hands. The purpose of that meeting was for the President of the United States, the greatest country on Earth, to implore the King to increase production of oil.

You know what? A confident nation, a nation that takes on the challenge of solving its own problems, does not go hat in hand to others and ask them, who are not our friends, incidentally, to solve our problems. We take that challenge on ourselves. We take it on because it's our responsibility. We also take it on because we know that in the doing of it, we are going to create jobs, clean our environment, and give us much more latitude in foreign policy.

So this debate on energy, misplaced as it is in this matter of electronic records and restoring the responsibility of Congress to the American people to conduct oversight and to preserve a historical record, important as that is, the argument on energy, the question of energy is the profound question that this country faces economically for the next generation, and the challenge will be whether we are willing to face that squarely and take it upon ourselves to solve our problems, or we are going to continue to be dependent on oil companies that have not played on behalf of the American people and on foreign countries that are not our friends; Venezuela, Middle East States, Russia. We have to take on this challenge ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I will just close by saying, going back to this bill, that it's an extraordinarily important bill, not just so that we can preserve records, but that we in Congress can restore confidence to the American people that we are a cop on the beat.

This bill makes significant and long overdue changes to document retention systems that were outdated and inefficient. The vast amount of government business that is currently conducted over e-mail requires that we update the law regulating record retention. Government e-mails should not be deleted or destroyed, as they are as important in revealing to the public and historians as paper documents, and we all know that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1318 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall, without intervention of any point of order, consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2208) to provide for a standby loan program for certain coal-to-liquid projects. All points of order against the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Science and Technology; and (2) an amendment in the nature of a substitute if offered by Representative Dingell of Michigan or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

(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) 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.''

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.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. 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 noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was 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 today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

PENSION PROTECTION TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2008

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6382) to make technical corrections related to the Pension Protection Act of 2006, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6382

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES TO ACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act may be cited as the ''Pension Protection Technical Corrections Act of 2008''.

(b) REFERENCES TO ACTS.—For purposes of this Act:

(1) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—The term ''1986 Code'' means the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) AMENDMENT OF ERISA.—The term ''ERISA'' means the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

(3) 2006 ACT.—The term ''2006 Act'' means the Pension Protection Act of 2006.

TITLE I—TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATED TO THE PENSION PROTECTION ACT OF 2006

SEC. 101. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE I.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTIONS 101 AND 111.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Clause (i) of section 302(c)(1)(A) of ERISA is amended by striking ''the plan is'' and inserting ''the plan are''.

(B) Section 302(c)(7) of ERISA is amended by inserting ''which reduces the accrued benefit of any participant'' after ''subsection (d)(2)'' in subparagraph (A).

(C) Section 302(d)(1) of ERISA is amended by striking '', the valuation date,''.