



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, AUGUST 1, 2014

No. 123

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

August 1, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

On this day, in the midst of great and urgent debate, we ask again that You give all Members peace and patience, with wisdom and courage to do what is best for our Nation.

Perplexing and competing questions and answers challenge us all to remember that our Nation is a people descended from immigrants, most in history, and many in faith. May all Americans, and those Members who represent them here, rise to the challenge of these days and prove to be the best of ourselves.

As always, may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(a) of House Resolution 694, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA)

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GARCIA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, August 1, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,

*Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 1, 2014 at 9:08 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to the conference report H.R. 3230.

That the Senate agreed without amendment H. Con. Res. 111.

That the Senate recedes in its amendment to the bill H.R. 5021.

Appointments:

State and Local Law Enforcement Congressional Badge of Bravery Board. Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor Review Board. State and Local Law Enforcement Congressional Badge of Bravery Board.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up

House Resolution 700 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 700

Resolved, That 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 September 5, 2014, providing for consideration or disposition of measures relating to the ongoing humanitarian crisis on the U.S. southern border, border security, and related immigration law.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of September 5, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to measures addressing the ongoing humanitarian crisis on the U.S. southern border, border security, and related immigration law.

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 the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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, yesterday the Rules Committee met to report a rule that would provide for same-day authority for any resolution reported from the Committee on Rules related to the ongoing humanitarian crisis on the southern border, border security, and related immigration law through September 5, 2014. Additionally, the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7191

rule provides suspension authority through September 5, 2014, on the same topics.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is very straightforward. It allows the House the maximum flexibility to deal with the crisis on the southern border during the district work period by providing both same-day and suspension authority through September 5.

Any legislation considered during this time period would still need to go through the regular process, by either a rule for consideration by the Rules Committee or under the standard suspension process. This resolution just allows for expedited consideration of those matters while preserving as much of the district work period as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this martial law rule.

The martial law authority created under this rule would last through September 5. In other words, the House Republicans can call us back on a whim, just to consider any kind of bill they call a border or immigration bill. So much for their 3-day rule. I wonder how much notice they have to give Speaker CRUZ before they call us back?

Let's just take a moment to remember how we got here.

The Republican leadership put together a partisan, inadequate, and unacceptable emergency supplemental bill that allegedly dealt with the humanitarian crisis at the southern border. That bill was mean-spirited and cruel, but it wasn't mean-spirited and cruel enough to satisfy the far-right wing of the Republican Conference. So the leadership tried to add another mean-spirited, cruel bill to block any further help for young immigrants under the DACA program, a program that has helped thousands of young people who have grown up in America come out of the shadows so they can go to school or hold a job without fear of being deported. But that wasn't mean-spirited and cruel enough for their base, so they pulled the whole package from the floor yesterday.

So last night, we had yet another meeting in the Rules Committee, and that is when they came up with this rule, but not a solution. That is right, Mr. Speaker. They still don't know what they are going to do. But I have an idea. They are going to make their cruel, mean-spirited immigration bill even worse, and that may not be enough to placate the far right who simply don't like immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, let's be honest. The far-right wing of the Republican base will never, ever be satisfied. And the martial-law authority created under this rule would last through September 5,

so if the Republicans can somehow come up with even more mean-spirited bills, if they can figure out a way to act even more cruelly, they can bring us back again and again and again to vote.

Now, in case any Americans are still watching, they could be forgiven for being a little confused about what happened this week. On Wednesday, House Republicans voted to waste millions of taxpayer dollars to sue the President for what they claim is excessive executive action. But on Thursday, this is what Speaker BOEHNER said about the border crisis:

There are numerous steps the President can and should be taking right now, without the need for congressional action, to secure our borders.

So which is it, Mr. Speaker? Is President Obama doing too much or not enough? I have got whiplash. It would be easier to take the Republicans seriously if they would just settle on one set of partisan talking points.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few words about the crisis at our border.

There are nearly 50 million refugees around the world, 50 million people fleeing violence, brutality, oppression, famine, disease—50 million. But when 50,000 minors, one-tenth of 1 percent of the total number, arrive at our border, my Republican friends have a collective hissy fit.

Is this really the face of America that we want the rest of the world to see? The United States of America, a nation of immigrants, do we really want the rest of the world to see us like this, petty and mean and small? I hope not.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, obviously, my friend and I are going to have a disagreement about the nature of the bill that I think will, in rather short order, be before us. Let's go back and look at a little bit of history here.

The administration was warned in 2012 and 2013 that we were going to have a crisis on our hands if we didn't do something, that we were going to get a flow of unaccompanied minors. They did absolutely nothing. As a matter of fact, the President of the United States submitted a budget to us which cut money for enforcement and detention at the border, which cut money for support of people that were here while they were being processed, and that cut money for aid to the countries where most of these folks are coming from. That is real foresight.

So we have been confronted with a crisis, and a crisis that, in our view, the President contributed to by unilaterally changing whole sections of the immigration law and leaving the impression, probably unwittingly, I would say, but leaving the impression to many people that, if we get to the United States, we are going to be able to stay.

There is no question criminal elements have picked that impression up, broadcast it. Thousands of people have sent them tens of thousands—millions, really—of dollars and put children on a perilous journey of over 1,000 miles to this country.

Now we are trying to act on that, and we think, number one, if we don't do that, the societies from which they are coming are going to be disrupted. And we have been told very clearly by the leaders of those countries: We would like our children back.

Number two, if we don't stop this process, we are going to continue to enrich cartels to an extraordinary degree. Frankly, as one border agent told me, he said, from a cartel standpoint, this is actually easier than drugs, because with drugs we try to interdict you every step along the way, and if you get to the border to cross, we continue to try and interdict you. In this case, we actually, once they bring an illegal unaccompanied minor here, complete the transaction. So it is encouraging the flow, and that is dangerous for the young people involved.

We all know that in the course of that journey there is a risk that sex trafficking will take place. There is a risk that people will be lured or forced into drug dealing. There is a terrific physical risk. We know a lot of those folks are abused in the course of this process or sexually assaulted, so we need to stop this flow. We need to do it in a humane and appropriate way.

The President, by the way, has suggested that this is due to the 2008 law which we all passed, in good faith, to deal with sex trafficking. I personally don't think that is the case, but if that is true, then we ought to make some tweak to that law. We don't need to repeal it, but we need to make sure that we do something so that we don't have an enormous backlog here and we can actually handle the flow appropriately.

We have waited in vain for the President to tell us what that tweak is. I mean, it was his Secretary of Homeland Security that actually raised this issue and said we need to be able—he said this in testimony in front of the United States Senate—we need to be able to treat people coming from the three Central American countries essentially the same way we treat Canadian and Mexican minors that arrive at our border. That was the position, but we have not seen any more requests.

So if you look at our bill, frankly, number one, it is going to take care of that problem with a tweak. Number 2, we are going to provide additional moneys to handle this process through the end of the fiscal year and the end of the calendar year. Number 3, then we can work, because there will probably be additional resources needed next year, under the caps in the Ryan-Murray budget agreement and redirect that flow of money from less urgent to more urgent problems.

So we think it is a responsible way to proceed. I think, essentially, that is

what we are going to try and put before the House. Regardless, once we pass something, then the Senate can pass something.

I am sad to say, Mr. Speaker, that the other body was unable to do anything yesterday and it has adjourned and gone home. Frankly, we were unable to get things done yesterday in a way that I think I certainly would have liked, but we stayed here, and we are going to continue to work through the problem, present a product. Hopefully, the Senate will come back and do the same, and then we can proceed legislatively and provide the resources and legislative corrections that are needed to deal with the situation.

I am pleased that we are in session. I am pleased that we are working toward a solution.

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

□ 1015

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in today's paper, there is an op-ed. It is written by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the new majority leader. And in that op-ed he said: "I have always believed that you must win the argument before you can win the vote. In Congress, committees act as idea factories for policies from both sides, and as majority leader, I will commit to the committee process and regular order."

Apparently, he didn't start yesterday doing that. And we don't start today doing that. This legislation has not been considered by committee, subcommittee, and none of us have seen it at this point in time.

I heard the gentleman from Oklahoma say that the legislation is going to do this, that, and the other.

We haven't seen it. It is 10:15. We haven't seen it. No regular order. No exercising of responsibility. We saw irresponsibility rampant yesterday in the House of Representatives. We saw a few months ago, shutting down government if you don't do it my way.

I will tell the American people, Mr. Speaker, none of the leaders of the Republican Party have reached across to say, how can we do this in a bipartisan way. And so, because of their unwillingness to do that, Mr. Speaker, the Senate is gone. What we do today will be useless, a show, a form without substance, a pretense, a political message to their base of how hard they can be because they are moving in exactly the opposite direction of trying to create bipartisanship.

So I urge my colleagues, stand up for doing the right thing and giving the resources necessary to meet the challenge that America has and America ought to be meeting today and yesterday and the day before.

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

I want to disagree with my good friend, the minority whip, on a point.

I don't think the Senate left yesterday because of anything the House did. It failed to act, and it left. It went home because it couldn't pass a bill. That is something we are not going to allow to happen here. We are going to pass legislation. We are going to get our part of the job done.

The Senate, then, will be free to come back and pass something, and we can go into a conference and do exactly what my friend suggests, work out a compromise. So hopefully that is where we will end up in this process.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, there are two real crises before us, and the Republican response was the misbegotten legislation, withdrawn yesterday, as it should have been, but the other wasn't even on the table in any form.

There were 236 new fires started in the Western United States last night. There are 31 large fires that are uncontained. And the Forest Service and the BLM are running out of money. In the Senate bill—which, granted, it didn't pass—but in the President's proposal was emergency firefighting money. But somehow, the Republicans here don't think those fires are an emergency and they don't care about the loss of resources, the potential loss of life, and the loss of property that is going to result.

When those agencies run out of money, they can't stop fighting the fires, but they have will have to cut back on programs of preparedness and things that would mitigate the disaster of future fires, deal with forest health, fuel reduction, and all those things. But they couldn't care less. They are taking no action. They didn't even put forward a lame proposal on that, unlike their very lame proposal on the border.

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

The gentleman may be surprised to find that, actually, we are not too far apart on the issue.

Now, currently, we have over \$700 million still on hand to deal with wildfires. The gentleman and I actually cosponsored legislation that our friend from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) has offered so that we can actually deal with this and change the structure of how we fund wildfire fighting. I suspect that issue will come back again. As a matter of fact, I was willing to work during the budget process with some of my friends on the other side of the Rules Committee to actually write the change into the budget. We had the votes on our side, working with our friends, to do that. For some reason, the Democratic amendment was withdrawn. I don't know why, and I cast no aspersions. But that is an area where we would like to work with you. I don't

think it is particularly appropriate to be done in this bill.

This bill is about dealing with the crisis on the southern border. It shouldn't be a Christmas tree or a grab bag. If we need additional resources, we should come back to do that. Again, we have sufficient resources on hand. Congress will be back in session in September, back in session after the elections. So I think we are going to have multiple opportunities to deal with this.

I look forward to working with my friends on this particular issue when those opportunities occur.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we would like to work on that. As I said, no option has been given to us for that. Secondly, you are not following regular order on the legislation. What is needed now are resources. And the reason the Senate didn't act is because no Member of your party would support action.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA).

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I am a fortunate man. I am a fortunate man because half a century ago, my father, at 17 years old, arrived at this country with my mother. And this country gave them refuge. Later, the rest of our family came. This country has been tremendously generous, as we were brutalized by a leftwing dictatorship, the Castro dictatorship.

And to think, Mr. Speaker, that a fellow Cuban American sits in the other House, dictating to this House that we should strip away rights, strip away rights from children, is unacceptable. It is un-American.

I am a fortunate man. And we are a rich and plentiful country, a country of laws.

We have an opportunity to do the right thing, to pass the bipartisan, comprehensive bill that the other House passed. It has now been 1 year and 1 month since that happened. The time has come. Let us pass comprehensive immigration reform.

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

I want to disagree with my friend on the root of this issue. I don't think whether or not we passed immigration reform has anything to do with the border crisis. I really don't. Frankly, what is occurring there would be illegal had we passed what the Senate passed. So it just simply doesn't address the problem.

What the problem here is, by our own actions in this country, we have sent a message that if you get here, you can stay, whether you are legally entitled to or not. And it is going to take so long to process you, you will essentially never be sent back.

And we have allowed criminal cartels to distort our position and to make tens of millions of dollars off of this. That needs to be stopped. That needs to be reversed. It is not helpful to anybody.

Now, again, we may differ on the ideas. Although, I would point out for the record once more, the administration did ask: Please do something about the 2008 law. They asked that a month ago. And then they have sort of gotten quiet since then. We don't hear anything else about that.

They have asked for resources. We have looked at what they need. We said we will be willing to do that. We are going to take them from existing moneys. We are not going to spend new money. This is an urgent priority. We think you are right. We are going to redirect that. And by the way, if you are going to need additional resources next year, we will work with you again there. We are going to do it under the Ryan-Murray budget cap. We are not going to go outside the process. And we are using that.

I think my friend from Maryland, the minority whip, is correct. We are using exceptional procedures—but they are procedures within the traditions of this House—to react to a crisis situation, and we are trying to stay here to get our work done and hopefully challenge the Senate to come back and do the same thing. So we are working the process and the crisis as best we can. With that, we will continue to work.

And I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I spoke on the connection between comprehensive immigration reform and the crisis that we have at our border. And I said then—and I will say it again—that it is the height of hypocrisy to be talking about trying to do something about our border security when we can't even bring comprehensive immigration reform to this floor that would have provided the funding for increased border security. You can't have it both ways.

But the Republican leadership said earlier this week and yesterday that, in fact, maybe the President should use his executive authority to deal with the issue at the border. But on Tuesday, they provided funding—some \$2 million—to sue the President for excessive use of executive authority. Which is it? You can't have it both ways. But it seems like some of our colleagues want to do that.

And then finally, a colleague from the Valley just said this morning: The problem we have is that some of our people just don't want to govern. That is correct. They don't. Once again, we are seeing politics trump good public policy for the people of our country.

What we ought to be doing is returning back to regular order. What we ought to be doing is putting together a

bipartisan effort to solve our border problems and to bring about comprehensive immigration reform for all the people of this country. That is what we ought to be doing.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I am here as a Member of this body who was sent here to work—quite frankly, which is the main reason why most immigrants come to this country—to work, to contribute to our economy, and to do the jobs that most of us are unwilling to do.

But the point that I want to make at this moment is that what the Republican proposal tried to do yesterday—and it failed—and what they are trying to do today is to strip away the rights of a child to live. The Republicans want to indiscriminately return children to their death.

And I challenge any American to look into yourself and realize and find out that many of these children will be returned with or without a change of the law today. They will be returned. But the ones that deserve to live should be able to stay. And the law was passed unanimously in 2008 to give that opportunity to those children, to these children, the children that are breathing today, the children who came to the most giving, loving, caring land ever created on Earth. And that is now about to change if they are successful.

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

I think we need to step back from the emotion a moment and look at the realities of the situation. Number one, anybody that seeks refugee status in the United States can go to any of the embassies in the country and request it. You don't have to travel 1,000 miles. You can go request it, and we will look to see whether or not you qualify.

Number two, the President of the United States has said that the vast majority of these children will be returned. That is not us. That is the President. He has said that. We are trying to do it and work with him in an expeditious way because we think sooner is better.

Number three, we are not returning them to criminals. We are returning them to the custody of their governments, their own officials, who are probably better situated to make these decisions than we are 1,000-plus miles away.

So let's be real. Nobody is stripping any rights away from anyone. We actually have a situation—a 2008 law—where a loophole has been exploited by criminals. That is what is happening. And we are trying to stop the loophole and keep people from embarking on a dangerous journey and discourage people from giving thousands of dollars of their hard-earned money to criminal cartels to participate in that. That is the effort that is underway here.

Nobody would have fewer rights than the people that are currently here from Mexico or Canada. We would still have the ability to adjudicate issues. The process would be a lot faster and, we think in that sense, more humane and more efficient and more expeditious.

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

□ 1030

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I and my colleagues on this side of the aisle don't have the intuitive gift to know that every child or the majority of every child that is there doesn't have a right to refuge and doesn't have a right to asylum.

That is why we have been so tenacious about protecting a law that provides due process, adjudication, and representation for these children, so that they have a fair opportunity to get refuge and to get asylum as the law prescribes.

The previous bill that failed dismantled that. TED CRUZ did not give it his seal of the approval, so it didn't get out of the Republican Caucus. Now, before us, we have a rule that is fraudulent, we have a forthcoming law that will be fraudulent, and it will be worse than the previous one.

Now, we are going to codify getting rid of DREAMers and DACA into this law. What is the purpose? To turn out a base? Is this a political strategy? Is this a political expediency on the shoulders of children, on the shoulders of the American values, and on the shoulders of our history?

How shameful, how cynical—vote “no” on the rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I just want to make the point to my friend. Nobody is trying to strip away the rights from anyone. The 2008 law has been abused. Those people have found a loophole in it, and they have clogged the legal system. We have offered not a repeal, but a relatively minor fix.

The President of the United States and his administration have also said this law is at fault. As a matter of fact, they are actually the ones who put that suggestion out there. The President of the United States is the person who said the vast majority of these people need to go home and will eventually go home. So if he has a better way to do this, we would love to see the proposal.

What he sent us was a funding proposal with no fix at all. It is a proposal aimed at better managing the flow of people, but not reversing that. It is a proposal, frankly, that goes well beyond this fiscal year, well beyond this calendar year, and allows him basically to operate outside the budget agreement limits—the caps—that we have all agreed to. We don't think that is appropriate. We think you reprioritize money toward the more urgent issue.

We agree with the President. This is an urgent issue. We are willing to find the savings in other parts of the budget. We are not willing to break the budget, and we are not willing to break the budget caps that both sides agreed to. That is really, I think, the essence of the difference. We are trying to offer a solution. It may not be the final solution.

I hope the Senate will offer their solution. We can go to conference, and we can work with the President, but so far, the only ideas that have been put forward to actually fix the problem, I think, have largely come from our side of the aisle.

I am sure that won't last indefinitely. I think my friends will do the same thing, but certainly, they dominate the Senate. The Senate can do the same thing. Sooner or later, they will get it done.

We will continue to work on this, but for right now, again, nobody's aim is to strip anybody's rights away, but we are going to try to confront an urgent crisis, and we are going to try and do it in an expeditious way, in a responsible way, and in a limited way.

We can come back here and look at the larger issues in September and after the election. With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused. The gentleman said that they have offered a solution. Is H.R. 15 contained in this rule or is any legislation to deal with our border contained in this rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the resolution. That is a matter for debate.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Can the Chair at least inform us whether or not there is anything of substance in this rule other than a martial law rule that allows them to call us back at any point from now until September 5?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As stated, the Chair will not interpret the pending resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, a sign: "Not our kids, not our problems," held angrily by a mob, shaken with "go home," to a group of little children who have made a perilous journey to this country. That really epitomizes what the Republican approach to this problem is.

They care about these children so much that their proposal is to tell them to get out of here just as quick as

they can, before they can present their claims that they were trafficked, or that they suffer a return to violence, murder, and rape at home.

The second thing they do, instead of unclogging our broken immigration system, is to say we need more semi-automatic weapons and military uniforms on our borders to greet these little children.

Finally, they say to another group of students, those who have told us "I have a dream," our DREAMers, that they want to turn that dream into a nightmare and send them away also.

I think that is the wrong approach. It is time for them to get off Cruz Control and join us for comprehensive immigration reform.

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

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't disagree with my good friend from Texas more. I think everybody on both sides of the aisle cares about these children. Now, we care about them enough to restore the cuts that the President made in the aids to the country of origin.

We care about them enough to restore the cuts that he made in his budget to our own border security. Yes, our border security does need to be armed, not to deal with children, but to deal with the criminals that brought them here and abused them in the process. That is what we are talking about here.

Now, there is nothing to be gained by continuing this flow. Even if some of you would like every particular person that got here to stay—and, again, I quote the President, the "vast majority" will not be allowed to, will be sent back—stopping the flow is what we ought to be focusing on and stopping people from giving thousands of dollars to criminal cartels to bring these children to the borders and abuse them in the process. The quicker that stops, the better off we are.

We are willing to work with the countries of origin, I think, on both sides of the aisle. We had the President up here saying, pretty emphatically, that they needed some assistance in dealing with that. We think that is appropriate. We try to do that in legislation, and frankly, we have done it in the foreign operations bill, where we are more generous to the countries of origin than the administration has suggested we should be in its own budget.

Mr. Speaker, we are interested in dealing with the problem, but we are also interested in helping countries keep their children in their country, which they tell us they want to do.

We are also interested in making sure those children are never subjected to this journey, which I think all would agree is difficult and dangerous, and we are also extraordinarily interested in making sure that the criminal cartels who are making profit off this are discouraged from doing this, that they can't go and tell their potential customers: Give us the money and put your kid at risk, but if we actually get

them there, there is a good chance they will stay.

That false promise, that dangerous promise offered by criminals victimizing innocent people is frankly what we ought to be focused on and what we are trying to focus on.

Again, we will continue to work toward that end. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we have a good product. I think that we will. The House will consider it, and then we hope the Senate actually comes back from its district work period and deals with it as well, and we will go from there.

That is the reason for the rule. That is the reason, so we can act during this multiweek district work period, should the opportunity actually occur to do that.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), the chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I rise again in opposition to this rule and against the martial law bill which has not been given to us to read, and I believe that that is the wrong thing to do to solve this problem.

Instead of working with Democrats to come up with a viable and bipartisan solution to deal with the vulnerable Central American children who are fleeing from violence and death, my Republican colleagues are apparently drafting a bill that is even worse than the one they proposed yesterday, on Thursday.

This new bill presumably continues the failed policy of enforcement only and will send thousands of these children back to certain death. If the funding levels remain the same as yesterday, the bill will not provide adequate funding to care for them while they are here.

We should instead be spending our time debating and voting on the bipartisan Senate comprehensive immigration bill that the Speaker has refused to bring up for over a year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the martial law.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for that request?

Mr. COLE. No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield. Therefore, the request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me make clear to the House that if we defeat the previous question, I will offer

an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 15, our immigration reform bill.

At this point, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, which we have been promised consideration on for so long, to address this crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma would need to yield for the purpose of that request.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would ask him to yield to the unanimous consent request so we can deal with this immigration problem in a comprehensive manner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield, and I do want to reiterate my previous announcement that all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only. I am not yielding for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent and would ask my friend to allow the bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill, H.R. 15, to be considered. It is a bill that I proudly cosponsor, and it would more than adequately address this humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill, to the floor. It was passed by the Senate over 1 year ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 today, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform measure to deal with the immigration problems we have and to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border that is taking place today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Again, the Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I, as chair emeritus of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

As the Chair advised on January 15, 2014, and March 26, 2014, even though a unanimous consent request to consider a measure is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such requests constitute debate and may become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

□ 1045

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address these humanitarian issues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to bring real solutions to the problems at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms.

KAPTUR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at our border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at our border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crises at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, which is a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill first brought to us by President Bush, a bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for

that purpose. The gentleman from Massachusetts will be charged for the time accordingly.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15 to the floor, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at our border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border to the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 15, a bi-

partisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill to properly address the humanitarian crisis at the border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to simply allow a vote on H.R. 15, a bill that has the bipartisan votes to pass today that we can have on the President's desk today to properly address this crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the gentleman from Oklahoma has not yielded for that purpose. Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 16¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment that I will offer in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE).

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, looking at the underlying bill, I have to wonder what my colleagues are afraid of. Are they afraid of these kids, children who are fleeing brutal violence in their home countries to come to our country to seek asylum? Are we so afraid of them that we would shortcut due process and send them right back into this violence?

Mr. Speaker, are they afraid of the border, that they would send the National Guard when we are already spending \$18 billion a year; more than on all Federal law enforcement combined; at a time when El Paso, Texas, the largest Texas city on the Mexican border, is also the safest city in this country; at a time when we are 70 percent lower in apprehensions at our southern border; and at a time when these apprehensions of children have fallen by almost 60 percent?

Mr. Speaker, I ask us not to be motivated by fear or anxiety, but instead the best traditions of this country: courage, compassion, and strength to do the right thing.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the ranking

member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing that the antislavery law has some loophole that is being exploited. That is not the truth. It is not what the Evangelical Immigration Table says. Here is what they write:

By making the legal process clearer and more efficient for children, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops found that the law is working. It should not be changed to address the current temporary situation. The law allows for responses to exceptional circumstances.

That is not some open borders crowd. That is the National Association of Evangelicals. That is the Southern Baptists. That is the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities.

I would note, also, that over a year ago we saw the Senate come together to pass bipartisan immigration reform. Republicans in this House have blocked a vote. We should vote on it today and get it to the President.

EVANGELICAL IMMIGRATION TABLE,

July 22, 2014.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS, In a matter of months, more than 50,000 unaccompanied children have arrived in the United States. Millions of Americans have been moved by the plight of these children who are currently awaiting processing, with many asking how they can help.

Children are vulnerable even in the best of circumstances and warrant special protection beyond that offered to adults. This vulnerability is compounded among children who flee situations of criminal gangs, sexual violence, trauma and extreme poverty, without their parents to accompany them.

Evangelicals are guided by Jesus' admonitions to welcome and protect children (Matthew 18:6, Mark 9:37, Luke 18:15-17). As our nation responds to this humanitarian crisis, we are thankful for laws that protect children and provide for their needs. While our systems are currently stretched, our laws uphold basic child protection principles.

Accordingly, we are concerned about potential weakening of protections afforded by the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act (TVPRA) which was enacted in 2008 and reauthorized in 2013. The TVPRA ensures that victims of trafficking are not only identified and screened properly but that traffickers are penalized and brought to justice. It also appropriately assigns responsibility for the care of unaccompanied children to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and ensures that children are placed with their families when possible. By making the legal process clearer and more efficient for children, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops found that since the passage and implementation of TVPRA 23% more children were assisted. The TVPRA is working according to its design. It should not be changed to address the current temporary situation. The law allows for responses to exceptional circumstances.

Additionally, we urge you to provide the necessary resources and policy guidance to address the current crisis, and then hold the Administration accountable for fulfilling its responsibilities under the law. Robust funding is needed for the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) in HHS which has extensive experience with vulnerable immigrants, including UACs, refugees, and victims of trafficking. To respond to this crisis, ORR is

considering reprogramming funding from other refugee programs. Funds must not simply be transferred from one vulnerable population to another. More funding is needed. There should also be increased funding for immigration courts and judges to more quickly screen the children and counsel for children going through legal proceedings so they know their rights and can understand the process. More robust investment in effectively addressing root causes of migration in Central America and Mexico is also imperative.

As we pray for these children and also our nation, we are reminded of Matthew 19:13-14 in which Jesus said, "Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them." Churches and faith-based organizations have long partnered with the federal government in serving immigrant children and families in the United States. Many churches and faith-based organizations are ready and committed to provide the same type of assistance and pastoral care in the case of these unaccompanied children.

We offer our prayers and service as you make important decisions about our nation's response to migrant children. We hope that any response you make will strengthen our country's tradition of providing safety and refuge to the vulnerable.

Sincerely,

Leith Anderson, President, National Association of Evangelicals; Stephan Bauman, President and CEO, World Relief; David Beckmann, President, Bread for the World; Noel Castellanos, CEO, Christian Community Development Association; Russell D. Moore, President, Southern Baptist Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission; William Robinson, Interim President, Council for Christian Colleges and Universities; Samuel Rodriguez, President, National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference; Gabriel Salguero, President, National Latino Evangelical Coalition; Richard Stearns, President, World Vision U.S.; Jim Wallis, President and Founder, Sojourners.

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

I want to point out that if the 2008 law is not the reason, then my good friend's remarks need to be directed to the administration because they have told us it is the reason. The President has cited this as the reason. But if it is because we have sent a signal down there by unilaterally changing something, there is some explanation for a tenfold increase in the flow of individuals across our border.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, 102 years ago, I assume a very frightened 14-year-old boy made his way on a boat called the RMS Caronia from Cork, Ireland, with his mother on his way to the United States, a very frightened 14-year-old boy who left behind his community, his friends and neighbors, and made his way to the United States. He later served in World War I and became a New York City police officer but didn't live long enough to see his grandson

become a Member of the House of Representatives. But that 14-year-old boy contributed mightily to the United States of America in so many ways. He was a scared boy being brought to America in much the same way that children along our border today are coming to seek a better way.

Don't turn our backs on these young children, these boys and girls, many of whom are suffering. Show the compassion and beauty of the United States. Welcome the best, the brightest, and the bravest.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the arrival of tens of thousands of children from Central America seeking refuge in our country has tugged at the conscience of the American people. It has demonstrated both our best and our worst instincts. The best are all of the people who are so generous in offering food and clothing and shelter to these kids who have come from so far. But we have also seen some bad instincts, like the armed militiamen in ski masks who have shown up at our southern border, whose leader has said that the way you keep people from coming to this country is that you point a gun at them and threaten to shoot them in the head. That is not America.

The question that we must answer now is: What does it mean to be a refugee in the 21st century? Just as we offered that status to Cubans fleeing Castro, to those from the Soviet Union, to the Vietnamese, just as our adversaries have changed, they are not always state actors—they are al Qaeda; they are ISIS—I would argue that so, too, have our refugees changed, and we must recognize that.

This bill is not good for our country, and it doesn't reflect who we are as a people.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder what my grandmother coming from Jamaica, West Indies, with two babies thought about this great country called America. I wondered as I went to the border and I looked into the eyes of a little 7-year-old who had just gotten off a bus by himself from someplace in Central America, or the toddler in a diaper who came here because there was true and actual violence, the beheading of their neighbors, the cutting of the throats of their young boys, the fear of the cartels, and to think of the words "no room at the inn."

□ 1100

Our Republicans are confused. They are prosecuting the children, not prosecuting the drug dealers, the criminals, and others. Why? Because they are taking away basic due process rights for humble children who have come just for opportunity. Not only that, they don't even want to give resources to all the cities in America who are helping, the Good Samaritans. And then they want legislation that literally undermines due process for these children.

I will tell you this is a bad bill. Do not pass it. Pass comprehensive immigration reform. Pass it now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in fervid opposition to this Martial Law Resolution and ask that you consider doing comprehensive immigration reform—a vote you would not even need to whip.

Yet we insist on wasting valuable House Floor time while we could be doing comprehensive immigration reform, comprehensive tax reform, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization, or the Voting Rights Act.

As the GOP Majority reaches further to the anti-immigrant right to scrounge up the votes for what was already an inadequate and heartless proposal, we Democrats have a better idea: comprehensive immigration reform.

The bipartisan immigration legislation that passed the Senate over a year ago offers comprehensive answers to the problems with our immigration system—but for more than a year House Republicans have refused to give the American people a vote.

The humanitarian crisis at the border is a powerful reminder of the importance of an immigration system that honors our values as a nation. The time is now. While House Republicans search for the compassion to help desperate children, Democrats are demanding a vote on the comprehensive immigration reform our nation needs.

The United States is a country made up of immigrants, and it is part of what makes us so strong and vibrant. And while immigration reform remains an unsolved challenge for our nation, House Democrats are leading the way towards comprehensive reform.

Indeed, the decision made by President Obama two years ago to defer deportation action against young people who were brought here by undocumented parents but have been raised here in our country was an important step in the right direction.

This decision has helped ensure that over half-a-million hard-working, eager, and talented individuals who came here not of their own choice, and who are contributing to our economy and our defense, can remain here and continue to be part of building a strong future for America.

Now we are faced, Mr. Speaker, with the surge of unaccompanied children on our southern border. They do not pose a threat to our national security; nevertheless the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act must be passed before Congress leaves town for its district work-recess.

Contrary to the shrill rhetoric used by some commentators, the nation is not being invaded by an army of children dispatched to do us harm. In fact the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and I witnessed one month ago the deplorable conditions with your own eyes—babies as young as three years old.

We are confronted with a humanitarian crisis resulting from the alarming scale of violence and economic desperation in three Central American countries: El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. Politicizing the issue will not solve the problem.

In the short term, we need to allocate the resources needed to deal with the increase in unaccompanied children seeking refuge in the United States.

Yet this Congress has failed to provide any resources needed to fund the courts and judges needed to send these children through the legal system; therefore, we should fund the number of immigration judges needed. Without them, the result is a current average delay of 578 days to hear over 366,000 pending cases.

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 pass the emergency supplemental and provide the funding needed to appoint 70 new immigration judges, as provided under legislation I recently introduced, H.R. 4990, the Justice For All Children Act.

I remain committed to working with my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, on this very important issue, and would hope for a spill-over effect into the realm of comprehensive immigration reform.

I remain committed to advocating for common sense enforcement measures as part of a broader immigration reform package that will further secure our borders, ensure agricultural interests have an ample labor supply, universities and businesses are not short workers, and proper workplace compliance is achieved, but also uphold our values as a Nation of immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, No Room at the inn! The Republicans are confused. Let us as Americans give relief to these innocent children. I ask my colleagues to reject this resolution and call for a vote on comprehensive immigration reform and the full funding of the emergency supplemental by hiring 70 new immigration judges, provide more resources for the border, to protect vulnerable children, and help communities that are helping these children.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, the question may not be: Who are the children at the border, and why they are here? The question may be: Who are we as a Nation, and why are we here as a Congress?

Our reputation has been never to turn people away, our reputation should never be to turn children away to what could be a certain death or a very difficult situation.

This is not a crisis. This is a situation that we have had before and we have known how to deal with. This is a moment for our country to show who we are. The world is looking. These are children. It is not their fault that they are here. There are many conditions that have brought them here. But how

we act will be our fault if we don't act properly. How we act will be our legacy.

This is not who we are as a country—I repeat. We are much better than that. We have to understand that these are children, these are our children. Just because a border separates us, this doesn't stop them from being our children.

Let's turn down and reject all of this nonsense that we are doing, and let's try to help them and help them in the proper way.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Dr. King reminds us that the truest measure of the person is not where you stand in times of comfort and convenience, but where do you stand in times of challenge and controversy.

In these times of challenge and controversy, I stand with those children at the border and I stand for due process. I don't stand for a fast-track adjudication that mimics due process and makes a mockery of justice.

I stand with the DREAMers. They have been given hope by our President. I will not vote for a bill that will destroy hope for those DREAMers. We must keep their hope alive.

I stand for due process, I stand with the DREAMers, and I stand for hope. I stand with the President.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Oklahoma how many speakers he has?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close whenever my friend is.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask for a unanimous consent request, because the interest on this issue and the passion on this issue on our side is so great that we don't have enough time.

So I would ask unanimous consent to extend the debate by 1 hour, equally divided. Like I said, we have a lot of speakers, and there is no pending business after this debate ends. At the very least, I think we can extend the debate.

We were not allowed any amendments when the previous incarnation of this border bill was brought before the House. I think the least we can do, in the spirit of collegiality, is to expand debate, and I would like to make that unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for that request?

Mr. COLE. I do not, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield for that purpose.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will try again.

At this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day for the United States when Republicans in this Congress see a problem and then choose not to work with Democrats to solve the problem. That is exactly what has happened here today: their draconian way or the high-way.

Let's be clear about what the problem is: unaccompanied minor children, frightened, some fleeing violence, needing due process, and deserving due process.

This is as much about who these children are as it is about who we are. As a mother and a legislator, I know that we should be compelled to act as a matter of humanity, but also as a matter of law.

We know we have problems on the border that are in need of solutions. Republicans have rejected one solution—comprehensive immigration reform—to address the problem. They have rejected another solution—the request of the President for a supplemental appropriation that includes resources for judges, representation, and services for minor children, and assistance to the countries of origin.

Now today, in the eleventh hour, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle demonstrate once again their lack of humanity and failure to solve yet another problem for the American people.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Sadly, the Republican leadership is continuing to play politics with the lives of innocent children at our border by failing to bring forward a bipartisan supplemental spending bill that can pass the House and be signed into law.

It is unbelievable that the failure to pass their own bill yesterday was not because of its completely inadequate funding level or the fact that it would undercut critical humanitarian protections in current law, but because it was not mean enough or punitive enough for their own Members to vote on.

Working together, as Leader PELOSI offered Speaker BOEHNER but was refused, we could have come to a reasonable compromise.

Instead, Republicans have resorted to martial law, not because it is in the best interest of our country or these children, but so they can have the time to write a bill that will appease the extremists in their party.

Let's reject this rule and come together in the best tradition of this House to pass a clean supplemental bill that will address the humanitarian crisis at our border in a way that meets our government's urgent needs and upholds our most basic American values.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in strong opposition to this bill.

I have been deeply saddened and distressed to see the images and hear the stories of so many unaccompanied minors at our border.

But from Massachusetts, I have also read other stories. I have read the stories of the over 150 overdoses from heroin that we experienced in Taunton, with over ten deaths.

I recently met with the DEA officials in Massachusetts, who indicated that the heroin drug trade alone with Mexico is over \$40 billion a year; that the cartels have moved up into owning trafficking corridors throughout Mexico; that despite many of my other colleagues who are calling for the destruction of aid and reduction of aid to Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador, the United States bilateral aid is less than \$200 million a year. Gang violence in Los Angeles alone costs over \$1 billion a year.

If we are truly going to address this problem, we have to get to its core. We have to take a good, hard look at what is driving an economic instability that is pushing young kids to figure that they have a better life by getting on a bus by themselves to our border.

This is what our country is supposed to be all about: a better future for young children trying to make a life for themselves. I hope that we come to that conclusion.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good friend, my colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague on the Rules Committee, my friend from Oklahoma, for yielding.

I am not sure what it is that is happening here on this floor right now because the bill that is before us that everyone is rising to object to is the bill that allows us to bring up the same day, just as soon as we find a solution that can bring this House together, bring a bill immediately to the floor to solve a crisis. I just want to make that clear. The bill that is before us today is the only piece of legislation in this town that allows us to move immediately to solve a crisis. I am not talking about a crisis that is imagined by Republicans or imagined by Democrats.

I have in my hand here a letter from Jeh Johnson, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. Mr. Speaker. In an open letter to families all across the world he says:

So, let me be clear: there is no path to deferred action or citizenship, or one being contemplated by Congress, for a child who crosses our border illegally today.

I have heard the hearts of my friends on the other side of the aisle, I have heard the hearts. But we are a Nation of laws, as well as hearts, and you know that the law of the land does not allow for that, as the Secretary of Homeland Security said. Yet, down here on the floor today, if I was watch-

ing this from my home in Guatemala or Honduras or El Salvador, I would be led to believe there is.

We are better than that, and we have to be better than that because this is, in fact, a crisis. It is not an imagined crisis. It is a real crisis.

Folks thought this House was going to go home yesterday, they thought this House was going to go home yesterday, just like the Senate did, without providing a response. That is not the House I ran to be a part of.

We are still here, we are still here working, and, by golly, I believe we are going to have a solution on the floor. I believe we are going to have a solution on the floor before the Sun goes down today, and I am so proud, I am so proud that we are here to do that. But I tell you this, we cannot do it if this bill does not pass. This rule today gives us a pathway to success. In its absence, that pathway will be delayed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman referred to a bill that the Republicans are working on. We haven't seen such a bill. Does this rule give us any indication of what bill they are talking about?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, the Chair will not interpret the pending resolution.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

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

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I will answer my friend's question that was just asked as he was speaking.

What is happening on the floor is Republicans are trying to weaken human trafficking laws. That is what is happening.

Over the last few days, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have jumped through linguistic and logical hoops to say that the most humane way to deal with these children is to deport them quickly without due process to discourage other children from making the dangerous journey.

There is no question that the journey is dangerous. Children are killed, robbed, raped, and maimed along the way, but the children know the risks. They are not ignorant to those risks.

Why? Because back in Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala, children are being raped, killed, and robbed every day. It is a fact. Read the news.

Deporting children without process to these conditions or locking them into their home countries and preventing them from fleeing to find safety is not humane. It would be, as the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops said, like sending them back into a burning building. We can do better than this.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this rule, exactly what bill is it that we are going to vote for or against as relates to the rule? Because depending on the substance of the bill, it is going to determine whether I vote for or against the rule. If they are not prepared to tell us exactly what the bill is going to be in it, how could we possibly make a judgment as to whether we support the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, as the Chair has said repeatedly, the Chair will not interpret the pending resolution. That is a matter for debate among the Members.

Mr. RANGEL. May I further inquire, we are not asking you to opine anything, Mr. Speaker. We are asking you to tell us exactly what we will be debating. If we don't know what we are going to be debating—I am not asking the Speaker to tell us what is in the bill. I am asking the Speaker to find out from the majority exactly what this rule is going to be allowed for them to bring up so that I would know whether to stay here or not to stay here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. To the gentleman, the Chair would say that that matter is for debate among the Members.

Mr. RANGEL. Debate on what, Mr. Speaker? Just tell me what will we be debating on? That is my question. You tell me what the Members will be debating on, and I am satisfied. I don't want you to opine. I want you to tell me what is going to be in the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has been patient with the gentleman from New York. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, a man once said:

I believe in the idea of amnesty for those who have put down roots and who have lived here, even though sometime back they may have entered illegally.

Mr. Speaker, those words were from the great bastion of Republican thinking: President Ronald Reagan.

□ 1115

Oh, how his party has changed. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if Ronald Reagan were in office today, he would probably have a primary challenge for being too "liberal" thinking.

Mr. Speaker, the House today is bringing up their only immigration-related bill, and it has just one message: deport, deport, deport. Deport children seeking refuge from extreme violence. Deport a mother away from her chil-

dren. Deport a young person who has pledged allegiance only to one flag, and that is our flag.

Mr. Speaker, it looks like the bill the Republicans will want to bring is a security only, no to DREAMers supplemental. It does not address our broken immigration system. Have we lost the core message of our country? What happened to, "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free"? What happened to that America?

I am sure Ronald Reagan knows, but his party does not.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 5¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the legislation being put forward by the House Republicans, which is an insincere attempt to address the humanitarian crisis at our border.

This bill is misguided, unreasonable, and wrong. It does very little to address the actual root of this problem and cuts important funding from the Department of Defense, FEMA, and the State Department's Economic Support Fund.

I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to return to the drawing board, so we can help these children and fix this issue.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

The proposed legislation is ill-conceived, and does not solve the main problem.

I am opposed to this legislation and ask my colleagues to propose a solution that really helps these children.

Thank you.

La legislación propuesta está mal planteada, y no resolverá el problema principal.

Estoy opuesto a esta legislación y pido que mis colegas propongan una solución que realmente ayudara a estos niños.

Gracias.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the gentleman that he will need to provide the Clerk a translation for the RECORD.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, when the Republican leadership pulled this legislation from the floor, I assumed that they had come to their senses and realized that they couldn't treat children so poorly. Much to my

shock, however, your old bill was not punitive enough for these children, so you went back and made it worse.

Mr. Speaker, when did we lose our way? Let me be crystal clear. The change that has been added to the supplemental will make the lives of the children worse.

How we respond to a crisis of children in need of safe haven speaks to the character of our Nation, to who we are. How could we go around the world and provide resources and bring democracy, yet treat our neighbors this way?

We should not gut children's protections, just to appease the most radical elements of a particular political party. That is not the American way.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the course of the debate is about to end. There is representation that there is an underlying bill to this martial law. The Democrats have already made a commitment to stay and finish the job.

My inquiry is, the underlying bill's principles are based upon protecting children and fully funding the President's mark on the emergency supplemental to deal with this crisis and emergency.

Those are simple parliamentary inquiries as the underlying premise of the bill—two points: protecting the children and providing the full resources for helping the children. That is not giving us the contents of the bill. It is the premise of the bill for Members to be able to intelligently come to floor to assess the need to vote for the martial law.

I, again, state the parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how we can possibly frame a parliamentary inquiry to find out exactly what is in the underlying bill that we are asked to pass or vote against this rule.

In any event, I know one thing. We as Americans, especially those of us in the Congress, have a particular responsibility to pass on a legacy to those that follow us in terms of what this country really stands for.

Besides the Star-Spangled Banner and the Stars and Stripes, we also have the Statue of Liberty close to my hometown. People come from all over the world because it is symbolic of what this great country believes in.

Not that many years ago, a group of Jewish people attempted to flee Germany because they feared that Hitler

would be looking for them in order to arrest, kill, and to eliminate them as a people. We refused that ship that came into our harbor, called the St. Louis. We denied them the opportunity to come to this country, and they returned to Germany.

I don't know what is on our conscience, but we should take a look at our history and what we are leaving as a legacy.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out that the legal experts in the country have urged that we not change the antislavery law.

We do recognize the need for resources to make that law work. I can't help but notice that the Republican majority is denying the resources to actually adjudicate these cases in the bill that was before us yesterday. I think it is ironic to say it doesn't work and then say we won't give you the resources to allow you to enforce the law. It is hypocrisy at its worst.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire from the gentleman from Oklahoma whether he has any additional speakers or if he would like to give us some of his time?

Mr. COLE. I am prepared to close whenever my friend is prepared to close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" on this terrible martial law rule. We have no idea what the hell we are going to be voting on.

This is just a rule that allows them to bring up anything at any time between now and September 5. I want to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, and if we defeat the previous question, I will bring up H.R. 15, which is the bipartisan Senate passed comprehensive immigration reform bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about poor kids, most of them fleeing terrible violence. I am ashamed at the insensitivity and the lack of compassion from the other side. America is a better country. Let's not lose our humanity in this process.

If the United States of America stands for anything, it stands out loud and foursquare for human rights. We are better than the angry mobs yelling at children. The anger and the nastiness and the insensitivity is not the face of America we want to show the rest of the world. We are better. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to act like it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

We have had a very passionate and—in many cases, compassionate—debate. I want to recognize that quality in

many of the speakers, my friends on the other side. I have no doubt about their passion. Frankly, I have no doubt about their compassion. I know they want to do the right thing.

I also want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this bill actually is, as my friend from Massachusetts suggested, a mechanism to keep us in session and working on the problem, so that we have the ability between now and September 5 to actually act and act quickly. I think that is a very important thing.

It is important, too, to think back about the nature of the problem that we are dealing with. In the last 3 years, the number of unaccompanied juveniles arriving at our borders has gone from about 6,000 to—the estimates I hear this year will be somewhere like 90,000 and may well reach 150,000 within the next year or two.

The administration, according to news reports and testimony, was actually warned about this in 2012 and 2013. Frankly, they didn't prepare for it. I am quite certain they didn't anticipate it.

They actually submitted a budget this year that called for cuts in many of the areas that we are clearly going to need to deal with this huge—and unanticipated, I guess, on their part—influx of unaccompanied juveniles.

Worth noting for the record, we actually restored a lot of those cuts in the foreign operations bill that has now cleared the full Appropriations Committee. I am glad we did.

The administration then, when confronted with this crisis which it did not anticipate, told us this was due to the 2008 sex trafficking law. Frankly, I am somewhat skeptical about that because this influx didn't happen in 2009, 2010, or 2011. It only begun to be remotely visible in 2012. That coincides, by the way, with some of the President's unilateral abrogation of immigration law.

I think that is probably more likely to be the cause, but regardless, the administration has pointed to the 2008 law. The President has done that. The Secretary of Homeland Security has done that.

So far, they have offered no formal solution, although in testimony before the Senate, the Secretary of Homeland Security said he would like the law changed, so that people arriving at our borders are treated the same way as Canadian and Mexican juveniles. That was his request, not a repeal of the law, but that was—at least in testimony—his suggestion.

The President has said that, regardless, the great majority of these children will eventually be returned home. He sent us a request recently to deal with the crisis in terms of the financial resources that he needs.

He did not send us a fix, he did not send us a proffered legislative solution, just simply a mechanism for money that would go around or go outside of the Ryan-Murray budget agreement that we had agreed upon.

What has been our response? I would be the first to acknowledge this is a difficult problem to deal with. That is why the administration, I presume, has not offered us a solution.

That is why the Senate, which tried to pass one yesterday, gave up and went home. It is not an easy problem. Indeed, yesterday, we weren't able to bring legislation to the floor that would actually address the problem.

The difference between this body and the other body is this body decided to stay here and continue to work on it and try to come up with a legislative response. That response, undoubtedly, will include a fix, a tweak, an amendment to the 2008 law.

If my friends have a better solution, then I would hope the administration or the Senate or somebody offers that. So far, it has been as if we blame the problem on the 2008 law, but we are told you can't change the 2008 law.

That position is both intellectually and politically, I think, indefensible. If this is the problem, tell us how to fix the problem. If you won't tell us, we will suggest one, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

We have also decided to look at the financial issue, and there is no question additional resources are needed to handle this influx, secure the border, add additional judges, and add additional courtroom facilities to handle an enormous backlog.

So we say, well, we are not going to give you a 13-month blank check, but we will redirect resources from within the existing budget toward what we agree is a more urgent problem, and we will help you get through this fiscal year and this calendar year, and then let's sit down and talk about what is necessary for fiscal year 2015 and try to do that within the Ryan-Murray budget agreement. I think that is what we are going to do.

So we are willing to work with the administration in these areas.

□ 1130

I would also suggest, at the end of the day, the worst thing we could do would be to go home and not do anything. My friends have suggested—and I think appropriately so—that you can't tell the President he is overreaching in one area and then is pulling back in another without providing legislative authority and legislative guidance. I think they are absolutely correct in that position. I have made that point myself both privately and publicly, but that is what we are going to try and accomplish. Hopefully, we can accomplish it today. If we do that today or this weekend, we will have done our part of the job. The Senate then, by the way, could reconvene and do its part of the job. Then we could go to conference, in working with the administration, and come up with something, but it does begin with somebody at least doing his job. That is what this House and that is what this majority is absolutely determined to do.

Mr. Speaker, there is not much more that can be said on a resolution that is only 10 lines long. This resolution is important so that we can consider possible legislation in a timely fashion related to the border crisis. I would urge my colleagues to support the rule.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 700 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That 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. 2. 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 noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 184, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Blackburn	Capito
Amash	Boustany	Carter
Amodei	Brady (TX)	Cassidy
Bachmann	Bridenstine	Chabot
Bachus	Brooks (AL)	Chaffetz
Barletta	Brooks (IN)	Clawson (FL)
Barr	Broun (GA)	Coble
Barton	Buchanan	Coffman
Benish	Bucshon	Cole
Bentivolio	Burgess	Collins (GA)
Bilirakis	Byrne	Collins (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Calvert	Conaway
Black	Camp	Cook

Cotton	Jones
Cramer	Jordan
Crawford	Joyce
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)
Culberson	King (IA)
Daines	King (NY)
Davis, Rodney	Kingston
Denham	Kinzinger (IL)
Dent	Kline
DeSantis	Labrador
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa
Duffy	Lamborn
Duncan (SC)	Lance
Duncan (TN)	Lankford
Ellmers	Latham
Farenthold	Latta
Fincher	LoBiondo
Fitzpatrick	Long
Fleischmann	Lucas
Fleming	Luetkemeyer
Flores	Lummis
Forbes	Marchant
Fortenberry	Marino
Fox	Massie
Franks (AZ)	McAllister
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)
Gardner	McCauley
Garrett	McClintock
Gerlach	McHenry
Gibbs	McKeon
Gibson	McKinley
Gingrey (GA)	McMorris
Gohmert	Rodgers
Goodlatte	Meadows
Gosar	Meehan
Granger	Messer
Graves (GA)	Mica
Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)
Griffin (AR)	Miller (MI)
Griffith (VA)	Mullin
Grimm	Mulvaney
Guthrie	Murphy (PA)
Hall	Neugebauer
Hanna	Noem
Harper	Nugent
Harris	Nunes
Hartzler	Olson
Hastings (WA)	Palazzo
Heck (NV)	Paulsen
Hensarling	Pearce
Herrera Beutler	Perry
Holding	Petri
Hudson	Pittenger
Huelskamp	Pitts
Huizenga (MI)	Poe (TX)
Hultgren	Pompeo
Hunter	Posey
Hurt	Price (GA)
Issa	Reed
Jenkins	Reichert
Johnson (OH)	Renacci
Johnson, Sam	Ribble
Jolly	Rice (SC)

NAYS—184

Barber	Costa	Heck (WA)
Barrow (GA)	Courtney	Higgins
Bass	Crowley	Himes
Beatty	Cuellar	Hinojosa
Becerra	Cummings	Holt
Bera (CA)	Davis (CA)	Honda
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Danny	Horsford
Bishop (NY)	DeFazio	Hoyer
Blumenauer	DeGette	Huffman
Bonamici	Delaney	Israel
Brady (PA)	DeLauro	Jackson Lee
Braley (IA)	DelBene	Jeffries
Brown (FL)	Deutch	Johnson (GA)
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Bustos	Doyle	Kaptur
Butterfield	Duckworth	Keating
Capps	Edwards	Kelly (IL)
Capuano	Ellison	Kennedy
Cardenas	Engel	Killdeer
Carney	Enyart	Kilmer
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Kind
Cartwright	Esty	Kuster
Castor (FL)	Farr	Langevin
Castro (TX)	Foster	Larsen (WA)
Chu	Frankel (FL)	Larson (CT)
Ciulline	Fudge	Lee (CA)
Clark (MA)	Gabbard	Levin
Clarke (NY)	Galleo	Lewis
Cleaver	Garcia	Lipinski
Clyburn	Green, Al	Loeb sack
Cohen	Grijalva	Lofgren
Connolly	Guтиérrez	Lowenthal
Conyers	Hahn	Lowey
Cooper	Hastings (FL)	

Lujan Grisham (NM)	Payne	Shea-Porter	Frelinghuysen	Long	Ros-Lehtinen	Neal	Ruppersberger	Swalwell (CA)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Pelosi	Sherman	Gardner	Lucas	Roskam	Negrete McLeod	Ryan (OH)	Takano
Lynch (NM)	Perlmutter	Sinema	Garrett	Luetkemeyer	Ross	Nolan	Sánchez, Linda T.	Thompson (CA)
Maffei	Peters (CA)	Sires	Gerlach	Lummis	Rothfus	Owens	Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (MS)
Maloney,	Peters (MI)	Slaughter	Gibbs	Marchant	Royce	Pallone	Sarbanes	Tierney
Carolyn	Peterson	Smith (WA)	Gibson	Marino	Runyan	Pascrell	Schakowsky	Titus
Maloney, Sean	Pingree (ME)	Swalwell (CA)	Gingrey (GA)	McAllister	Ryan (WI)	Pocan	Schiff	Tonko
Matheson	Pocan	Takano	Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)	Salmon	Payne	Schneider	Tsongas
Matsui	Polis	Thompson (CA)	Goodlatte	McCaul	Sanford	Pelosi	Schrader	Van Hollen
McCarthy (NY)	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)	Gosar	McClintock	Scalise	Perlmutter	Schwartz	Vargas
McCollum	Quigley		Granger	McHenry	Schweikert	Peters (CA)	Scott (VA)	Veasey
McGovern	Rahall		Graves (GA)	McKeon	Scott, Austin	Peters (MI)	Scott, David	Vela
McIntyre	Rangel		Graves (MO)	McKinley	Sensenbrenner	Peterson	Serrano	Velázquez
McNerney	Richmond		Griffin (AR)	McMorris	Sessions	Pingree (ME)	Sewell (AL)	Visclosky
Meeks	Roybal-Allard		Griffith (VA)	Rodgers	Shimkus	Pocan	Shea-Porter	Walz
Meng	Ruppersberger		Grimm	Meadows	Shuster	Polis	Shea-Porter	Wasserman
Michaud	Ryan (OH)		Guthrie	Meehan	Simpson	Price (NC)	Sherman	Schultz
Miller, George	Sánchez, Linda T.		Hall	Messer	Smith (MO)	Quigley	Sinema	Waters
Moore	Sanchez, Loretta		Hanna	Mica	Smith (NE)	Rahall	Sires	Waxman
Napolitano	Sarbanes		Harper	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)	Rangel	Slaughter	Welch
Neal	Schakowsky		Harris	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)	Richmond	Smith (WA)	Wilson (FL)
Negrete McLeod	Schiff		Hartzel	Mullin	Southerland	Roybal-Allard	Stockman	Yarmuth
Nolan	Schneider		Hastings (WA)	Mulvaney	Stewart			
O'Rourke	Schrader		Heck (NV)	Murphy (PA)	Stivers	Bilirakis	Gowdy	Nadler
Owens	Schwartz		Hensarling	Neugebauer	Stutzman	Campbell	Grayson	Nunnelee
Pallone	Scott (VA)		Herrera Beutler	Noem	Terry	Cantor	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Pascrell	Scott, David		Holding	Nugent	Thompson (PA)	Clay	Hanabusa	Ruiz
Pastor (AZ)	Serrano		Hudson	Nunes	Thornberry	DesJarlais	Kirkpatrick	Rush
	Sewell (AL)		Huelskamp	Olson	Tiberi	Dingell	McDermott	Schock
			Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo	Tipton	Fattah	Miller, Gary	Speier
			Hultgren	Paulsen	Turner	Garamendi	Moran	
			Hunter	Pearce	Upton			
			Hurt	Perry	Valadao			
			Issa	Petri	Wagner			
			Jenkins	Pittenger	Walberg			
			Johnson (OH)	Pitts	Walden			
			Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)	Walorski			
			Jolly	Pompeo	Weber (TX)			
			Jordan	Posey	Webster (FL)			
			Joyce	Price (GA)	Reed			
			Kelly (PA)	Reichart	Wenstrup			
			King (IA)	Renacci	Westmoreland			
			King (NY)	Ribble	Whitfield			
			Kingston	Rice (SC)	Williams			
			Kinzinger (IL)	Rigell	Wilson (SC)			
			Kline	Roby	Wittman			
			Labrador	Roe (TN)	Wolf			
			LaMalfa	Rogers (AL)	Womack			
			Lamborn	Rogers (KY)	Woodall			
			Lance	Rogers (MI)	Yoder			
			Lankford	Rohrabacher	Yoho			
			Latham	Rokita	Young (AK)			
			Latta	Rooney	Young (IN)			
			LoBiondo					

NOT VOTING—22

Campbell	Grayson	Nadler
Cantor	Green, Gene	Nunnelee
Clay	Hanabusa	Ruiz
DesJarlais	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Dingell	McDermott	Schock
Fattah	Miller, Gary	Speier
Garamendi	Moran	
Gowdy	Murphy (FL)	

□ 1154

Messrs. VELA, SCHNEIDER, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and MCINTYRE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 474 (On Ordering the Previous Question related to H. Res. 700), had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 190, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 475]

AYES—219

Aderholt	Calvert	Daines
Amash	Camp	Davis, Rodney
Amodei	Capito	Denham
Bachmann	Carter	Dent
Bachus	Cassidy	DeSantis
Barletta	Chabot	Diaz-Balart
Barr	Chaffetz	Duffy
Barton	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (SC)
Benishke	Coble	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Coffman	Ellmers
Black	Cole	Farenthold
Blackburn	Collins (GA)	Fincher
Boustany	Collins (NY)	Fitzpatrick
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Fleischmann
Bridenstine	Cook	Fleming
Brooks (IN)	Cotton	Flores
Buchanan	Cramer	Forbes
Bucshon	Crawford	Fortenberry
Burgess	Crenshaw	Fox
Byrne	Culberson	Franks (AZ)

NOES—190

Barber	Davis, Danny	Kaptur
Barrow (GA)	DeFazio	Keating
Bass	DeGette	Kelly (IL)
Beatty	Delaney	Kennedy
Becerra	DeLauro	Kildee
Bentivolio	DelBene	Kilmer
Bera (CA)	Deutch	Kind
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Kuster
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Langevin
Blumenauer	Duckworth	Larsen (WA)
Bonamici	Edwards	Larson (CT)
Brady (PA)	Ellison	Lee (CA)
Braley (IA)	Engel	Levin
Brooks (AL)	Enyart	Lewis
Broun (GA)	Eshoo	Lipinski
Brown (FL)	Esty	Loeb
Brownley (CA)	Farr	Loeb
Bustos	Foster	Lofgren
Butterfield	Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal
Capps	Fudge	Lowey
Capuano	Gabbard	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Cardenas	Gallego	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Carney	Garcia	Lynch
Carson (IN)	Green, Al	Maffei
Cartwright	Grijalva	Maloney,
Castor (FL)	Gutiérrez	Carolyn
Castro (TX)	Hahn	Maloney, Sean
Chu	Hastings (FL)	Massie
Ciçilline	Heck (WA)	Matheson
Clark (MA)	Higgins	Matsui
Clarke (NY)	Himes	McCarthy (NY)
Cleaver	Hinojosa	McCollum
Clyburn	Holt	McGovern
Cohen	Honda	McIntyre
Connolly	Horsford	McNerney
Conyers	Hoyer	Meeks
Cooper	Huffman	Meng
Costa	Israel	Michaud
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Miller, George
Crowley	Jeffries	Moore
Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Murphy (FL)
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano
Davis (CA)	Jones	

NOT VOTING—23

Bilirakis	Gowdy	Nadler
Campbell	Grayson	Nunnelee
Cantor	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Clay	Hanabusa	Ruiz
DesJarlais	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Dingell	McDermott	Schock
Fattah	Miller, Gary	Speier
Garamendi	Moran	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1202

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 475 (On Agreeing to the Resolution related to H. Res. 700), had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 475, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 474 & 475, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3548. An act to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to expand the definition of trauma to include thermal, electrical, chemical, radioactive, and other extrinsic agents.

H.R. 4360. An act to designate the facility of the United States Forest Service for the Grandfather Ranger District located at 109 Lawing Drive in Nebo, North Carolina, as the “Jason Crisp Forest Service Building”.

H.R. 4631. An act to reauthorize certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to autism, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4838. An act to redesignate the railroad station located at 2955 Market Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, commonly known as “30th Street Station”, as the “William H. Gray III 30th Street Station”.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested: