

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, over the conflict in the area of Iraq, dating from the first gulf war to the second, we have had staunch allies in the Kurdish people.

And just as the American people had within them the desire for independence in 1776, so, too, rises the tide of self-determination among the Kurdish people. And should they choose to take that path in a referendum and seek to separate themselves from the failing Iraqi State, I strongly encourage America to promptly recognize a new, independent Kurdistan to take its place among other important American allies, like Israel, in the region.

SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, before we go home for the August work period, I think it is important for this House to reaffirm to the world our support for Israel. Under President Obama, it would seem that America has switched sides from its historical support for Israel, which dates back to 1948.

The President seems to want hostilities to end so bad that he and his supporting cast within the mainstream media fail to remember or point out that Hamas has been lobbing rockets into Israel from shortly after Israel's withdrawal from Gaza in 2005.

In Secretary Kerry's mind, it would seem, a stop to hostilities means Israel must stop defending its people. But there is never mention of Hamas ending the constant barrage of rockets—22 red alerts have gone off thus far in Israel today. That is not 22 rockets. That is 22 separate events where rockets have been launched into Israel.

This President seems more interested in appeasing Hamas, which is a terrorist organization, than he is in comprehending Israel's desire to end this threat to its people and its existence.

This position put forward by the President and his Secretary of State, John Kerry, is an injustice and a betrayal toward a longtime friend and ally in the region. Israel deserves better, and they deserve more, Mr. President.

As for me and my office and my house and my family, we will always stand with Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5230, SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5272, PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DEFERRED ACTION FOR ALIENS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5021, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 696 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 696

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any 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 Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. After passage of H.R. 5230, and on the legislative day of July 31, 2014, the House shall consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any 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 the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee that the House disagree to the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

SEC. 4. Any motion pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXII relating to H.R. 5021 may be offered only by the Majority Leader or his designee.

SEC. 5. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of July 31, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her des-

ignee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 6. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of July 31, 2014.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), 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. COLE. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of three measures: H.R. 5230, the supplemental appropriations bill to deal with the influx of unaccompanied minors across the southern border; H.R. 5272, a bill that would prevent the administration from expanding the use of deferred action for individuals who are not legally present in the United States; and the Senate amendment to H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014.

The resolution provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 5230, the supplemental appropriations bill. This is consistent with the way all seven supplemental appropriations acts considered in the 110th and 111th Congresses were treated when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were in the majority. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, and provides for one motion to recommit.

In addition, the resolution also provides that after the passage of H.R. 5230, that it be in order to consider H.R. 5272, a bill that would prevent the administration from expanding the use of deferred action for individuals who are not legally present in the United States. The resolution provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 5272, provides for 60 minutes of debate, equally divided by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and provides for a motion to recommit.

In addition, the rule also provides for consideration of a motion to disagree to the Senate's amendment to H.R. 5021, so we can send the bill that easily passed the House on an overwhelming bipartisan vote back to the Senate.

Finally, the rule provides for same-day and suspension authority today to

resolve any outstanding issues before the August recess.

Mr. Speaker, this rule demonstrates this House's careful consideration of the President's supplemental request. Earlier this month, the President submitted to Congress a \$3.7 billion request to deal with both the urgent crisis of unaccompanied juveniles crossing the border and with wildfires.

Since then, Chairman ROGERS, Chairman GRANGER, Speaker BOEHNER, and the Republican Conference have thoughtfully considered what resources the President needs to address this crisis through the end of the fiscal year.

The result, Mr. Speaker, is a significantly pared-down piece of legislation. It provides \$659 million to meet the immediate border security and humanitarian needs. This supplemental sends the message that this administration has been unwilling to send, that if you come here illegally, you will be deported. And it provides the resources to effect just that.

It provides \$334 million for Immigration and Customs Enforcement for boosted enforcement efforts, accelerates judicial proceedings by providing \$22 million to hire temporary immigration judges and provide courts with video teleconferencing equipment, and makes smart policy reforms, like changing the 2008 sex trafficking law to require that all unaccompanied minors are treated the same, among others.

These important policy reforms, which the President initially asked for, are a reasonable, thoughtful response to the tenfold increase of unaccompanied alien children since 2011.

Mr. Speaker, the President's advisers warned him this crisis was coming back in 2012 and 2013, but he ignored that advice. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the administration has mismanaged this entire issue from the beginning.

If the President's FY 2015 budget had become law, we would have seen a reduction of nearly 3,500 detention beds, a 2 percent reduction in ICE's investigative capacity, and a 12 percent reduction to CBP air and marine operations, all vital tools to deal with this problem.

In addition, the President's budget request for the Central American Regional Security Initiative, which confronts narcotics and arms trafficking, gangs, and organized crime in that region and addresses border security deficiencies and disrupts criminal infrastructure, was actually proposed to be cut in the President's FY 2015 budget. The House FY15 foreign operations bill reverses those cuts and actually increases the resources to deal with these related problems.

Mr. Speaker, at every turn, the administration has failed to address the border crisis adequately, and now the President wants a blank check to proceed. His aim is not to stop and reverse the flow of unaccompanied minors into this country. He merely aims to manage that influx more efficiently. The House cannot accept that.

This legislation, H.R. 5230, adequately funds the shortfalls caused by this administration's policy by using existing resources. And Republicans are willing to provide additional resources should they be needed in FY 2015 appropriations, within the bipartisan budget cap set by the Ryan-Murray budget agreement. But we believe that this bill provides the appropriate resources at this time.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the bill provides for consideration of H.R. 5272, which would prevent the administration from expanding the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, the so-called DACA program. I, like many of my colleagues, believe that DACA has incentivized juveniles to attempt the long and dangerous journey from Central America, with the hope of staying in this country permanently. Executive orders, like DACA, only serve to keep that hope alive. I believe it is important to send a strong signal that this program should not be expanded. H.R. 5272 does just that.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule would send back the original House-passed highway bill to the Senate. While I appreciate what my friends in the other body have been able to do, I believe it is important to provide Members the maximum amount of flexibility to craft a long-term highway bill. By accepting the Senate amendment, which would only provide adequate funding of the highway trust fund through mid-December, we would be effectively creating a new crisis in the middle of a lame duck session of Congress. Given the limited number of session days before the election, this does not seem like a prudent course to take. Instead, the House should return to the Senate its bipartisan legislation, which passed this Chamber by a vote of 367-55.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important to move forward on these three important pieces of legislation before the August district work period. I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am looking over the rule that was passed late last night, and my reading of the rule indicates that that there was a change in the standing rules of the House. Mr. Speaker, I would like some parliamentary clarification on that provision.

If you look at the resolution in section 4, it says, "Any motion pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXII relating to H.R. 5021"—that is the transportation-related bill—"may be offered only by the Majority Leader or his designee."

Now, I am looking at the standing rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, and the standing rules of the House provide that "when the stage of disagreement

has been reached on a bill or resolution with House or Senate amendments, a motion to dispose of any amendment shall be privileged."

My question is: Doesn't "privileged" mean available to any Member of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is asking the Chair to interpret the pending resolution, and that provision will not be interpreted by the Chair while it is under consideration.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Well, Mr. Speaker, my understanding of a parliamentary inquiry was where the Speaker was supposed to clarify questions of the rules and the parliamentary order.

I am simply asking whether or not, in previous rulings by this House and by the Parliamentarian, "privileged" has been interpreted to mean something that is available to any Member of the House, not just to the majority leader or the designee of the majority leader?

□ 0930

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret this resolution during its pendency.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. If the Chair does not want to interpret this parliamentary inquiry at this time, at what point would it be in order to ask the Parliamentarian and the Chair to interpret the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A parliamentary inquiry should relate in some practical sense to pending proceedings.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Is it not the rule, passed out of the committee, that is pending? That is the parliamentary inquiry. Is that what is pending before the House, the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's inquiry is a matter for debate on the resolution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. But, Mr. Speaker, isn't the matter pending before the House the rule that the designated chairman—acting chairman—of the Rules Committee just spoke about?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. House Resolution 696 is pending at this time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. That is correct, Mr. Speaker. And I am reading one of the provisions of that resolution, specifically section 4 of that rule, which is before the House which changes the rules of the House to say that a motion may only be made by the majority leader or his designee, as opposed to the privileged motion required under the underlying rule. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has stated, the Chair will not interpret the pending resolution. That is a matter for debate.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. If I could ask for 1 minute of time to discuss this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I will further yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Look, yesterday, we were on the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker, and our Republican colleagues passed a measure to sue the President of the United States, waste millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to sue the President of the United States, and the claim was the President has exceeded his authority.

That is a specious claim, but what is incredible is the very next day our Republican colleagues are here suspending democracy in the House, changing the standing rules of the House to take away from any Member of the House the opportunity to offer a motion with respect to the transportation bill, which is what the standing rules of the House provide, and they want to say no, we are going to take that right away from a Member, and we are going to give it exclusively to the Republican leader or the Republican leader's designee.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, the last time we saw this happen? On the government shutdown. Our Republican colleagues used the same measure to refuse to take up the Senate bill, which would have ended the government shutdown. They didn't want to end it, so they kept it going. That cost the American taxpayer \$24 billion in damage to the economy.

Let's not play games with the rule, that this rule allows every Member their rights. The Speaker is not the king, and we should make sure that every Member has an opportunity.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to address the underlying rule, and I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland's efforts to get clarity as to what is in this rule.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we saw this rule for the first time late last night. We saw the bill for the first time late last night. I believe the underlying bill was dropped shortly after 8 p.m., and Rules Committee convened after 10 p.m.

We are still in the process of trying to understand what is in this rule and this bill. I know that there are legitimate questions with regard to how it changes the rules of our entire House of Representatives, as well as what this bill actually does.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to both the process of the rule and the underlying bill. The bill, of course, prohibits certain actions with respect to deferred actions for people who are already in our country.

This provision was added at the last minute in the midnight hour to restrict the deferred action for the childhood arrivals program, which is a form of prosecutorial discretion, which is

used by all prosecutorial and administrative agencies.

When you have a situation where 10 or 11 or 12 million people have illegal presence in our country, clearly, with our limited enforcement resources, we need to have prosecutorial discretion and priorities. Whom should we be going after and in what form, given that it is not possible with the limited resources they have, to in any way address the entire issue?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to think that it makes perfect sense, with regards to the deferred action program, that we focus our limited enforcement resources on criminal aliens. Those are people who, in addition to having unlawful presence here, have committed some kind of crime. It might have been a DUI. It might have been an assault.

We need to focus on promptly bringing people who have committed crimes to justice and deporting them under our laws. So whom does it make sense to not focus on, given our prosecutorial discretion?

I think the deferred action program is a perfect example, and this bill, in our understanding, even recognizes that, that many of the people that grew up in our country, that know no other country, that came when they were 2 or 3, that were cheerleaders or high school football players and know no other country than the United States of America and owe their loyalty to us, of course, should not be the enforcement priority of laws that are broken until we can fix our immigration system.

It makes sense that the President work—any President, Democrat or Republican—to identify additional groups that we can use with our prosecutorial discretion and offer some kind of deferred action to, so that we can further focus our limited enforcement resources on those who would do us harm or represent a threat to our safety or our economy.

If there is a way, for instance, to include the parents of American children who are here unlawfully and are not violating any criminal laws of our country, it would make sense that their enforcement should come after those who have committed criminal violations in our country. That is a customary aspect of prosecutorial discretion ranging from any DA to the Attorney General to the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, under the language of this bill, it would further restrict the ability of the President to focus our limited enforcement resources on criminal aliens who would do us harm, reducing the security of the American people.

Now, we all know the real answer here is to replace our broken immigration system with one that works. The answer is not to have 10 million, 12 million, who knows how many million people here illegally and just focus on which group we can actually enforce the law on. We need to have a law that we can enforce universally.

There should not be people that are here illegally in our country. We need to secure our borders, we need to reunite American families, and we need to grow our economy. Later on today, if we defeat the previous question, Mr. GARCIA will offer a bipartisan bill that will do just that.

Instead of even allowing amendments on these controversial bills, including amendments that are extremely commonsense, we have a closed process that, as Mr. VAN HOLLEN pointed out, changes the very rules of the House, in the name of preventing the President from focusing on deporting criminal aliens.

Look, Republicans and Democrats alike acknowledge that there is a crisis on our southern border. Unaccompanied minors are fleeing from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala, fleeing horrific situations. I had the opportunity to visit the border the weekend before last, along with many of my colleagues, and got to speak to some of the kids, as well as the Customs and Border Patrol and HHS officials, and hear some of those stories firsthand.

We had this discussion yesterday in Rules Committee. Action means a bill passing the House, a bill passing the Senate, and the President signing it. Instead of taking action to address the crisis on our southern border, the House is considering a House-only bill that the President has said he would veto, that the Senate won't likely even bring up, and then promptly going home for a 1-month vacation. We wonder why Congress has a 12 percent approval rating.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to disagree with my friend on a couple of points that he made. First, I would suggest the President actually hasn't taken action or suggested action. A month ago, he told us that the 2008 sex trafficking law was responsible for his inability to return people to their country of origin, unaccompanied minors.

We have been waiting for his corrective for 30 days; instead, Mr. Speaker, we get an open-ended supplemental that goes through from this fiscal year to the end of the next fiscal year with a lot of measures—some of which, by the way, we agree with—to manage the flow, but absolutely nothing to stop and reverse the flow.

So we think, in that absence of leadership from the executive branch, we have acted. We have actually done what a month ago at least he was suggesting ought to be done, giving some discretion and giving some ability to try to deal with the loophole in the law.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we have looked at what he put in front of us, and we have decided, look, we can actually offset this money. We don't have to spend extra money. This is a higher priority. We will take money from lower priority areas.

We will get us through the end of this fiscal year and through the end of this calendar year, and in that interim time, we will have an opportunity to work with the administration to continue to address the problem within the limits of the Ryan-Murray budget agreement that we agreed to on a bipartisan, bicameral basis not that long ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this issue of the DACA controversy that we have here, I would like to make the following points: first, nothing in this legislation changes the current state of affairs at all. In other words, what the President has done up to this point is left undisturbed.

However, we do believe the abuse of prosecutorial discretion is actually one of the things that contributed to the current crisis that we have—not deliberately, but, frankly, I think the President unwittingly or unknowingly sent a signal that if you get here and you get across our border, you are going to be able to stay. So we want to be very careful that doesn't happen again.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the President has said if Congress doesn't do certain things by such and such a date or by the August work period, then I intend during that time to use my pen and my phone to effect some changes that I want.

What is interesting to us, by the way, less than 2 years ago, he said these kinds of things were unconstitutional and couldn't be done by the executive branch. Now, he has changed his view on that.

So we are going to finally put in place something that will prevent him in our absence from once again abusing prosecutorial discretion to achieve other aims.

With that, I would like to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, my House Republican friends never cease to amaze me. Once again, House Republicans have turned control of their agenda to Senator Speaker TED CRUZ. The last time they did this, they shut the government down, and look at how that worked out for them. Some people never learn.

Mr. Speaker, it is not enough that House Republicans, despite Speaker BOEHNER's promises of a more open House, continue to block consideration of comprehensive immigration reform. No, they need to go even further.

Last night, after a lengthy meeting with Senator Speaker CRUZ, House Republicans caved in a desperate and partisan way and produced an extreme bill that would prevent President Obama from building upon the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. This bill was introduced last night. It has never had a hearing, but here it is.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are victims of their own shortsightedness.

In their attempts to placate the fringe elements on the far right, especially as the November elections grow closer, House Republicans continue to refuse to bring up any kind of comprehensive immigration reform bill.

Of course, the Senate passed comprehensive immigration reform overwhelmingly, and we know that the bill would pass this House if it were brought up for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, this process is absurd. The bills we will consider today are cruel and cheap political stunts. They would do nothing to alleviate the crisis and merely serve as political cover, and what is worse, the Republicans are playing games with the lives of vulnerable children.

Further, the supplemental appropriations bill is a sham. It does not even come close to addressing the humanitarian crisis on our border. It provides nothing in terms of necessary resources for the Border Patrol, HHS, Homeland Security, and our immigration system to give these children and their families the attention that they need.

The policy is bad enough. The process absolutely stinks. The deal the Republican leadership cut with the hard right is this: if you want the opportunity to vote for a nasty bill to block expansion of DACA—which has absolutely nothing to do with the crisis on the border—then you have to vote for this terrible supplemental.

No wonder the approval rating of Congress is at 7 percent. With stunts like this, I am surprised it is that high. I know this is an election season, but I plead with Republicans: let's not lose our humanity in this process.

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

Mr. Speaker, my friend is always a terrific and impassioned speaker, and I love to hear him. I genuinely do, but what he is saying is, frankly, at odds with the facts.

Look at the record. It was the President in his budget who wanted to cut border security, cut detention beds, reduce aid to Central America, and reduce law enforcement. That was the President's proposal.

□ 1045

Before this crisis, we had already corrected some of those mistakes in the FY15 Foreign Operations budget. So in terms of who has been willing to put resources not only in a law enforcement sense but in a humanitarian sense, it has been the majority side of the aisle, not the minority.

Frankly, our plan will not increase suffering; it will decrease it. What will increase suffering is continuing to send the signal that coming here illegally will be rewarded. The challenge of that is, number one, when you encourage that behavior, we are destroying the societies from which those young people are coming. The officials of those governments have met with ours, and they say that we would like our chil-

dren back. That is a terrible thing that we are doing to those countries.

Number two, the people who are financing it, well-meaning people in most cases, trying to bring children into the United States, are turning their money over to criminal enterprises and cartels. They are strengthening the very people who are destroying their society and committing crimes across the entire region, not just our country.

And finally, the children that are encouraged to come are young people, mostly juveniles from three countries and, frankly, are subject to a horrific and dangerous journey. Along the way, they can be pressed into sex trafficking. They can be turned into drug smugglers. They can be physically abused. We don't know how many of them never make it here at all.

Any policy left in place that encourages that, wittingly or unwittingly, ought to be changed. Until the signal is sent unmistakably to these societies, don't spend your money, don't put your kids at risk, the flow will continue.

Now the President of the United States, at least 2 weeks ago, said:

The majority of these children are going to be returned.

That is his statement, not ours, not us doing something that he said isn't going to happen. He said the overwhelming majority of these children will be returned. Doing this quickly and humanely might keep other children from following the same route.

This is a tough, tough situation. It is a situation, quite frankly, that the President was warned would happen in 2012, was warned in 2013 by officials in his own administration, and ignored. You can see he ignored it in terms of the budget he actually proposed to present to Congress this year. Thank goodness we didn't actually do what he asked us to do.

I think if you look at this objectively, you can see the President was overtaken by a crisis. He fumbled it and mismanaged that crisis, in my opinion, and now my friends on the other side of the aisle are trying to turn this into something that it is not. It is a border crisis debate and discussion. It is not an overall immigration debate. It is not a political stunt. We certainly didn't plan for this to happen. My friends clearly did not plan for it to happen. The President didn't plan for it to happen or he would never have submitted the budget that he did. So we are trying to respond quickly and expeditiously to a crisis.

This is not, by the way, a once-and-for-all response. We are here in August. We will be back here in September. We will be back here after the election. We have an appropriations process, probably an omnibus bill waiting in the lame duck that will continue to address this, but something has to be done now.

What the President requests, again, doesn't address the problem. It is an open-ended check and, frankly, sort of

gets him off the hook until September 30, 2015, when we would have to come back here again.

The bill in front of us is a much more prudent, much more targeted, much more thoughtful, and much, frankly, more efficient use of resources in the interim while we continue to work to get a handle on the situation.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE).

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, allow me to address some of the concerns raised in the underlying bill concerning unaccompanied alien children. If our concern is with a secure border, you can talk to someone such as myself who represents El Paso, Texas, the largest city in Texas on the Mexican border which, today, is also the safest city not just in Texas, but in the entire United States. You can talk to other elected leaders, to the folks who actually live on the border, and you can look at the facts.

Apprehensions at the U.S.-Mexico border are down nearly 70 percent over the last 15 years. In the year 2000, we had 1.6 million apprehensions. This last year, 420,000. And even with this spike of refugees from Central America, we are not expected to get to half a million this year. The border, by the numbers, is as secure as it has ever been.

If your concern is with the welfare of these children once they enter this country, then I say let's increase the amount that we are spending with Health and Human Services which, in this current bill, is a pittance against what is necessary and what should be required.

And if your concern is with the welfare of these children in Central America and along this journey, then I ask you to do what this country's proud history, what our conscience, and what the law already mandates, which is to accept their applications for asylum, to help them once they are in this country, and to work with our neighbors in Central America and this hemisphere to resolve the underlying problems.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule, to reject the underlying bill, and to come back together in September and to work on something that is rational, that is humane, and that is in the best interests of all concerned.

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

Let's talk for a minute about the additional money to HHS. That is exactly, by the way, what this does. The difference—and I think there is probably some confusion here—is we are doing it for a short period of time, and then we are going to probably continue to do it next year, but do it within the constraints of the Ryan-Murray budget deal. The President, frankly, hot-wires around the congressional agreement that was made to lower the budget by extending these expenditures to the end of the next fiscal year.

So just to reassure my friend, nobody is more interested, I think—actually, let me put it this way. I think we are both interested in making sure that, when anybody is in the custody of the United States, they are treated humanely and that there are sufficient resources there to do the job. So this does it in the short-term. I would expect in the appropriations process—again, within the overall spending caps that we have both agreed to—we would continue to do that by moving resources from less important areas to more important areas.

I am going to disagree with my friend on, I think, his point that most of these folks ought to remain inside the United States. Frankly, I agree with the President of the United States: most of them should not.

There is a process, by the way, if you want to apply for refugee status. You do that by going to an American Embassy which is actually in the countries there and they make that determination. You don't do it by breaking the laws of Mexico and breaking the laws of the United States by simply arriving here.

The President has said that most of these young people will be returned. The longer they are here, the more you are going to encourage other people to come, the more people will be subjected to that journey that we all know is dangerous and deadly, and the more often criminal enterprises will be enriched as people give them money to transport juveniles to what they think will be permanent residence in the United States when the President of the United States himself says it will not be permanent, that most of them will return. Better to act on this now.

Now, again, I will be the first to tell you that I don't expect this to be the final piece of legislation. This is an emergency measure. It is timely, it is focused, and it is funded at an appropriate level. We will be back here again in September. We will be back here working on the appropriations process, no doubt, in a lame duck. Frankly, at that time, the appropriate additional resources will undoubtedly be made available, but they will be made available within the budget caps of the Ryan-Murray deal.

I think sometimes when we compare this bill to the budget request the President made, the supplemental request, we really are comparing apples to oranges because the timeframes are much different. Remember, the President's bill also includes wildfire funding. That may be appropriate, but we just don't think it is appropriate in this vehicle, in what ought to be a focused approach.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We spent a good time here yesterday debating and voting on a resolution to sue the President for doing his job, and we are up to about the same kind of tricks today. But if that show yesterday of the Republican obstinance wasn't enough, last night at 10:30, the majority changed the rules in the House to block efforts to achieve a long-term solution to our infrastructure problem. Can you believe that? I want my colleagues and everyone else to know what the majority is up to.

Mr. Speaker, we know and everybody knows that we need a long-term highway bill that would create more jobs and strengthen our infrastructure and provide more certainty for highway construction. And under the rules of the House—always—any Member of the House would have had the right to bring up real solutions to this problem, but not any more. In the middle of the night, the Republicans at the Rules Committee took that right away and gave it to one person, only one person out of 435: the Republican leader. It seems that Republicans are so fixated with my way or the highway that they are even willing to change the rules of the House to block a vote.

This parliamentary trick has only been used once before in the history of the House—only once—and it was during the government shutdown that we recently experienced. While they were obsessing over how to deny people health care, they changed the rules to ensure that no one could open the government back up. None of us could bring that up except one person, just one: the Republican leader. And the last time they pulled this stunt with the government shutdown, it cost the economy of the United States \$24 billion. That is with a B.

Now, we don't know what will happen this time, but what we do know is that it is a dangerous ploy that will undermine economic recovery and job creation. The interest here today is not with the people of the United States; it is purely, absolutely a political stunt after the stunts yesterday. And the whole bill, what we are doing on the border issue, again, is simply a diversionary tactic that signifies not much.

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

Let me pull us back from arguing about rules and procedures to what the real essence of the conflict on the transportation bill is: 357 Members, an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, voted to send the transportation bill to the United States Senate.

That bill, by the way, ran through, if I recall correctly, May of next year, giving us enough time to actually then come to what I know both sides want, and that is a longer-term highway bill.

What the Senate did was send us back something with fewer dollars and a shorter timeframe that actually reaches simply into December, meaning a lame duck Congress would have to deal with the transportation deal. Not likely to happen, particularly

when we will also be dealing with the omnibus spending bill since the Senate, in its infinite wisdom, has been unable to pass a single appropriations bill.

So I think cluttering the calendar with the transportation fund dispute and problem in a short timeframe simply isn't wise. We think it was a political game on the part of the United States Senate. But regardless, the position of this House as expressed by a bipartisan vote of 357, is overwhelmingly clear. We want to expedite that and get it back to the other side so hopefully they can see that type of gamesmanship doesn't work and they accede to the position that, frankly, both sides of this Chamber adopted in overwhelming numbers.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Sadly, Mr. Speaker, the do-nothingism of the 19th century, the anti-immigrant fervor of that time, is alive and well here today in the House. Republicans are overwhelmed with fear. They are fearful of immigrants. They are fearful of little children at our border. But I think most of all, they are fearful of their own shadows—fearful that if they try to deal with any of the major problems that our country faces, that they might suffer political losses. So it is not only know-nothingism, it is do-next-to-nothing that prevails today.

Even when the Republican chair of the Homeland Security Committee last May obtained unanimous committee approval for a bill that he said would secure our border, Republicans were afraid to have it debated on the floor of the House for fear that it might lead to real comprehensive immigration reform, reform that was approved by the United States Senate over a year ago for which they have offered us nothing but excuses, one excuse after another as to why we could not permit a majority of this House to consider the best way to reform our broken immigration system.

□ 1000

Affording full participation to our DREAMers, students who came here long ago as children through no fault of their own without a visa, will not only benefit them as individuals to achieve their all, but it will create jobs and grow our economy. I met with these DREAMers. They have tremendous potential to give back to our country. Some want to deny that opportunity.

What about these children at our border? Aren't they all God's children? Aren't they our children? Don't all children deserve a chance to survive without exploitation and violence and terror? We are not asking that every one of these children be permitted to stay in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 25 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. We are not asking for amnesty, but how about just a little decency, a little civility, a little humanity, how about just following existing law, going after the smugglers, and providing the supplemental resources needed to see that their rights are protected?

I believe that children who came here seeking refuge in this country at least deserve a fair adjudication, not to be met with the barrel of a gun and a one-way ticket back without considering whether they are justly in this country.

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

This is a subject on which, obviously, there is considerable passion and considerable emotion. I respect that on all sides.

I will remind my friends who are insisting on immigration, they did actually control the Chamber for 4 years and didn't bring up an immigration bill ever, had two different Presidents who would have signed anything that they cared to pass, and never introduced one.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I will not yield until I finish my point. You have got plenty of time. I think you can make your points on your own.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield on just a quick correction on that point?

Mr. COLE. I certainly will yield to my friend on that.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The House of Representatives did pass the DREAM Act during the lame duck session.

Mr. COLE. Reclaiming my time, I thought we were talking about comprehensive immigration reform—safely after an election I might add.

But the President of the United States, who ran in 2008, saying he would have a bill on the floor within 100 days, didn't do it.

My friends had basically complete control of this Chamber and the other Chamber. They demonstrated that by passing, again, ObamaCare without a single Republican vote, passing Dodd-Frank, and passing the stimulus bill, so they had the ability to do this and chose not to do it. That is their right. They were in the majority. But please don't lecture us on people stopping individual bills.

We have 350 bills, by the way, this Chamber has passed, sitting and waiting for the Senate to consider any of them, any of them. So I recognize, again, there is a great deal of passion here, but that is not what this debate is about.

This debate is about a border crisis that we both recognize exist. This debate is to give the President additional resources to deal with that, even though he in some measure contributed

to creating it. And this debate is to make sure that we send the message unmistakably: if you subject children to this journey and pay criminals thousands of dollars to bring them across, they are not likely to get to stay—a point that the President of the United States has made. He has said a majority of these children are going to go home. If my friends have a quarrel with that, they should direct that to the President, not to us.

In this case, we do think if you don't discourage that, you are going to feed criminal behavior. You are going to put these children at risk, and you are going to destroy the society from which they came.

I don't think we can in a single bill have an overall solution to this problem of this level. I personally think it is going to take an effort somewhat similar to what we did in Colombia—in a bipartisan sense, I might add—on the drug trade, where we invested considerable resources in Colombia to help them deal with that problem. I am not going to tell you it is perfect there, but it is considerably better than it was in the 1980s and 1990s.

So that is where we worked together constructively and did something good for those societies and something good for our own country. That will probably be the model that has to emerge again in Central America.

But, again, that is a problem far ahead of us and legislative in scope. This is a response to a crisis. We think it is the appropriate response.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. O'ROURKE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of a 4-year-old Honduran girl whose body was found in a nylon bag showing signs of torture.

[From La Tribuna, July 20, 2014]

KIDNAP AND KILL A GIRL IN OLANCHO
(This is a Google Translation)

SAN FRANCISCO DE LA PAZ, Olancho. A heinous crime committed against a minor, has shaken an entire community that is not answered the savage and ruthless attitude of those involved in the sadistic action.

A little of just four years had disappeared last Thursday afternoon a little after 2:00 pm, according to the account of his father Anibal Cardona, about 30, who wept inconsolably so the tragedy.

Apparently a family would have caused neglect subjects mysterious little girl lifted backyard to lead to an unknown destination Quiscamotelugar the community, the origin of the parents of the unfortunate infant.

INSIDE SACK

The body of the girl was placed inside a nylon bag and left abandoned near the home where a day earlier had kidnapped.

Showed signs of torture and was handcuffed, and the conditions under which the body was giving signs of having been killed on the day she disappeared.

The crime involves a mystery, which generates various speculations in the whole population and in the same family, which not only repudiate what happened, they also believe that someone close may be linked to macabre done.

The house where he carried the creature is roughly an area of half acre of land, fenced with cyclone wire mesh and only one entry and when the body was found no one saw who placed it on the site though many neighbors accompanied the family at that time.

RESCUE

The other uncertainty that goes through the head of the citizens, is related to an alleged phone call asking for ransom, which the authorities are already investigating and could become the thread from the skein that leads to the true origin of what happened.

It was learned that the police is on the trail of four subjects, which might be collusion, or have enough information from individuals who committed the detestable fact.

Those who were arrested in a nearby village and that from the beginning of the alarm mentioned that they were responsible, but last night only two people were detained for investigation.

The girl's father, Anibal Cardona, and uncle, Luis Alonso Duarte.

In less than a year, this olanchano municipality has been involved in two violent incidents that result in death left two young children, who still has shaken society.

On 11 October last year, another toddler died a brutal hands of a mentally alienated, brutalized by the effect of alcohol and drugs, committed a heinous murder.

At that time, parishioners wanted to take justice into their own hands hours after police stopped the confessed responsible, a young 22 year old named Carlos Peralta.

Today, the San Franciscan people revive those feelings of grief, sorrow and helplessness, and calls to the appropriate speed in the latter investigations mourns another family event. (FS)

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of a 17-year-old Guatemalan boy who received asylum because a gang killed his father and they were threatening him.

Cesar, a 17-year old boy from Guatemala, lost his father to gang violence at the age of 4. For 13 years, Cesar was harassed by the same gang who killed his father. When he refused to join the gang, he feared for his life and fled the country, swimming across the Rio Grande to cross the border. He was granted asylum, loves school and hopes to attend college.

Cesar—Asylum

Cesar, from Guatemala, was four years old when his father was killed by gangs in their community. The gang members were never arrested and continued to live in the town. They started harassing Cesar when he was very young and never stopped. He was very scared but there was no way he could get away from them.

By the time he turned 17, Cesar could not stand the gang harassment any more. The gangs were trying very hard to get him to join and he was very afraid he was going to be killed. He decided to make the journey to the United States. He said was very hard; sometimes he didn't think he would survive. He swam across the Rio Grande to cross the border. A pro bono attorney KIND matched

him with from Kirkland & Ellis helped him gain asylum. He loves school and wants to attend college.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of an 11-year-old Salvadoran boy who is applying for asylum because he was threatened by gang members who killed his cousin and who suffered severe domestic abuse.

Andres is an 11-year-old Salvadoran boy, abused by his caretakers and fleeing gang violence after his cousin was killed, he entered the U.S. to reunite with his mother, grandmother (USC), and extended family. He entered in July 2013 when he was 10 years old. He is applying for asylum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As indicated by previous occupants of the Chair on June 26, 2003, on June 27, 2002, and on March 24, 1995, although a unanimous consent request to insert remarks in debate may comprise a simple declarative statement of the Member's attitude towards the pending measure, it is improper for a Member to embellish such a request with other oratory, and it can become an imposition on the time of the Member who has yielded for that purpose.

The Chair will entertain as many requests to insert as may be necessary to accommodate the Members, but the Chair must also ask that Members cooperate by confining such requests to the proper form.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. When these requests are submitted, the Members are merely stating the title of the document that is being submitted, which clearly has to have a name. I want a clarification as to whether that is charged to our time, if they are simply submitting a document and telling you the name of that document?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As most recently ruled by the Chair on July 11, 2013, a unanimous consent request that extends beyond a simple declarative statement of a Member's attitude about the underlying measure constitutes debate and may result in time being charged to the yielding Member upon execution of that order.

Mr. POLIS. Again, Mr. Speaker, I inquire—I would like your judgment, in fact—on when these motions are made and the document is submitted, clearly the document that is being referred to has to be referred to in the remarks. These Members are submitting a document, and they are, in fact, naming that document that they are submitting. I want to ensure that that complies with the Chair's interpretation of the House rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Also stated on July 11, 2013, the Chair will exercise discretion in determining whether an individual unanimous consent request results in a yielding Member being charged time in debate.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, what is the Chair's conclusion with regard to these unanimous consent requests?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Requests that include remarks in the nature of debate will be charged against the yielding Member.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, have the previous submissions of documents gone beyond the unanimous consent request compliance that the Chair stipulated?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not yet charged any time to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the Chair.

I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of a 12-year-old girl who was trafficked for sex and labor and escaped slavery with her baby and received a T visa in the United States.

LUTHERAN IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE SERVICE: VOICES OF CENTRAL AMERICAN YOUTH—WHY THEY ARE FLEEING THEIR COUNTRIES
BACKGROUND ON THE HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN CENTRAL AMERICA

Since the Fall of 2011, prior to the President's announcement of DACA, Customs and Border Protection (CBP) started apprehending significantly more unaccompanied minors from Central America. ORR promptly started to open more shelters and detention sites for these children.

Updated data from the UNHCR, has shown a 712% increase in asylum requests in Mexico, Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Belize by nationals from El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras.

ORR has reported a significant increase in both younger children and girls coming.

Maria, a 12 year old girl from Central America, was trafficked for labor and sex, she fled with her baby to escape slavery. Maria was 12 years old, when she was kidnapped at gunpoint and taken to a home where she was held captive. She was beaten and raped on an almost daily basis and eventually forced into prostitution. Because of this she became pregnant and gave birth to a girl while captive. Maria fled with her child, riding on top of trains so that they might escape the sexual bondage. Maria ended up qualifying for a T-visa and is currently doing well She has now graduated high school.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of a young Honduran girl the age of my granddaughter, who fled domestic violence and kidnapping. The document is from Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, and it is entitled: "Voices of Central American Youth—Why They Are Fleeing Their Countries."

Laura, an 8 year old girl from Honduras fled domestic violence and kidnapping. Laura was living in Honduras with her aunt while mother was in the U.S. working to provide for her family. One day a man she called "step-father" who was an ex-boyfriend of her mother's, kidnapped her from her aunt's care. Laura's mother in the U.S. said she could not report the kidnapping to authorities as they would do nothing. This step-father beat Laura daily with belts and pieces of wood, resulting in bruises, bleeding, and leaving visible scars on her body. On multiple occasions, he also threatened to kill her with a gun. The step father finally threatened Laura's mother that he would kill the Laura if her mother did not send him money. Laura's mother was finally able to save and send a large amount of money to the step-father and Laura was able to escape to come live with her in the U.S. A child like Laura might apply for asylum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado will be charged.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Mrs. CAPPAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of an 11-year-old Honduran boy who was kidnapped, tortured, and murdered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the only unanimous consent request that has been charged to our time is Mr. DOGGETT's. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Again, Mr. DOGGETT stated the title of the document that he submitted, which seems to be a prerequisite for submitting a document. I would like to inquire as to why the Chair has ruled to charge the time to us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the Chair's discretion, the gentleman engaged in debate.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, how can submitting a document and saying what the name of the document is constitute debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, the gentleman was engaging in debate.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, can the Chair provide advice, so that my colleagues will understand what it is in reading the title and the source of the document that described the tragedy of this little Honduran girl seeking refuge in our country, constituted debate, rather than simply identifying the title?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is exercising his discretion.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, without any guidance to my colleagues as to how they can present documents within the rules of the House without reading the title and the source of the document, can the Speaker describe anything about my remarks that differed from any of the other remarks that were given by my colleagues, other than the reading of the title and the source from Lutheran Services of this young girl who sought refuge in our country?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. To clarify, the Chair has stated that a unanimous consent request to insert extraneous material may include a simple declarative statement of the Member's attitude towards the measure, but it is improper for the Member to embellish such a request with extended oratory.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of a 15-year-old Salvadoran boy who has requested asylum because local gang members threatened to kill him after he refused to sell drugs for them.

PANGAEA LEGAL SERVICES CLIENT STORY

Jose is 15-years-old. He grew up in El Salvador with his grandparents. His parents immigrated to the United States when Jose was still a toddler, and he had not seen them since. Jose considered his grandparents as his parents and wished nothing but to continue living with them and his little brother. In April 2013, at age 14, Jose was forced to flee his country after gangs threatened to kill him if he didn't sell drugs for them. The family suspects that Jose was targeted by the gang because Jose's uncle is the mayor of the small Salvadoran town, and has attempted to establish rehabilitation and anti-gang programs for several years. Jose is in removal proceedings and his asylum application is currently pending with USCIS.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of seven very young Honduran children who were tortured and brutally murdered after refusing to join a gang.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of a young Honduran girl who resisted being robbed for \$5, was clubbed over the head, dragged out by two men who cut a hole in her throat and left her in a ravine.

[From the New York Times, July 11, 2014]

THE CHILDREN OF THE DRUG WARS

(By Sonia Nazario)

Cristian Omar Reyes, an 11-year-old sixth grader in the neighborhood of Nueva Suyapa, on the outskirts of Tegucigalpa, tells me he has to get out of Honduras soon—"no matter what."

In March, his father was robbed and murdered by gangs while working as a security guard protecting a pastry truck. His mother used the life insurance payout to hire a smuggler to take her to Florida. She promised to send for him quickly, but she has not.

Three people he knows were murdered this year. Four others were gunned down on a nearby corner in the span of two weeks at the beginning of this year. A girl his age resisted being robbed of \$5. She was clubbed over the head and dragged off by two men who cut a hole in her throat, stuffed her panties in it, and left her body in a ravine across the street from Cristian's house.

"I'm going this year," he tells me.

I last went to Nueva Suyapa in 2003, to write about another boy, Luis Enrique Motiño Pineda, who had grown up there and left to find his mother in the United States. Children from Central America have been making that journey, often without their parents, for two decades. But lately something has changed, and the predictable flow has turned into an exodus. Three years ago, about 6,800 children were detained by United States immigration authorities and placed in federal custody; this year, as many as 90,000 children are expected to be picked up. Around a quarter come from Honduras—more than from anywhere else.

Children still leave Honduras to reunite with a parent, or for better educational and economic opportunities. But, as I learned when I returned to Nueva Suyapa last month, a vast majority of child migrants are fleeing not poverty, but violence. As a result, what the United States is seeing on its borders now is not an immigration crisis. It is a refugee crisis.

Gangs arrived in force in Honduras in the 1990s, as 18th Street and Mara Salvatrucha members were deported in large numbers from Los Angeles to Central America, joining homegrown groups like Los Puchos. But the dominance in the past few years of foreign drug cartels in Honduras, especially ones from Mexico, has increased the reach and viciousness of the violence. As the

United States and Colombia spent billions of dollars to disrupt the movement of drugs up the Caribbean corridor, traffickers rerouted inland through Honduras, and 79 percent of cocaine-smuggling flights bound for the United States now pass through there.

Narco groups and gangs are vying for control over this turf, neighborhood by neighborhood, to gain more foot soldiers for drug sales and distribution, expand their customer base, and make money through extortion in a country left with an especially weak, corrupt government following a 2009 coup.

Enrique's 33-year-old sister, Belky, who still lives in Nueva Suyapa, says children began leaving en masse for the United States three years ago. That was around the time that the narcos started putting serious pressure on kids to work for them. At Cristian's school, older students working with the cartels push drugs on the younger ones—some as young as 6. If they agree, children are recruited to serve as lookouts, make deliveries in backpacks, rob people and extort businesses. They are given food, shoes and money in return. Later, they might work as traffickers or hit men.

Teachers at Cristian's school described a 12-year-old who demanded that the school release three students one day to help him distribute crack cocaine; he brandished a pistol and threatened to kill a teacher when she tried to question him.

At Nueva Suyapa's only public high school, narcos "recruit inside the school," says Yadira Saucedo, a counselor there. Until he was killed a few weeks ago, a 23-year-old "student" controlled the school. Each day, he was checked by security at the door, then had someone sneak his gun to him over the school wall. Five students, mostly 12- and 13-year-olds, tearfully told Ms. Saucedo that the man had ordered them to use and distribute drugs or he would kill their parents. By March, one month into the new school year, 67 of 450 students had left the school.

Teachers must pay a "war tax" to teach in certain neighborhoods, and students must pay to attend.

Carlos Baquedano Sánchez, a slender 14-year-old with hair sticking straight up, explained how hard it was to stay away from the cartels. He lives in a shack made of corrugated tin in a neighborhood in Nueva Suyapa called El Infiernito—Little Hell—and usually doesn't have anything to eat one out of every three days. He started working in a dump when he was 7, picking out iron or copper to recycle, for \$1 or \$2 a day. But bigger boys often beat him to steal his haul, and he quit a year ago when an older man nearly killed him for a coveted car-engine piston. Now he sells scrap wood.

But all of this was nothing, he says, compared to the relentless pressure to join narco gangs and the constant danger they have brought to his life. When he was 9, he barely escaped from two narcos who were trying to rape him, while terrified neighbors looked on. When he was 10, he was pressured to try marijuana and crack. "You'll feel better. Like you are in the clouds," a teenager working with a gang told him. But he resisted.

He has known eight people who were murdered and seen three killed right in front of him. He saw a man shot three years ago and still remembers the plums the man was holding rolling down the street, coated in blood. Recently he witnessed two teenage hit men shooting a pair of brothers for refusing to hand over the keys and title to their motorcycle. Carlos hit the dirt and prayed. The killers calmly walked down the street. Carlos shrugs. "Now seeing someone dead is nothing."

He longs to be an engineer or mechanic, but he quit school after sixth grade, too poor

and too afraid to attend. "A lot of kids know what can happen in school. So they leave."

He wants to go to the United States, even though he knows how dangerous the journey can be; a man in his neighborhood lost both legs after falling off the top of a Mexican freight train, and a family friend drowned in the Rio Grande. "I want to avoid drugs and death. The government can't pull up its pants and help people," he says angrily. "My country has lost its way."

Girls face particular dangers—one reason around 40 percent of children who arrived in the United States this year were girls, compared with 27 percent in the past. Recently three girls were raped and killed in Nueva Suyapa, one only 8 years old. Two 15-year-olds were abducted and raped. The kidnapers told them that if they didn't get in the car they would kill their entire families. Some parents no longer let their girls go to school for fear of their being kidnapped, says Luis López, an educator with Asociación Compartir, a nonprofit in Nueva Suyapa.

Milagro Noemi Martínez, a petite 19-year-old with clear green eyes, has been told repeatedly by narcos that she would be theirs—or end up dead. Last summer, she made her first attempt to reach the United States. "Here there is only evil," she says. "It's better to leave than have them kill me here." She headed north with her 21-year-old sister, a friend who had also been threatened, and \$170 among them. But she was stopped and deported from Mexico. Now back in Nueva Suyapa, she stays locked inside her mother's house. "I hope God protects me. I am afraid to step outside." Last year, she says, six minors, as young as 15, were killed in her neighborhood. Some were hacked apart. She plans to try the journey again soon. Asking for help from the police or the government is not an option in what some consider a failed state. The drugs that pass through Honduras each year are worth more than the country's entire gross domestic product.

Narcos have bought off police officers, politicians and judges. In recent years, four out of five homicides were never investigated. No one is immune to the carnage. Several Honduran mayors have been killed. The sons of both the former head of the police department and the head of the national university were murdered, the latter, an investigation showed, by the police.

"You never call the cops. The cops themselves will retaliate and kill you," says Henry Carias Aguilar, a pastor in Nueva Suyapa. A majority of small businesses in Nueva Suyapa have shuttered because of extortion demands, while churches have doubled in number in the past decade, as people pray for salvation from what they see as the plague predicted in the Bible. Taxis and homes have signs on them asking God for mercy.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees recently interviewed 404 children who had arrived in the United States from Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala and Mexico; 58 percent said their primary reason for leaving was violence. (A similar survey in 2006, of Central American children coming into Mexico, found that only 13 percent were fleeing violence.) They aren't just going to the United States: Less conflicted countries in Central America had a 712 percent increase in asylum claims between 2008 and 2013.

"If a house is burning, people will jump out the window," says Michelle Brané, director of the migrant rights and justice program at the Women's Refugee Commission.

To permanently stem this flow of children, we must address the complex root causes of violence in Honduras, as well as the demand for illegal drugs in the United States that is fueling that violence.

In the meantime, however, we must recognize this as a refugee crisis, as the United Nations just recommended. These children are facing threats similar to the forceful conscription of child soldiers by warlords in Sudan or during the civil war in Bosnia. Being forced to sell drugs by narcos is no different from being forced into military service.

Many Americans, myself included, believe in deporting unlawful immigrants, but see a different imperative with refugees.

The United States should immediately create emergency refugee centers inside our borders, tent cities—operated by the United Nations and other relief groups like the International Rescue Committee—where immigrant children could be held for 60 to 90 days instead of being released. The government would post immigration judges at these centers and adjudicate children's cases there.

To ensure this isn't a sham process, asylum officers and judges must be trained in child-sensitive interviewing techniques to help elicit information from fearful, traumatized youngsters. All children must also be represented by a volunteer or government-funded lawyer. Kids in Need of Defense, a nonprofit that recruits pro bono lawyers to represent immigrant children and whose board I serve on, estimates that 40 percent to 60 percent of these children potentially qualify to stay under current immigration laws—and do, if they have a lawyer by their side. The vast majority do not. The only way to ensure we are not hurtling children back to circumstances that could cost them their lives is by providing them with real due process.

Judges, who currently deny seven in 10 applications for asylum by people who are in deportation proceedings, must better understand the conditions these children are facing. They should be more open to considering relief for those fleeing gang recruitment or threats by criminal organizations when they come from countries like Honduras that are clearly unwilling or unable to protect them.

If many children don't meet strict asylum criteria but face significant dangers if they return, the United States should consider allowing them to stay using humanitarian parole procedures we have employed in the past, for Cambodians and Haitians. It may be possible to transfer children and resettle them in other safe countries willing to share the burden. We should also make it easier for children to apply as refugees when they are still in Central America, as we have done for people in Iraq, Cuba, countries in the former Soviet Union, Vietnam and Haiti. Those who showed a well-founded fear of persecution wouldn't have to make the perilous journey north alone.

Of course, many migrant children come for economic reasons, and not because they fear for their lives. In those cases, they should quickly be deported if they have at least one parent in their country of origin. By deporting them directly from the refugee centers, the United States would discourage future non-refugees by showing that immigrants cannot be caught and released, and then avoid deportation by ignoring court orders to attend immigration hearings.

Instead of advocating such a humane, practical approach, the Obama administration wants to intercept and return children en route. On Tuesday the president asked for \$3.7 billion in emergency funding. Some money would be spent on new detention facilities and more immigration judges, but the main goal seems to be to strengthen border control and speed up deportations. He also asked Congress to grant powers that could eliminate legal protections for children from Central America in order to expedite removals, a change that Republicans in Congress have also advocated.

This would allow life-or-death decisions to be made within hours by Homeland Security officials, even though studies have shown that border patrol agents fail to adequately screen Mexican children to see if they are being sexually exploited by traffickers or fear persecution, as the agents are supposed to do. Why would they start asking Central American children key questions needed to prove refugee status?

The United States expects other countries to take in hundreds of thousands of refugees on humanitarian grounds. Countries neighboring Syria have absorbed nearly 3 million people. Jordan has accepted in two days what the United States has received in an entire month during the height of this immigration flow—more than 9,000 children in May. The United States should also increase to pre-9/11 levels the number of refugees we accept to 90,000 from the current 70,000 per year and, unlike in recent years, actually admit that many.

By sending these children away, “you are handing them a death sentence,” says José Arnulfo Ochoa Ochoa, an expert in Honduras with World Vision International, a Christian humanitarian aid group. This abrogates international conventions we have signed and undermines our credibility as a humane country. It would be a disgrace if this wealthy nation turned its back on the 52,000 children who have arrived since October, many of them legitimate refugees.

This is not how a great nation treats children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado will be charged.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, again, if there is discretion that can be shared, that was directly from the article that I asked to be entered into the RECORD. On many occasions I have been on this floor and been part of many debates in the 5 years I have been honored to serve with the Congress and have used the exact same approach and have never been charged. Is there any discretion that the Speaker can give us direction on?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is exercising his discretion as the Chair has said previously. The Chair has discretion in this matter.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, with that being said to debate, even though the same practices are used by Members, rulings can change by the Chair on this particular issue?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does have discretion. The guidance has been to confine the request to a simple declaratory statement of the Member's attitude toward the pending measure.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, for clarification, that is

exactly what I did, which is I read a statement from the article.

I am confused, Mr. Speaker. I am just maybe a junior Member from a small farm in New Mexico, but it seems that if I am reading from the article directly, that I don't appear to be violating any rules to be charged time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Embellishments or statements on other matters are debate and will be charged to the manager.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, this was not an embellishment. This was a direct quote from the article. It appears to me that my understanding of an embellishment are my own words being added.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has advised that embellishments or statements on other matters are debate and will be charged.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for submitting that powerful testimony.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of a 17-year-old girl who fled her country with her 2-year-old daughter to escape constant physical and sexual abuse from the baby's father.

[From the National Immigrant Justice Center]

Lauren, a 17-year old, fled the country with her 2-year old daughter due to constant physical, sexual and verbal abuse from the baby's father. While in DHS custody, Lauren and her baby were held in two “hieleras” for a total of six days without adequate food and warmth.

Lauren is a 17-year-old who came to the United States with her two-year-old daughter, Charise. Charise's father, Juan, was physically and verbally abusive. He has hit, choked, and raped Lauren and threatened to kill her and take their baby. Lauren fled to the United States with Charise to live with her parents and U.S.-citizen sister. While in DHS custody, both Lauren and her baby were held in two “hieleras” for about six days total. Lauren had to use her own clothing to keep Charise warm because DHS only gave her an emergency mylar blanket for Charise, despite the cold. Lauren slept on the floor of her cell with Charise in between her legs. DHS gave Charise two small burritos to eat each day, and gave Lauren a piece of bread with deli meat and an apple twice a day. When she asked for more food for her baby, who was hungry and cold, DHS told Lauren there wasn't any more food available.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of a 15-year-old

Salvadoran boy whose body was found in a plastic bag with his hands and feet bound.

[From La Página, June 25, 2014]

BURN BUS ROUTE 177 IN TECOLUCA AFTER ASSAULTING PASSENGER

(By Maribel Montenegro and Carlos Hernandez)

A bus route 177 was intercepted by at least 8 heavily armed men, forcing passengers to surrender their belongings and then burned them down the unit, police said.

According to reports, the incident occurred in the village of Las Pampas, on the road that leads to San Vicente Zacatecoluca Tecoluca in the jurisdiction of the department of San Vicente.

Police said the fire was set and the place has become a unit of the Fire Department to extinguish the flames of the unit was completely destroyed.

Depending on the version of the automotive PNC was off course forcing it to penetrate into the community Las Pampas, where 20 passengers were assaulted. The authorities say they are on the trail of the perpetrators.

He also said that he reported no casualties, only material damage.

RESUME, RESUME

The body of an unknown man was found this morning in the subdivision Istepec, Canton El Cerrito, the, in the department of Sonsonate municipality Nahuizalco. Police said the incident occurred the night before and do not know the motives of the crime that was committed with knives.

RESUME, RESUME

A 16 year old girl was killed by multiple gunshot wounds that caused unknown subjects while walking on the 3rd km of the Pan American Highway, in the jurisdiction of the municipality of El Carmen, department of Cuscatlan.

The victim was identified as Adonis Hernandez, according to the PNC disappeared yesterday. So far the police said he was unaware if the victim had any connection with gang groups.

COLON, LA LIBERTAD

The body of a 15 year old boy was found tied hand and foot in a plastic bag that was abandoned in Lourdes, Colón, La Libertad morning.

The victim was identified as Ivan N., who was kidnapped last week in La Libertad.

According to the PNC, the young man had at least 36 hours have passed.

RESUME

A young man was killed last night near the resort Spain, CV.

According to authorities, the victim, identified as Brandon Ch, was attacked and killed by unknown assailants who left him seriously injured so he had to be rushed to a hospital emergency where he died in surgery.

SAN SALVADOR

The woman, identified as Marlene Rivas, was wounded with a knife this morning in the vicinity of San José San Salvador park.

According to police, the woman resisted being assaulted by a homeless man, who reacted violently and caused a wound in the neck.

The victim had to take shelter in a supermarket in the area, where Rosales was taken to hospital.

MERCEDES UMANA, USULUTAN

A gang Mara Salvatrucha, was murdered in Canton The Caulote, Mercedes Umana, Usulután.

The victim was identified as Fredy Mejia, 17, who authorities say was attacked by two gang Barrio 18 traveling on a motorcycle.

GARDENS SELTSUT RESUME

A trader was shot to death at night in the Garden Colony Selsut, Ilopango, San Salvador.

The victim was identified as Jorge Mario Arteaga, 53, who was killed by gang members for refusing to pay extortion, according to PNC.

NEW GUADALUPE, SAN MIGUEL

A man who was deported from the United States months ago was killed Tuesday evening in Freedom Colony, New Guadalupe in San Miguel.

The victim was identified as Adilio Quintanilla, 41, who had multiple gunshot wounds in the body. The authorities know the motive for the attack.

CANTON PLANS CONCEPCIÓN, LA PAZ

A man was killed in the canton Plans Concepcion, La Paz. The victim was identified as Carlos Palma, 47, who was shot at by unknown persons. Attack the causes are unknown.

SAN MARTÍN

A blind seniors tonight was killed by gang members in the neighborhood of Las Mercedes and Santa Teresa Street Project, San Martin.

The victim was identified only as Francisco and authorities said he was about 70 years. The old man died at the scene after being shot several times.

According to the PNC, the man was hit by bullets when the gang tried to assassinate some people who were inside a vehicle on the street entered Project, Las Mercedes neighborhood.

Subjects discharged a burst of lead impacted the blind who could not dodge bullets due to its limitation. After committing the fact, the gang fled in an unknown direction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado will be charged.

□ 1015

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I further yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. CÁRDENAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD the story of an 18-year-old Mexican boy who was trafficked into the United States and held by the U.S. Marshals Service so he could testify as a material witness to some deaths that he witnessed.

Juan Antonio is an 18-year-old Mexican UAC. He fled severe cartel and criminal gang violence in his home town. His uncle, cousin, and several family members were killed before he fled from Mexico. He was trafficked to the US and initially in the US Marshals custody to testify as a material witness before being turned over to ICE and released to ORR because he was a minor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado will be charged.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I further yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD the story of

a 12-year-old girl who was trafficked for sex and labor, escaped slavery with her baby, and received a T visa in the United States.

LUTHERAN IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE SERVICE: VOICES OF CENTRAL AMERICAN YOUTH— WHY THEY ARE FLEEING THEIR COUNTRIES
BACKGROUND ON THE HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN CENTRAL AMERICA

Since the Fall of 2011, prior to the President's announcement of DACA, Customs and Border Protection (CBP) started apprehending significantly more unaccompanied minors from Central America. ORR promptly started to open more shelters and detention sites for these children.

Updated data from the UNHCR, has shown a 712% increase in asylum requests in Mexico, Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Belize by nationals from El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras.

ORR has reported a significant increase in both younger children and girls coming.

Maria a 12 year old girl from Central America was trafficked for labor and sex, she fled with her baby to escape slavery. Maria was 12 years old, when she was kidnapped at gunpoint and taken to a home where she was held captive. She was beaten and raped on an almost daily basis and eventually forced into prostitution. Because of this she became pregnant and gave birth to a girl while captive. Maria fled with her child, riding on top of trains so that they might escape the sexual bondage. Maria ended up qualifying for a T-visa and is currently doing well. She has now graduated high school.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado will be charged.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in the well to appeal to my Republican colleagues about this debate, which isn't about the underlying bill, it is about the rule. You ought to all be worried. We all ought to be worried. This rule is a sham to the institution of Congress.

I am an appropriator, and I am proud to do that. We respect the jurisdiction of all other committees. That is why we have standing committees. We don't do their business.

This rule ignores all the standing committees in Congress. This rule says you can write a bill in the darkness of night. Nobody has read it. No Republicans read it, no Democrats read it. You can pick it up in the hallway here. I read it this morning.

The rule waives all points of opposition, which we say in this rule, "All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived."

All points—that means all the ideas of all the committees that are supposed to be writing these bills. Nobody is going to be thanked if they vote for this. First of all, nobody is going to thank you for voting for the rule because it does so many things that misjudge the purpose of Congress, misappropriate the purposes of Congress, which is to have transparency and allow people to get into the debate.

Nobody who understands the problem in the embassies of the host country was able to testify. Nobody in the administration who deals with the border was able to testify. No Member of Congress who has some knowledge about this was able to testify. This bill says: So what? We wrote the bill, and you just have to accept it, and if you any objections, we waive all those points of orders.

So the rule does a disservice to Congress, and it ought to be rejected.

Secondly, on the bill, when you get to it, if it isn't rejected—first of all, if we reject the rule, nothing is broken. We can fix it. We can make it better because no own is going to thank you for voting for this.

Just to show you how outrageous it is, it says to the host countries that: we are going to give you money, but you have 15 days to convene your legislatures and enact legislation, secure your borders, and make sure everything is secure.

You couldn't do that in Washington in 15 days, much less essentially Third World countries. There are all kinds of provisions in here that don't make any sense and don't help fix anything that is broken, and for all the testimony you have just heard, there are a lot of other things that need to be addressed that aren't in this bill.

So my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the best thing we can do to respect this institution is to reject this rule and vote "no."

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

I have a great deal of respect for my friend from the Appropriations Committee. He is an excellent legislator and tremendous Member.

I am, though, going to point out the record of the Democratic majority the last time they were here and in control of what happened on the floor.

In the 111th Congress, the final 2 years of Representative PELOSI's time as Speaker, the House never considered a single bill under an open rule—not one bill. That is the definition of a closed process.

Under Republican control, the House has returned to consideration of appropriations bills under an open process, with 22 open rules. We had no open rules on appropriations when my friends were in the majority.

This year alone, the House has considered 404 amendments during the appropriations process, and 189 of them offered were by our friends on the other side.

When you actually compare the record overall, frankly, I think the comparison is much to the advantage of Republicans. So we are trying to deal with complex issues in a relatively short period of time.

I know the Congress will be back in session in September. We will be working on the appropriations process in the lameduck again, so there are going to be ample legislative opportunities, but we are in a crisis situation, which we are in this case.

We are trying to respond thoughtfully and expeditiously. We are trying to put resources toward the problem. We are trying to get at the core of the problem, which the administration itself a month ago identified as a 2008 law, but has now offered absolutely no suggestions how to fix.

So we have not tried to repeal it. We have tried to tweak it and address the problem. If my friends have a better solution, we would love to hear it, but we haven't heard it. Instead, we have been told the 2008 law caused the problem, but you can't change the law. That seems to me both politically and intellectually indefensible.

We are going to continue to try to solve the problem that has been identified by the administration. At some point, we hope they will join us in trying to actually correct the problem that they say exists.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the story of two Honduran brothers who were tortured and murdered by gang members in San Pedro Sula, the murder capital of the world.

Mr. Speaker, how we treat our children speaks to the character of our Nation.

[From The New York Times, July 9, 2014]
FLEEING GANGS, CHILDREN HEAD TO U.S.
BORDER

(By Frances Robles)

SAN PEDRO SULA, HONDURAS—Anthony O. Castellanos disappeared from his gang-ridden neighborhood on the eastern edge of Honduras's most dangerous city, so his younger brother, Kenneth, hopped on his green bicycle to search for him, starting his hunt at a notorious gang hangout known as the "crazy house."

They were found within days of each other, both dead. Anthony, 13, and a friend had been shot in the head; Kenneth, 7, had been tortured and beaten with sticks and rocks. They were among seven children murdered in the La Pradera neighborhood of San Pedro Sula in April alone, part of a surge in gang violence that is claiming younger and younger victims.

The killings are a major factor driving the recent wave of migration of Central American children to the United States, which has sent an unprecedented number of unaccompanied minors across the Texas border. Many children and parents say the rush of new migrants stems from a belief that United States immigration policy offers preferential treatment to minors, but in addition, studies of Border Patrol statistics show a strong correlation between cities like San Pedro Sula with high homicide rates and swarms of youngsters taking off for the United States.

"The first thing we can think of is to send our children to the United States," said a mother of two in La Pradera, who declined to give her name because she feared gang reprisals. "That's the idea, to leave."

Honduran children are increasingly on the front lines of gang violence. In June, 32 chil-

dren were murdered in Honduras, bringing the number of youths under 18 killed since January of last year to 409, according to data compiled by Covenant House, a youth shelter in Tegucigalpa, the capital.

With two major youth gangs and more organized crime syndicates operating with impunity in Central America, analysts say immigration authorities will have a difficult time keeping children at home unless the root causes of violence are addressed.

In 2012, the number of murder victims ages 10 to 14 had doubled to 81 from 40 in 2008, according to the Violence Observatory at the National Autonomous University of Honduras. Last year, 1,013 people under 23 were murdered in a nation of eight million.

Although homicides dropped sharply in 2012 after a gang truce in neighboring El Salvador, so far this year murders of children 17 and under are up 77 percent from the same time period a year ago, the police said.

Nowhere is the flow of departures more acute than in San Pedro Sula, a city in northwestern Honduras that has the world's highest homicide rate, according to United Nations figures.

Between January and May of this year, more than 2,200 children from the city arrived in the United States, according to Department of Homeland Security statistics, far more than from any other city in Central America.

More than half of the top 50 Central American cities from which children are leaving for the United States are in Honduras. Virtually none of the children have come from Nicaragua, a bordering country that has staggering poverty, but not a pervasive gang culture or a record-breaking murder rate. "Everyone has left," Alan Castellanos, 27, the uncle of Anthony and Kenneth, said in an interview in late May. "How is it that an entire country is being brought to its knees?"

He said the gangs operated with total impunity. "They killed all those kids and nobody did anything about it," Mr. Castellanos said. "When prosecutors wanted to discuss the case, they asked us to meet at their office, because they were afraid to come here. If they were afraid, imagine us."

The factors pushing children to migrate vary, according to an analysis of their home cities by the Department of Homeland Security.

The Guatemalan children who arrive in the United States are more often from rural areas, suggesting their motives are largely economic. The minors from El Salvador and Honduras tend to come from extremely violent regions "where they probably perceive the risk of traveling alone to the U.S. preferable to remaining at home," the analysis said.

"Basically, the places these people are coming from are the places with the highest homicide rates," said Manuel Orozco, a senior fellow at the Inter-American Dialogue, a Washington-based research group. "The parents see gang membership around the corner. Once your child is forced to join, the chances of being killed or going to prison is pretty high. Why wait until that happens?"

A confluence of factors, including discounted rates charged by smugglers for families, helped ignite the boom, he said. Children are killed for refusing to join gangs, over vendettas against their parents, or because they are caught up in gang disputes. Many activists here suggest they are also murdered by police officers willing to clean up the streets by any means possible.

In the case of the Castellanos family, the police said the older boy was a lookout for the gang and had decided to quit. The order to kill him, the police said, came from prison.

Several arrests have been made. Hector A. Medina, 47, who the police said lived at an

abandoned house controlled by the 18th Street gang, where Kenneth was killed, was charged in the boys' deaths. "It's a serious social problem: any children born in this neighborhood are going to get involved in a gang," said Elvin Flores, a police inspector in charge of La Pradera. "Our idea is to lower crime every day. We need a state policy to involve kids from when they are little to go to school."

But gangs, which rob, sell drugs locally, kidnap people and extort money from businesses, often recruit new members at schools.

In some cities, blocks are empty because gangs demanding extortion payments have forced out homeowners. Many people have had to move within the country in a displacement pattern that experts liken to the one seen in Colombia's civil war.

The office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees said that from 2008 to 2013, the number of asylum claims filed in Mexico, Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Belize increased sevenfold.

Most were from people of Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras, the three nations with large numbers of migrants now arriving at the United States border.

Refugee advocacy organizations have urged the State Department to treat the children arriving at the United States border as refugees, and proposed a processing system where asylum claims could be reviewed in Central America and those accepted could move safely to the United States or countries willing to accept them, as was done in countries such as Haiti and Iraq. They have not yet received a response, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops said.

President Obama urged Congress on Wednesday night to pass a \$3.7 billion budget supplement that would, among other things, beef up border security, hasten deportations and help Central American nations address security problems. "The best thing we can do is make sure the children can live in their own countries, safely," he said.

During a recent late-night visit to the San Pedro Sula morgue, more than 60 bodies, all victims of violence, were seen piled in a heap, each wrapped in a brown plastic bag. While picking bullets out of a 15-year-old boy shot 15 times, technicians discussed how they regularly received corpses of children under 10, and sometimes as young as 2.

Last week, in nearby Santa Barbara, an 11-year-old had his throat slit by other children, because he did not pay a 50-cent extortion fee.

"At first we saw a lot of kids who were being killed because when the gang came for their parents, they happened to be in the car or at the location with them," said Dr. Darwin Armas Cruz, a medical examiner who works the overnight shift. "Now we see kids killing kids. They kill with guns, knives and even grenades."

Dr. Armas said his family was thinking of migrating, too.

CORRECTION: JULY 11, 2014

Because of an editing error, an article on Thursday about the murderous gang violence in Honduras that is a factor in the recent wave of migration of Central American children to the United States misstated the amount of money that President Obama has requested from Congress to address the problem. It is \$3.7 billion, not more than \$4 billion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado will be charged.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), the chair of the Hispanic Caucus and the ranking member

on the Education and Workforce Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5230 and the underlying rule.

I represent McAllen, Texas, which has been the epicenter for this humanitarian crisis. For years, my Republican colleagues have been ignoring the problems caused by their inaction on immigration reform. They have cut funding for immigration judges, so that people wait years to have their cases heard.

They have cut funding to help the countries of Central America deal with the internal problems causing their children to flee. The Republican solution has always been more walls and fences and more soldiers to militarize the border.

I live on that border of Texas and Mexico, and I know that their enforcement-only approach is not working because it doesn't address the root cause of immigration. It has been economically devastating to border communities who vainly try to persuade companies to move their plants and factories to our region to create jobs and bring us out of poverty that is the highest in the Nation.

Our veterans suffer because the VA can't get doctors to move to the border. All these companies and doctors hear is that the border is a war zone flooded with dangerous immigrants. That is not the border I know. My border home is a vibrant, educated, fast-growing, culturally diverse, welcoming region. I am proud of how we have embraced these children and families.

We are now voting once again to militarize our border, deny children legal representation and due process, and providing little help to Central America. We are not fixing the problem, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and this bill.

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

Just a few correctives, if I may. We are actually putting in additional resources. We haven't cut resources. It is the President's budget that cut resources. It cut detention beds, enforcement, and aid to the countries in Central America that are dealing with this problem. That is the President's budget.

Those things were all corrected in the Foreign Operations budget that has not yet reached the floor, but has been passed by the full Appropriations Committee.

I am going to disagree with my friends on the other side that this has anything to do with comprehensive immigration reform. Quite frankly, it does not. It is a border crisis. It has nothing to do with this legislation.

The root cause of the problem here are criminals who go back and tell people: if you pay money and subject yourself to a dangerous journey and we get you to the United States, you will be able to stay. That is who is at fault

here. That is where the focus ought to be.

When my friends point to specific cases, I always point out, number one, we have an avenue called the United States Embassy. In the country, you can go and plead refugee status there. You don't have to travel 1,000 or 2,000 miles across very dangerous country. You simply afford yourself of the available opportunities.

Finally, in the President's judgment, most of these children will be returned. That is the President's judgment. Frankly, I think he made that judgment, trying to discourage what is happening now. That is precisely what we are trying to do in this piece of legislation.

So I think there is a lot of passion, and it is appropriate because there are some heartwrenching cases, but there is also a lot of political theater here. The reality is, again, most of these children, according to the President, will be returned.

The quicker that can happen, the less likely it is that other children will follow them and be subjected to a very dangerous journey. That is what we are trying to achieve. We are going to try to do that in this measure today, but we invite our friends to work with us as we go forward, as I suspect that we will.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, last week, we were part of a conversation and debate around strengthening antihuman trafficking laws. We all came to this floor, and Democrats and Republicans found a way to talk to one another and talk to the American public about what we should do to protect these children that are in harm's way, not just fleeing street violence, but being brutally murdered and raped, Mr. Speaker.

This week, what my Republican colleagues are doing is coming out of a conference and weakening antihuman trafficking laws.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, all I can say is God help this Congress if it is now our policy to weaken human trafficking laws. It is a sad, sad day, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly hope that my colleagues take a chance to look at this and look into their hearts and pray on that and come to the floor and do the right thing.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 696. This rule would provide for consideration of a supple-

mental appropriations bill that clearly demonstrates its Republican authors either have no idea what is needed to address the current situation at the border, or they are more concerned with scoring political points than making public policy.

The resources provided under the bill are both inadequate to provide the necessary humanitarian relief and misdirected toward so-called border security efforts that are unlikely to have any real effect on the number of unlawful border crossings.

For example, deploying the National Guard to the border when children and families are already running to the Border Patrol agents is a waste of taxpayer money; instead, we should be providing the Border Patrol with the funding necessary to move additional experienced agents to the Rio Grande Valley, which is what their leadership has indicated they need.

This misguided bill has also included provisions to undermine due process for unaccompanied children, many of whom are refugees fleeing terrible violence in their home countries.

Mr. Speaker, we are better than this as a Congress and as a Nation. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying supplemental.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the distinguished Member from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

□ 1030

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, the heartbreaking stories my colleagues are telling about these young people coming across the border and being exploited and hurt and injured just confirm the wisdom of the approach the Republicans have taken to this problem based on common sense and long experience. It is called law enforcement. This is not complicated.

In order to protect these kids, protect the people of the United States, protect the communities along the border, we believe strongly in enforcing the existing law and in ensuring that the people of the United States are protected against the lawlessness: the drug dealers, the cartels, the smugglers, the gun runners who are coming across the border and exploiting these kids.

This is not a complicated problem. It has worked for years in Texas. We understand the border problem. It is simply a matter of law enforcement. No nation can survive that doesn't secure its borders and enforce its laws.

By enforcing the law and by bringing peace and quiet to the border, you will also ensure that free trade—that legal trade back and forth between Mexico, our biggest trading partner—can proceed as it should. Laredo is the largest inland port in the United States, and in order for businesses to do their jobs, they have got to have peace and quiet, and that means law enforcement.

That is the Republican approach to this problem. Enforce the law.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to inquire if the gentleman from Oklahoma has any remaining speakers.

Mr. COLE. I do not. I am prepared to close whenever my friend is.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 6¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. I would ask the gentleman from Oklahoma for the courtesy that, if somebody else shows up on my side, I might further yield, but, otherwise, I am prepared to close.

Mr. COLE. I would certainly do that for my friend.

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

The House Republican proposal includes a provision that would roll back our bipartisan antihuman trafficking protections that have been in place for 20 years and that were most recently reaffirmed unanimously by Congress in 2008. This is a debate to maintain our due process laws under the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008, which this bill strips, that help promote the safety of unaccompanied minors.

According to the United Nations High Commissioner of Refugees, 58 percent of children fleeing to the U.S. from Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Mexico may have valid claims to asylum or other legal protections. Our existing laws ensure that these children receive due process. Many of them are victims of human trafficking, of sexual violence, or of other persecution, and they need to have the meaningful opportunity under a law to present their protection claims before an immigration judge. The underlying bill would, according to the UNHCR, drastically weaken the due process protections by subjecting Central American children to an inadequate screening process.

We have had our additional speaker arrive to offer our PQ, Mr. Speaker; and if the House had taken up the Senate immigration reform bill, the current influx of migrant children from Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala may never have even become the humanitarian crisis that is facing us today. That is why today, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to give the House a second chance.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 15, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, so the House can finally vote on a broad, long-term solution to overhaul our country's immigration system and to address the border crisis. At the same time, it addresses the systemic causes rather than simply trying to apply Band-Aid, after Band-Aid, after Band-Aid. The House will soon find there are not enough Band-Aids made. We need to address the health of the patient.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA).

Mr. GARCIA. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say this bill were a joke. This is far worse than a joke. Not only does the underlying bill fail to provide adequate funding to deal with the situation at hand, it flat out ignores the root cause of the problem.

By tacking on a vote on the so-called "No New DREAMERS Act," House leadership is not just refusing to take action on immigration reform, it is prohibiting the President from doing things to fix a broken system. This is akin to watching a train crash or knowing that it is going to crash and stoking the furnace more, making the damage greater. They have no interest in fixing this crisis. They have no interest in fixing the problem. They are playing politics with people's lives, and they are playing politics with our Nation's economy.

This isn't a game. These are human beings. This is doing damage to our country. If we are truly committed to tackling this crisis on the southwest border and to ensuring a fair and efficient process for dealing with these kids, we need to begin with comprehensive immigration reform.

If the previous question is defeated, we will offer H.R. 15, the House bipartisan comprehensive immigration bill. Only by fixing our broken immigration system can we begin to better allocate the resources where they are needed most.

My bill provides a path forward for people already here so that their cases are no longer clogging our immigration courts and so that immigration officials can spend their time going after those who wish to do our Nation harm. It will provide green cards for thousands of Hondurans and El Salvadorans who have languished for over a decade under temporary status, and it adds the necessary due process protection for children on the border.

A speaker on the side opposite brought up the issue of what caused this. What was the straw that broke the camel's back? I will tell you what the straw is. Some of these children have waited 5 years; some of them have waited 8 years; and some of them have waited over a decade on the promises of this Congress—and there is blame to go to both sides—to have comprehensive immigration reform. Then the Speaker who had promised earlier in the year to work with the President finally announced there would be no comprehensive immigration reform. That was the straw that broke the camel's back because 55 percent of these children are coming to be with their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, our country needs comprehensive immigration

reform, and the American people support comprehensive immigration reform. There are enough votes in this House to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

I ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can finally consider comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In our last week—on our last day—before this House adjourns for a 5-week recess, we have an opportunity with Mr. GARCIA's previous question in that, if we can defeat the previous question, we can actually address these issues with a bipartisan bill, H.R. 15, comprehensive immigration reform, nearly identical to the Senate bill. I am confident that, if this body passes that bill, Senate Majority Leader REID will promptly act on it and send it to the President's desk so that we not only can address this border crisis but can prevent future border crises from arising by securing our border and restoring the rule of law to our Nation. The American people expect this body to act in a way that is consistent with our values. We have that opportunity today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question to bring up H.R. 15, the House's bipartisan immigration reform bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question so this body—this House and this Congress—can tackle immigration reform and restore the rule of law to our country. I further encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the underlying bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I am going to differ with my friends, obviously, on a number of important issues.

First, I think they, probably, without thinking it through, accused us of wanting to roll back a human sex trafficking bill that passed this body unanimously. Absolutely untrue. Nobody has any intention of doing anything like that. It is the administration that said that legislation—a loophole in it—is what caused this crisis. I would dispute that, quite frankly.

I think what has caused it is, first and foremost, the President's sending an unmistakable signal, a signal that may have been misinterpreted that, if you manage to get to the United States, you are going to be able to stay. He did that by unilaterally changing and thwarting whole sections of our own immigration law, by doing things that he, himself, had said a year

before were unconstitutional. That signal, I think, has been picked up by criminals and turned into a message that has been directed at naive and vulnerable people, saying, if you give us thousands of dollars, we will take you on this journey, get you to the United States, and then you are going to be able to stay.

When the President first addressed this problem—again, he was warned in 2012 and 2013 by his own advisers that this might well happen—he did not prepare for it. He submitted a budget that actually cut border enforcement and that cut security aid to the Central American countries so they could secure their own territory. When he finally dealt with this, he said this 2008 law is part of the reason.

What this bill does is tweak it. It simply says we are going to treat children coming from the affected areas, from noncontiguous countries, in the same way we treat Mexican children. It has always been a question as to whether or not we should have that distinction. There is no particular reason why somebody from Central America should automatically be treated differently than somebody from Mexico.

In addition, I will point out to my friends there is an easier way. Just go to the American Embassy in the country, and if you have got status that would qualify as refugee status, you can make your case there. You don't have to pay thousands of dollars. You don't have to subject yourself to a dangerous journey in the company of criminals.

The President, frankly, has said that this is an immigration issue. I don't think it is. I think it is a border crisis, and I think it needs to be dealt with that way. I think the record is, again, pretty clear on this, and that is exactly what we are trying to do. We have acted on a problem the President has identified.

When my friends express concern that the majority of these children will be returned, number one, remember they are going to be returned to the custody of their governments. They are going to be returned to the people who are actually responsible for trying to take care of them within their societies. Second, that is exactly what the President said is going to happen. Those were his words. The overwhelming majority of these young people will be returned. The quicker and the more humanely and the more expeditiously we accomplish that, the fewer of them will undertake this journey, and the fewer of these families will be conned out of their money. You are not doing the next people a favor by not dealing with the problem in front of us.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, this legislation continues this House's commitment to govern and deal with crises before they become even worse—the shortfall in the highway trust fund, for instance, in the supplemental request. They are all things the American people expect us to deal with before the

August district work period. I would urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker I rise to speak in strong opposition to the Rule for H.R. 5230, a bill to make supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014 to address the humanitarian crisis on our nation's southern border.

As a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security and the Ranking Member on the Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I have visited the border and seen the children that this bill intends to help.

This bill offers to little in funding to address the need that over 50 states are attempting to address by providing shelter and assistance to the tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors who are now living in our country.

This bill does too little to actually help the thousands of children who are awaiting immigration hearings. They are victims of human trafficking, sexual violence, and witnesses to murders as well as acts of violence against other children who took that dangerous trek to the United States.

We should be focused on learning what they know and what they experienced to be sure the guilty are found and punished.

I offered, along with several other members of the House amendments in attempts to improve the bill, but all were rejected by the Rules Committee, which chose to place H.R. 5230 before the House in the form of a closed rule.

The Jackson Lee Amendment would have authorized designated federal agencies to reimburse State and local governments and private nonprofit organizations for the costs incurred in providing psychological counseling, housing, education, medicine and medical care, food and water, clothes, personal hygiene and other in dispensable consumables, other human services in response to the humanitarian crisis on the Southwest Border.

This Congress has had the Senate's version of a Comprehensive Immigration reform bill for nearly a year, without accomplishing the task of taking up the issue and passing a House version.

Our nation's immigration system is broken and needs reform, but the only attempt at addressing immigration into the United States is this bill that is being presented as an appropriations bill.

H.R. 5230 is not an appropriations bill it is an immigration reform bill, which covers the jurisdictions of the two committees I serve on—the House Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees. Neither of these committees were given the opportunity to hold hearings or make the needed changes to the bill to make sure it conforms with long standing policies relating to unaccompanied minor or issues related to refugees.

The Jackson Lee amendment would have helped nonprofits, local and state governments in all of the 50 states who are now providing assistance to the tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors within the United States.

The message has gotten to families in El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. Parents are no longer sending their children to the United States once they learned of the dangers and the prospects for their children surviving the journey without becoming victims of human trafficking.

Over two-thirds of the language in H.R. 5230 will make significant changes in existing law or creates new law regarding immigration policy without going through the committees of jurisdiction such as the House Committees on Homeland Security, Judiciary, and Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 5230 contains too much language that is legislative such as:

The bill makes significant changes to 2008 trafficking victims protection act. This change will subject all children to the initial screening process that now applies only to children from Mexico and Canada; erects a new expedited immigration court screening for any children who pass the initial screening; prohibits administrative appeals from children ordered removed through the new expedited process; requires detention of certain children who demonstrate a credible fear of persecution throughout the pendency of their asylum proceedings; establishes new, high burdens of proof; and sets up a principle of "Last In, First Out" in the adjudication process.

The bill prohibits the secretaries of the interior and agriculture from impeding, denying, or restricting the activities of U.S. customs and border protection on federal land located within 100 miles of the U.S./Mexico border—This issue has already been addressed. Both Interior and Agriculture have existing Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) with U.S. Customs and Border Protection and all these agencies, as well as the GAO, have testified that these agreements are working and that federal land management laws and activities do not impair border security.

The bill provides too few emergency immigration judges—the bill only requires the Department of Justice to designate up to 40 temporary immigration judges within 14 days of enactment of this legislation. Then the bill permits hiring of retired judges or magistrate judges, or the reassignment of current immigration judges, to conduct expedited hearings for unaccompanied alien children to try to meet the new requirement that their cases be heard within 7 days of being screened by DHS officials.

The bill undermines a long standing policy reparding asylum—H.R. 5230 Prohibits anyone believed to have been convicted outside the U.S. of any drug-related offense punishable by a prison term of more than a year from being granted asylum.

The bill makes the wrong decision on border security by sending the national guard support for border operations—H.R. 5230 would deploy National Guard under Title 32 Status. National Guard troops with this change may be assigned duties as deemed necessary to provide assistance in operations, with priority given to high traffic areas experiencing the highest number of crossing by unaccompanied children.

The bill denies safe shelter to children through its sense of congress—the states that the Secretary of Defense should not be allowed to shelter unaccompanied children or other migrants unless certain conditions are met.

These children have found the compassion and love of thousands of Americans founds in the states of Texas, Alabama, Alaska, California, Illinois, North Carolina, South Dakota, New York, Utah, Virginia and—yes—even the U.S. Virgin Islands.

The nature of America is that of the Good Samaritan.

On July 3, 2014, I went to McAllen, Texas and observed a Customs and Border Protection (CBP) facility where unaccompanied children were being processed by the Border Patrol.

As I walked through the facility, I saw frightened and needy children, some as young as five years old.

Mr. Speaker, some members of this body who have not taken the time to visit the border or visit the children who are now in their own states will stand before this body and accuse them of being dangerous—but they are not.

They are traumatized and frightened children driven from their homes by violence and inducements of these same gangs to get payments from desperate parents seeking to save the lives of their children to bring them to the United States.

These children had risked their lives to make their way to the U.S. by riding atop freight trains through dangerous territories in Mexico. One can only imagine the desperation and hopelessness that would prompt a parent to send their young child on such a treacherous journey.

It takes courage and desperation to escape senseless violence and I know that is what Cuban Americans faced, and Christians, Jews and all other groups facing violence have endured.

These are refugees and their status requires that the United States act appropriately.

Some may mention that the United States has a quota on refugees that we can take each year and that number has been reached. The program they refer to is for refugees that other nations around the world are providing shelter—but if the refugees are crossing our own border there is not limit.

This international law that the United States has backed for decades and pressured other nations to enforce. If the refugees are Christians escaping ISIS or Boko Haram or they are children escaping violent gangs in Central America they are not and should not be turned back.

Children do not leave their homes and families by the tens of thousands unless fear is driving them from their homes.

Upon my visit to South Texas borders, I witnessed hundreds of children whose young faces were pressed against glass jails with tears running down their faces. We are dealing with helpless children who have traveled a treacherous journey, and it should be within our American values to care for these children who fled their homes to escape violence.

These children are not perpetrators or criminals—they are in many cases victims fleeing deadly violence in Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador, and are seeking temporary safe haven in the United States, as so many people before them have done for centuries.

The surge of unaccompanied children on our southern border does not pose a threat to our national security. Contrary to the shrill rhetoric used by some commentators, the nation is not being invaded by army of children dispatched to do us harm.

We are confronted instead with a humanitarian crisis resulting from the alarming scale of violence and economic desperation in three Central American countries that now lead the world in murder rates: El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala.

Politicizing the issue will not solve the problem. Taking actions that address the root

causes in the short and long term will. We should be taking up Immigration Reform to deal with the wide range of immigration problems.

The current status on the border is the number of children coming across the border has abated. Those children remaining in detention shelters along the border number only a few hundred.

According to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, these three Central American countries have among the highest per capita homicide rates in the world, with Honduras topping the list and the other two nations in the top five.

To address this issue of the humanitarian crisis, I introduced H.R. 4990, the “Justice for Children Now Act of 2014,” which authorizes the immediate hiring of an additional 70 immigration judges in the Executive Office of Immigration Review.

This bill will help but it is not sufficient to address the backlogs to help advance the flow of the children’s immigration court hearings.

The amount allowed under this bill will leave states and aid agencies footing a significant portion of the cost for assisting these helpless children—when it is the role of the federal government to be present and actively engaged in leading the effort.

I support the President’s request for \$3.7 billion to respond to the humanitarian crisis on the border and urge my colleagues in leadership to reconsider the level of funding for this great need.

Congress should allocate the resources needed to deal with the increase in unaccompanied children seeking refuge in the United States. Some of these persons are attempting to enter the country unlawfully and without justification. Our laws do not permit this and they should not be allowed entry.

The Administration is following immigration law as it relates to these unaccompanied minors.

The Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008, signed by President George W. Bush establishes the legal status of the children who have entered the nation unaccompanied.

That law provides persons fleeing lethal violence or escape from human trafficking the opportunity to have their case heard by an immigration judge.

Over the time Congress has delayed acting and an additional 366,000 pending cases were added to the immigration courts that must have hearings before any action can be taken.

Because this situation is untenable for everyone—law enforcement, taxpayers, and individuals petitioning for relief, the first thing that we can and should do to reduce the backlog is provide the funding needed to appoint 70 new immigration judges, as provided under legislation.

Ensuring that there are available sufficient facilities to house detained children in a humane manner while they await their immigration hearing is another challenge.

I ask that the Rules Committee approve the Jackson Lee Amendment for inclusion in H.R. 5230.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 696 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS FROM COLORADO

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

SEC. 7. 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. 15) to provide for comprehensive immigration reform 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 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. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 15.

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. COLE. 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. POLIS. 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.

REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, proceedings will now resume on H.R. 935, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. CAPPS. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Capps moves to recommit the bill H.R. 935 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. PROTECTING INFANTS AND CHILDREN FROM KNOWN OR SUSPECTED CARCINOGENS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall not apply to a discharge of a pesticide—

(1) if the pesticide—

(A) is a known or suspected carcinogen for infants or children; or

(B) is known or suspected to harm the neurological or physiological development of infants or children; or

(2) if the discharge is located in a geographic area that contains a cancer cluster.

(b) CANCER CLUSTER DEFINED.—In this section, the term "cancer cluster" means a defined geographic area where there is the occurrence of a greater than expected number of cancer cases among infants or children over a specific time period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer this final amendment to H.R. 935.

If this amendment is adopted, it will not kill the bill or send it back to committee.

□ 1045

The House will have an opportunity to vote on final passage immediately after consideration of this amendment. What the amendment will do is ensure that our children are protected from known chemical threats.

Mr. Speaker, it should come as no surprise that when it comes to pesticides, infants and children are among the most vulnerable to harmful health impacts. Pound for pound, children drink more water, eat more food, and breathe more air than adults, and, as a result, they absorb a higher concentration of pesticides.

Infants and children are also exposed to pesticides in unique ways because of how they interact with the world. As any parent can tell you, children and infants crawl on the floor and on the grass, and they put almost everything into their mouths, including their hands, again, putting themselves at greater risk of exposure to pesticides than adults.

And the exposure of infants and children to pesticides poses a greater risk than the same exposure would do to an adult for an additional reason, and that is because children's internal organs are still developing, and their bodies may provide less natural protection from these toxins than adults have.

Simply put, our children are at greater risk from pesticide exposure, so they need greater protection, and that is what my amendment would do. It would help reduce risk by preserving several commonsense tools to protect children and infants from increased exposure to toxic pesticides.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our farmers and mosquito control districts have raised legitimate concerns about these regulations that need to be addressed, and I have supported the underlying bill in the past because I believe the legislative process needs to move forward to find the right solution to these issues.

However, this bill is not perfect. It takes a very broad approach that could be more targeted to ensure that we are

doing everything possible to protect our most vulnerable people. Unfortunately, this bill now has come to the floor with no opportunity to consider floor amendments to make these commonsense improvements, and so this is our last—really, our only—opportunity to strike the right balance between supporting our local farmers and protecting our children.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that pesticide exposure can lead to a variety of adverse health effects, especially for children. These harmful effects range from neurological disorders to birth defects to certain forms of cancer. In fact, recent news reports have highlighted more and more examples of potential cancer clusters associated with pesticide exposure.

For example, in Highland, New York, health officials are investigating the cases of six children who, one after another, were diagnosed with the same form of leukemia. Local residents believe that environmental pollution may be the cause and point to the routine pesticide sprayings in the area.

In Kern County, California, local officials are investigating over 20 cases of childhood malignancies, including the death of an 8-year-old boy, that may be linked to pesticides in that area.

In Washington State, local health officials are investigating why roughly 60 people in the Yakima area have fallen ill, reporting difficulty breathing, skin rashes, nausea, vomiting, and headaches, some of whom required emergency hospitalization. In this instance, State health officials suspect these health issues may be related to 15 different instances of spraying in commercial orchards.

These are just a few examples.

Mr. Speaker, I represent an area of California with a vibrant agricultural economy and culture that we all treasure. Our farmers and their families drink the same water as everyone else, so they have just as much at stake in this as anyone. Pesticides are an unfortunate but necessary part of food production, and our central coast farmers do the best they can to navigate the rules and use these pesticides safely, but there is clearly more that could and should be done to minimize pesticide exposure, especially when it comes to our children.

My amendment targets the most toxic of all pesticides, those that research indicates are known or suspected to cause serious health issues in infants and children. I want to be clear. This amendment does not block the use of these pesticides or block consideration of this bill. It simply says that if you are a pesticide applicator, you should minimize your use of these toxic chemicals, monitor any adverse impacts from their use, and report the location and quantities to local permitting agencies.

We may not agree on all the potential impacts of this bill, but surely we can agree that protecting our Nation's infants and children from toxic chemicals warrants our full support. Simply