

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. 12) to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, 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 among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, Science, Space and Technology, Veterans' Affairs, Oversight and Government Reform. 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 12.

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: "Al-

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

□ 1345

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. MCGOVERN. 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.

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 votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

SUPPORTING UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 990) supporting the officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 990

Whereas the national security interests of the United States are dependent on the brave men and women who enforce our Nation's immigration laws;

Whereas abolishing United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) would mean open borders because it would eliminate the main agency responsible for removing people who enter or remain in our country illegally;

Whereas calls to abolish ICE are an insult to these heroic law enforcement officers who make sacrifices every day to secure our borders, enforce our laws, and protect our safety and security;

Whereas abolishing ICE would allow dangerous criminal aliens, including violent and ruthless members of the MS-13 gang, to remain in American communities;

Whereas during fiscal year 2017, ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) arrested more than 127,000 aliens with criminal convictions or charges;

Whereas ICE ERO made 5,225 administrative arrests of suspected gang members in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas criminal aliens arrested by ICE ERO in fiscal year 2017 were responsible for more than—

- (1) 76,000 dangerous drug offenses;
- (2) 48,000 assault offenses;
- (3) 11,000 weapon offenses;
- (4) 5,000 sexual assault offenses;
- (5) 2,000 kidnapping offenses; and
- (6) 1,800 homicide offenses;

Whereas ICE Homeland Security Investigations made 4,818 gang-related arrests in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas ICE identified or rescued 904 sexually exploited children;

Whereas ICE identified or rescued 518 victims of human trafficking;

Whereas abolishing ICE would mean that countless illegal aliens who could pose a threat to public safety would be allowed to roam free instead of being removed from American soil;

Whereas abolishing ICE would mean more dangerous illegal drugs flowing into our communities, causing more Americans to needlessly suffer;

Whereas ICE plays a critical role in combatting the drug crisis facing our Nation;

Whereas ICE seized more than 980,000 pounds of narcotics in fiscal year 2017, including thousands of pounds of the deadly drugs fueling the opioid crisis;

Whereas ICE seized 2,370 pounds of fentanyl and 6,967 pounds of heroin in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas ICE logged nearly 90,000 investigative hours directed toward fentanyl in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas abolishing ICE would leave these drugs in our communities to cause more devastation;

Whereas abolishing ICE would mean eliminating the agency that deports aliens that pose a terrorist threat to the United States;

Whereas ICE was created in 2003 to better protect national security and public safety after the 9/11 terrorists exploited immigration laws to gain entry into the United States;

Whereas the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks found that many of the 9/11 hijackers committed visa violations;

Whereas ICE identifies dangerous individuals before they enter our country and locates them as they violate our immigration laws; and

Whereas abolishing ICE would enable the hundreds of thousands of foreign nationals who illegally overstay their visa each year to remain in the United States indefinitely: Now, therefore, be it