the following:
“SEC. 20327. Of the uncosted balances available from funds appropriated under Section 130 of Division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108-199) under the heading ‘Department of Energy, Energy Programs, Science’, as amended by Section 315 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109-103), for the Iowa Environmental and Education project in Coralville, Iowa, \$44,569,000 is rescinded.”

Page 87, line 6, strike “\$25,423,250,000” and insert “\$25,467,819,000”.

At the end of chapter 5 of title II of the division B being added by section 2, add the following new section:

“SEC. 20522. (a) In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated or made available by this division, \$400,000,000 is appropriated for the purpose of making payments for fiscal year 2007 under sections 102 and 103 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-393; 16 U.S.C. 500 note). The Secretary of the Treasury shall use such funds to make such payments in lieu of using funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, as otherwise authorized by sections 102(b)(3) and 103(b)(2) of such Act.

“(b) There is hereby rescinded an amount equal to .00086 percent of the budget authority provided (or obligation limit imposed) for fiscal year 2007 for any discretionary account pursuant to this division.”

The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

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 Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, 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) de-

scribes 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.”

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will 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 definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here’s how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly’s “American Congressional Dictionary”: “If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.”

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 Democratic majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 yeas 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put each question on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

H. Res. 59, by the yeas and nays;
H. Con. Res. 34, by the yeas and nays;
The previous question on H. Res. 116, by the yeas and nays;

Adoption of H. Res. 116, if ordered.
The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL ENGI- NEERS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 59.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 59, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

YEAS—417

Abercrombie	Brown-Waite,	Davis, Lincoln
Ackerman	Ginny	Davis, Tom
Aderholt	Buchanan	Deal (GA)
Akin	Burgess	DeFazio
Allen	Burton (IN)	DeGette
Altmire	Butterfield	Delahunt
Andrews	Calvert	DeLauro
Arcuri	Camp (MI)	Dent
Baca	Campbell (CA)	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bachmann	Cannon	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bachus	Cantor	Dicks
Baird	Capito	Dingell
Baker	Capps	Doggett
Baldwin	Capuano	Donnelly
Barrett (SC)	Cardoza	Doolittle
Barrow	Carnahan	Doyle
Bartlett (MD)	Carney	Drake
Barton (TX)	Carson	Dreier
Bean	Carter	Duncan
Becerra	Castle	Edwards
Berkley	Castor	Ehlers
Berman	Chabot	Ellison
Berry	Chandler	Ellsworth
Biggert	Clarke	Emanuel
Bilbray	Clay	Emerson
Billirakis	Cleaver	Engel
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	English (PA)
Bishop (NY)	Coble	Eshoo
Bishop (UT)	Cohen	Etheridge
Blackburn	Cole (OK)	Everett
Blumenauer	Conaway	Fallin
Blunt	Conyers	Fattah
Boehner	Cooper	Feeney
Bonner	Costa	Ferguson
Bono	Costello	Filner
Boozman	Courtney	Flake
Boren	Cramer	Forbes
Boswell	Crenshaw	Fortenberry
Boucher	Crowley	Fox
Boustany	Cubin	Frank (MA)
Boyd (FL)	Cuellar	Franks (AZ)
Boyd (KS)	Culberson	Frelinghuysen
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Galleghy
Brady (TX)	Davis (AL)	Garrett (NJ)
Braley (IA)	Davis (CA)	Gerlach
Brown (SC)	Davis (IL)	Giffords
Brown, Corrine	Davis (KY)	Gillibrand
	Davis, David	Gillmor