

talent and devotion, Stephanie Mew, the Hawaii State Teacher of the Year.

Stephanie is currently an elementary school teacher at Kapunahala Elementary School, but her career has taken her all across the globe to the U.S. mainland, Thailand, Japan, and India.

She came to teaching because she was touched by the struggles of at-risk youth and wanted a job in which she could plant seeds for a successful, productive, and peaceful life. Through her nearly 20 years as a teacher, she has done just that for her countless students.

Her service doesn't stop there. Stephanie also volunteers to feed the homeless and sings at a local nursing home for the kupuna residents.

Mahalo, Stephanie Mew, for your dedication to such an important occupation and for sharing your knowledge and light with your students and colleagues day in and day out.

Congratulations on this most prestigious award. I wish you the best of luck in the final selection for National Teacher of the Year.

WEAR RED WEDNESDAY: BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today is Wear Something Red Wednesday to bring back our girls.

This week marks the second anniversary of the April 14, 2014, kidnapping of the Nigerian Chibok schoolgirls, 730 days.

This week and next, Members of Congress will join us in commemorating the tragic event that captured the world's attention and calling for increased action to defeat Boko Haram, the world's deadliest terrorist organization.

Members of Congress—Republicans and Democrats, men and women—have all galvanized behind this cause. House leadership, including House Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI and Conference Chair CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, have joined us in wearing something red on Wednesday to bring attention to this cause.

I urge my colleagues and everyone to continue to lend their voices to this cause and join us. We should never forget. We must never forget the Nigerian Chibok girls.

For almost 2 years we have tweeted to raise awareness to this issue in Congress, and we will continue to tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls. Tweet every day. Tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls.

THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, households across America have budgets. People

sit around the kitchen table trying to make the hard choices, figuring out should they send their kid to summer camp, can they afford to go out to dinner more often, can they afford a family trip.

Businesses have budgets. I was in the private sector before I came here, and we had to have those tough discussions and discuss where we were going to reinvest and where we were going to cut.

But, apparently, for the Republicans, they say that our country shouldn't have a budget. The time is running short in which the Republicans can present and pass a budget for the United States of America.

Shouldn't America have a budget just as it has had in the past, just as families across our country have, and just as businesses have?

What is it that they are trying to hide? Can they not make the numbers match without privatizing Social Security and Medicare? Are they trying to hide huge tax increases for the middle class?

We will never know unless the public pressure is so great that the Republicans feel that they have to present a responsible budget before our body. I hope we see it soon.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 13, 2016.

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 April 13, 2016 at 9:20 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2133.
With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,
KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2666, NO RATE REGULATION OF BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 672 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 672

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. 2666) to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from regulating the rates charged for broadband Internet access service. 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 Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. 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 committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BURGESS. 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. BURGESS. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 672 provides for consideration of H.R. 2666, the No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided between the majority and the minority of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

The Committee on Rules made in order three amendments that were submitted to the committee, all three of which were submitted by the minority.

Finally, the rule affords the minority the customary motion to recommit, a final opportunity to amend the legislation should the minority choose to exercise that option.

H.R. 2666, the No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act, was introduced by Mr. KINZINGER, a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, to address the issue of an out-of-control independent agency, the Federal Communications Commission, or the FCC.

The bill is targeted and does one thing only. It prohibits the Federal Communications Commission from regulating the rates charged for broadband Internet access.

In February of 2015, the Federal Communications Commission voted on a party-line vote to adopt rules that reclassify broadband Internet access as a title II telecommunications service, reversing their previously stated position that they would not reclassify the Internet under title II, and, in fact, afterwards, the President himself interjected into the debate and demanded that the Commission reconsider and that they do so.

The rules prevent blocking, throttling, and paid prioritization of the Internet. This reclassification poses a serious risk for the regulation of rates charged by providers for the delivery of Internet service, a move that has never before been taken by the government.

Under the Federal Communications Commission's unprecedented use of a 100-year-old statute to regulate the Internet under its net neutrality rule, the Commission gave itself the authority to regulate the rates that Internet service providers charge to consumers for service.

In response to this power grab by the Commission, the Energy and Commerce Committee held oversight hearings. That resulted in the drafting and passage of the legislation before the House this week, which is intended to prevent the Federal Communications Commission from using reclassification of broadband Internet service to engage in rate regulation, whether that be directly through tariffing or indirectly through enforcement actions.

Rate regulation—or even the threat of rate regulation—out of the Federal Communications Commission creates massive uncertainty for Internet service providers. Because of this, Internet service providers could slow or stop altogether the investment and will be less likely to offer specialized or unique pricing offers to their consumers.

As the Federal Communications Commission consolidates more and more power to regulate the Internet—and make no mistake, the Federal Communications Commission is very eager to regulate the Internet—providers will have fewer and fewer avenues for providing consumer service plans and packages.

The chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Tom Wheeler, and President Obama have both stated that net neutrality rules would not result in the FCC regulating rates.

Yet, less than a year after the rules were adopted in March of 2016 during

an Energy and Commerce hearing, Chairman Wheeler admitted that the FCC should and will have the authority to regulate broadband rates under these new rules.

Like all government agencies, the Federal Communications Commission can't help itself. It sees an unregulated space—the Internet—and it just can't allow it to go on without government control.

Under net neutrality, the Federal Government will have the ability to control the Internet. Let me say that again. Under net neutrality, the Federal Government will have the ability to control the Internet.

Even if this current Federal Communications Commission chooses not to regulate the rates charged, the Commission's net neutrality rules permit future FCC commissioners to do exactly that.

These rules from the Federal Communications Commission have the potential to cost well north of 43,000 jobs, according to a recent study commissioned by the United States Telecom Association. The bill before us this week will take a step toward protecting the Internet industry from those job losses.

I urge my colleagues to support today's rule and support the underlying legislation to protect consumers from an out-of-control Federal bureaucracy.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have just days before the legally mandated budget deadline. Yet, instead of debating your budget, Mr. Speaker, my budget, Mr. Speaker, anybody's budget, Mr. Speaker, we are debating whether to codify existing FCC policy.

There is limited time to provide a budget for our country. Households across our country have budgets, and businesses have budgets. Unless there is an announced change to the schedule in bringing Congress to work on Friday and Saturday and Rules Committee convening today or tomorrow, it seems like Congress will miss the deadline for the budget and perhaps never produce a budget.

Now, folks on the other side will say that there have been years Democrats didn't produce a budget, and that is true. But Republicans ran to take over this body, saying: We are going to do better. We are going to produce a budget. Republicans have had the chance, and there is not even a vote on the budget.

I am going to offer later in this debate a motion to defeat the previous question. If that passes, Mr. Speaker, I will be able to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the budget resolution.

I hope it does. I hope there are enough Democrats and Republicans in

this Chamber who are outraged by the failure of the Republican leadership to allow the Republican and Democratic Members of this body to present and vote on their budgets.

□ 1230

We have historically had a very open process around budgets. There is usually five or six budgets that come before the House and we try to get to one that passes. There have been years where I think they have a king of the hill process and whichever one gets the most votes can become the budget.

But it looks like, rather than any of those debates or give Members who have thoughtfully been preparing the budgets from the Republican Study Group or from the progressive Democratic coalition the chance to present their budgets, along with the Republican and Democratic members of the Budget Committee, I think the Republicans are saying: we don't want to have those tough decisions about where to cut or where to tax; we would rather just pretend like our country is in good fiscal order and spend the day discussing codifying FCC policy rather than discussing what the American people sent us here to do—how to balance the budget, restore fiscal stability, and pass a budget.

There is another missed opportunity here today. When talking about broadband—if that is what we are going to talk about—in districts like mine in Colorado, we have communities that simply don't have reasonable access to the Internet. I talk to constituents in Evergreen and Conifer in Grand County every day, rapidly growing communities, where people only have access to speeds that were more relevant to the 20th century rather than the 21st century. I remember I visited a school in Grand County where the district has an initiative to provide every child with a Chromebook computer and the computer science teacher there didn't even have high-speed access from his own home.

Access to broadband is essential for our economy, particularly our rural economy like those in my district. It is essential for the education of our kids, for a vibrant private sector, for civil society, and democracy. While the FCC and the Department of Commerce have some tools in place, there is not nearly the tools they need or the resources to make our Nation competitive coast to coast by making sure that every American has access to broadband.

Bills that try to codify regulations certainly have their place. I would argue it is probably not when we are 48 hours from reaching a budget deadline. But I want to make sure that even if we are going to spend time discussing codifying FCC policy, that we have the more important discussion about how we can make sure that broadband access is available to our rural communities, such as the ones that I represent.

Democrats and Republicans largely agree on some of the goals of this bill.

In fact, I think there is a missed opportunity to have worked on a bipartisan version that likely could have passed on suspension. There are a number of amendments under consideration, and it is my hope that some of the consumer protection issues can be addressed through that.

But I think the big picture here, Mr. Speaker, is we are just 2 days away from Congress' own deadline for passing a budget with no budget in sight. If we can defeat the previous question, we can immediately move to consider the budget. I call upon my Republican and Democratic colleagues to do that. As we look at broadband, which I am hopeful that we can do after this deadline passes—I am happy to revisit this bill if my motion to defeat the previous question passes and we move into the budget debate—I will be happy to resume this debate next week. I haven't seen any particular reason that we have to try to cram in codifying FCC regulations around broadband in the 48 hours before our own budget deadline expires.

So let's get back to talking about the budget. It is never easy. The Republicans have certainly talked about how they wanted the country to have a budget. Well, the country is not going to have a budget unless Congress gets to work debating it and passing it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I rise to oppose the rule on this legislation, not necessarily because this is a bad bill—I do think it is a vague solution in search of a nonexistent problem—but I oppose the rule for another reason, and that is because I thought that since we were going to bring this bill to the floor anyway, even though it is unnecessary, even though Chairman Wheeler of the FCC has said that the FCC does not intend to regulate rates on broadband, I thought maybe I would at least try to accomplish something productive and offer an amendment to solve a real problem that the American people are seeing in front of them every day right now. That is the problem of television ads, political ads, that do not truly identify their source.

Under section 317 of the Communications Act of 1934, the FCC requires broadcasters to put on the ad the true identity of the people running the ad. This makes a lot of sense. The idea is that when you see somebody trying to influence your vote or to influence your attitude about a particular public issue, that you should understand who is actually trying to influence you.

But because of dramatic changes in the way campaign laws are implemented and because of the Citizens United Supreme Court decision, what has happened is that we now have ads run by organizations like Americans

for Kittens and Puppies, and that doesn't do the American voter, the American consumer, any good. They don't understand who is actually paying.

What my amendment would have done, had it been made in order by the Rules Committee, it would have basically restated the law that exists and say the FCC should regulate these ads by requiring the true identity. Right now they are relying on a 1979 staff interpretation of true identity. They are saying we need to put the sponsor of the ad on the ad, but the sponsor of the ad, again, is a nebulous, vague, title organization that nobody knows who they are.

What we would like to do is say you have to put on the ad who is really paying for it. So instead, for instance, if you had an ad in support of sugared soft drinks and it was being paid for by Coca-Cola, under this interpretation you could put the ad agency that actually put the ad on the air and nobody would know that Coca-Cola was actually paying for it.

The people, again, are seeing this every day on their television screens right now. These laws and interpretations have resulted in endless sums of anonymous money coming into the system trying to influence the outcomes of our elections. That is not what Congress intended. Despite having the authority to do it, the FCC has refused to take action to close this loophole.

My amendment would have restated the original Congressional intent and would send a message to the FCC that it is time to act. This amendment would have been germane, it would have been within the rules of the body, and, most importantly, it would have been supported by the vast majority of Americans: Republicans, Democrats, and Independents who want us to reform our campaign finance system so that it is on the up and up, so people understand who is trying to influence them and also to end the influence of big money in politics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. I wish that the Rules Committee had made that amendment in order, but they didn't, so I will oppose the rule and urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Colorado how many additional speakers he has?

Mr. POLIS. I am prepared to close.

Mr. BURGESS. In which case, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the Republican budget resolution and allow for consideration of alternative budget

proposals under a similar process to that which we have used every year in recent history. It is truly time for the Republicans to stop the partisan game and finally consider a budget before this Friday's legally mandated deadline.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, Americans get it. Households have to balance their budget, businesses have to balance their budget. Not talking about it and putting your head in the sand is only a recipe for increased debt and increased liability for future generations of Americans.

The fact that we are spending \$400 billion or \$500 billion more than we are taking in—of course we might not know about that for the next year until after the fact if we don't have a budget—the fact that we have enormous unfunded liabilities in Medicare and Social Security doesn't go away just because Republicans ignore the topic and refuse to have a debate on balancing our budget.

I am proud to sponsor a balanced budget amendment. I think that by working together, Democrats and Republicans can restore fiscal responsibility to our Nation.

How can we do it?

Well, I will tell you how we can't do it. We can't do it by 48 hours from the deadline to pass a budget by discussing obscure bills to codify FCC regulations with our valuable floor time.

It starts with an honest discussion. It starts with Democrats and Republicans offering their budgets. I have been proud in the past to support bipartisan budgets that have come to this body. I have supported and opposed some of the Democratic budgets that my colleagues have offered, but we have to have that discussion on the floor. The work doesn't do itself and the problem doesn't go away when Republicans choose to ignore it.

I wish our budget deficit was as easy to solve as simply ignoring it. Wouldn't that be convenient if we could simply ignore the budget deficit and it would go away? Wouldn't it be convenient if we could just ignore the national debt and it would go away? Wouldn't it be convenient if we could ignore the damage to agencies that an indiscriminate sequester has caused and it would simply go away?

I like that line of thinking, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, it is completely unrealistic. The American people realize it is completely unrealistic. That is why when America looks to Congress and says: we have these discussions in our households about our budget, and businesses have these discussions. Why can't you, Mr. Speaker?

Why can't you? That is the reason the Congressional approval rating is so low.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, back in the late 1990s, in the middle of what was called the dot-com boom, my predecessor, the then-majority leader of the House of Representatives, Richard Arme, came and spoke to the Dallas Chamber of Commerce. The purpose of his discussion that day was to talk about the dot-com boom that the economy was experiencing.

He confessed that the Internet was the gosh darnedest thing, no one had ever seen anything like it, but he cautioned us. As business leaders that day, he cautioned us. He said: Look, when the government doesn't understand something, the first thing it will want to do is regulate it, the next thing it will want to do is tax it, and you have then effectively killed it.

Mr. Speaker, it wasn't an accident that I used in the opening statement the language that under the proposed rules from the FCC, the Federal Government will have the ability to control the Internet. That is a significant and important fact. If you allow the Federal Government to control the Internet, you have effectively damaged the promise of the Internet to the point where it will no longer function for its citizens the way it was intended to function: as a free and open process.

Mr. Speaker, it is pretty simple. Today's rule provides for consideration of a bill to rein in the Federal Government that is all too eager to regulate every aspect of our lives.

H.R. 2666 will protect the Internet from government regulation and allow it to continue to thrive without interference.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. KINZINGER for his work on this legislation, and I want to thank the committee for the work that they did in getting this legislation to the floor.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 672 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

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

SEC. 2. At any time after the 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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 125) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent reso-

lution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Tiberi of Ohio and Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York or their respective designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except amendments in the nature of a substitute. Each such amendment shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 7 of rule XVI (germaneness). If more than one such amendment is adopted, then only the one receiving the greater number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted. In the case of a tie for the greater number of affirmative votes, then only the last amendment to receive that number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been finally adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1245

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3340, FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL REFORM ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3791, RAISING CONSOLIDATED ASSETS THRESHOLD UNDER SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANY POLICY STATEMENT

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 671 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 671

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the