

As we speak, Puerto Rico remains without power, communication lines are down, and a major dam could burst. We are proud of how Americans came together for Texas and Florida. Let's not abandon Puerto Rico. We must act now. We are seeing a major humanitarian crisis unfold on U.S. soil.

Mr. Speaker, is there any reason why U.S. citizens are being ignored in these times of desperate need?

We must help Puerto Rico now.

THE GREAT LAKES RESTORATION INITIATIVE

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

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to thank all of the Members who voted to support the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

In the appropriations legislation the House passed 2 weeks ago, we included \$300 million in the fiscal year 2018 budget for protecting our Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes are a critical resource and an essential part of Michigan's outdoor heritage. They are enjoyed by millions of Americans from across the country, and they are a unique ecosystem with one-fifth of the world's freshwater. They are also a major trade route and they form an international border.

There is a Federal role for protecting the Great Lakes, and by working with public and private organizations like Michigan's universities and Ducks Unlimited, the GLRI does vital work to protect the Great Lakes and the streams, rivers, and wetlands that flow into them.

Again, I want to thank all of my colleagues for their support of this critical program.

NATIONAL HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Hispanic Heritage Month. Each year, Americans observe National Hispanic Heritage Month from September 15 to October 15 to celebrate the contributions of Americans of Hispanic descent to our Nation's diverse history and culture.

Our central Washington communities are blessed to include a growing number of Hispanic Americans, and I have witnessed firsthand the many ways Hispanic Americans strengthen our communities and our way of life. Hispanic Americans have greatly contributed to our country's history. These Americans have enhanced our economy through entrepreneurship, and many have served our Nation honorably in the U.S. Armed Forces.

America is truly the world's melting pot where people of diverse back-

grounds and cultures come together as one people united by shared values. We cherish our unity and diversity. In the upcoming month, we will celebrate Hispanic Americans' patriotism and the traditions they add to American culture.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring National Hispanic Heritage Month.

CENTRAL ARKANSAS VETERANS HEALTHCARE SYSTEM HELPS HOUSTON

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks we have seen the unity, courage, and kindness the American people offered to those affected by the destruction caused by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and now Maria.

Today I would like to take a minute and acknowledge the Central Arkansas Veterans Healthcare System in Little Rock, where employees extended help to assist with incoming calls from the VA in Houston, Texas. All calls were forwarded to Arkansas during the relief efforts.

While the Little Rock VA usually takes in 200 to 300 calls a day, in the days following the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey, our VA team in Little Rock averaged 2,900 calls a day from those seeking refuge and help. Employees worked 8-hour shifts to provide 24/7 service.

I thank these Arkansans in the Central Arkansas VA for helping our neighbors in Texas in their time of need.

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, over the past three decades, our Federal Tax Code has ballooned to 74,000 pages filled with loopholes for special interests. Moreover, the Federal tax system has become too complicated for hard-working taxpayers to navigate alone.

Since joining Congress, I have traveled all across my district meeting with people and businesses who have all made it clear that our current tax system needs change. Small businesses like Vaughan & Bushnell Manufacturing in Bushnell, Illinois, want a simpler Tax Code that lowers rates and closes loopholes so they can invest in innovation, higher wages, and more jobs.

Middle class families across Illinois have told me how a simpler Tax Code would mean more money in their pockets to save and spend. Earlier this year, it was estimated that our House blueprint for tax reform would save the median Illinois family over \$5,000 in taxes every year. We can all agree that our

system needs work, and this week we will take the necessary first steps towards fixing it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join in this effort to make our system work for everyday Americans, not special interests.

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, September 26, 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 September 26, 2017, at 11:43 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 2810.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2824, INCREASING OPPORTUNITY AND SUCCESS FOR CHILDREN AND PARENTS THROUGH EVIDENCE-BASED HOME VISITING ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2792, CONTROL UNLAWFUL FUGITIVE FELONS ACT OF 2017; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 533 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 533

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. 2824) to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program. 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 Ways and Means. 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 Ways and Means 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 115-33. 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 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 recommit 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. 2792) to amend the Social Security Act to make certain revisions to provisions limiting payment of benefits to fugitive felons under titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill 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 Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. In the engrossment of H.R. 2824 the Clerk shall—

(a) add the text of H.R. 2792, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 2824;

(b) conform the title of H.R. 2824 to reflect the addition of H.R. 2792, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(c) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(d) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

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 Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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 533 provides for the consideration of two bills which were reported by the House Ways and Means Committee.

For the first bill, H.R. 2792, the Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017, the rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order and makes in order no further amendments to the legislation. However, the minority is afforded the customary motion to recommit.

For H.R. 2824, the Increasing Opportunity and Success for Children and Parents through Evidence-Based Home Visiting Act, the rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The Rules Committee made in order four amendments to H.R. 2824, one Republican amendment, two Democratic amendments, and one bipartisan amendment. Finally, the rule provides for the customary motion to recommit with or without instructions.

H.R. 2792, the Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017, amends the Social Security Act to give the Social Security Administration the necessary tools to prevent Federal benefits and payments from being made to persons who are actually on the run from the law.

Many people might hear this and think: Why would the government ever continue to pay someone who is actively fleeing from law enforcement?

It is a legitimate question, and it has an unfortunate answer.

In 1996, President Clinton signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act into law. One major provision of this reform bill was a restriction on the ability of fugitive felons and probation and parole violators from receiving Social Security benefits.

□ 1230

Similar provisions have been included in other Federal entitlement programs, including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program. This policy was expanded in 2004, with the passage of the Social Security Protection Act.

However, subsequent to the passage of these commonsense reforms, several judges in cases from the mid-2000s ruled that the Social Security Administration's interpretation of these provisions was too broad and limited the Social Security Administration's ability to curtail payments to three narrow categories of fugitives, namely: escape, flight to avoid prosecution or confinement, and flight escape.

The bill before the House today, H.R. 2792, would restore Congress' original intent to the reforms passed under both Presidents Clinton and George W. Bush. Specifically, H.R. 2792 would prohibit an individual who is the subject of an outstanding arrest warrant for a felony or parole violation from receiving monthly Social Security income payments. This applies only to felony charges or a crime carrying a minimum term of 1 year or more in prison.

This legislation would not punish individuals convicted of a misdemeanor, such as outstanding parking tickets. In fact, some people have falsely claimed that.

Individuals who have potentially committed a felony or a parole violation should not be able to use taxpayer dollars to evade capture. Providing the Social Security Administration with the tools in H.R. 2792 is a commonsense way to show that the Federal Government is sincere in its commitment to being a good steward of Federal taxpayer dollars. The Social Security benefits can be restored once the individual resolves the outstanding issues related to his or her warrant or parole violation.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from South Dakota, KRISTI NOEM, for her work on this legislation, and I urge Members of the House to support this worthy bill.

The second bill in today's rule, H.R. 2824, the Increasing Opportunity Through Evidence-Based Home Visiting Act, extends funding for the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program, which is more commonly referred to as MIECHV.

The Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program is an important program that provides low-income families with opportunities to receive home-visiting services to help support a child's first years. These services range from prenatal care to early childhood services and allow for children to grow up in healthy homes.

As not only a physician but a physician who specialized in obstetrics and gynecology, I did spend 25 years working with pregnant women and families to help ensure that all mothers could deliver and raise healthy children. As an OB/GYN, I know the best way to ensure that a child succeeds is to invest in long-term services and to ensure that the child receives access to appropriate care.

Because of the Nurse-Family Partnership's work, 90 percent of all babies who are supported by the organization are born full term, 95 percent of those babies receive all their immunizations by 24 months, and nearly 89 percent of those mothers breastfeed their newborns.

These are important milestones for newborn children that can have lasting impacts on their health for the rest of their lives, and it is important that we support initiatives that support vital, lifesaving programs like these.

Furthermore, the program succeeds by not only supporting the health and well-being of children, but by supporting pregnant women and mothers as well. In my home State of Texas, the reported incidence of maternal mortality has increased in recent years, in part, as the State has collected more comprehensive data on causes of death up to a year after childbirth.

While no amount of maternal mortality is ever acceptable, the new data has shown us that the causes for maternal mortality in the State have shifted away from those traditional acute cases that I was familiar with during my residency back in the 1970s. There were illnesses such as pregnancy-induced hypertension, hemorrhage, and infection during pregnancy. Now it is different. We have cardiac disease, suicide, and opioid overdose, which oftentimes occurs in the months after childbirth.

By supporting children in their first years, MIECHV can not only help children live healthy lives, but help mothers live healthy lives as well, so that they can continue to be there for their children.

The MIECHV Program and organizations like the Nurse-Family Partnership succeed because they identify families in need that do not have readily available care and work to provide services in home settings.

Families cannot raise healthy children without access to care. When families cannot find providers in their area, MIECHV grant recipients are there to provide that support.

H.R. 2824 builds upon the successes of the MIECHV Program by tailoring the program to ensure that it can continue to help families that truly need the help.

For example, H.R. 2824 requires for States receiving MIECHV grants to conduct statewide needs assessments by 2020, in order to reaffirm which populations and communities should receive these services. The last time such an assessment was required was in 2010.

As the needs of populations of States have evolved over these past 10 years, so should the program as well. It is important to ensure that tax dollars continue to be invested efficiently, and this bill ensures that MIECHV can continue to do so.

Additionally, H.R. 2824 provides additional opportunities for States to promote quality and enhanced outcomes. The bill updates the program by allowing for States to promote models that will have greater impact on multiple sites and locations, thus expanding the reach of grants and providing States with the opportunity to reimburse grant recipients based on the quality and outcomes associated with their programs.

I certainly want to thank members of the Ways and Means Committee for the work they have put into this bill. It is a smart bill that continues a Federal program for low-income families that actually has evidence of its effectiveness and, furthermore, links future funding to the assurance of greater cost-effectiveness.

This program serves as a model for Federal programs to help low-income families and children. I want to thank Chairman SMITH and Chairman BRADY for their efforts on this bill.

For these reasons, I encourage everyone in this body to support this rule and the underlying bill today.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate the rule for consideration of H.R. 2824, the Increasing Opportunity Through Evidence-Based Home Visiting Act; and H.R. 2792, the Control Unlawful Fugitive Felons Act of 2017.

The first measure, H.R. 2824, reauthorizes the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program, or MIECHV, and provides pregnant women and families access to resources to improve maternal and child health and promotes child development.

I am glad to see this bill getting the attention that I think we all agree it deserves, considering the important role the program plays in all of our communities. However, my concern is that, once again, we are witnessing my Republican friends take a policy that should garner broad, bipartisan support and instead scuttle the effort by playing politics.

H.R. 2824's State matching provision is a threat to the core existence of this program. Because of this change from the past authorization, I fear that many States will lose Federal funding and will be forced to cut off home visiting services altogether.

Where do you propose poorer States with lower investments in home visiting get the money to meet the matching requirements?

Then, Mr. Speaker, what about Tribal programs? They are especially vulnerable to the devastation that will be wrought by making them come up with a 30 percent match. Native American communities struggle enough, as it is, without having to put up with these absurd requirements.

I do compliment Mrs. NOEM for fighting along with our colleague on the Rules Committee, TOM COLE, for a 5-year hiatus before they would have to make the match. But as one who represents two Tribes, the Seminoles and the Miccosukees, I don't even think, after 5 years, their vulnerability to devastation is going to be avoided.

Mr. Speaker, I ask: Why are my Republican colleagues again choosing to abandon bipartisanship in favor of partisan politics?

Our goals should be to reauthorize the vital program, not change long-established and successful policies that will hurt the most vulnerable in our country.

This program, as traditionally reauthorized, puts families first in order to strengthen communities and improve outcomes for kids and their families. Without the MIECHV Program, at-risk families will suffer.

I strongly support moving quickly to reauthorize this program before it expires on September 30, 2017. But adding a provision that will make it impos-

sible for many States to fully participate in this program is not only not the way forward, it is downright dangerous.

The second measure is H.R. 2792. It is a sidecar bill, as its only purpose in being considered is to offset the cost of the MIECHV Program.

H.R. 2792 would reinstate an old, failed policy that had damaging effects for many seniors and people with disabilities by taking away Supplemental Security Income benefits from every individual who has an outstanding felony warrant, regardless of the seriousness of the alleged violation, the age of the warrant, or the condition of the recipient.

Mr. Speaker, over 110 national, State, and local organizations have warned that H.R. 2792 is a cruel bill that could have catastrophic consequences for some of our most vulnerable citizens.

Everyone can agree that dangerous criminals should not receive public benefits while fleeing justice. In fact, the Social Security Administration already provides regular notification to law enforcement of any beneficiary who has an outstanding warrant. This bill, on the other hand, despite its title, would harm seniors and people with severe disabilities, not felons.

Mr. Speaker, a larger issue at hand is not simply the dangerous policy changes in the first bill, nor the failed unnecessary policy found in the second, but rather the partisan manner in which these bills are being considered, especially in the face of the laundry list of items that this body needs to urgently address in a bipartisan manner.

We do not have the luxury of time to debate the majority's attempts to legislate failed and dangerous policies that will threaten families.

We should be acting in the most exigent fashion to address issues such as ascertaining the full scope of Hurricane Maria's devastation on Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands and what we need to do to make our brothers and sisters in those areas whole again.

We should not be spending our time taking a partisan approach to a program that provides pregnant women and families access to resources to improve maternal and child health. Rather, we should be working across the aisle to address the real pressing issues facing our country.

□ 1245

Congress should be addressing the plight of the millions of American citizens living in total devastation in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Five days after Hurricane Maria decimated what Hurricane Irma had spared, 15,000 people remain in government shelters, thousands of homes are destroyed, roads are blocked, bridges buckled, and a dam in Puerto Rico is on the edge of collapse, threatening the lives of nearly 70,000 people with flash flooding. Two hospitals in the Virgin Islands have been destroyed, and lest I

not mention that we have not dealt adequately with what is required in Texas and in southwest Louisiana and in Florida.

Today, in my office, numerous representatives of government officials and organizations came to present issues concerning ongoing matters having to do with their concerns in our area. The Speaker of the House and the chairman of appropriations were with several of us in the Florida delegation last week to review and view the damage that has occurred in the Keys. And here we are, rather than dealing with a humanitarian crisis as towns are left without fresh water, power, and fuel, we are dealing with a dangerous bill that will address vulnerable people in a negative way.

Officials reported that 1,360 of Puerto Rico's 1,600 telephone cell towers are down. The same holds in the Virgin Islands. With 85 percent of aboveground and underground phone and internet cables knocked out—the same in the Virgin Islands—officials still had not had communication with 9 of the 78 municipalities. It has been difficult or nearly impossible for individuals to reach or connect with their loved ones.

Let me make something very clear that many Members of the House do not understand. Everybody cries that FEMA should do all of the things that we would want it to do as the Federal Emergency Management Agency, but FEMA today is dealing with 30 disasters in this country.

I sat here a moment ago and heard our colleague from Montana describe over a million acres of fire ongoing there. In southern California, there is an extraordinary fire that is taking place in that particular area.

This devastation, these disasters as in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and elsewhere are only cracks of the service of the long to-do list that Congress is confronted with. The list is long and time is short.

In addition to the MIECHV program, which the majority has decided to undermine here today, at the end of the week, the Children's Health and Insurance Program—CHIP, the Children's Health and Insurance Program—Medicare provisions, and the Community Health Centers Fund all expire without any discussion at all in this House. We are leaving not only our constituents, young and old, and the American people in a quandary about their health insurance or treatment facilities, but adding unnecessary anxiety to their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I would argue that the snowball is only going to grow with the end of the calendar year looming right around the corner.

Let me just remind my colleagues in the majority what needs to be addressed by December 8: reauthorizing the National Flood Insurance Program—I don't know what that was yesterday that they were trying to do with the FAA authorization—an absolute necessity in the wake of these dev-

astating storms; keeping the government open and EPA pesticide registration fees. And by the end of the year, we must also act to reauthorize the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, FISA, which we now know plays a critical role in the fundamental aspects of our democracy.

The Affordable Care Act's annual fee on health insurance providers needs to be addressed, important for the health of the marketplace, and the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund financing rate.

Now, Democrats stand ready to work in a bipartisan fashion to address each and every one of the matters that I just talked about, and all of them must pass pieces of legislation. What we are witnessing today is a clear indication that my Republican friends do not share the same spirit, but would rather play politics.

Let me just add one little bit about that. In the other body, the United States Senate, we saw an example of partisan politics play out to its extreme, and it is not likely that there is going to be an important measure dealing with the healthcare of Americans coming from the United States Senate back to this body that passed something that was an awful bill earlier in the year.

But what did it do?

It caused LAMAR ALEXANDER and PATTY MURRAY, who were working on bipartisan measures, to stop their bipartisan efforts so that we could go forward in the Senate on a partisan measure that is going nowhere. People sent us here to work together. They did not send us here to be partisan in every one of our moves. What we are witnessing here today is another example of partisanship.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk again just for a minute about the second bill in today's rule, H.R. 2824, the Increasing Opportunity and Success for Children and Parents through Evidence-Based Home Visiting Act, that does extend funding for the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program.

I just wanted to talk for a minute about some of the results that we have seen in these program grants and, at this point, reference my home State of Texas to see how they have performed.

The Nurse-Family Partnership is a community-based home services group that supports pregnant women and new mothers in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. They have used grants from this program to support women through both the promotion of preventive and prenatal services for pregnant women, like connecting women to physicians, helping them get medications, and through the utilization of risk reduction services such as smoking cessation.

Again, I tell you this to reiterate that these are good programs. This is a good program that we are reauthor-

izing today and it is worthy of our attention and support.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleague will support the DeBene amendment, which will eliminate the matching funds for Tribes altogether. I mentioned that earlier.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), my good friend.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I associate myself with his remarks about everything we need to do by the end of the fiscal year, which is the end of this week; in particular, reauthorization of CHIP that has helped so many millions of kids get health insurance and get the care that they need.

I rise today, though, to talk about the MIECHV bill, which is up today, and to express my deep disappointment that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have chosen to walk away from yet another opportunity to work on a bipartisan basis. We could extend this program on a bipartisan basis just the way we started it. It is really a success story.

The evidence-based models are proven to deliver results for kids and families in every single State. Investments in MIECHV are investments in the success of America's children and their futures. Peer-reviewed evidence proves that MIECHV leads to improvements in health outcomes for mothers and babies, school achievement, parenting practices, and overall early childhood development.

On top of all that, MIECHV is a great return on investment for Federal dollars. For example, for every Federal dollar in the Nurse-Family Partnership, we get \$5.70 in return. Sadly, this bill that the House is considering today would set MIECHV back. The partisan proposal would make it more difficult for MIECHV models in all of our States to continue their success stories.

Under current law, MIECHV only has enough funding to reach 6 percent of eligible families. But instead of working together to help the program reach more children, this bill curtails the reach. It cuts the funding and, as my ranking member said, it imposes a harmful State-matching requirement that could force some of these home health visit programs to shut down altogether.

It is really a shame that when you are talking about healthy starts for kids, we can't work together on both sides of the aisle. I would hope we would defeat this legislation and come back and do what we have done before on this program, work together to have a robust piece of legislation.

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

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

It is shameful that President Trump would end the DACA program without a single thought to the consequences

this decision would have on the 800,000 young lives this program protects.

Do the American people even want DACA to end?

The answer is clearly no.

According to a Politico/Morning Consult poll: "Support for allowing these immigrants to remain in the United States spans across party lines: 84 percent of Democrats, 74 percent of Independents, and 69 percent of Republicans think they should stay."

Congress must act to protect our DREAMers.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here is our chance to rectify President Trump's heartless decision and restore the American people's faith in us. If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act. This bipartisan, bicameral legislation would help thousands of young people who are Americans in every way except on paper.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, through the Chair, I would advise my friend from Texas that I have no further speakers and that I am prepared to close.

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

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

We stand here today with a to-do list a mile long, and we don't have much time to cross items off that list. By kicking the can down the road on nearly every past piece of legislation, this Republican majority has shown itself completely unable to govern. They have abdicated their duty to the American people to accomplish even the most basic of legislative tasks: passing a budget. Without Democratic help, they wouldn't be able to even keep the lights on.

My sincere hope is that the next time we meet we will take up legislation that provides some much-needed relief to our brothers and sisters in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, as well as my home State of Florida and Texas and southwest Louisiana; and address the other disasters that are occurring throughout our country, more specifically having to do with wildfires in Montana, in Oregon, and in California; and that we will begin the process of addressing every single one of the needs of this Nation, particularly its health and its healthcare in a bipartisan way.

My colleagues on this side of the aisle stand ready to do so. I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from en-

gaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of two important pieces of legislation to restore sanity to the administration of the Social Security program and to provide critical tools for disadvantaged homes in helping families raise their children with the best possible practices.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BRADY, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. SMITH for the work on each of their respective pieces of legislation, and I urge Members of this body to support both bills and the rule which will provide for their consideration.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 533 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

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

SEC. 4. 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. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children 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 shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. 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. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

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. HASTINGS. 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.

—
HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 4 of rule XVI, I move that