

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, today I missed rollcall vote No. 441 due to family commitments. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" to provide necessary relief for victims of Hurricane Harvey.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 2:15 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1415

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KATKO) at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3354, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 500 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 500

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, 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 two hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-31, modified by Rules Committee Print 115-32 and the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 or clause 5(a) of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with the colon on page 327, line 22, through "crime"

on page 328, line 2; beginning with the semicolon on page 535, line 12, through "(12 U.S.C. 3907(b)(2)).'" on page 536, line 14; and section 7080. Where points of order are waived against part of a section, points of order against a provision in another part of such section may be made only against such provision and not against the entire section.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution, and pro forma amendments described in section 4 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 20 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

SEC. 5. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment pursuant to this resolution, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 6. (a) During consideration of H.R. 3354, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment proposing both a decrease in an appropriation designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and an increase in an appropriation not so designated, or vice versa.

(b) This paragraph shall not apply to an amendment between the Houses.

SEC. 7. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of September 9, 2017, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 8. 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 re-

ported through the legislative day of September 9, 2017.

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), my good friend, 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 and reported a rule for consideration of H.R. 3354, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018, also known as the Make America Secure and Prosperous Appropriations Act of 2018. The rule provides for 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriations package in front of us is the second installment of the House's effort to pass all 12 appropriations bills on the floor for the first time since 2006. The overall package will consider the remaining eight bills, covering \$416.3 billion in total spending. It represents many months of work by the Appropriations Committee.

Today's rule covers four divisions of the bill: the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act; the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act; the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act; and the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

Together, these four divisions encompass \$168.2 billion of discretionary Federal spending. This represents a decrease of \$7.8 billion from fiscal year 2017, as Congress seeks to fulfill its obligation to the American people to be fiscally responsible stewards of the taxpayers' hard earned money.

Most importantly, it represents the next step in fulfilling the greatest responsibility we have as legislators: to fund the Federal Government and keep it open each year to provide our constituents the services they deserve while ensuring that we appropriately prioritize where and how to spend taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies division will provide approximately \$20 billion in appropriations, a decrease of \$870

million from fiscal year 2017. The division will fund critical programs for farmers and ranchers, which is of critical importance to my home State of Oklahoma.

The bill also supports conservative priorities, including language rolling back regulations that harm businesses, industries, farming and ranching operations, and rural and urban communities alike. In particular, the bill includes language allowing schools to get waivers from particularly problematic Obama administration regulations governing school lunches, and prevents the Commodities Futures Trading Commission from imposing harmful de minimis levels of trading activity that would force thousands of end users to comply with onerous regulatory requirements.

The bill also includes language changing the Food and Drug Administration's predicate date rules for premium cigars, e-cigarettes, and vaping products, thereby preventing the FDA from regulating these industries out of existence.

There is much to like in the Agriculture Appropriations division, and I look forward to considering the bill on the floor.

On the security side of the ledger, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations division provides \$44.3 billion, an increase of \$1.9 billion over fiscal year 2017. Of importance, the bill provides \$7 billion for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, an increase of \$620 million. These funds will be used to enforce immigration laws and combat illegal immigration, which our constituents have repeatedly told us they oppose.

The bill provides \$13.8 billion for Customs and Border Patrol, an increase of \$1.6 billion, to ensure the continued security of our border. It also provides \$1.6 billion for physical barrier construction on the Southern border, thus fulfilling the first step of one of President Trump's key promises. It provides \$10.5 billion for the Coast Guard and supports FEMA's disaster relief fund at \$7.3 billion.

As with the earlier security appropriations package the House passed at the end of July, the funds in this division will help ensure America's national security and go a long way towards funding key Member priorities.

The State and Foreign Operations Appropriations division provides \$47.4 billion, a decrease of \$10 billion from fiscal year 2017. Even with this decrease, the committee has funded key priorities. Security assistance is funded at \$8.8 billion, and full funding is provided for battling international organized crime, antiterrorism programs, and combating cybercrime. The bill also fully funds the \$3.1 billion Memorandum of Understanding with Israel.

The Appropriations Committee has prioritized programs of importance and de-prioritized programs that are not in the best interests of the United States, such as reducing funding for the U.N. by \$939 million, eliminating all funding

for UNESCO, and eliminating funding for the Global Climate Change Initiative.

In producing this division, the Appropriations Committee made difficult choices about the Nation's priorities, and made them well, and ensured that taxpayer dollars are going to the most important, critical, and efficient programs.

Finally, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations division provides \$56.5 billion, an increase of \$1.1 billion over fiscal year 2017. That number does not include \$45 billion also authorized to be spent by the highway trust fund for America's highways. Of note, the bill provides \$16.6 billion for the Federal Aviation Administration, an increase of \$153 million, to maintain and promote air travel and security. This sum includes \$1 billion for so-called NextGen for more efficient air traffic control, and \$162 million for the contract tower program, a crucial safety net that covers many districts across the country, including facilities like Westheimer Airport in Norman, Oklahoma, as well as towers in Lawton and Ardmore in my own home district.

It provides \$38.3 billion in net discretionary funding to Housing and Urban Development. Critically, it sustains Section 8 and Public and Native American housing programs at \$27.5 billion. It also includes increases in funding for programs benefiting vulnerable citizens, including \$573 million for housing for the elderly, an increase of \$70.6 million over fiscal year 2017, and \$47 million for housing for Persons with Disabilities, an increase of \$800,000 over fiscal year 2017.

In all, T-HUD Appropriations covers important priorities and ensures that our Nation's housing and transportation infrastructure will be adequately funded to meet our needs.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill. The package before us represents a fulfillment of our most important responsibility as Members of Congress, and provides appropriate funding in four areas: Agriculture; State and Foreign Operations, Homeland Security, and Transportation and Urban Development.

I applaud my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their months of work in making this bill a reality, and I cheer their efforts on moving forward to the completion of the fiscal year 2018 appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

□ 1430

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing but the highest respect for my colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), and I know he wants this House to run better. But the fact of the matter is, I feel bad that he has to defend this lousy, restrictive, indefensible process.

As I said last night in the Rules Committee, regular order in this House is dead. The current Republican leadership has made it very clear that they have nothing but contempt for regular order, and today's appropriations package is only another example of that fact.

Instead of considering bills one by one, and allowing thoughtful debate and Member input, Republican leaders decided to call up eight appropriation bills all at once this week, and even set amendment deadlines while Members were back in their districts for the August work period.

Last night, in the Rules Committee, Republicans blocked 229 amendments from even coming to the floor on the four bills we are talking about today alone. Those are Democratic and Republican ideas that won't be heard and won't be debated. Who knows how many more they will block on the next set of appropriation bills?

That is not the open process that we were promised by Speaker RYAN. That is not regular order, my friends.

What is even worse than this terrible process is the substance of the bills that are being brought before us. They are filled with funding cuts and poison pill riders that attack women's health, attack poor people, attack healthcare rights; repeal important financial reforms that protect our constituents and our economy; undermine the Affordable Care Act; make our land, air, and water dirtier; make our roads less safe; and undermine important civil rights protections. I could go on and on and on and on.

These bills are political documents, Mr. Speaker. They are red meat for the Republican base which, I think, is at around 15 percent of the American people the last time I checked. That is right, Mr. Speaker, the majority's ideas are so unpopular that over three-quarters of the American people disapprove of what they are doing here today. That is not coming from any liberal or leftwing source. That poll was released last week by FOX News, you know, the network that you guys always watch.

We all know we will need a continuing resolution to avert a government shutdown on October 1, so why are we wasting the House's time on this partisan exercise when we should be dealing with the CR?

And oh, yes, we need to raise the debt ceiling, pass a budget, continue to fund hurricane relief, and so much more we need to do.

Mr. Speaker, I am sick and tired of playing to the extremes. I am sick and tired of this President picking a fight with a different group of people every week, constantly trying to divide

Americans, rather than unite us for the common good.

And the latest target are the DREAMers. The DREAMers are our co-workers, our relatives, our neighbors, and our children's classmates. They have lived nearly their entire lives in America. They are part of the very fabric of our country.

The decision to end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, is a cruel betrayal of their trust in the United States. It needlessly and stupidly robs us of the enormous talents, hard work, and ingenuity of these 800,000 young people. Ending DACA is a lose-lose proposition for America and for us all.

President Trump vowed to show great heart in his decision and declared that DREAMers could rest easy. That is a lie, and that is a betrayal.

And shame on the Republican leadership of this House that has avoided making DACA a permanent program for nearly 7 years. Shame on the Republican Party for voting against the DREAM Act in 2010, even though it ultimately passed the House.

Shame on the Republicans in the Senate for blocking cloture in 2010, when it was clear that there were plenty of votes to pass the DREAM Act then. Shame on the Republican leadership of this House for not making DACA a permanent law when President Obama first initiated the program in 2012.

Shame on the House Republican leadership for failing to take up the Senate-passed comprehensive immigration bill for the past 4 years, which included DACA and a pathway to permanent residency and citizenship for the DREAMers and so many other immigrants caught in legal limbo in our country.

Shame on the Republican leadership for being such political cowards that they have failed time and time again to actually demonstrate leadership and resolve these problems.

800,000 young people, who are totally American in every way that matters, put their trust in the United States Government and in us here in this Congress, not just to protect them, but to be proud of them. They have been cruelly betrayed.

The memo issued yesterday by the Department of Homeland Security even says that they should be prepared to pack their bags and be deported to their countries of origin. But, Mr. Speaker, the simple truth is, America is their home.

It is unconscionable that the President pardoned radical racist Sheriff Arpaio, who actually is a criminal, while punishing 800,000 law-abiding, hardworking DREAMers.

I stand with the CEO of Microsoft and hundreds of other business leaders who said to the President: "To deport a DREAMer, you'll have to go through us."

I stand with the thousands of religious leaders, college and university

presidents, mayors, State attorneys general, and civic leaders who demand that we reject the President's decision and have Congress pass the DREAM Act immediately. This Congress cannot and must not continue to fail these 800,000 young people.

This morning, this House passed emergency aid for Hurricane Harvey. A DREAMer died in Houston attempting to rescue victims of the floodwaters. Another DREAMer, who is a Houston paramedic, and who worked night and day in rescue and relief efforts, just found out yesterday that his country, the only country he has ever known, has turned its back on him. Well, I refuse to turn my back.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the DREAMers need a permanent legislative fix. We can do that this very day. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative ROYBAL-ALLARD's bipartisan, bicameral bill, the DREAM Act. It is time to do what is right.

You know, earlier today, Speaker RYAN said: Well, we have time to work this out. Really?

The Speaker seems totally content to have 800,000 people continue to live with uncertainty and fear. I think that that is sad and that is cruel.

He also said: We need to develop some sort of compromise.

I don't know what he is thinking about. Maybe he is thinking about trying to add more border security money or add this stupid wall that the President keeps on talking about.

Well, here's the deal. There is nothing to compromise on. You either support the DREAMers or you don't. They are not political pawns. They are people like you and me and our kids. They deserve better from us. Stop screwing around with their lives.

Defeat the previous question. We can pass the DREAM Act today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

I want to begin by discussing process with my good friend from Massachusetts, where I think he makes some good points, but I think he fails to recognize the progress that this bill represents.

My good friend knows, because we have the privilege of working together on the Rules Committee, I have thought for many years, frankly, that we needed to get back to regular order. I remind this House the last time we actually operated under it in an appropriations process was in 2006. My friends were actually in the majority when we got rid of open rules on appropriations bills. My friends never brought all 12 appropriations bills to the floor and where they were subject to amendments by various Members.

I would agree with my friend, this is not a perfect process that we have. If I had my way, we would go back to the way we operated in 2006, before the last Democratic majority, actually bring the bills down individually and, frankly, give every Member an open shot at amendment. I think that is the appropriate way to proceed.

Again, my friends thought differently when they were in the majority and never made a move to restore regular order—quite the opposite. We have actually fought to do that. We did have a period of open rules on appropriations bills. We didn't get every bill down here, I regret to say, but we got quite a few of them down. But my friends decided they would engage in poison pill tactics.

I regret, honestly, personally, that my conference gave into that; were more worried about casting tough votes. I think you are sent here to cast tough votes.

So I will make this commitment to my friend. I will continue to work with him and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who would like to return to that process. However, I do recognize this is significant progress toward doing that.

This is the first time, since 2006, that all 12 bills, in one form or another, will reach this floor, and, frankly, every single Member has been free to offer amendments on any portion of those 12 bills that they care to. Now, not all of them were made in order by the Rules Committee, and I would hope we get past that again some day.

But, again, before my friends decry that too much, they need to remember the role they played in actually getting us out of that process.

I also would like to talk just briefly with my friend about his thoughts about DACA, and I am sure we will have a good discussion on that in the course of the day, and, honestly, I think the discussion is helpful.

But I think the President of the United States did the right thing when, number one, he recognized that he does not have the constitutional authority, something even his predecessor wondered about, to actually engage in law and put this issue back in the hands of the Congress. The Congress now has 6 months to deal with it. The Speaker has assured us that we will do that.

I think the appropriate way to proceed is to have the committee of jurisdiction actually hold hearings and move forward, but we will see which way we go. But I think there is a better chance for a long-term solution, as even my friend agrees, if we have a legislative fix to the problem. I think that will involve some give-and-take, but my hope is we will end up at a place where all parties are satisfied. But we will see. That is what the legislative process is all about.

Final point to make, Mr. Speaker, I think we need to recognize that what we are debating on here today, in terms of these four appropriations

bills, and we will have another tranche of appropriations bills down here later, is actually a process.

What we are really doing today is defining the position of the majority party as to where it stands on funding the government. I don't expect my friends to agree with that. There will be elements of these bills that they agree with without a doubt. I don't think they will oppose a lot of things that we do in regard to T-HUD, or in regard to some of these other various programs that we will deal with.

But at the end of the day—and my side needs to recognize this—we are going to end up in a negotiation with the United States Senate and the administration some time probably after the 1st of October, and that negotiation has to be bipartisan.

As my friends know, the other body requires 60 votes, and that would mean there has to be Democratic participation. And quite frankly, the appropriations bills that have moved across the floor here in fiscal year 2015, fiscal year 2016, fiscal year 2017, have all been bipartisan. They have all been the product of negotiations.

At the end of the day—and I remind my friends, in May, a majority of them actually voted in favor of the omnibus spending bill for FY 2017 in the House and in the Senate, as did, by the way, a majority of Republicans in the House and Senate, and President Trump signed it. So we know how this process ends, and we know how to make it work appropriately. This is simply another step in the process.

It is my hope that, at the end of the day, we arrive at a bicameral, bipartisan process that actually funds the government, and we are able to accomplish, in concert with one another, things that we think are important to the American people. I have a great deal of confidence we will get there because that is what we have done the last 3 years. We are actually doing it a little better this year.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my good friend from Oklahoma, who I respect a great deal, that if he wants to defend this process, he can go right ahead and do so. But I think most people watching this, the fact that two-thirds of all discretionary Federal spending is going to be decided in, like, a week's time, I don't think is a good process, and I don't think it is one that the American people have much confidence in.

I don't think it is reasonable to expect that any Member, really, has read all 1,305 pages of the eight bills that my friend is bringing to the floor, and I am not sure everybody has had time to read all the 970 amendments that were proposed—many of them that were not made in order by the Rules Committee. So this is not a process I think anybody wants to defend.

The final point I want to make with regard to the President's decision on DACA, as the gentleman knows, this Congress and the previous Congresses could have acted on this any time they wanted to. When the Democrats were in control here in the House, we did. We passed the DREAM Act. Unfortunately, many of you wouldn't support it, but it actually passed the House, and we had Republican obstructionism in the Senate.

Now, if you want a legislative fix, we have the solution for you. Vote "no" on the previous question, and we will bring up Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD's bill to pass the DREAM Act. We will get this done today. We will actually have a day of consequence where we are doing something to help people in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am going to ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question. We will then offer Representative ROYBAL-ALLARD's bipartisan, bicameral bill, H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act.

□ 1445

The legislation would help thousands of young people like the ones whose heroic stories my colleagues will highlight today and who are Americans in every way except on paper.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), the ranking member of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision to rescind DACA brings heartbreak and fear to hundreds of thousands of young DREAMers who, regardless of their immigration status, are American in every way.

The President's senseless and cruel action is upending their lives and the lives of their families, and it is sending a chilling message to our immigrant communities.

It is unbelievable that we first introduced legislation to help DREAMers in 2001. That is 16 years ago. The fight to protect DREAMers has gone on for far too long. Defeating the previous question will enable us, today, to vote on the DREAM Act of 2017, which is a bipartisan, bicameral bill that will protect our Nation's DREAMers once and for all.

The fact is this is our chance, as Members of Congress, to fulfill our responsibility on this serious issue. For those of my colleagues who say they support the DREAMers but that they believe that DACA is unconstitutional, this is your opportunity to help the

DREAMers through the legislative process.

The DREAMers did not choose to circumvent American immigration laws, and they should not be punished for something they are not responsible for. Today, my Republican colleagues can provide relief to these young people by voting to bring the DREAM Act for a vote.

Protecting DREAMers is not only a moral issue, it is also an economic issue. The President's decision to end DACA strikes a vicious blow to our economy. Forcing hundreds of thousands of young people out of the workforce will disrupt businesses across our Nation. California, alone, stands to lose \$11.6 billion annually, and the U.S. stands to lose a cumulative \$460 billion in GDP over the next decade if DREAMers are removed from our economy.

As Members of Congress, we represent the American people, and the vast majority of Americans, regardless of their political affiliation, support our Nation's DREAMers.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so we can pass the bipartisan, bicameral DREAM Act today to enable our DREAMers to continue contributing to our Nation without fear of deportation from the only country they know as home.

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

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Adam, a student at the University of California Santa Cruz majoring in mathematics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Mithi, who attends the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA and dreams of saving thousands of lives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I am reiterating my earlier announcement that all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only, and I will not yield for any other purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect Cristel, an attorney who came to this country when she was only 9 years old.

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 Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Shingai, who came to the U.S. when he was 13, graduated with a political science degree from Hawaii Pacific University, and is putting that degree into practice today.

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 gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Juan, who graduated from Arizona State University and is currently working as a mechanical engineer.

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 gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLÁN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SABLÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Riya, who grow up pledging allegiance to our flag, and who has worked for two Members of this Congress.

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 gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, in honor of DREAMer Marine Corporal Jose Angel Garibay, the first from Orange County to be killed in combat in the Iraq Desert.

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 gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect New York DREAMers like Lisette, who graduated from Harvard with honors thanks to DACA. We are here to stay—*aquí estamos y nos quedamos*.

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 gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DACA recipients like Gerardo, a computer programmer in Santa Barbara, who has grown up, gone to school, and worked in the United States for the past 13 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Fernando, who is a doctoral student at UC San Francisco thanks to DACA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect the 20,000 DREAMers in my district on the central coast of California like Adam, a student at the University of California Santa Cruz majoring in mathematics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Felipe, who works at Microsoft Bing, Skype, and at Doppler Labs, a San Francisco startup.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Eduardo, a student at UC Davis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect New Jersey DREAMers like Christian, who arrived when he was 7 years old and is a researcher at the Icahn School of Medicine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Jesus Contreras, who as a DACAmented paramedic worked 6 days straight after Hurricane Harvey. Jesus rescued people from flood waters and transported them to local hospitals. Jesus deserves our support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

As the Chair advised on previous occasions, such as 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 will become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect New York DREAMers like Jessica, who has been in this country since she was two and hopes to become a doctor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Maria, who is the coordinator of the DREAMers Resource Success Center at Cal State San Bernardino.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

BORDALLO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Christine, who arrived in my home district of the territory of Guam as a child and is now a registered nurse saving lives and caring for our community on Guam thanks to DACA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Ola, a University of Michigan pre-med student who aspires to be a surgical oncologist.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), who deserves a vote in this House, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect Ricardo, who arrived when he was 4 and is studying to be a prosecutor to help fight crime.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Juan, who obtained a master's degree from our Florida State University and works in digital advocacy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Martha, who graduated from Cal State University Channel Islands and now is on staff there supporting students.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like my former intern, Luis, who came to this country when he was 6 years old.

□ 1500

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect California's DREAMers like Luceyda, who at age 31 hasn't been home to Mexico in 27 years because this is her home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), who is the head of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect Vanessa, a DREAMer from New Mexico, who dreams of becoming a doctor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Nadia, who received a master's degree in public health from UC Davis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. GALLEGU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Vasthy, who attends Arizona State University and aspires to become a science teacher.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Alfonso, who is in his third year at Western State College of Law in Orange County.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect

Deyanira, a DACA recipient, who is in my State, who is majoring in neuroscience at the University of Texas at Austin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Elaine, who is studying for her master's in public health at UCLA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Sayra, from California, who is pursuing her MBA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect California DREAMers like Monica, a college student who has started her own business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Eduardo, a UCLA student and an anti-bullying activist.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect Pennsylvania DREAMers like Jazmin here, who aspires to become an attorney.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers

like Daniel, a first-generation college student.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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 bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect California DREAMers like Oscar, who says that DACA has allowed him to go to school, to work, and has made him feel free.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect Monica, an Illinois DREAMer with a nursing degree, who has dedicated her life to taking care of others.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect Massachusetts DREAMers like Andres, who is working as an engineering technologies consultant.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Karina from my home State of California. She currently works in the biotech industry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect Riccy, a mother of two, who was recently arrested and detained despite having DACA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R.

3440, the DREAM Act, which would protect DREAMers like Gladys. She has been able to buy a home and a car with her healthcare job.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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 respectfully request unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect Michigan DREAMers like Jonathan, who aspires one day to help the SpaceX and NASA space programs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my colleague on the Rules Committee, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, for Johana. She graduated from the University of Colorado and went on to medical school, and we need to bring this bill up for her.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect Fatima, whose young brothers—exceptional soccer talents in Montgomery County, Maryland—were deported over a great public protest just last month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect a young woman from the Midwest like Amy, who works as a user experience designer in a technology company in Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect Julia, who joined Teach For America and is a middle school teacher in San Antonio, Texas, my hometown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I know we have a new manager on the Republican side. Maybe he will yield for a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) will control the time of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOODALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I was not here for opening statements. I imagine that all time was yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we just want to bring up the DREAM Act so we can resolve this issue today, but I am hoping that the gentleman would be more favorable than his predecessor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect young people like Isabelle, a DREAMer who graduated from Baruch College in New York and now works to help low-income veterans recuperate and get better. Thanks to DACA, she was able to do this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Daniel, who arrived at the age of 2 and graduated from the University of North Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

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

I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Mariella. She is a Ph.D. student at UC Irvine. It is time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TROTT). As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect New York DREAMers like Mila, who is able to go to college, get a job, and get a driver's license thanks to DACA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Rey, a priest at the Cathedral of Christ the King in Atlanta.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Victor, who arrived when he was 7 years old and now works as an IT support analyst.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished whip, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, in order to carry out the Speaker's expressed intent, to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Jean, who studies at the University of Maryland and is a credit to that institution, a credit to our State, and a credit to our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from 18 evangelical religious leaders and other religious leaders in opposition to President Trump's decision to end DACA.

SEPTEMBER 4, 2017.

A LETTER FROM FAITH LEADERS AND EVANGELICALS FOR BIBLICAL IMMIGRATION (.COM)

President DONALD J. TRUMP,
The White House,

Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL,
Speaker of the House PAUL RYAN.

HONORABLE PRESIDENT TRUMP, MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND SPEAKER RYAN: We agree that immigration reform and DACA are difficult subjects. God loves the foreigner. Indeed, God loves us all. It takes time to discern the balance of mercy and justice by which a nation thrives.

It is easier to speak publically of mercy, as we, and many, do. And, while loving mercy, who will also stand for justice to those citizens who cannot find a job due to cheaper foreign labor? Who will speak of the real cost of illegal immigration to our states? And while many non-citizens are good neighbors, who will stand for justice for Americans victimized by people here illegally who do not uphold our values and laws? And who will prevent more needless crime and death?

The Church is called to serve all people, and our Government leaders are elected to defend and uphold the Constitution and the rule of law. Though there are tragic stories on every side of illegal migration, for our elected officials, responsibility to oaths must prevail. Law and order sustain stability and peace. A nation of wise rule grows strong enough to sustain care for the vulnerable in our midst.

While some faith groups use selective Bible words for open borders and amnesty, we consider the whole counsel of Scripture. We find that the Bible does not teach open borders, but wise welcome. We are to welcome the lawful foreigner, who, like a convert, comes as a blessing (e.g.s Ruth and Rahab) We also find Nehemiah building walls to protect citizens from harm. In Isaiah 1, we see God condemning the destruction of borders and indigenous culture.

All lives matter. The lives of North, Central and South Americans matter. The lives of Africans, Asians, Europeans and people from the Middle East matter. In Scripture, we learn that God placed us each in a family, a land, an epic story of creation, the fall and redemption. The Bible envisions a world of beautiful and unique nations, not a stateless "open society" run by global oligarchs. Each of us is called to be a blessing where God has placed us in the world.

In policy decisions ahead, while treating undocumented people kindly, we ask that you would first and foremost honor often forgotten American citizens whose families have served our nation for many generations, and the patient people who have applied lawfully to come here and to become citizens of the United States. These lives also matter. These people also dream. Gratefully Yours,

Names are listed alphabetically and for identification purposes only.

David Barton, Founder, WallBuilders;
Timothy Barton, President, WallBuilders; Paul Blair, President, Reclaiming America for Christ; Lt. Gen. William G. Boykin (Ret.), Executive Vice President, Family Research Council; Mark Christian M.D., Executive Director, Global Faith Institute; Phil Cohn, President, Christ for All Peoples; Steven Deace, CRTV host and Conservative Review contributor; Maria Espinoza, Co-founder & National Director, The Remembrance Project; Becky Gerritson, President, Wetumpka TEA Party (AL), Founder, Born Free American, LLC; E.W. Jackson, Bishop; Founder, Exodus Faith Ministries; Jerry Johnson, Ph.D, President, National Religious Broadcasters (NRB); Kelly Kullberg, American Association of Evangelicals (AAE); Eric Metaxas, Host of The Eric Metaxas Show; Samuel Rohrer, Pastor; President, American Pastors Network (APN), Former State Representative, Pennsylvania; Rick Scarborough, Ph.D, Founder, Vision America Action; Aubrey Shines, Bishop, International Communion of Evangelical Churches Pastor, Glory to Glory Ministries, Tampa, Florida; Elizabeth Yore, Esq., International Child Advocate; John Zmirak, Ph.D, Journalist; author, The Politically Incorrect Guide to Catholicism.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by 20 State attorneys general in strong opposition to what the President has done.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Sacramento, CA, July 21, 2017.

Re June 29, 2017 letter from Ken Paxton re Texas, et al., v. United States, et al., Case No. 1:14-cv-00254 (S.D. Tex.).

Hon. DONALD J. TRUMP,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We write to urge you to maintain and defend the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, or DACA, which represents a success story for the more than three-quarters of a million "Dreamers" who are currently registered for it. It has also been a boon to the communities, universities, and employers with which these Dreamers are connected, and for the American economy as a whole.

Since 2012, nearly 800,000 young immigrants who were brought to this country as children have been granted DACA after completing applications, submitting to and passing a background check, and applying for a work permit. In the case of young adults granted DACA, they are among our newest soldiers, college graduates, nurses and first responders. They are our neighbors, coworkers, students and community and church leaders. And they are boosting the economies and communities of our states every day. In fact, receiving DACA has increased recipients' hourly wages by an average of 42 percent and given them the purchasing power to buy homes, cars and other goods and services, which drives economic growth for all.

In addition to strengthening our states and country, DACA gives these bright, driven young people the peace of mind and stability to earn a college degree and to seek employment that matches their education and training. The protection afforded by DACA gives them dignity and the ability to fully pursue the American dream. For many, the United States is the only country they have ever known.

The consequences of rescinding DACA would be severe, not just for the hundreds of thousands of young people who rely on the program—and for their employers, schools, universities, and families—but for the country's economy as a whole. For example, in addition to lost tax revenue, American businesses would face billions in turnover costs, as employers would lose qualified workers whom they have trained and in whom they have invested. And as the chief law officers of our respective states, we strongly believe that DACA has made our communities safer, enabling these young people to report crimes to police without fear of deportation.

You have repeatedly expressed your support for Dreamers. Today, we join together to urge you not to capitulate to the demands Texas and nine other states set forth in their June 29, 2017, letter to Attorney General Jeff Sessions. That letter demands, under threat of litigation, that your Administration end the DACA initiative. The arguments set forth in that letter are wrong as a matter of law and policy.

There is broad consensus that the young people who qualify for DACA should not be prioritized for deportation. DACA is consistent with a long pattern of presidential exercises of prosecutorial discretion that targeted resources in a constitutional manner. Indeed, as Justice Antonin Scalia recognized in a 1999 opinion, the Executive has a long history of "engaging in a regular practice . . . of exercising [deferred action] for humanitarian reasons or simply for its own convenience." *Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 483-84 (1999). DACA sensibly guides immigration officials' exercise of their enforcement discretion and reserves limited resources to address individuals who threaten our communities, not those who contribute greatly to them.

Challenges have been brought against the original DACA program, including in the Fifth Circuit, but none have succeeded. On the other hand, in a case relating to Arizona's efforts to deny drivers' licenses to DACA recipients, the Ninth Circuit stated that it is "well settled that the [DHS] Secretary can exercise deferred action." *Ariz Dream Act Coalition v Brewer*, 855 F.3d 957, 967-968 (9th Cir. 2017). The court also observed that "several prior administrations have adopted programs, like DACA, to prioritize which noncitizens to remove." *Id.* at 976.

As the Fifth Circuit was careful to point out in its ruling in the Texas case, the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents ("DAPA") initiative that was struck down is "similar" but "not identical" to DACA. *Texas v. United States*, 809 F.3d 134, 174 (5th Cir. 2015). Indeed, as DHS Secretary Kelly pointed out in a press conference the day after his June 15 memorandum explaining that DACA would continue, DACA and DAPA are "two separate issues," appropriately noting the different populations addressed by each program. Notably, only a fraction of the 25 states which joined with Texas in the DAPA case before the Supreme Court chose to co-sign the letter threatening to challenge DACA.

Among other significant differences, DACA has been operative since 2012 while DAPA never went into effect. More than three-quarters of a million young people, and their employers, among others, have concretely benefitted from DACA, for up to five years. The interests of these young people in continuing to participate in DACA and retain the benefits that flow from DACA raise particular concerns not implicated in the pre-implementation challenge to DAPA. Further, the Fifth Circuit placed legal significance on the "economic and political magnitude" of the large number of immigrants who were affected by DAPA, *Texas*, 809 F.3d at 181; thus, it is notable that many fewer people have received DACA (about 800,000) than would have been eligible for DAPA (up to 4.3 million).

One additional, but related, issue concerns DHS's current practices regarding DACA recipients. A number of troubling incidents in recent months raise serious concerns over whether DHS agents are adhering to DACA guidelines and your repeated public assurances that DACA-eligible individuals are not targets for arrest and deportation. We urge you to ensure compliance with DACA and consistent enforcement practices towards Dreamers.

Mr. President, now is the time to affirm the commitment you made, both to the "incredible kids" who benefit from DACA and to their families and our communities, to handle this issue "with heart." You said Dreamers should "rest easy." We urge you to affirm America's values and tradition as a nation of immigrants and make clear that you will not only continue DACA, but that you will defend it. The cost of not doing so would be too high for America, the economy, and for these young people. For these reasons, we urge you to maintain and defend DACA, and we stand in support of the effort to defend DACA by all appropriate means.

Sincerely,

Xavier Becerra, California Attorney General; George Jepsen, Connecticut Attorney General; Matthew Denn, Delaware Attorney General; Karl A. Racine, District of Columbia Attorney General; Douglas S. Chin, Hawaii Attorney General; Lisa Madigan, Illinois Attorney General; Tom Miller, Iowa Attorney General; Janet T. Mills, Maine Attorney General; Brian Frosh, Maryland

Attorney General; Maura Healey, Massachusetts Attorney General; Lori Swanson, Minnesota Attorney General; Hector Balderas, New Mexico Attorney General; Eric T. Schneiderman, New York Attorney General; Josh Stein, North Carolina Attorney General; Ellen F. Rosenblum, Oregon Attorney General; Josh Shapiro, Pennsylvania Attorney General; Peter Kilmartin, Rhode Island Attorney General; TJ Donovan, Vermont Attorney General; Mark Herring, Virginia Attorney General; Bob Ferguson, Washington State Attorney General.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, how did we get here? In December of 2010, the House passed the DREAM Act right here on this floor. Almost all of the Democrats voted for it, and a handful of Republicans, too. The goal was to legalize immigrants who had grown up in the U.S., achieved education, and had no way of getting legalization status unless Congress took action.

Way back in 2001, I had introduced the first bill to legalize immigrant youth. So it took almost 10 years until it passed in the House in 2010. And later that same week, there was a vote in the Senate. Fifty-five out of 100 Senators voted for cloture on the DREAM Act to legalize the status of undocumented immigrant youth.

We know you need 60 votes in the Senate to move something forward, so the DREAM Act was blocked, even though it had a majority of the votes of the Senators because of a filibuster led by Republicans.

□ 1515

Not just any Republican led the filibuster, but the leader of the opposition to the DREAM Act was none other than the Attorney General of the United States, Jeff Sessions. So yesterday the President, unwilling to go out to the cameras and announce he was killing the DACA program himself, sent Jeff Sessions out to tell 800,000 immigrants: We don't want you here anymore.

Included in that announcement was a halfhearted sales pitch for Congress to pass legislation. But remember, when Sessions had a chance to do exactly that, he led the fight to stop it. That is hypocrisy on steroids. So President Obama finally took the only action he could take 2 years later and crafted a narrowly defined program call DACA that has never been successfully challenged in court.

DACA recipients are teachers, nurses, and one is even a Chicago policeman who straps on his gun and badge to protect people every day in my city of Chicago. During Hurricane Harvey, DREAMers with DACA were first responders and volunteers and those who gave their lives to save others, like Alonso Guillen of Lufkin, Texas.

Look, we want a clean DREAM Act, an up or down vote.

Democrats, let's be clear. This is a crisis that requires swift passage of

legislation to fix it, as big a priority as anything else we need to pass this month. Our votes are needed on the debt ceiling, Democrats, and on this bill and on the CR. What are we getting for our votes, Democrats?

When the CEO of Microsoft says that you can only take my DREAMers with DACA by coming first through me, that is a challenge to every policymaker in this Chamber and especially to my Democratic colleagues.

When will we throw down and say: No, you cannot have our votes unless you give us the DREAM Act? When, Democrats?

When will we say: You cannot have our vote unless we can bring 800,000 young lives along with us? When, Democrats?

Let's demand a vote on the DREAM Act. We can pass it right here, right now, and give our young people, the future of our Nation, the safety and security they need and deserve to contribute to the United States of America.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. It is the only country they have known. They are American in everything but a piece of paper, and we should all be ashamed of ourselves by not allowing a vote. 800,000 young people, once, twice, three times registered with the government, and what do they get? Six months. Pack your bags and leave.

They have pledged allegiance to only one flag, the United States of America and this country. This cowardly action turns its back on them. I say no CR. I say no debt ceiling. Let's have a vote first on the DREAM Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't think my colleague is confused about where he is on this issue, and I don't think any amount of talking on the floor is going to change his mind on this issue. I would say that the underlying bill, which makes in order over 140 amendments so that we can have a conversation about different ideas and different outcomes and lets the people's voice be heard, is the right way to craft legislation. With the support of this body and this bill, we will move on to that underlying debate, and we will have that voice heard.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the gentleman neglected to mention that there were 227 amendments, Democratic and Republican amendments, that were denied yesterday. The frustration that we have over here is that we are going through an exercise with these appropriations bills knowing that they are going nowhere and that we are going to have to deal with a short-term continuing resolution,

and there will probably be a big omnibus that will be passed at the end and which might not reflect any of the deliberations that we are doing on the appropriations matters in the next couple of days.

It is a little bit frustrating because we have other things to do. What we are saying is let's make this week a week of consequence, and let us bring up the DREAM Act.

President Trump did something horrible yesterday. He basically pulled the rug right from underneath 800,000 good, decent, and law-abiding people, citizens in this country, good people who are American in every way except they don't have a piece of paper. They were brought here, in many instances, when they were infants. They now have businesses, are leading relief efforts in Texas, and serve in our military. And he pulled the rug right from underneath them all. It is a cruel, awful, and nasty thing to do.

Listening to the rationale of this White House, this kind of schizophrenic tirade that we have seen unfold where 1 minute he is against the DREAMers, then he loves the DREAMers, then he is against the DREAMers, then he loves them, all of this kind of rambling that we have seen out of the White House hasn't changed the fact that he has thrown 800,000 lives in turmoil. People now have to live in fear and in uncertainty, and it is just a rotten thing to do. What we are saying is let's fix it.

My friends say they didn't like what President Obama did through executive order. We tried to legislate. We did, in 2010, pass the DREAM Act here in the House. Republicans did their best to make sure we couldn't bring it to the floor in the Senate, but we tried that way. Then President Obama, thank goodness, stepped up to the plate and put forward an executive order which has protected 800,000 people.

My friends say that they like the DREAMers and they want to help them. Well, let's help them. You guys are in charge. You can do anything you want. All we are asking for is a vote—that is it, a vote. The way we can ensure a vote is to defeat the previous question so we can bring up the DREAM Act.

If you don't have the courage to bring it up yourself, then vote to defeat the previous question and we will bring it to the floor. We will have the debate, and you can vote any way you want.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President, and to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank you for that admonition.

Mr. Speaker, these are very serious issues that my friends on the other side were trying to have a debate on the appropriations bills. My friends have a

very legitimate concern about an immigration issue, characterized with terms like "cruel" and "nasty" and "rotten" and "no courage."

I would say to my friends we can try to belittle each other into a compromise. I have not seen that work before. We can try to insult each other into a solution. I have not seen that work before.

I have seen my colleagues coming down the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, one after the other to tell a compelling story about a man or a woman they know who they believe would make an amazing United States citizen, who they believe would add value to our communities, and who they believe is serving admirably in our church and is working admirably in our community. They have a story to tell, and they should tell it.

Guess what? I have got a few of those stories to tell myself. But I would say to my friends, I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that the insults and the acrimony are going to get us where any of us wants to be.

For my friends who believe differently, I would tell you I think we have tried that path before, and it didn't take us where we want to go.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that my friend doesn't like words like "cruel" when it comes to the President's actions with regard to the DREAMers.

A man named Jesus Contreras, a Houston paramedic, helped rescue flood victims after the storm, Harvey, hit Texas. Now he faces deportation if stripped of his DACA protections. I don't know what you call that. I call it cruel. I can't imagine why anybody would want to take away this man's ability to be able to live his life in the only country he knows, a man who is saving lives.

This is just one of many stories. We are telling these stories because we are hoping that maybe it might move some of my friends on the other side of the aisle. Maybe it might move the leadership to allow us to schedule a vote and actually fix this and remove the level of uncertainty and fear that, now, 800,000 people have to deal with because of what the President did yesterday and because of the inaction, over the years, of this Congress.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3440, the DREAM Act, to protect DREAMers like Laura Flores, who are just as American as you and me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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 include in the RECORD a letter of support for revoking President Trump's threat to deny 800,000 DREAMers legal status in this country and to support his executive order affirming DACA for so many young people across this Nation—4,400 in Ohio, for example—who are following the rules, who came here as children, who are Americans as apple pie and only want a chance to succeed in our country like Linda who was brought here from Palestine when she was 8 years old. She is studying now in our area in a very difficult STEM program and is working her way through college through Work-Study in order to make a firm contribution to our Nation in the future and to the future of whatever family she establishes.

Why should they be denied this opportunity and made to feel so put upon by the Government of the United States?

AUGUST 14, 2017.

President DONALD J. TRUMP,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT TRUMP: As immigration law teachers and scholars, we write to express our position that the executive branch has legal authority to implement Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA 2012). This letter provides legal analysis about DACA 2012. In our view, there is no question that DACA 2012 is a lawful exercise of prosecutorial discretion. Our conclusions are based on years of experience in the field and a close study of the U.S. Constitution, administrative law, immigration statutes, federal regulations and case law. As the administration determines the future of DACA 2012, understanding its legal foundation and history is critical.

DACA 2012 was announced by the President, and implemented in a memorandum by the Secretary of Homeland Security, on June 15, 2012. It enables qualifying individuals to request a temporary reprieve from removal known as "deferred action." Deferred action is one form of prosecutorial discretion in immigration law and has been used for decades by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (and formerly the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS)) and over several administrations.

Whether a requesting individual receives deferred action under DACA 2012 is at the discretion of DHS. Qualifying individuals may request DACA 2012 if they came to the United States before the age of sixteen; are currently in school or have graduated; have continuously resided in the United States since June 15, 2007; have not been convicted of a felony, "significant misdemeanor," or three or more non-significant misdemeanors; do not otherwise pose a threat to public safety or national security; and otherwise warrant protection as a matter of discretion. Individuals who are granted DACA 2012 receive a two-year period in deferred action and also gain eligibility to apply for employment authorization.

The legal authority for DACA 2012 originates from the U.S. Constitution. Article II, Section Three (the Take Care Clause) states in part that the President "shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed." Inherent in the function of the "Take Care Clause" is the ability of the President to target some immigration cases for removal and to use prosecutorial discretion favorably in others. As described by the U.S. Supreme

Court: “[W]e recognize that an agency’s refusal to institute proceedings shares to some extent the characteristics of the decision of a prosecutor in the Executive Branch not to indict—a decision which has long been regarded as the special province of the Executive Branch, inasmuch as it is the Executive who is charged by the Constitution to ‘take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.’”

As early as 1976, former INS General Counsel Sam Bernsen executed a legal opinion that identified the Take Care Clause as the primary source for prosecutorial discretion in immigration matters. He wrote: “The ultimate source for the exercise of prosecutorial discretion in the Federal Government is the power of the President. Under Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution, the executive power is vested in the President. Article II, Section 3, states that the President ‘shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.’”

The U.S. Supreme Court has also recognized the role of prosecutorial discretion in the immigration system. In *Arizona v. United States*, the Court noted that “[a] principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials . . . Federal officials, as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all . . .”

Congress created the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act or INA) in 1952 and it remains the primary statutory authority for immigration law today. Importantly, Congress has delegated most discretionary immigration functions to DHS. Section 103 of the Act provides that “[t]he Secretary of Homeland Security shall be charged with the administration and enforcement of this Act and all other laws relating to the immigration and naturalization of aliens . . .”

Congress has repeatedly acknowledged that the Executive has power to grant “deferred action” for certain categories of people such as victims of crimes and human trafficking. Additionally, previous administrations have announced deferred action programs to protect qualifying individuals. For example, under the George W. Bush administration, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (part of DHS) announced a deferred action program for students affected by Hurricane Katrina and later developed a program for the widows of U.S. citizens. Moreover, Congress also recognized legal authority for immigration prosecutorial discretion in INA §242(g), which bars judicial review of three specific prosecutorial discretion decisions by the agency: to commence removal proceedings, to adjudicate cases, and to execute removal orders.

Another important legal source for deferred action is Title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Section 274a.12(c)(14) dates to 1981 and is the product of notice and comment rulemaking. This regulation specifically identifies deferred action by name and allows individuals granted deferred action to apply for work authorization upon a showing of “economic necessity.” Over the last two decades, thousands of individuals have applied for and received work authorization based on a deferred action grant.

There are also agency guidance documents related to deferred action issued by DHS (and formerly INS) over the last four-plus decades. The 1976 legal opinion by former INS General Counsel Sam Bernsen cites to the Take Care Clause of the U.S. Constitution, as well as statutory and case law from as early as 1825 to affirm the exercise of prosecutorial discretion in immigration. It was around this time when INS published its first guidance on deferred action in the form of an “Operations Instruction.” This “Operations Instruction” stated “(i) Deferred action. In every case where the district director deter-

mines that adverse action would be unconscionable because of the existence of appealing humanitarian factors, he shall recommend consideration for deferred action category.” Since 1975, deferred action has been identified in several subsequent guidance documents. Guidance documents are common in administrative law and are a recognized form of agency action under the Administrative Procedure Act.

At tension with the aforementioned body of law is a letter sent by ten state Attorneys General to the administration requesting that DACA 2012 be rescinded. This letter refers to DACA 2012 as “unlawful” and does so without citing to the foundational legal authorities behind deferred action. Furthermore, the letter conflates deferred action, “lawful presence” and work authorization in ways that are legally unsound and unclear. Finally, the letter itself shoehorns arguments into *Texas v. United States*, a lawsuit that never included the core of DACA 2012, and instead involved policies that are at this point in time moot. Moreover, a previous lawsuit challenging DACA 2012 failed on jurisdictional grounds and would inevitably inform any future challenge.

While the scope of this letter is to describe the legal foundation for DACA 2012, it is important to highlight the history and inevitability of prosecutorial discretion in immigration enforcement. Prosecutorial discretion exists because the government has limited resources and lacks the ability to enforce the law against the entire undocumented population. Recognizing this resource limitation, Congress has charged the Secretary of DHS with “establishing national immigration enforcement policies and priorities.” Prosecutorial discretion and policies like DACA 2012 also have a humanitarian dimension, and such factors have long driven deferred action decisions. Finally, DACA 2012 has been an unqualified policy success, allowing over three-quarters of a million recipients to continue their education, receive professional licensing, find employment, and pay taxes into Social Security and other tax coffers.

This letter outlines the legal foundation for DACA 2012 and confirms that maintaining such a policy falls squarely within the Executive’s discretion. The legal authority for the Executive Branch to operate DACA 2012 is crystal clear. As such, choices about its future would constitute a policy and political decision, not a legal one. As the administration decides how best to address DACA 2012, we hope that the legal foundation and history for this policy is addressed wisely and that decisions on the future of DACA 2012 are made humanely.

*All institutional affiliations are for identification purposes only and do not signify institutional endorsement of this letter.

Thank you for your attention.

Shoba Sivaprasad Wadhia Esq.*, Samuel Weiss Faculty Scholar & Clinical Professor of Law, Director, Center for Immigrants’ Rights Clinic, Penn State Law; Jill E. Family, Commonwealth Professor of Law and Government, Widener University Commonwealth Law School; Michael A. Olivas, William B. Bates Distinguished Chair in Law, University of Houston Law Center; Stephen Yale-Loehr, Professor of Immigration Law Practice, Cornell Law School; Hiroshi Motomura, Susan Westerberg Prager Professor of Law, University of California Los Angeles.

Lenni Benson, Professor of Law, Director Safe Passage Project Clinic, New York Law School; Roxana C. Bacon, Adjunct Professor, University of Miami School of Law; Renee C. Redman, Adjunct Professor of Law, University of Con-

necticut School of Law; Kristina M. Campbell, Professor of Law, UDC David A. Clarke School of Law; Caitlin Barry, Director, Farmworker Legal Aid Clinic, Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law; Jessica Anna Cabot, Clinical Teaching Fellow, University of Connecticut School of Law.

Sarah Song, Professor of Law and Political Science, U.C. Berkeley School of Law; Geoffrey Hoffman, Director, University of Houston Law Center Immigration Clinic University of Houston Law Center; Randi Mandelbaum, Distinguished Clinical Professor of Law Rutgers Law School; Stephen Legomsky, John S. Lehmann, University Professor Emeritus, Washington University School of Law; Maryellen Fullerton, Professor of Law, Brooklyn Law School; Polly J. Price, Asa Griggs Candler Professor of Law, Emory University School of Law.

Linda Bosniak, Distinguished Professor Rutgers Law School; David Baluarte, Associate Clinical Professor of Law, Washington and Lee University School of Law; Jennifer Lee, Assistant Clinical Professor of Law, Temple University Beasley School of Law; Karen Musalo, Bank of America Foundation Chair in International Law Professor & Director, Center for Gender and Refugee Status, U.C. Hastings College of the Law; Melynda Barnhart, Visiting Associate Professor, New York Law School; Janet Beck, Visiting Assistant Clinical Professor, University of Houston Law Center.

Kevin Ruser, Professor of Law, University of Nebraska College of Law; Dr. Barbara Harrell-Bond, Emerita Professor, Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford; Deborah M. Weissman, Reef C. Ivey II Distinguished Professor of Law, University of North Carolina School of Law; César Cuauhtémoc García Hernández, Associate Professor of Law, University of Denver Sturm College of Law; Miriam Marton, Assistant Clinical Professor of Law, University of Tulsa College of Law; Michael J. Wishnie, William O. Douglas Clinical Professor of Law, Yale Law School; Hiroko Kusuda, Clinic Professor, Loyola New Orleans College of Law;

David Abraham, Professor of Immigration and Citizenship Law, University of Miami School of Law; Elissa Steglich, Clinical Professor, University of Texas School of Law; Marisa Cianciarulo, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Professor of Law, Chapman University; Benjamin Casper Sanchez, Director, James H. Binger Center for New Americans, University of Minnesota Law School; Leti Volpp, Robert D. and Leslie Kay Raven Professor of Law, U.C. Berkeley School of Law; Michael J. Churgin, Raybourne Thompson Centennial Professor in Law, University of Texas at Austin.

Enid Trucios-Haynes, Professor of Law, Brandeis School of Law, University of Louisville; Christopher N. Lasch, Associate Professor, University of Denver Sturm College of Law; Rubén G. Rumbaut, Distinguished Professor, University of California, Irvine; Maureen A. Sweeney, Associate Professor, University of Maryland Carey School of Law; Alina Das, Professor of Clinical Law, New York University School of Law; Violeta R. Chapin, Clinical Professor of Law, University of Colorado Law School; Kate Griffith, Associate Professor, Cornell University

School of Industrial and Labor Relations.

Stephen Wizner, William O. Douglas Clinical Professor, Emeritus and Professorial Lecturer, Yale Law School; Peter Margulies, Professor of Law, Roger Williams University School of Law; Perna Lal, Staff Attorney and Clinical Supervisor EBCLC, a clinic of Berkeley Law, U.C. Berkeley School of Law; Theo Liebmann, Clinical Professor of Law, Hofstra Law School; Sylvia Lazos, Justice Myron Leavitt Professor, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada Las Vegas; Rachel E. Rosenbloom, Professor of Law, Northeastern University School of Law.

John A. Scanlan, Emeritus Professor of Law, Maurer School of Law, Indiana University-Bloomington; Denise Gilman, Director, Immigration Clinic University of Texas Law School; Stella Burch Elias, Professor, University of Iowa College of Law; Jennifer Moore, Professor of Law, University of New Mexico School of Law; Charles Shane Ellison, Special Assistant Professor of Law in the Immigrant and Refugee Clinic, Creighton University School of Law; Marissa Montes, Co-Director, Immigrant Justice Clinic, Loyola Law School;

Howard F. Chang, Earle Hepburn Professor of Law, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Estelle M. McKee, Clinical Professor, Cornell Law School; Laila L. Hlass, Professor of Practice, Tulane University School of Law; Stewart Chang, Associate Professor of Law and Director of the Center for International and Comparative Law, Whittier Law School; Sarah Sherman-Stokes, Associate Director of the Immigrants' Rights and Human Trafficking Program, Boston University School of Law; Sabi Ardalán, Assistant Clinical Professor, Harvard Law School.

Charles H. Kuck, Adjunct Professor, Emory Law School; Rebecca Sharpless, Clinical Professor, University of Miami School of Law; Jennifer Nagda, Lecturer, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Linda Tam, Clinical Instructor, U.C. Berkeley School of Law; Philip L. Torrey, Managing Attorney, Harvard Immigration and Refugee Clinical Program, Harvard Law School; David B. Thronson, Professor of Law and Associate Dean for Experiential Education, Michigan State University College of Law.

Veronica T. Thronson, Clinical Professor of Law, Director, Immigration Law Clinic, Michigan State University College of Law; Peter L. Markowitz, Professor of Law, Cardozo School of Law; Christina Pollard, Visiting Assistant Professor, University of Arkansas School of Law; Laura A. Hernandez, Professor of Law, Baylor Law School; Rebecca Kitson, Adjunct Professor of Law, University of New Mexico School of Law; Irene Scharf, Professor of Law, University of Massachusetts Dartmouth School of Law; Maria Woltjen, Lecturer, University of Chicago Law School.

Michelle A. McKinley, Bernard B. Kliks Professor of Law, University of Oregon School of Law; Gabriel J. Chin, Edward L. Barrtt Jr. Chair & Martin Luther King Jr. Professor of Law, U.C. Davis School of Law; Ericka Curran, Immigration Clinic Professor, Florida Coastal School of Law; Jennifer Lee Koh, Professor of Law, Western State College of Law; Anil Kalhan, Associate

Professor of Law, Drexel University Kline School of Law; Kari Hong, Assistant Professor, Boston College Law School; Holly S. Cooper, Lecturer and Co-Director of the Immigration Law Clinic, U.C. Davis School of Law.

Julia Vazquez, Directing Attorney & Lecturer of Law, Southwestern Law School; Anita Sinha, Assistant Professor of Law, American University, Washington College of Law; Victor C. Romero, Professor of Law, Penn State Law; Alan Hyde, Distinguished Professor, Rutgers Law School; Kit Johnson, Associate Professor of Law, University of North Dakota School of Law; Mary Holper, Associate Clinical Professor, Boston College Law School; Jon Weinberg, Professor of Law, Wayne State University.

Gloria Valencia-Weber, Professor Emerita, University of New Mexico School of Law; Sarah Paoletti, Practice Professor of Law and Director, Transnational Legal Clinic, University of Pennsylvania School of Law; Monika Batra Kashyap, Visiting Assistant Professor of Law, Seattle University School of Law; Margaret H. Taylor, Professor of Law, Wake Forest University School of Law; Kathleen Kim, Professor of Law, Loyola Law School Los Angeles; Susan Hazeldean, Assistant Professor, Brooklyn Law School.

Joanne Gottesman, Clinical Professor of Law and Director, Immigrant Justice Clinic, Rutgers Law School; Sabrina Rivera, Staff Attorney/Adjunct Faculty, Western State College of Law; Lynn Marcus, Professor of the Practice; Co-Director, Immigration Law Clinic, University of Arizona James E. Rogers College of Law; Raquel E. Aldana, Associate Vice Chancellor for Chancellor for Academic Diversity and Professor of Law, U.C. Davis School of Law; Andrew Moore, Associate Professor of Law, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law.

Jayesh Rathod, Professor of Law, American University, Washington College of Law; Mariela Olivares, Associate Professor of Law, Howard University School of Law; Muneer I. Ahmad, Clinical Professor of Law and Deputy Director for Experiential Education, Yale Law School; Sheila Velez Martinez, Jack and Lovell Olender Professor of Asylum, Refugee and Immigration Law, University of Pittsburgh School of Law; Richard A. Boswell, Professor of Law, U.C. Hastings College of the Law; Ediberto Roman, Professor of Law & Director of Immigration and Citizenship Initiatives, Florida International University.

Ms. KAPTUR. So with this unanimous consent request, I stand on behalf of those 4,400 Ohioans as well as 800,000 young Americans who are DREAMERS and will inject new energy and new possibility into our country, help to fund programs like Social Security which they are paying into if they are working, and make their contribution to our country's future.

It is really an honor to rise on her behalf and ask for Congress to act immediately to pass legislation to protect these young people whose economic and cultural contributions will only make our Nation stronger. They will not displace anyone—any person—who has an application currently pending before our immigration service, but

they will wait in line like everyone else because they are fair people and they deserve to be treated fairly by the Government of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the materials will be included in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article about Alonso Guillen, a DREAMER who died trying to rescue Harvey flood victims.

[From the LA Times, Sept. 4, 2017]

'DREAMER' DIES TRYING TO RESCUE HARVEY FLOOD VICTIMS

(By Molly Hennessy-Fiske)

Alonso Guillen drove more than 100 miles south from his home in Lufkin, Texas, last week, determined to help those trapped by Hurricane Harvey flooding in the Houston area.

But he and another man disappeared after their boat capsized in a flood-swollen creek Wednesday, and relatives began searching for their bodies.

On Friday, searchers found the body of Tomas Carreon, 25, of Lufkin. On Sunday, relatives spotted Guillen's body.

"He was floating in the water," his brother Jesus Guillen, 36, a Lufkin truck driver, said in Spanish during a phone interview.

Luis Ortega, 22, of Lufkin, who survived the boat accident, told searchers the men had been swept away by a powerful current. Ortega barely escaped by grabbing a floating gas tank, then a tree.

Relatives said Guillen, a Mexican national, was a "Dreamer" enrolled in the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, which President Trump is said to be poised to scrap, though he may leave it intact for six months to give Congress time to find a legislative solution. (Ortega is a U.S. citizen, as was Carreon, Guillen's brother said.)

Guillen moved to Lufkin at age 14 from just across the border in Piedras Negras, Mexico. He later graduated from Lufkin High School, attended St. Patrick's Catholic Church, worked in construction and at a local club, Rodeo Disko, and radio station, SuperMix 101.9 FM.

He was known as "DJ Ocho," who mixed country and hip-hop, followed Texans football and the Houston Astros, played softball and soccer, sported Cowboy hats and red, white and blue sunglasses.

He used the station to organize fundraisers for those in need. "It didn't matter what situation it was," said friend Linda Alvarez.

Guillen masterminded the rescue trip to the Houston area just like one of his radio station fundraisers: on the fly, with friends' help. After the storm hit, they borrowed a boat and drove south to save strangers.

Like many in Texas, Guillen's family has mixed immigration status and is divided by the border. His mother, a Mexican national, still lives in Piedras Negras, Mexico, with one of his brothers. His father is a legal resident, and his brother Jesus is a U.S. citizen.

Alonso Guillen applied for DACA, an Obama-era program that protected from deportation about 800,000 immigrants brought to the country illegally as children. He applied because so many of his family and friends were in the U.S., and that's where he saw his future, his brother said.

"His dream was to open a restaurant, something the whole family could enjoy and where they could come together," his brother said.

"He was trying; he was always updated with the news about the Dreamer program.

He was ready to get it fixed and done,” friend Manny Muniz said of Guillen’s immigration status.

Muniz, a fellow disc jockey, met Guillen a few years ago in the midst of a more minor crisis: He had booked a gig and didn’t have any speakers. Guillen lent him some, and they started working together.

After the storm struck, Guillen started posting weather reports on Facebook.

Early last week Guillen told Muniz he was headed to Houston, “to go save lives, go help people, volunteer his time.”

Muniz said part of the reason Guillen applied for DACA and wanted to become a legal resident was that he longed to be able to cross the border legally to visit Mexico, especially his hometown.

Instead, Guillen will be buried this week in Lufkin. He is survived by an 8-year-old daughter, Mariana, who lives in Guanajuato, Mexico, his brother said.

Guillen’s family is planning his funeral at St. Patrick’s Catholic Church. Guillen’s mother may not be allowed to attend. The U.S. government has not granted her permission to cross the border for the service, relatives said.

“We hope that she can come, that they allow her to come,” said Jesus Guillen’s 14-year-old daughter, Zorayda.

U.S. Customs and Border Protection tweeted condolences to Guillen’s family Monday, calling him “a rescue volunteer who died during Hurricane Harvey” and promising to allow Guillen’s mother to cross the border to attend his funeral.

Jesus Guillen said he hopes the DACA program will not be dismantled.

“It gives people like my brother opportunities to be better, to have strength and believe in themselves and become what they want to be,” he said.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a letter to Members of Congress from The United States Conference of Mayors strongly objecting to what the President did.

THE UNITED STATES

CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,

Washington, DC, September 5, 2017.

An Open Letter to the Congress on Dreamers from America’s Mayors

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE U.S. SENATE: We write on behalf of the nation’s mayors to urge you to quickly pass bipartisan legislation that would enable Dreamers—people who have lived in America since they were children and built their lives here—to earn lawful permanent residence and eventually American citizenship if they meet certain criteria. We pledge to work with you in this effort and to do whatever we can to assist you in seeing it enacted into law.

This June at the 85th Annual Meeting of The United States Conference of Mayors, we adopted strong policy supporting permanent legal status for Dreamers and extension of the DACA program. We did this because it is the right thing to do—for Dreamers, for our communities and for our country.

DACA has benefitted nearly 800,000 undocumented youth since it began in 2012. With work authorization and without the fear of deportation, these young people, who have done nothing illegal, have been able to participate in and contribute to our country, our cities and the nation’s economy:

Eighty-seven percent of DACA recipients are employed by American businesses, and six percent have started their own businesses, leading to higher wages and better economic outcomes.

DACA recipients contribute 15.3 percent of their wages to taxes, which fund Social Secu-

rity and Medicare, and DACA recipients are investing in assets like houses, and starting new businesses, bringing significant tax revenue to cities and states.

It is expected that DACA recipients will contribute \$9.9 billion in tax contributions over the next four years, and at least \$433.4 billion to our gross domestic product (GDP) over the next decade.

There is broad public support for Dreamers:

Sixty-four percent of Americans support letting “Dreamers” remain in the U.S.

Seventy-one percent of Americans feel undocumented immigrants working in the U.S. should be offered a chance to apply for legal status.

Seventy-five percent of Americans who voted for the President support Dreamers.

Because of the Trump Administration’s decision to terminate DACA in six months, this legislation must be passed as quickly as possible so that the benefits to Dreamers, to our cities, and to our nation can continue. It would remove Dreamers’ fears of deportation and allow them to contribute even more to the country they love, which for many is the only country they have known. They would be able to reach their full potential in many ways, including serving in the military. The U.S. Conference of Mayors pledges to work with you to make this happen.

Sincerely,

MITCHELL J. LANDRIEU,
Mayor of New Orleans, President.

ERIC GARCETTI,
Mayor of Los Angeles, Chair, USCM Latino Alliance.

JORGE ELORZA,
Mayor of Providence, Co-Chair, Immigration Reform Task Force.

TOM TAIT,
Mayor of Anaheim, Co-Chair, Immigration Reform Task Force.

JOHN GILES,
Mayor of Mesa, Trustee.

TOM COCHRAN,
CEO and Executive Director.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, next, I include in the RECORD an article that appeared on the National Public Radio web page, entitled, “Microsoft President to Trump: To Deport a DREAMER, You’ll Have to Go Through Us.”

[From NPR, Sept. 5, 2017]

MICROSOFT PRESIDENT TO TRUMP: TO DEPORT A DREAMER, YOU’LL HAVE TO GO THROUGH US

America’s business leaders are speaking out against President Trump’s move to end DACA.

The president of Microsoft, Brad Smith, took a notable stand. He said not only will his company lobby for a legislative solution but also that Microsoft is calling on Congress to make immigration the top priority, before tax reform. And he is calling on other business leaders to follow suit.

“There is nothing that we will be pushing on more strongly for Congress to act on,” Smith said in an interview with NPR. “We put a stake in the ground. We care about a tax reform bill. The entire business community cares about a tax reform. And yet it is very clear today a tax reform bill needs to be set aside until the DREAMERS are taken care of. They have a deadline that expires in six months. Tax reform can wait.”

Smith also said if the government moves to deport DREAMERS who are Microsoft employees, “it’s going to have to go through us to get that person.”

This is the second time in a week that Smith has spoken out. Last Thursday, Smith and Microsoft CEO Satya Nadella both issued statements calling on the administration to preserve DACA. Nadella, a first-generation immigrant from India, struck a personal note: “I am a product of two uniquely American attributes: the ingenuity of American technology reaching me where I was growing up, fueling my dreams, and the enlightened immigration policy that allowed me to pursue my dreams.”

Meanwhile, in a letter to employees this morning, Apple CEO Tim Cook said more than 250 Apple workers are affected by the DACA repeal and that he has been hearing from them all weekend.

“I want to assure you that Apple will work with members of Congress from both parties to advocate for a legislative solution that provides permanent protections for all the Dreamers in our country,” Cook said.

Dozens of CEOs including Jeff Bezos of Amazon, Reed Hastings from Netflix, Randall Stephenson from AT&T and Tim Sloan of Wells Fargo wrote a letter addressed to the president asking him to preserve the program.

The leaders argued that all DACA recipients grew up in America and give back to the community and pay income taxes. They said: “More than 97 percent are in school or in the workforce, 5 percent started their own business, 65 percent have purchased a vehicle, and 16 percent have purchased their first home. At least 72 percent of the top 25 Fortune 500 companies count DACA recipients among their employees.”

In a public post, Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg said about Trump’s announcement: “This is a sad day for our country” and that he and his immigration advocacy vehicle at Fwd.US will be “doing even more in the weeks ahead to make sure Dreamers have the protections they deserve.”

Sundar Pichai, the CEO of Google (an arm of Alphabet), did not make quite the same commitment on Twitter. But he took a moral stand, writing, “Dreamers are our neighbors, our friends and our co-workers. This is their home. Congress needs to act now to #DefendDACA. #WithDreamers.”

When President Trump was first elected, leaders in the tech industry were reluctant to criticize campaign pledges of his that went against their values and interests. They took a wait-and-see approach and grappled with how to be a successful multinational in an increasingly nationalistic world. Tuesday morning’s outpouring illustrates a clear shift in business leaders’ willingness to speak out against decisions by the administration.

Microsoft’s Smith says in the beginning of 2017, business leaders looked around and wondered how they would navigate this new unpredictable environment. They feared being attacked by the commander in chief on social media. Now, Smith says, “I don’t think people get up in the morning worrying about tweets. We have much bigger problems to worry about than that.”

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from over 500 business leaders in support of DACA who oppose what the President did yesterday and who are upset at Congress for its inaction.

OPEN LETTER FROM LEADERS OF AMERICAN
INDUSTRY ON DACA

August 31, 2017

To: President Donald J Trump

To: Speaker Paul Ryan; Leader Nancy Pelosi; Leader Mitch McConnell; and Leader Charles E. Schumer

As entrepreneurs and business leaders, we are concerned about new developments in immigration policy that threaten the future of young undocumented immigrants brought to America as children.

The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, which allows nearly 800,000 Dreamers the basic opportunity to work and study without the threat of deportation, is in jeopardy. All DACA recipients grew up in America, registered with our government, submitted to extensive background checks, and are diligently giving back to our communities and paying income taxes. More than 97 percent are in school or in the workforce, 5 percent started their own business, 65 percent have purchased a vehicle, and 16 percent have purchased their first home. At least 72 percent of the top 25 Fortune 500 companies count DACA recipients among their employees.

Unless we act now to preserve the DACA program, all 780,000 hardworking young people will lose their ability to work legally in this country, and every one of them will be at immediate risk of deportation. Our economy would lose \$460.3 billion from the national GDP and \$24.6 billion in Social Security and Medicare tax contributions. Dreamers are vital to the future of our companies and our economy. With them, we grow and create jobs. They are part of why we will continue to have a global competitive advantage.

We call on President Trump to preserve the DACA program. We call on Congress to pass the bipartisan DREAM Act or legislation that provides these young people raised in our country the permanent solution they deserve.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a statement signed by over 1,300 Catholic educators who call on President Trump and his administration to save DACA and protect the DREAMers.

[From Faith in Public Life, Ignatian Solidarity Network, and the Jesuits]

OVER 1,300 CATHOLIC EDUCATORS CALL ON
TRUMP ADMINISTRATION TO SAVE DACA AND
PROTECT DREAMERS

DEAR GEN. KELLY: As educators at Catholic institutions, we write to convey profound concern for our vulnerable immigrant students. In your new position as Chief of Staff, you are now one of the most prominent Catholics in the Administration. Your direct line to President Trump and recent experience as Secretary of Homeland Security provides an opportunity for you to be an influential champion for the children and youth who are the next generation of American leaders. We ask that you protect the dignity of our nation's immigrant youth by advocating for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program until Congress passes the Dream Act.

We stand with our students who are DACA beneficiaries. Their perseverance, hard work and hopefulness is an example to us as teachers. We witness the obstacles they overcome each day as they pursue their dream of a better life for themselves and their families. In facing adversity and uncertainty with grace and hope, they embody the best of our schools, our country and the Catholic tradition.

It is a moral and policy failure when our government targets children and young

adults who simply aspire to live the American dream. Breaking up families and communities undermines the best values of our nation.

Bishop Joe S. Vasquez, Chair of the Migration Committee at the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and Bishop of Austin, Texas, said recently in a statement.

"These young people entered the U.S. as children and know America as their only home. The dignity of every human being, particularly that of our children and youth, must be protected."

We join Bishop Vasquez in urging you to uphold the DACA program. On several occasions, you have expressed that you would not make changes to DACA. We strongly encourage you to maintain DACA as an essential program for the well-being of young people and our communities.

Please know we are praying that you use your power prudently and that we remain committed to constructive dialogue.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Massachusetts I am prepared to close when he is. I have no further speakers remaining.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I inquire how much time I have remaining, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 7½ minutes remaining.

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

First of all, with regard to the underlying bill that is being brought before the House today, a whole bunch of appropriations bills bunched together in an unprecedented way and, I would say, in an undemocratic way as well—nobody has had a chance to read these bills, over 1,300 pages—I don't think anybody in this Chamber has read them all.

Close to 1,000 amendments were submitted. They were all asked to be submitted before we came back into session while people were still on work recess. I don't think Members have had a chance to review all of the amendments. As I said, hundreds of good amendments have already been rejected.

Last night in the Rules Committee, I invoked Senator JOHN MCCAIN's name. He recently wrote a piece in which he called upon Congress to go back to regular order. I agree with him. We ought to go back to regular order. That is what the Speaker of the House promised when he took the gavel, we would have regular order. This is not regular order. This is not the way we should decide spending matters.

I will tell you right now that there will be lots of mistakes in this legislation that is being rushed through—if it even goes anywhere—because we are now being told we are going to have to do a continuing resolution, and chances are we are going to end up having to do a long-term spending bill. But process matters, and when you bunch things together and when you rush things like this, mistakes are made.

As I said in my opening, we are going to ask for people to vote "no" on the previous question. If you vote "no" on the previous question, I will offer an amendment to bring up Representative ROYBAL-ALLARD's bill, which is the DREAM Act, which would actually solve the dilemma that we face. It would solve the dilemma that 800,000 good people in this country are now facing as a result of President Trump's cruel decision yesterday to repeal DACA, to end DACA.

These are people who, as you have heard from all my colleagues as they have told their stories, are working in this country. They are leading efforts to rescue people in hurricane-ravaged Texas. They are paramedics and they serve in our military.

□ 1530

These are good people. This is their country. They were brought here as infants. This is the only country they know. The fact that we are treating these good people in such a terrible way, every one of us should be ashamed. That is not who we are. We keep on saying that every time the White House does something else that we find offensive. We keep on saying: That is not who we are; that is not who we are.

Well, at some point, we have to prove it. We have to show it.

If we believe DREAMers are a valuable part of our community, then we need to protect them. This is a way to do it today. There is no need for compromise and more discussion. It is very simple: you either support the DREAMers or you don't. That is it. That is the only question at hand. If you want to load it up with all kinds of other extraneous materials, that is not a fair thing to do. That is not what these people deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are hearing from their constituents. I know they are hearing from their churches, synagogues, and mosques that we need to protect these people. Well, let's do it. The DREAMers don't need your words. They don't need your sympathies. They don't need your empathy. They need your vote.

We have an opportunity today, by voting "no" on the previous question, to have a vote today on whether to protect the DREAMers. It is that simple. Some of my colleagues on the Republican side have spoken very eloquently about the DREAMers. If you mean it, then give us your vote. If you mean it, do less talking and give us the vote. That is what we are asking for today.

Vote "no" on the previous question. Let us help these great people. Let us help these people who have been such a valuable part of our community. Let us treat them with the dignity and respect that they deserve. Let us recognize that they view this country as their home. We should view this country as their home as well.

Vote "no" on the previous question. If that doesn't work, then vote "no" on this lousy rule.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

Mr. Speaker, I fear you are going to have to use that admonition a great deal in the coming days, and I regret that.

I regret that folks have begun to confuse civility with weakness. My experience is, when you are strong, you don't have to insult the people around you. When you are strong, you don't have to call folks around you names. Civility and weakness are confused. In fact, more often than not, there is a loss of civility when folks feel at their weakest.

My friends on the other side of the aisle right now, Mr. Speaker, with good reason, feel very restricted. Being in the minority in the House of Representatives is a hard place to be. For my friend from Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, being in the minority on the Rules Committee is among one of the hardest places to be. So I don't fault him for his frustration one little bit. If I was in his shoes, I would be frustrated as well.

Let me be clear: we are in this position with DACA today for one reason and one reason only, and that is because instead of leading the Congress and leading the Nation, President Obama chose to act alone in a way that he knew would not be permanent.

The instability that you see today is the result of folks acting in a way that was not stable. The confusion that you see today is the result of an administration that committed itself to that confusion instead of committing itself to consensus.

I have been in this Congress for 7 years, Mr. Speaker. That is 7 years. For 4 of those 7 years, the United States Senate was led by the Democratic Party. Not once in those 7 years has an immigration bill come to my desk from the United States. Not once. I know, as we sit here right now, the House Judiciary Committee has acted on immigration bill after immigration bill after immigration bill.

Let's be clear, Mr. Speaker: the situation that the DREAMers find themselves in today is the symptom of a Nation that does not have the security of its borders. Had America had security for its borders, we would not have allowed these families to put their children in these positions.

Today, we have an amazing opportunity to have this debate. I tell you that our President is in a unique position to lead us.

It frustrates me so much, Mr. Speaker, that folks want to assume the worst about one another and that the media is all too anxious to report the worst about one another. The President could have just canceled the DACA program. He could have instructed DHS to start

proceedings today. He didn't. It wouldn't have been the right thing. It wouldn't have been the prudent thing to do. He didn't do it.

What did he do?

He said: I have read this thing called the United States Constitution. It turns out that only one group in the land has the opportunity to write the laws. It is me and my friend from Massachusetts. It is the majority leader from Kentucky and the minority leader from New York across the way.

He said: Congress, there is only one way this should have even been done. It should have been done in the Halls of Congress. That is not the way President Obama chose to do it. He should have done better. He didn't. We can do better. Let's do.

Now, to the sky-is-falling reports that came out one right after the other almost with glee from the fourth estate, the President spoke again to say: Listen, you know what? If Congress doesn't get it right, I may have to act myself.

I hope he doesn't. I think that folks have too little confidence in what we can do together when we set our minds to it, but we do have to ask ourselves, watching the display here on the floor today, watching the displays we have had here on the floor in the past: Do we have a serious group of men and women here who want to work together on solutions? Or do we have a group of men and women here who want to just get the next headline, who want to just send out that next tweet, who just want to just make that next front page story of hysteria?

I believe the former is true. I know the men and women on this floor, Mr. Speaker, not the caricature of the men and women that you read in the newspaper, but the real men and women on this floor, who each come here every single day to diligently serve the almost 700,000 men and women that they report to back home. And I am proud to do it.

I plea, Mr. Speaker, for you to use your leadership to not allow us to devolve into the name calling and the acrimony that the fourth estate would like to suggest characterizes this Chamber, but to lead us to the sincere debate of caring about people, caring about the rule of law, caring about families.

Let me just say, the best part of this job is the casework that each one of us does back home. You all know it. People think the job happens in Washington, D.C. It doesn't. It happens one family at a time back home.

You have heard the comments on the floor of the House today, Mr. Speaker. I have families in my district separated from one another. You want to talk about uniting families? I have families separated from one another standing in line to come to this country legally.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker: How many folks have you heard standing up for my constituents whose families have been separated because they have been

standing in line to get here for more than a year? How many folks have stood up for them? Not one.

What about those families standing in line 2 years, Mr. Speaker? I have got them in my district, too.

What about those families who have been separated for 3 years and standing in line trying to get to America the right way? Who is standing up for them? I don't hear those calls on the floor of the House. I have got them in my district, too.

What about 4 years, Mr. Speaker; 5 years, Mr. Speaker; 6 years, Mr. Speaker? If you wanted to bring your adult child in from Mexico, you had to file in the 1990s for their number to be coming up today. That is crazy. It is crazy.

Where is the conversation about reforming the system that got us here to begin with? I applaud my friend for trying to solve the symptom. I beg my friend to work with me to cure the disease.

We have a President who can lead us in that direction, Mr. Speaker. He has the credibility of being tough on borders and he has the heart of someone who wants to keep families united. We have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker. We can take it or we can reject it. I believe we are going to take it.

But that is not for the business today. The business today is an appropriations process. My friend from Massachusetts called it unprecedented. He is right. I take no small amount of pleasure in talking about how right he is. I have been in this body for 7 years and we don't generally get the appropriations bills done before the end of the year, Mr. Speaker. Deadlines don't tend to mean anything to us. We are about to make that happen.

Mr. Speaker, 1997 was the last time Congress funded the government ahead of schedule, before the deadline. It has taken a continuing resolution every other year since 1997. We have an opportunity this year to do it. I don't know if we will take it or not. I hope that we will.

We can't solve everything every day, but we can solve something every day. We can make something better for someone every day.

If you support this rule, we will bring to the floor four appropriations bills and 119 amendments, give or take. We are up in the Rules Committee right now making even more amendments in order, Mr. Speaker, to have even more voices be heard, to have even more opportunity to make a difference for the families that we all represent back home.

Support this rule. Be proud of this rule. Be proud of the work the Appropriations Committee did. Mr. Speaker, you don't hear it on the floor of the House, but it so frustrates me. If you had been in the Rules Committee last night, you would have seen Democrats and Republicans sitting side by side talking about the amazing work they did together on the appropriations

process in the Appropriations Committee, talking about the great admiration and respect that they had for one another because of the work they do together on the Appropriations Committee.

We don't hear that here on the floor of the House, and we should. We should hear more of that. We should hear more about the good work we are doing together. If we support this rule, Mr. Speaker, we will get a chance not to hear about it, but to experience it, to do it.

I know my colleague from Massachusetts and I have another 6, 7, 8 hours of Rules Committee work to do together tonight. I know my colleague is going to challenge us to do even better than what we are doing. I am prepared to accept that challenge.

But for today, Mr. Speaker, for this moment, I urge my colleagues to come to this floor; support this rule; move the appropriations process forward; finish the appropriations process before the September 30 deadline; and serve your constituents back home, like I know every man and woman in this Chamber does.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule and support for the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 500 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 9. 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 (HR. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 10. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not

merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "A refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 187, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

YEAS—233

Abraham	Gowdy	Olson
Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Allen	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Amash	Graves (MO)	Paulsen
Amodei	Griffith	Pearce
Arrington	Grothman	Perry
Babin	Guthrie	Pittenger
Bacon	Handel	Poe (TX)
Banks (IN)	Harper	Poliquin
Barletta	Harris	Posey
Barr	Hartzler	Ratcliffe
Barton	Hensarling	Reed
Bergman	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Biggs	Hice, Jody B.	Renacci
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Rice (SC)
Bishop (MI)	Hill	Roby
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Roe (TN)
Black	Hollingsworth	Rogers (AL)
Blackburn	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Blum	Huizenga	Rohrabacher
Bost	Hultgren	Rokita
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rooney, Francis
Brat	Hurd	Rooney, Thomas
Brooks (AL)	Issa	J.
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)	Roskam
Buck	Johnson (LA)	Rothfus
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Rouzer
Budd	Johnson, Sam	Royce (CA)
Burgess	Jones	Russell
Byrne	Jordan	Rutherford
Calvert	Joyce (OH)	Sanford
Carter (GA)	Katko	Schweikert
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Cheney	King (IA)	Sessions
Coffman	King (NY)	Shimkus
Cole	Kinzinger	Shuster
Collins (GA)	Knight	Simpson
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (MO)
Comer	Labrador	Smith (NE)
Comstock	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	LaMalfa	Smith (TX)
Cook	Lamborn	Smucker
Costello (PA)	Lance	Stefanik
Crawford	Latta	Stewart
Culberson	Lewis (MN)	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	Taylor
Davidson	Long	Tenney
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Denham	Love	Thornberry
Dent	Lucas	Tiberi
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Tipton
DesJarlais	MacArthur	Trott
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Turner
Donovan	Marino	Upton
Duffy	Marshall	Valadao
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Wagner
Duncan (TN)	Mast	Walberg
Dunn	McCarthy	Walden
Emmer	McCaul	Walker
Estes (KS)	McClintock	Walorski
Farenthold	McHenry	Walters, Mimi
Faso	McKinley	Weber (TX)
Ferguson	McMorris	Webster (FL)
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	McSally	Westerman
Flores	Meadows	Williams
Fortenberry	Meehan	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Messer	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Mitchell	Womack
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Gaetz	Mullin	Yoder
Gallagher	Murphy (PA)	Yoho
Gianforte	Newhouse	Young (AK)
Gibbs	Noem	Young (IA)
Gohmert	Norman	Zeldin
Goodlatte	Nunes	
Gosar		

NAYS—187

Adams Gallego Nolan
 Aguilar Garamendi Norcross
 Barragán Gomez O'Halleran
 Bass Gonzalez (TX) O'Rourke
 Beatty Gottheimer Pallone
 Bera Green, Al Panetta
 Beyer Green, Gene Pascarell
 Bishop (GA) Grijalva Payne
 Blumenauer Gutiérrez Pelosi
 Blunt Rochester Hanabusa Perlmutter
 Bonamici Hastings Peters
 Boyle, Brendan Heck Peterson
 F. Himes Pingree
 Brady (PA) Hoyer Pocan
 Brown (MD) Huffman Polis
 Brownley (CA) Jayapal Price (NC)
 Bustos Jeffries Quigley
 Butterfield Johnson (GA) Raskin
 Capuano Johnson, E. B. Rice (NY)
 Carbajal Kaptur Richmond
 Cardenas Keating Rosen
 Carson (IN) Kelly (IL) Roybal-Allard
 Cartwright Kennedy Ruiz
 Castor (FL) Khanna Ruppersberger
 Castro (TX) Kihuen Rush
 Chu, Judy Kildee Ryan (OH)
 Cicilline Kilmer Sánchez
 Clark (MA) Kind Sarbanes
 Clarke (NY) Krishnamoorthi Schakowsky
 Clay Kuster (NH) Schiff
 Cleaver Langevin Schneider
 Clyburn Larsen (WA) Schrader
 Cohen Larson (CT) Scott (VA)
 Connolly Lawrence Scott, David
 Conyers Lawson (FL) Serrano
 Cooper Lee Sewell (AL)
 Correa Levin Shea-Porter
 Courtney Lewis (GA) Sherman
 Crist Lieu, Ted Sinema
 Crowley Lipinski Sires
 Cuellar Loeb sack Slaughter
 Davis (CA) Lofgren Smith (WA)
 Davis, Danny Lowenthal Soto
 DeFazio Lowey Speier
 Delaney Lujan Grisham, M. Swalwell (CA)
 DeLauro M. Takano
 DelBene Luján, Ben Ray Thompson (CA)
 Demings Lynch Thompson (MS)
 DeSaulnier Maloney, Carolyn B. Titus
 Deutch Maloney, Sean Tonko
 Dingell Matsui Torres
 Doggett McCollum Tsongas
 Doyle, Michael McEachin Vargas
 F. McEachin Veasey
 Ellison McGovern Vela
 Engel McNeerney Velázquez
 Eshoo Meeks Visclosky
 Espallat Meng Walz
 Esty (CT) Moore Waters, Maxine
 Evans Moulton Watson Coleman
 Foster Murphy (FL) Welch
 Frankel (FL) Nadler Wilson (FL)
 Fudge Napolitano Yarmuth
 Gabbard Neal

NOT VOTING—13

Bridenstine Garrett
 Costa Granger
 Cramer Higgins (NY)
 Cummings Jackson Lee
 DeGette Ross

□ 1608

Messrs. MCEACHIN, SCHNEIDER, and POLIS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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 230, noes 191, not voting 12, as follows:

Roll No. 443

AYES—230

Abraham Gowdy Olson
 Aderholt Granger Palazzo
 Allen Graves (GA) Palmer
 Amodei Graves (LA) Paulsen
 Arrington Graves (MO) Pearce
 Babin Griffith Perry
 Bacon Grothman Pittenger
 Banks (IN) Guthrie Poe (TX)
 Barletta Handel Poliquin
 Barr Harper Posey
 Barton Harris Ratcliffe
 Bergman Hartzler Reed
 Biggs Hensarling Reichert
 Bilirakis Herrera Beutler Renacci
 Bishop (MI) Hice, Jody B. Rice (SC)
 Bishop (UT) Higgins (LA) Roby
 Black Hill Roe (TN)
 Blackburn Holding Rogers (AL)
 Blum Hollingsworth Rogers (KY)
 Bost Hudson Rohrabacher
 Brady (TX) Huizenga Rokita
 Brat Hultgren Rooney, Francis
 Brooks (AL) Hunter Rooney, Thomas
 Brooks (IN) Hurd J.
 Buchanan Issa Roskam
 Buck Jenkins (KS) Rothfus
 Bucshon Jenkins (WV) Rouzer
 Budd Johnson (LA) Royce (CA)
 Burgess Johnson (OH) Russell
 Byrne Johnson, Sam Rutherford
 Calvert Jordan Sanford
 Carter (GA) Joyce (OH) Schweikert
 Carter (TX) Katko Scott, Austin
 Chabot Kelly (MS) Sensenbrenner
 Cheney Kelly (PA) Sessions
 Coffman King (IA) Shimkus
 Cole King (NY) Shuster
 Collins (GA) Kinzinger Simpson
 Collins (NY) Knight Smith (MO)
 Comer Kustoff (TN) Smith (NE)
 Comstock Labrador Smith (NJ)
 Conaway LaHood Smith (TX)
 Cook LaMalfa Smucker
 Costello (PA) Lamborn Stefanik
 Crawford Lance Stewart
 Culberson Latta
 Curbelo (FL) Lewis (MN)
 Davidson LoBiondo
 Davis, Rodney Long
 Denham Loudermilk
 Dent Love
 DeSantis Lucas
 DesJarlais Luetkemeyer
 Diaz-Balart MacArthur
 Donovan Marchant
 Duffy Marino
 Duncan (SC) Marshall
 Duncan (TN) Mast
 Dunn McCarthy
 Emmer McCaul
 Estes (KS) McClintock
 Farenthold McHenry
 Faso McKinley
 Ferguson McMorris
 Fitzpatrick Rodgers
 Fleischmann McSally
 Flores Meadows
 Fortenberry Meehan
 Foxx Messer
 Franks (AZ) Mitchell
 Frelinghuysen Moolenaar
 Gaetz Mooney (WV)
 Gallagher Mullin
 Gianforte Murphy (PA)
 Gibbs Newhouse
 Gohmert Noem
 Goodlatte Norman
 Gosar Nunes

NOES—191

Adams Brownley (CA) Clyburn
 Aguilar Cohen
 Amash Butterfield Connolly
 Barragán Capuano Conyers
 Bass Carbajal Cooper
 Beatty Cardenas Correa
 Bera Carson (IN) Courtney
 Beyer Cartwright Crist
 Bishop (GA) Castor (FL) Crowley
 Blumenauer Castro (TX) Cuellar
 Blunt Rochester Chu, Judy Davis (CA)
 Bonamici Cicilline Davis, Danny
 Boyle, Brendan Clark (MA) DeFazio
 F. Clarke (NY) Delaney
 Brady (PA) Clay DelLauro
 Brown (MD) Cleaver DelBene

Demings Langevin Polis
 DeSaulnier Larsen (WA) Price (NC)
 Deutch Larson (CT) Quigley
 Dingell Lawrence Raskin
 Doggett Lawson (FL) Rice (NY)
 Doyle, Michael Lee Richmond
 F. Levin Rosen
 Ellison Lewis (GA) Roybal-Allard
 Engel Lieu, Ted Ruiz
 Eshoo Lipinski Ruppersberger
 Espallat Loeb sack Rush
 Esty (CT) Lofgren Ryan (OH)
 Evans Lowenthal Sánchez
 Foster Lowey Sarbanes
 Frankel (FL) Lujan Grisham, M. Schakowsky
 Fudge M. Schiff
 Gabbard Luján, Ben Ray Schneider
 Gallego Lynch Schrader
 Garamendi Maloney, Carolyn B. Scott (VA)
 Gomez Carolyn B. Scott, David
 Gonzalez (TX) Maloney, Sean Serrano
 Gottheimer Massie Sewell (AL)
 Green, Al Matsui Shea-Porter
 Green, Gene McCollum Sherman
 Grijalva McEachin Sinema
 Gutiérrez McGovern Sires
 Hanabusa McNeerney Slaughter
 Hastings Meeks Smith (WA)
 Heck Meng Soto
 Himes Moore Speier
 Hoyer Moulton Swalwell (CA)
 Huffman Murphy (FL) Takano
 Jackson Lee Nadler Thompson (CA)
 Jayapal Napolitano Thompson (MS)
 Jeffries Neal Titus
 Johnson (GA) Nolan Tonko
 Johnson, E. B. Norcross Torres
 Jones O'Halleran Tsongas
 Kaptur O'Rourke Vargas
 Keating Pallone Veasey
 Kelly (IL) Panetta
 Kennedy Pascarell Velázquez
 Khanna Payne Visclosky
 Kihuen Pelosi Walz
 Kildee Perlmutter Waters, Maxine
 Kilmer Peters Watson Coleman
 Kind Peterson Welch
 Krishnamoorthi Pingree Wilson (FL)
 Kuster (NH) Pocan Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Bridenstine Garrett Suozzi
 Costa Higgins (NY) Wasserman
 Cramer Ros-Lehtinen Schultz
 Cummings Ross
 DeGette Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1616

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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 182, answered “present” 2, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 444]

YEAS—230

Abraham Bacon Biggs
 Adams Banks (IN) Bilirakis
 Aderholt Barletta Bishop (GA)
 Allen Barr Bishop (UT)
 Amodei Barton Black
 Arrington Bergman Blumenauer