

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

when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3 p.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to.

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 533;

Adopting House Resolution 533, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 533) providing 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; providing for consideration of 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; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 189, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 532]

YEAS—230

Abraham	Bost	Comer
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Comstock
Allen	Brat	Conaway
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Cook
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Costello (PA)
Arrington	Buchanan	Cramer
Babin	Buck	Crawford
Bacon	Bucshon	Culberson
Banks (IN)	Budd	Curbelo (FL)
Barletta	Burgess	Davidson
Barr	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Barton	Calvert	Denham
Bergman	Carter (GA)	Dent
Biggs	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Bilirakis	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bishop (MI)	Cheney	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (UT)	Coffman	Donovan
Black	Cole	Duffy
Blackburn	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Blum	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)

Dunn	Knight	Rokita
Emmer	Kustoff (TN)	Rooney, Francis
Estes (KS)	Labrador	Rooney, Thomas J.
Farenthold	LaHood	Roskam
Faso	LaMalfa	Ross
Ferguson	Lamborn	Rothfus
Fitzpatrick	Lance	Rouzer
Fleischmann	Latta	Royce (CA)
Flores	Lewis (MN)	Russell
Fortenberry	LoBiondo	Rutherford
Fox	Loudermilk	Sanford
Franks (AZ)	Love	Schweikert
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Scott, Austin
Gaetz	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner
Gallagher	MacArthur	Sessions
Garrett	Marchant	Shimkus
Gianforte	Marino	Shuster
Gibbs	Marshall	Simpson
Gohmert	Massie	Smith (MO)
Goodlatte	Mast	Smith (NE)
Gosar	McCarthy	Smith (NJ)
Gowdy	McCauley	Smith (TX)
Graves (GA)	McClintock	Smucker
Graves (LA)	McHenry	Stefanik
Graves (MO)	McKinley	Stewart
Griffith	McMorris	Stivers
Grothman	Rodgers	Taylor
Guthrie	McSally	Tenney
Handel	Meehan	Thompson (PA)
Harper	Mitchell	Thornberry
Harris	Moore	Tipton
Hartzler	Mooney (WV)	Trott
Hensarling	Mullin	Turner
Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)	Upton
Hice, Jody B.	Newhouse	Valadao
Higgins (LA)	Noem	Wagner
Hill	Norman	Walberg
Holding	Nunes	Walden
Hollingsworth	Olson	Walker
Hudson	Palazzo	Walorski
Huizenga	Palmer	Walters, Mimi
Hultgren	Paulsen	Weber (TX)
Hunter	Pearce	Webster (FL)
Hurd	Perry	Wenstrup
Issa	Pittenger	Westerman
Jenkins (KS)	Poe (TX)	Williams
Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin	Wilson (SC)
Johnson (LA)	Posey	Wittman
Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe	Womack
Jones	Reed	Woodall
Jordan	Reichert	Yoder
Joyce (OH)	Renacci	Yoho
Katko	Rice (SC)	Young (AK)
Kelly (MS)	Roby	Young (IA)
Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)	Zeldin
King (IA)	Rogers (AL)	
King (NY)	Rogers (KY)	
Kinzinger	Rohrabacher	

NAYS—189

Adams	Crist	Himes
Aguilar	Crowley	Hoyer
Barragán	Cuellar	Huffman
Bass	Cummings	Jackson Lee
Beatty	Davis (CA)	Jayapal
Bera	Davis, Danny	Jeffries
Beyer	DeFazio	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Delaney	Keating
Blunt Rochester	DeLauro	Kelly (IL)
Bonamici	DelBene	Kennedy
Boyle, Brendan F.	Demings	Khanna
Brady (PA)	DeSaulnier	Kihuen
Brown (MD)	Deutch	Kildee
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	Kilmer
Bustos	Doyle, Michael F.	Kind
Butterfield	Ellison	Krishnamoorthi
Capuano	Engel	Kuster (NH)
Carbajal	Eshoo	Langevin
Cárdenas	Españillat	Larsen (WA)
Carson (IN)	Esty (CT)	Larson (CT)
Cartwright	Evans	Lawrence
Castor (FL)	Foster	Lawson (FL)
Castro (TX)	Frankel (FL)	Lee
Chu, Judy	Fudge	Levin
Ciallone	Gabbard	Lewis (GA)
Clark (MA)	Gallago	Lieu, Ted
Clarke (NY)	Garamendi	Lipinski
Clay	Gomez	Loeb
Cleaver	Gonzalez (TX)	Loeb
Clyburn	Gotthelmer	Lowenthal
Cohen	Green, Al	Lowey
Connolly	Green, Gene	Lujan Grisham,
Conyers	Grijalva	M.
Cooper	Gutiérrez	Luján, Ben Ray
Correa	Hastings	Lynch
Costa	Heck	Maloney,
Courtney	Higgins (NY)	Carolyn B.
		Maloney, Sean

Matsui	Polis	Slaughter
McCollum	Price (NC)	Smith (WA)
McEachin	Quigley	Soto
McGovern	Raskin	Speier
McNerney	Rice (NY)	Suozi
Meeks	Richmond	Swalwell (CA)
Meng	Rosen	Takano
Moore	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Moulton	Ruiz	Thompson (MS)
Murphy (FL)	Ruppersberger	Titus
Nadler	Rush	Tonko
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Torres
Neal	Sánchez	Tsongas
Nolan	Sarbanes	Vargas
Norcross	Schakowsky	Veasey
O'Halleran	Schiff	Vela
O'Rourke	Schneider	Velázquez
Pallone	Schrader	Visclosky
Panetta	Scott (VA)	Walz
Pascarella	Scott, David	Wasserman
Pelosi	Serrano	Schultz
Perlmutter	Sewell (AL)	Waters, Maxine
Peters	Shea-Porter	Watson Coleman
Peterson	Sherman	Welch
Pingree	Sinema	Wilson (FL)
Pocan	Sires	

NOT VOTING—14

Bridenstine	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Dingell	Long	Scalise
Granger	Meadows	Tiberi
Hanabusa	Messer	Yarmuth
Johnson, E. B.	Payne	

□ 1327

Messrs. PETERS, BRADY of Pennsylvania, CÁRDENAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mrs. LOWEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 532.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 230, noes 190, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 533]

AYES—230

Abraham	Brat	Cook
Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Costello (PA)
Allen	Brooks (IN)	Cramer
Amash	Buchanan	Crawford
Amodei	Buck	Culberson
Arrington	Bucshon	Curbelo (FL)
Babin	Budd	Davidson
Bacon	Burgess	Davis, Rodney
Banks (IN)	Byrne	Denham
Barletta	Calvert	Dent
Barr	Carter (GA)	DeSantis
Barton	Carter (TX)	DesJarlais
Bergman	Chabot	Diaz-Balart
Biggs	Cheney	Donovan
Bilirakis	Coffman	Duffy
Bishop (MI)	Cole	Duncan (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Duncan (TN)
Black	Collins (NY)	Dunn
Blackburn	Comer	Emmer
Blum	Comstock	Estes (KS)
	Conaway	Farenthold