

the Pediatric Quality Measures Program, express lane eligibility, and outreach and enrollment grants. These policies are also included in the bipartisan Senate proposal on CHIP, and we thank the committees of jurisdiction in both chambers for including these crucial policies.

If CHIP funding is not extended soon, CHIP-enrolled children may become underinsured or uninsured altogether. CHIP is an important bipartisan health coverage program for over 6 million low-income children. CHIP builds off of a strong Medicaid program by providing age-appropriate and affordable coverage for children who fall above Medicaid eligibility levels, but lack access to other health coverage options.

Concerning reports indicate that states are taking steps to limit programs in order to address the looming funding shortfall, despite receiving federal redistribution funds. We urge Congress to act now and avoid potentially disastrous consequences caused by further delay by enacting a strong, bipartisan five-year extension of CHIP.

Children's hospitals thank Congress for its long-term bipartisan commitment to CHIP and the children it serves. We look forward to working with lawmakers to maintain a strong CHIP program and strengthen health care for children into the future.

Mr. BURGESS. Finally, Madam Speaker, I will tell you I am perplexed. I, frankly, do not understand why there is reticence to providing an offset for funding of children's health insurance by income relating to part B premiums for people who earn over \$500,000 a year, seniors who earn over \$500,000 a year, or a couple who earns over \$875,000 a year. This was language that was included in President Obama's budget, so don't tell me it is not bipartisan, because it was bipartisan.

Now, Madam Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of an important piece of legislation to maintain the important funding streams for millions of underprivileged children depending on the program.

I want to thank Chairman WALDEN for his efforts to continually work with the minority on the Energy and Commerce Committee, repeatedly providing the requested extensions by the ranking member in order to continue discussions on the legislation.

The package reflects hours of work to create legislation that will benefit millions of America's children so that they can lead healthier lives. I urge my colleagues to support today's rule and the underlying legislation, the CHAMPIONING HEALTHY KIDS Act.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 601 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER

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

SEC. 2. It shall not be in order to consider a comprehensive tax reform measure or matter reported pursuant to Sections 2001 or 2002 of House Concurrent Resolution 71 in the House or in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union unless easily searchable electronic estimates and comparisons prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office and Joint Committee on Taxation have been made available on a publicly available website of the House 48 hours in advance.

(b) It shall not be in order to consider a comprehensive tax reform measure or mat-

ter reported pursuant to Sections 2001 or 2002 of House Concurrent Resolution 71 in the House or in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, that is called up pursuant to a rule or order that makes an amendment in order or considers such an amendment to be adopted, unless easily searchable updated electronic estimates and comparisons prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office and Joint Committee on Taxation reflecting such amendment have been made available on a publicly available website of the House 48 hours in advance.

(c) It shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (a) or paragraph (b). As disposition of any point of order under paragraphs (a) and (b), the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the measure, matter, or rule as applicable. The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.

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. Madam 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. Madam 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1455

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PALMER) at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 600;

Adopting House Resolution 600, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 601; and

Adopting House Resolution 601, if ordered.

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