

this has happened are complicit in this policy.

Now, today, we will take up two pieces of legislation, neither of which deal substantially with the immigration problem.

My God in Heaven, let's get this done.

ENDING ALZHEIMER'S

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, on the summer solstice, Alzheimer's disease advocates do what they love: From sunrise to sunset, they hike, they bike, they sing, and they run in order to raise funds and awareness about the indiscriminate and crippling disease. They do so on the longest day to symbolize the challenges the 5.7 million Americans living with this deadly disease face from sunrise to sunset.

Alzheimer's is the sixth leading cause of death. It kills more than breast cancer and prostate cancer combined.

We have an obligation to do everything we can to understand this disease so that we can cure it, which is why we and I work to increase funding at the National Institutes of Health. One breakthrough there can save millions of lives over generations and can find cures for this disease, which as many as 16 million Americans could live with by 2050.

Every day, from sunrise to sunset, I am proud to stand with all those fighting this deadly disease and all those who are fighting with them.

Mr. Speaker, together, we will end Alzheimer's.

IMMIGRATION

(Ms. BARRAGÁN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Trump signed an executive order, an order that he said was to stop separation of families at the border. This is a policy that he caused, and he has now taken a victory lap. It is ridiculous.

My response: To stop family separation once and for all, President Trump must end his failed zero-tolerance policy. Replacing family separation with indefinite family detention is not the solution. We cannot continue to overwhelm our immigration system and incarcerate families who pose no threat to the United States to please immigration hardliners.

HOMELAND SECURITY SECRETARY NIELSEN

(Mr. TED LIEU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, Homeland Security Secretary

Nielsen brazenly told the American people that there was no policy of family separation. Then she reversed and said there was a policy, but she is not going to apologize for defending it. Then she reversed again and said it is actually not a policy, that only Congress can change the laws on it.

Yesterday, the executive order by Donald Trump puts her statements very clearly in the spotlight as all lies. Her credibility has been shredded. She needs to resign.

By the way, there are 2,300 babies and children still separated from their mothers and fathers. That is evil. That is sinful. We need to know where those children are and how we are going to reunite them.

Mr. Speaker, 20 days ago, I led a letter to Secretary Nielsen, along with other Members of Congress, asking very basic questions:

How do you make sure that some of those kids are not put with child molesters?

How do you make sure we reunite those kids with their parents?

She still has been unable to answer those questions. She needs to go. She needs to resign. She is a national embarrassment, and she is executing an evil policy.

□ 1015

MONDELEZ INTERNATIONAL

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in solidarity with the workers who have paid in for years to have retirement security only to have the rug pulled out from under them. Mondelez International, the maker of iconic Nabisco products, like Oreo cookies, has, in recent years, moved hundreds of good-paying middle class jobs to Mexico. Now they have doubled down on shafting their U.S. employees.

On May 23, Mondelez-Nabisco announced it would withdraw from their employees' pension plan. How nice. They have participated in this plan for 60 years. This decision jeopardizes the hard-earned retirement security of 110,000 current and future retirees.

This decision comes at the same time that this corporation, Mondelez, paid its new CEO, Dirk Van de Put, \$42.4 million for 41 days of work in 2017.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention Mondelez reaped millions of dollars in tax breaks as a result of the passage of the recent Trump tax cuts.

Since 2014, Mondelez has increasingly shifted production from the U.S. to Mexico and taken major jobs with it.

On December 15, I wrote a letter to the United States Trade Representative asking them, in the context of NAFTA, to prioritize strong, enforceable labor provisions to discourage this kind of outsourcing to Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, this is an epidemic.

COMMUNICATION FROM COMMUNITY LIAISON, THE HONORABLE ANDY HARRIS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from John Wingrove, Community Liaison, the Honorable ANDY HARRIS, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the Circuit Court for Queen Anne's County, Maryland.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JOHN WINGROVE,
Community Liaison.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 21, 2018.

HON. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 21, 2018, at 9:31 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 770.

Appointment:
United States Commission on International Religious Freedom.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 18 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1030

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4760, SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE ACT OF 2018

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 954 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 954

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4760) to amend the immigration laws and the homeland security laws, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), 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. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 954 provides for the consideration of a bill aimed at curbing the flow of illegal immigration across our southern border by combining a strong border wall and security measures with targeted modifications to the current immigration visa process.

The rule provides for one hour of debate on H.R. 4760, the Securing America's Future Act of 2018, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes controlled by the Committee on Homeland Security.

The rule provides for the adoption of the Goodlatte amendment reflecting a number of provisions, which were negotiated with numerous parties since the bill was first introduced in January of this year. This amendment will be incorporated into H.R. 4760 upon adoption of the rule today.

It also includes the McCaul amendment, which makes technical corrections to the underlying bill.

Further, the rule provides the minority with one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The laws and legal agreement currently governing our enforcement ef-

forts along the southern border are between 20 and 60 years old. America is a Nation built and continually supported by immigrants. However, the world has changed and how we accept new immigrants may adapt as well.

H.R. 4760 begins the process of reforming our immigration system for the first time in decades, and I encourage the passage of the rule to consider this important bill.

The Securing America's Future Act refocuses legal immigration for the skills that our country needs. It also secures our border, strengthens interior enforcement, and makes changes to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. The diversity visa lottery program, which awards 50,000 green cards to a randomly selected pool of applicants, is eliminated, along with visas for relatives except for spouses and minor children. Overall, immigration levels are decreased, while visas for skilled workers are increased and the agricultural guest worker program is reformed to better meet the needs of our farmers and food processors.

Construction of a border wall system is authorized, including the use of additional cameras, sensors, and aviation assets. Recently, President Trump approved the use of the National Guard along the border, increasing capacity by over 1,100 personnel and 14 aircraft. This bill would also authorize the use of the National Guard aviation and intelligence support. It requires full implementation of the biometric entry-exit system at all ports of entry and provides for 10,000 border patrol agents and officers.

To strengthen interior enforcement, the bill mandates E-Verify so that all employers check the immigration status of their employees. It combats sanctuary city policies by withholding law enforcement grants and allows the Department of Homeland Security to detain dangerous, illegal immigrants who cannot be immediately removed from the country.

Many illegal immigrants without legal status claim asylum when apprehended by border agents. While there are legitimate claims of fear of persecution, there are also instances of immigrants being coached to say the correct phrase to obtain asylum. To combat this fraud, the bill increases the credible fear standard. It also makes being a gang member a removable offense and qualifies illegal presence as a Federal misdemeanor.

In 2015, Kate Steinle was killed by an immigrant without status while walking with her father in San Francisco. The man responsible for her death had been deported multiple times and should never have been in the country on that day.

Constituents of the 26th District of Texas experienced a similar tragedy in 2013 when a young girl in a crosswalk was struck and killed by someone in the country without legal status.

While the recent enforcement policies along our southern border have led

to a temporary separation of parents and children, a father and a grandmother in the 26th District of Texas will never be reunited with their daughter and granddaughter.

Kate's Law enhances criminal penalties for multiple illegal reentry to help prevent future tragedies. Inclusion of this provision will reduce the possibility of the tragic killing of American citizens.

Finally, the bill provides for a 3-year renewable legal status for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival recipients that allows them to work and travel overseas. This will apply to approximately 700,000 individuals who are currently in the United States. While it was not the fault of these then-children that they entered the country without legal documentation, the fact of the matter is that they are here now and we need a solution.

While I do not support an expedited path to citizenship, I do support allowing them to get in line and apply just like any other law-abiding potential immigrant. The bill does not allow for a special path to citizenship. However, it does allow the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival recipient to obtain a green card and apply for citizenship like any other law-abiding applicant.

Recently, we have heard a lot about the enforcement policies along the southern border. Mr. Speaker, this crisis is not new. In 2014, the number of unaccompanied alien children increased exponentially and reached crisis levels. It remained steadily above 400,000 apprehensions from 2013 until the present.

During a visit by the Honduran First Lady in 2014, she was asked if Honduras wanted their children back, and without hesitation, she responded that they did. So a planeload of women and children was sent back to Honduras that resulted in an immediate reduction in the attempted crossings of unaccompanied alien children. However, because there was no follow-on enforcement actions, the numbers again began to increase, reaching above 563,000 in 2016.

In the lead-up to the 2010 election, the numbers increased, because then-candidate Trump spoke about securing our border with a wall that would finally end the possibility of illegal entry along our southern border. When candidate Trump became President-elect Trump, this number dramatically decreased because potential immigrants believed that construction of the border wall was imminent.

As a Member of Congress representing a border State, I have maintained regular contact with Customs and Border Protection and the Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials. What we heard during this period, 2016, was that immigrants crossing the border illegally wanted to get into the country before the possibility of a Trump election occurred and could direct construction of the border wall. They were under the impression that if

you crossed our border, at a point of entry or illegally, you would be granted amnesty and welcomed into the country. While we do welcome legal immigrants, this perception led to only more vulnerable children being entrusted by parents to human traffickers, typically for large sums of money, to bring their children to the United States.

On this journey, children could experience harsh conditions. Some were abused physically, sexually, and emotionally. And this abuse is not a threat just from the adults that are supposed to care for them, but also it can occur from their fellow travelers. A lot of these kids are just trying to survive, trying to make it to a life where they may one day thrive, but this existence is often all they have known, and they react in a way that reflects this reality.

While there is a concern about children arriving with parents who are then prosecuted for illegal entry and subsequently placed in the custody of the Health and Human Services Office of Refugee Resettlement, numerous children never get to make this journey with their parents or even relatives. Many adults are now bringing nonrelated children with them in an attempt to be released into the United States because of their association with a child that cannot, because of the Flores Agreement from 1997, be held in custody.

When the influx of unaccompanied alien children began exceeding the capacity of the Office of Refugee Resettlement, I traveled to the border area specifically to visit these facilities. I engaged with the Office of Refugee Resettlement to fully understand the care that these children were receiving in 2014, 2015, and 2016. The Office of Refugee Resettlement responded to my concerns about threats of communicable diseases from foreign countries being brought to our homeland. Mr. Speaker, there was not even a physician employed in the Office of Refugee Resettlement in 2014 before I raised this issue.

The issue became a concern because there were members of Customs and Border Control that actually felt that they were perhaps developing a condition as a result of contact with people because of a skin parasite that was easily communicated. And the question arose, could other diseases be communicated as well? And people were rightfully concerned about that. It is not just an illness like scabies; it is an issue like multiple-drug-resistant tuberculosis that people were most concerned about.

While treatment in facilities has vastly improved in the last couple of years, the path by which immigrants come here is still dangerous. On one of my visits near the border at McAllen, Texas, I traveled with border patrol agents along a cactus-strewn, dusty road, mesquite bushes growing in from the sides. They brought a bus down

there, a big bus. They stopped, they flashed their lights, they honked their horn, and the bus filled up with people. The bus went off to town, bouncing across this dusty road, and I remained back with the Customs and Border Patrol.

Then a State agent came up, someone from Fish and Wildlife, and said: I need help. I have got people over here that I think belong in your jurisdiction because you are the Federal Government.

And Customs and Border Patrol went over to the area that he had pointed out, and here were a number of women, small children, and teenage boys. They had come across the river, delivered by traffickers, just literally on the other side of the river, and dropped there. They had no idea what was the direction to town. They were not equipped to travel in the harsh conditions. It was probably 110 degrees outside that day. Small children, children, babes in arms, probably 1 year of age or less: this is what the traffickers left on the side of the river.

Had the Fish and Wildlife Service not come by and the U.S. Customs and Border Patrol not come by, I don't know how these people would have made it to town. And it is quite possible they would not have made it safely.

So the situation along the southern border is not just a border crisis, it is also an immigration crisis. Attorney General Sessions announced a zero-tolerance policy to finally and fully enforce our laws. I believe he did this so that Americans and immigrants alike would recognize and remember that we are a Nation of laws, and also to demonstrate that the dangerous journey to our southern border is sometimes not worth the risk and the struggle required to make it within just a few miles of a fence.

The ebb and flow of border crossings has consistently reflected the rhetoric of American leadership and perception of enforcement of our laws. The rate of border crossings rapidly increased in the last year because there has been no significant visible action by the Congress to President Trump's request for a border wall. However, this is not the only factor.

It is no secret that countries in what are called the northern triangle, Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador, are some of the most dangerous countries in the world. Yet, these countries receive millions of dollars of aid each year for economic development, for military financing, and security initiatives.

□ 1045

This funding rapidly increased to more than \$600 million each year beginning in fiscal year 2014, mostly in response to the growing crisis with unaccompanied alien children. So I think it is appropriate to ask ourselves, is the funding being allocated in a way that will help improve domestic conditions on the ground and reduce the desire to leave?

To address this concern, I introduced the Unaccompanied Alien Children Assistance Control Act, and I offered this bill as an amendment to H.R. 4760. Simply put, this bill would reduce foreign aid allocations to Mexico, Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala by \$15,000 per child to each country if their child crosses the border illegally or if they are referred to the Office of Refugee Resettlement for custody and care.

While this may not seem like a lot, the reality is that each child cared for by the Office of Refugee Resettlement costs the American taxpayer about \$35,000. Even Attorney General Sessions has stated that the care these children receive is better than the average American child.

While we cannot leave children without care, we must recognize that prioritizing alien children over our own sends the wrong message. Removing that \$15,000 of foreign aid per child will send a message to Mexican and Northern Triangle leaders that our accepting their children will not be without cost to them.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, if you want to make it important, it has to be about the money.

Unfortunately, the accountability in these countries is poor, and the use of funds largely goes unchecked. They rely on American aid, and we must ensure that it is being used appropriately and wisely to combat the forces that are driving their future generations—it is their future—away from their own countries.

By withholding funding in the face of rampant corruption, we not only provide a potential funding stream for President Trump's proposed border system, but we send a signal that we will not willingly deprive the children and desperate immigrants of the life they desire and need in their countries of origin.

The best place for a child and a family is their home. Because of the condition in the Northern Triangle countries, home for many children is now a stark facility along a foreign border.

It is time to take steps that would not only strengthen our immigration laws for the security of American citizens, but is in the interest of restoring and maintaining the home from which many would-be immigrants try to escape.

Congress has not successfully reformed our immigration laws in decades. It is time to begin that debate to align our immigration system with current realities. For this reason, I encourage the adoption of the rule to begin consideration of H.R. 4760, Securing America's Future Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support today's rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

This rule makes in order H.R. 4760, the so-called Securing America's Future Act, and two amendments in the legislation.

Before I speak on the legislation, let us consider why we are here today. President Trump has created immigration crisis after immigration crisis. President Trump is the reason Dreamers are at risk of deportation. President Trump is the reason families are being separated at our Nation's borders. This is a Trump-manufactured crisis, plain and simple.

President Trump's executive order, signed yesterday, does nothing to fix this. His order does nothing to reunite the thousands of children separated from their parents. In fact, his order directs his deportation force to now jail families at the border, which is in direct violation of current court orders. It will lead to more family separation, and the only difference now is that families will wait 20 days before being separated.

I want every Member of this body and everyone watching at home to imagine what it must be like. Imagine traveling thousands of miles to flee some of the most dangerous countries in the world, countries with the highest murder rates, and then, when you finally think you are safe, having your child ripped away from you.

In 1946 to 1948, during the Truman administration, human experiments were conducted in Guatemala. American doctors infected mostly uneducated and indigenous people with syphilis. Today, in the Trump administration, we are forcing drugs in pill form and injection on the indigenous children seeking asylum.

So this brings us to why we are here today. Mr. Speaker, everyone watching this debate should be crystal clear on what this bill does. This bill fails to solve the separation of families on our Nation's border. It reduces legal immigration. It fails to offer DACA recipients a path to citizenship. It adds \$25 billion to our growing wall of debt on top of the \$2 trillion that we already added when Republicans voted for their tax scam.

This bill makes it harder for those seeking asylum to receive protection, and it fails to protect the 2,000 children who have already been separated from their parents.

Many will call this legislation the more conservative option that the House will consider today. But let us be clear, this bill is not conservative at all.

After adding trillions to our Nation's debt through the tax scam, Republicans now are putting us in another \$25 billion debt. Where are we going to borrow this money from?

Remember, colleagues, President Trump has declared a trade war with China. What will happen if China decides to cash in on that debt?

In addition, President Trump's family jails will cost the American taxpayer 10 times more than the alter-

native policy he ended for family migration.

Conservative? Absolutely not. Cruel? Inhumane? Absolutely, yes.

Mr. Speaker, last night, during consideration of this bill in the Rules Committee, my colleagues and I offered many fixes, which were all blocked by this rule. My amendment to replace the bill with the Keep Families Together Act, which would have reunited families, was blocked.

Representative ROYBAL-ALLARD and Representative POLIS joined me in offering the Dream Act as an alternative, but that was blocked also.

Another Rules Committee Member, Representative HASTINGS, and his amendment to fix TPS, blocked.

But not all amendments were blocked. Just like President Trump's executive order contained misspellings, this bill contained a giant typo to give President Trump an additional \$100 billion for his wall.

So which is it? \$25 billion? \$100 billion? Are Mexicans going to pay for it? What is it?

The committee has said that they are making this correction, and they did so in the middle of the night. But I doubt President Trump would be happy to hear that, so we will wait and see.

If this truly is a mistake, these kinds of corrections could have been caught if Democrats had been allowed to participate in this process, if we would have had a committee hearing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and this cruel legislation now, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a crisis of President Trump's making. Those of us who served here during the Bush administration were aware that this was a problem. Certainly, those of us who served during the Obama administration were aware that this was a problem.

When President Obama declared the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals in 2012, it was immediately followed, 2 years later, by the wave of unaccompanied alien children who came to our southern border. This crisis has been a long time in the making. Congress does need to solve this problem. The President is quite correct in that.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, Leviticus Chapter 19: 33-34, in the Old Testament—Democrats can quote the Bible also. As a practicing Catholic, let me do that.

"When a foreigner resides among you in your land, do not mistreat them. The foreigner residing among you must be treated as your native-born. Love them as yourself, for you were foreigners in Egypt. I am the Lord your God."

When did, Mr. Speaker, this barbaric, xenophobic, anti-immigrant modern agenda begin? Let's go through it quickly.

One, the birther issue: An embarrassment to this country by the administration, the head of the administration.

The Muslim ban: Imagine banning people that profess a particular religion.

Third, Charlottesville: That debacle, equal opportunity.

Fourth, the incendiary talk that painted the entire Mexican population—our ally, probably our third or fourth leading trade partner, our ally—with a wide brush of pure prejudice, pure. He painted the entire population.

To say that Democrats are for open borders, that is a lie. You know it; I know it. I am standing up to reject it. You sit quietly. You sit quietly and say nothing.

I was on the original starting gate at the Homeland Security after 9/11. Democrats, just as well as Republicans, worked together to put that together. How dare anybody insinuate that we don't accept the security of this Nation.

By the way, by the way, we have four borders, not one. The people who attacked us on 9/11 came from Canada. They didn't come from Mexico. You have never met a Mexican terrorist, and I certainly haven't met one either.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would just point out that, under current conditions, current laws, the United States of America takes in 1.1 million new citizens every year. We are the most generous country on the face of the Earth. American citizens should be rightly proud of that.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

□ 1100

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here today is simply insane.

For 8 years, Republican leaders have blocked every attempt to debate bipartisan immigration bills. They blocked Senate-passed comprehensive immigration reform. They blocked the bipartisan Dream Act, which has 203 cosponsors.

Speaker RYAN has refused to consider the Dream Act, all while shedding crocodile tears over the 700,000 Dreamers for whom America is the only home they know. Instead, he has held the Dreamers hostage, used them as bargaining chips, used them as leverage to waste tens of billions of taxpayer dollars on a senseless wall and to militarize our southern border.

Now, as our Nation is haunted by imagines of children being ripped from their parents' arms and by the sounds of their cries, Speaker RYAN decides this is the time to bring two of the most hateful, bigoted, anti-immigrant pieces of legislation I have ever seen to the House floor for debate under a closed process—no amendments, no committee hearings.

This is a scandal, Mr. Speaker. Republicans should hide their faces in shame.

It didn't have to be this way. If the bipartisan queen-of-the-hill discharge petition was allowed to move forward, we could be having a real debate on immigration. We could take up these two hyperpartisan anti-immigrant bills, and we could also consider two bipartisan bills to protect the Dreamers, namely, the Dream Act and the USA Act.

The petition was nearing 218 signatures, but Republicans couldn't stand considering anything they disagree with. They couldn't even stand debating them. This rule will kill the discharge petition because Republicans fear a fair fight.

This is an insult to this institution and to the many Members on both sides of the aisle who have waited so long to vote on these bills.

The Rules Committee even came back at 10 p.m. for an emergency meeting to fix a so-called drafting error in this bill.

Do you know what the drafting error was?

\$100 billion. That is right. Republicans almost accidentally gave President Trump \$125 billion for his border wall instead of the \$25 billion. That is quite an error, although I am sure President Trump would have loved it.

Oh, my God. This is what happens when you jam bills through with no hearings, no markups, no CBO score, which would have caught this enormous mistake.

Mr. Speaker, the President's executive order will only lead to keeping these children behind bars, some with and some without their parents, in unlimited, indefinite detention. And these Republican bills turn this cruel policy into the law of the land.

This is not a solution, Mr. Speaker; this is cruel and inhuman punishment.

The President of the United States must stop his vicious approach on immigration. It is immoral. And he must stop his hate peddling and he must stop his lies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule that kills the discharge petition; reject this rule that kills any hope for action on bipartisan immigration bills. I say to my colleagues: Have zero tolerance for this rule and have zero tolerance for these bills.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I just remind people in this body that 10 years ago the Democrats were in the majority. Indeed, then in the 2008 election that occurred 10 years ago, they strengthened that majority. House Republican Members were so far in the minority as to be irrelevant in all exchanges.

There was a 60-vote majority over in the Senate. You may recall that is where the Affordable Care Act and Dodd-Frank and other pieces of legislation that I would have thought would never pass actually did pass in that environment.

A question that I hear a lot is: Why didn't Democrats do something about the Dreamer problem when they controlled all the levers of power? And it is a valid question.

Senator DURBIN had a bill, as you will recall, in that next session of Congress that began in January of 2009. Senator DURBIN had a bill to deal with the Dreamer situation, and he worked on it all year. It never came up until December of 2010.

Now, you remember in November of 2010, actually, the majority changed in the House of Representatives and there were enough Republicans elected that the Democrats would not be in the majority the next year.

So here we are in a so-called lame duck session of a party that is exiting power, and I think it was December 8 of that year that, in the House, the Democrats brought Senator DURBIN's bill up and passed it on the House floor, as would be expected. They did have a significant majority.

They lost one vote over in the Senate, as I recall, and had 59 Democrats. Speaker PELOSI told me at a Rules Committee hearing several months ago that it was then that the Republicans blocked that vote from happening in the Senate.

But that is not exactly true.

Three Republicans voted with the Democrats on the Durbin bill. Five Democrats voted in the negative, and that is what killed the Durbin bill when the Democrats controlled all levers of power in 2010, the last time they did.

Mr. Speaker, don't blame this problem on President Trump. It has been in existence for some time, but it is up to us to solve it.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind Mr. BURGESS that he has the levers of power now, and I predict that today, the two measures that we are going to be dealing with are not likely to reach the President's desk.

But none of this was happening 4 months ago. None of this was happening 2 months ago. But a policy that

was announced by Jeff Sessions is what brought us to this, and that had to come through the President.

Last night, at our Rules Committee, I offered an amendment that would have provided a pathway to citizenship for certain long-term temporary protected status holders. Not surprisingly, in this historically closed Congress, my amendment was not made in order.

Let me repeat that. This historically closed Congress—89 closed rules. Never in the history of this body have we had as many closed rules.

As we discussed the need for Dreamers to have a path to citizenship, which they must, I wanted to make sure that those who are in our country under temporary protected status are not passed over and forgotten. They are from El Salvador. They are from Honduras, Nicaragua, Nepal, Syria, Sudan, South Sudan, Somalia, and Haiti.

These individuals are hardworking taxpayers, many of whom have U.S.-born children or U.S. citizen spouses, and they contribute to our economy and our communities. They pay taxes, and in myriad and dynamic ways they work at our airports and our service industries, in our healthcare sector, and on our construction sites.

They are fathers, mothers, sisters, and brothers. They are members of our faith-based communities. And every single one of them, to a person, hails from a country still recovering from natural disasters, internal violence, or both.

I will give you just one example.

On January 12, 2010, Haiti was devastated by a 7.0 magnitude earthquake. 1.5 million people were displaced, 300,000 buildings were destroyed, and 8 years on, tens of thousands of people remain in camps.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, then they had a hurricane. The hurricane was the first category 4 hurricane to hit Haiti in over half a century, claiming 1,000 lives and displacing more than 2 million people.

Haiti, quite simply, continues to climb out from the rubble of the earthquake, cholera outbreak, and Hurricane Matthew, and we in the United States have tried to help them to do so, as we should.

In its wisdom, the Trump administration has decided to end TPS for Haiti and many other countries. Not only does this conclusion fly in the face of the facts as we know them, but it needlessly inflicts countless wounds on our communities and our families.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the author of H.R. 4760.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time and for his hard work on this issue as well.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good bill. It is not something that was cooked up overnight. This bill was introduced 6 months ago. It is based upon legislation that has passed out of the Judiciary Committee in previous Congresses, and some of it in this Congress. It is a good effort to make sure that we are addressing all three aspects of immigration law that need to be addressed.

It has a very good proposal with regard to the DACA recipients. They get a legal status permanently for the rest of their lives, renewable every 3 years, as long as they don't commit a crime. And that is a statutory protection.

That is not something that is subject to court challenges. That is not something that is subject to the whims of any President, past, present, or future. It is something that allows them, then, to avail themselves of existing pathways to citizenship, and it is something that will allow them to work in the United States, live in the United States, own a business in the United States, and travel in and out of the United States.

I think it is a good first step in addressing this situation.

Secondly, the President has made it very clear, and people watching the news coverage know, the difficulties that the administration—any administration, this administration, the Obama administration, the Bush administration before it—has with laws that need to be corrected to make sure that loopholes are not followed at our border.

We have, now, a waiting list of 600,000 people applying for asylum. Historically, asylum, which is a very good part of our immigration law, has been granted to 5,000—some years, maybe as many as 10,000—people.

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, the great Soviet dissident, who wrote "The Gulag Archipelago," got political asylum in the United States. But when everyone who is apprehended coming across the border illegally trying to avoid detection, when they are apprehended then says, "Oh, I am here for political asylum," and you create a backlog 600,000 people long and then they are released into the interior of the country and don't return for their hearings in many, many, many instances, that is a very flawed aspect of our immigration system. This bill addresses that, as it does the problem with unaccompanied minors.

Children 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 years of age, mostly young boys, coming across all of Mexico and then through the desert or across the Rio Grande River and then thinking that this is an acceptable thing for them to do to enter our country, they need to be returned safely home, and the laws need to be reformed to accomplish that.

We need to reform many other aspects of our border security laws, close these loopholes.

We need to have greater technology. We need to have, along some segments of our border, improved wall tech-

nology. We have fences and some walls already. The fences have big holes in them. People come with chain cutters and cut holes through them in a matter of seconds and go through them when it is foggy there in San Diego or other times when they have that opportunity.

We need to have a more secure border both with technology and with a wall in some places and with the necessary personnel to handle this, including not just Border Patrol, but the judges and other officers who are necessary to process people when they are apprehended. This is a very serious problem, and it is addressed in this legislation.

We also need to move toward a merit-based immigration system.

We have, as the gentleman from Texas has repeatedly noted, the most generous immigration policy in the world. We have tens of millions of people who come to visit this country every year: some to work, some to go to school, some to conduct business. For more than 75 different categories of reasons they come here.

We also have more than a dozen immigrant visa categories that allow people to come to the United States, and we give out, on average, about 1.1 million green cards a year to people who go through the process lawfully. That is the most generous system in the world. We need to recognize that as we do that, we have to move toward a system where we are meeting the needs of American citizens, as well, as we do it.

Areas where we have shortages so that we can keep businesses in the United States rather than having them move elsewhere in the world where they can find the workers they need is an important part of this. So eliminating things like the visa lottery, where we give 55,000 green cards out for no good reason at all other than the pure luck that people attain from that and instead use those to have a new system where we have the opportunity to move towards a merit-based system, which is not in this bill but should be the successor to this bill, is an important thing to do.

I think that all of those measures are contained in this legislation. I think it is very, very good legislation.

But this bill contains two important provisions that are not in the second bill, and I want to particularly address those.

□ 1115

First, we have in this bill the E-Verify program. This is a program, a very fine program, that exists today. More than 800,000 businesses use it. Many large businesses use it. I would bet that probably a majority of the people who process job applications today utilize it. But it is certainly not utilized by everybody.

As a consequence, it is not being totally effective, because the people who aren't using it either don't want to know whether somebody is lawfully present in the United States, or they

think they are unlawfully present and don't want to have a system that uncovers that.

But this bill, applying prospectively only—you don't have to apply it to your current employees—works 99.7 percent of the time. It is very, very accurate. And most importantly, it has a safe harbor for both the worker and the employer. So that if you get a false positive, and if you are getting that three-tenths of a percent of the time—that is still a significant number of people when you use the E-Verify system—the new law actually gives them a way to work out the catch-22 situation that workers and employers find themselves in.

Because under the current law, we use the I-9 forms. Oftentimes, someone will look at it and say: I am not sure these are genuine documents. But if they refuse to hire the individual and it turns out that they are genuine documents, they can be sued for discrimination.

And on the other hand, if they hire the worker and it turns out they are unlawfully present, they can be prosecuted for hiring someone unlawfully present in the United States.

And so the safe harbor says, you can go ahead and hire that person until we work out whether it is a false positive or a false negative without that consequence, and only until we know that, will you then have to not employ that person. You will face no consequences in doing that. That is good for the worker and it is good for the employer as well.

When you do that—there is no doubt that there are sectors of our economy where we have a lot of people who are not lawfully present in the United States working. And by far, the number-one sector that is affected by that is our agricultural workforce. There are some estimates that as many as 80 or 90 percent of people working in agriculture, beyond the actual family members who own a farm, are not lawfully present in this country.

Some estimate that more than 1 million people who are working, are not lawfully present in this country. Wouldn't it be great if we could turn that workforce into legal workers where they have the opportunity to go back and forth across the border, to go home to where their family is without the fear of being apprehended and prosecuted?

That is what this bill does. It gives farmers a much more reliable workforce. It gives them a much better program where they can self-certify, where the worker can come in for up to 2 years at a time. And in the dairy industry where they have no program at all today, or in processing plants, raw-food processing plants, they have no program at all today, we have the ability to help those farmers.

This is an area of our economy that is very much affected by international competition. It is exceedingly important that we pass this legislation to

move immigration in the direction it needs to move, and this is an enlightened way to do it. It is not a bad bill. It is a good bill for the American people.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, Chairman GOODLATTE just clarified that his bill has been in print for 6 months. I thank the gentleman for clarifying. The American people should know that your real intention was to allocate \$100 million for the Trump wall, and it wasn't until we shined the light on that, that in the middle of the night the Republican caucus scrambled to reduce that amount to \$25 million.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership on America.

I had the privilege of traveling with her, under the leadership of our colleagues JUAN VARGAS and SUSAN DAVIS, to their districts earlier this week to see firsthand what was happening at the border.

So I come to the floor now with that fresh information. And I come to the floor as a mother of five children, grandmother of nine, who knows, as many of you here who are parents know and all of you here who are children know, the importance of the bond between parent and child and how breaking that bond is outside the circle of civilized human behavior.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote a favorite President, I am sure of yours and many in this body, President Ronald Reagan.

In his final days of the Presidency, President Ronald Reagan said: "And since this is the last speech that I will give as President"—my colleagues, I want you to hear this because this is about Ronald Reagan. Maybe you don't want to hear it. Okay. They don't want to hear it.

President Ronald Reagan said: "And since this is the last speech that I will give as President, I think it's fitting to leave one final thought, an observation about a country which I love."

President Reagan went on to say: "Yes, the torch of Lady Liberty symbolizes our freedom and represents our heritage, the compact with our parents, our grandparents, and our ancestors. It is that lady who gives us our great and special place in the world."

President Reagan went on to say: "For it's the great life force of each generation of new Americans that guarantees that America's triumph shall continue unsurpassed into the next century and beyond."

These are the words of President Ronald Reagan in the final days of his Presidency as he said in the "last speech that I will give as President."

Beautiful values.

Today, we are considering two Republican bills that insult our Nation's values and tarnish our heritage, as the President said, "as a beacon of freedom and opportunity."

Both do absolutely nothing to solve the heartbreaking and horrific situation for children on the border. According to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, both bills "perpetuate child detention and undermine existing protections relating to such detention."

That is from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. Both of these bills fail to provide a permanent legislative fix for our Dreamers, selling out their American Dream to build the President's obscene border wall.

Both are loaded full of every anti-immigrant provision imaginable, dismantling legal family immigration, slamming our doors to millions who have followed the rules and have been waiting for years for a visa, and cutting off the lifeline of asylum to countless vulnerable refugees.

In terms of those refugees, in testimony that was given at the House Democratic Steering and Policy Committee meeting that the Democrats had—the Republicans didn't come—the National Association of Evangelicals testified that the United States Refugee Resettlement Program is the crown jewel of American humanitarianism.

And, yet, it is horrible what they do in these bills to cut off the lifeline of asylum to countless vulnerable refugees.

The Speaker's bill carries out the President's family deportation agenda. It paves the way for long-term incarceration of families in prison-like conditions and the denial of basic health and safety protections for children.

The Republican plan is a family incarceration plan. It replaces one form of child abuse with another, and it brazenly violates children's human rights. Why do Republicans think traumatized, terrified little children at the border do not deserve the same basic respect that their own children do?

According to the American Academy of Pediatrics, family detention poses serious dangers to children's health and can result in "lifelong consequences for educational achievement, economic productivity, health status, and longevity."

Congress should be working day and night to protect vulnerable children. We should be working on legislation that protects Dreamers, keeps families together, and respects America's heritage as a land of newcomers, as spelled out by President Reagan in his last speech as President of the United States.

These bills will not go anywhere in the Senate. Yet, a vote for these bills is a vote to destroy the queen-of-the-hill discharge petition, destroying the best chance this Congress has to provide a bipartisan, permanent legislative fix for Dreamers.

Republicans need to walk away from these bills. They need to call on the President to rescind his family incarceration policy, which is as much a stain on our Nation's history as is his

family separation policy, tearing children away from their parents.

Democrats reject this outrageous legislation and reject the Republicans' attack on Dreamers, vulnerable children, and families, and we reject your zero policy. It has no place.

I urge a "no" vote on both of these bills in this rule and any subsequent rules that come up.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Ms. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Goodlatte bill and in opposition to the rule.

Do you know how many Democrats were involved in crafting the Goodlatte bill? Zero. If they had included Democrats, we could have told them that this bill does nothing to resolve the humanitarian crisis happening at the border.

Do you know how many hearings we had on the Goodlatte bill? Zero. If they had included Democrats, we would have told them that this bill does nothing to provide meaningful relief for Dreamers, and is dead on arrival in the Senate.

How many Dreamers does this help earn citizenship? Zero.

How many children does this bill put back in the arms of their parents? Zero.

How much compromise does this bill show people in need? Zero.

This administration likes to talk about zero tolerance. Well, we have zero tolerance for this President's anti-immigration agenda and the Republicans who enable it.

Bottom line, Mr. Speaker, this bill is a sham. It is the Republican's attempt to make it look like they want to help Dreamers, but, in reality, it is a non-starter, and it is another heartless action taken by this Congress. Oppose this bill. Oppose this rule.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

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

Mr. Speaker, these rules would mark the capitulation by a large number of Republicans who, for a time, reflected the views of 86 percent of the American people and the hopes of the Dreamers those Americans support. If they vote for this pretense of reform and security, they will have abandoned the principles they mouthed and the people who relied on their courage.

Contrary to the Speaker and majority leader, the test for bringing bills to

the floor must not be whether the President, untethered to principle, would sign them, but whether they reflect the will of the people and this House.

The Speaker refuses to put options on the floor supported by, at one time, 247 Members of this House. Now, 240 Members have supported a rule to give us four competing options to address the Trump-caused crisis. That number may not comply with the Hastert rule, but it does comply with democracy.

And it would give the Speaker his option as well. The Speaker clearly fears that his alternative will fail. As a result, he has opposed an open process. So much for the leadership that claimed—falsely—to pursue transparency, openness, and a willingness to take the tough issues head on and individually.

The bill it would bring to the floor, contrary to what Speaker RYAN and Leader MCCARTHY claim, is no compromise. A compromise, by definition, requires both sides to come together and meet in the middle. We did. And we built a majority of support for a bill.

The Ryan bill is a capitulation by those who have professed support of the Dreamers. Indeed, the only compromise in this bill is how it compromises our values, our principles as Americans, and how it compromises our economy and national security.

The conservative Cato Institute has said that only 12 percent of Dreamers would ever actually attain citizenship under this hoax of a bill.

□ 1130

For those seeking refuge from fear for their lives and from assault, and from having their children torn from their arms and separated—as Laura Bush pleaded, “immoral”—this bill does not provide a solution. Instead, it provides for locking up those children in prison with their parents. Isn't that a wonderful option?

The American people are overwhelmingly outraged by what is happening at the border and want to see Congress take real action. As JOHN McCAIN stated, such a policy that is being promoted by the President and the Republicans in Congress “is an affront to the decency of the American people.”

In addition, the Ryan bill imposes new restrictions on legal immigration. Democrats will strongly oppose this noxious bill.

Mr. Speaker, please summon the courage to let the people's House work its will and demand that the President return to a policy of treating these children as we would want our own children to be treated. That is not what these bills do. Reject these bills. We are America. We are better than these bills.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, there are lots wrong with these bills. I will discuss that during the debate on the

bills. This is about the rule. For my friends on the other side of the aisle, they need to understand that this is a self-executing rule. When they vote “yes” on this rule, they are voting to strip \$100 billion from funding President Trump's wall.

Let me say that again. A vote for this rule is a vote to take \$100 billion out of building President Trump's wall. I want them to understand that they are going to have to go home and explain to their constituents why they voted to strip \$100 billion out of funding President Trump's wall.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to strike the text of this rule and insert House Resolution 774, Representative DENHAM's bipartisan queen-of-the-hill resolution. This rule would bring up four separate immigration bills to be debated and voted on the House floor.

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 gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to ask every Member who believed in bipartisan, open debate on DACA here in the House to vote “no” on the previous question.

Every one of the 216 Members who signed the discharge petition should join me. Why? Because a vote against the previous question is a vote for queen-of-the-hill rule, and because if we defeat the previous question, we will immediately offer the queen-of-the-hill rule and finally start this debate.

There will be no more waiting for the last two signatures on the discharge petition to materialize. There will be no more waiting until the next discharge Monday comes up in the calendar. There will be no more waiting. We will end this process and vote on queen of the hill now.

Today, Republicans are bringing up two partisan, anti-immigrant bills. Democrats were completely cut out of the process that produced these bills, and, as a result, they will not get any bipartisan support. It is questionable if either of these bills can actually pass this House. If that is the case, then what is the point of all of this?

Is the goal to have a fake debate on DACA and have everything fail so we are in the same place as the Senate? What good does that do?

Dreamers are still left wondering when and what Congress will do to help them stay in this country.

Let's end this charade and actually have a bipartisan debate, and let's pass

a bipartisan bill to provide a pathway to citizenship for Dreamers.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a crazy week for sure. But one thing is clear: If we want to pass a fix for DACA, then we need to come together and pass a bipartisan bill. This previous question vote gives us the chance to do just that. Vote “no” on the previous question and bring up the queen-of-the-hill rule.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), who is the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the closed rule for H.R. 4760. I was proud to sign on to the bipartisan discharge petition to force a vote on a Dreamer bill. Passage of this rule will not only kill that discharge petition, but any hope of this Congress considering the one bill that has enough bipartisan support to deliver a meaningful remedy for the Dreamers.

What are we voting on instead? H.R. 4760 is an antifamily bill that maintains the cruel zero-tolerance policy, limits access to asylum, shrinks legal immigration, ends the diversity visa lottery program, abolishes protections for unaccompanied children, and builds President Trump's border wall.

We are considering only H.R. 4760—a measure that may not have the votes to pass—to placate the most extreme elements of the Republican Conference. Mr. Speaker, something is fundamentally wrong and broken in this body when the will of a handful of extremists overrules the will of a bipartisan majority.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the rule and the underlying bill.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, is this institution broken or has our leadership fled the field?

This rule will deprive the House of having a debate on the Dreamers. Eighty-two percent of the American people think these innocent kids who came here should be given legal status.

The leadership has refused to allow us to debate. With the help of Mr. DENHAM, in a courageous display of independence, he has a discharge petition, the last remaining tool for a majority of this House to say to leadership: Give us a vote. Let us debate.

But in an act of extraordinary irresponsibility—and I would say cowardice—the leadership is quelling, crushing, and incinerating the last vestige of independence in their own party.

This rule takes away from the House that tool to rise up and say: We are ready to work for the American people and give legal status to the Dreamers.

That is a disgrace. That is a reason why, if we care about ourselves as an

institution responsible to the people who elected us, we will assert our insistence that we vote. Vote “no” on this.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support H.R. 4760, and I cannot support this rule, obviously, for a number of reasons that we heard here today, but I would like to highlight two.

This bill does not provide the DACA fix that our Dreamers deserve. Personally, I have nearly 20,000 Dreamers in my district in California. I have met with many of them numerous times at their work and at their jobs. Although they were brought here through no fault of their own, these kids want to stay here; they want to live here; and, most important, they want to contribute here.

They don't want this given to them. They are willing to earn it. Unfortunately, this bill does not give them that chance. And that is why I cannot support it.

Also, in my district, we lay claim to being the salad bowl of the world. Our agriculture industry is due to our farmworkers. Now, I appreciate that this bill addresses ag labor, and the added amendments have tried to make it better, but it is just not enough.

This bill hurts our communities. Why? Because our ag workers are not just an important part of our ag industry, they are an integral part to our communities. Some of these people have been here 5, 10, 15, 20 years. They have spouses; they have kids; and they have families.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from California an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, because of the important role that they will play, and because of the lack of any information on what this can do for these ag workers, I am against the resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in 1970, a Guatemalan couple decided to send their daughter to the U.S. That young girl was I. I was welcomed here in a loving home. I was not put in a freezing cell. My parents felt they had no choice. My mother died a couple of years later.

These parents are making a choice that, frankly, I could not make today for my children. A few months ago, I was away from home for so long—4 weeks—that my grandson, a 3-year-old, felt he had to reintroduce himself to me because he had not seen me for 4 weeks. He didn't think that I would remember him. Imagine an infant when that infant is returned to their parent; they will be introduced to a total stranger.

Pope Francis just tweeted: Pray together, walk together, work together.

This is the way that leads to Christian unity.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and this cruel legislation. Let's help those who can't help themselves in these very corrupt countries of the Northern Triangle. They are not s—holes as the President has referred to them. Let's give them an opportunity to live another day.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to you about a story of separation, a father and daughter who have been separated. Chris, my constituent, came to me with this story several years ago.

He served his country in Iraq. While he was serving his country in Iraq, his wife developed cancer and died. Chris returned home to be a single dad to his daughter.

His daughter went out with friends one night and was struck and killed by an automobile—an automobile driven by someone who was in the country without the benefit of citizenship.

Chris comes to my townhalls and asks me: While I was serving my country, you were supposed to be enforcing the laws on the border. Because you did not do your job, I am now separated from my daughter in perpetuity.

H.R. 4760, the Securing America's Future Act of 2018, is the product of months of work by Chairman GOODLATTE, Chairman MCCAUL, and other stakeholders. This is an answer to our persistent problems with our immigration system that so many Members of this body have been talking about for years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support today's rule and move the debate forward on this legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee report (H. Rept. 115-772) to accompany House Resolution 954 should have included in its waiver of all points of order against consideration of H.R. 4760 a disclosure of the following violation:

Clause 12(a)(1) of rule XXI, requiring a comparative print to be made publicly available prior to consideration of a bill amending or repealing statutes to show, by typographical device, parts of statute affected.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. TORRES is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 954 OFFERED BY
MRS. TORRES

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That on the next legislative day after the adoption of this resolution, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4760) to amend the immigration laws and the homeland security laws, 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 Majority Leader and the Minority Whip or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall

be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment shall be in order except the amendments in the nature of a substitute specified in section 2 of this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order specified, may be offered only by the Member designated, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against such amendments are waived (except those arising under clause 7 of rule XVI). Clause 6(g) of rule XVIII shall not apply with respect to a request for a recorded vote on any such amendment. If more than one such amendment is adopted, then only the one receiving the greater number of affirmative recorded votes shall be considered as finally adopted. In the case of a tie for the greater number of affirmative recorded votes, then only the last amendment to receive that number of affirmative recorded votes shall be considered as finally adopted. After the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendment as may have been finally adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 2. The amendments in the nature of a substitute referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(1) A proper amendment in the nature of a substitute, if offered by Representative Goodlatte of Virginia or his designee.

(2) A proper amendment in the nature of a substitute, if offered by Representative Roybal-Allard of California or her designee.

(3) A proper amendment in the nature of a substitute, if offered by Representative Ryan of Wisconsin or his designee.

(4) A proper amendment in the nature of a substitute, if offered by Representative Denham of California or his designee.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 4760.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition.

Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 190, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

YEAS—232

Abraham	Banks (IN)	Bishop (UT)
Aderholt	Barletta	Blackburn
Allen	Barr	Blum
Amash	Barton	Bost
Amodei	Bergman	Brady (TX)
Arrington	Biggs	Brat
Babin	Bilirakis	Brooks (AL)
Bacon	Bishop (MI)	Brooks (IN)

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

NAYS—190

Adams	Clark (MA)	Doyle, Michael
Aguilar	Clarke (NY)	F.
Barragán	Clay	Ellison
Bass	Cleaver	Engel
Beatty	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bera	Cohen	Espallat
Beyer	Connolly	Esty (CT)
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Evans
Blumenauer	Correa	Foster
Blunt Rochester	Costa	Frankel (FL)
Bonamici	Courtney	Fudge
Boyle, Brendan	Crist	Gabbard
F.	Crowley	Galleo
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Garamendi
Brown (MD)	Cummings	Gomez
Brownley (CA)	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez (TX)
Bustos	Davis, Danny	Gottheimer
Butterfield	DeFazio	Green, Al
Capuano	DeGette	Green, Gene
Carbajal	Delaney	Grijalva
Cárdenas	DeLauro	Gutiérrez
Carson (IN)	DelBene	Hanabusa
Cartwright	Demings	Hastings
Castor (FL)	DeSaunier	Heck
Castro (TX)	Deutsch	Higgins (NY)
Chu, Judy	Dingell	Himes
Cielline	Doggett	Hoyer

Huffman	Matsui	Sánchez
Jackson Lee	McCollum	Sarbanes
Jayapal	McEachin	Schakowsky
Johnson (GA)	McGovern	Schiff
Johnson, E. B.	McNery	Schneider
Kaptur	Meeks	Schrader
Keating	Meng	Scott (VA)
Kelly (IL)	Moore	Scott, David
Kennedy	Moulton	Serrano
Khanna	Murphy (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Kihuen	Nadler	Shea-Porter
Kildee	Napolitano	Sherman
Kilmer	Neal	Sinema
Kind	Nolan	Sires
Krishnamoorthi	Norcross	Smith (WA)
Kuster (NH)	O’Halloran	Soto
Lamb	O’Rourke	Speier
Langevin	Pallone	Suozi
Larsen (WA)	Panetta	Swalwell (CA)
Larson (CT)	Pascrell	Takano
Lawrence	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Lawson (FL)	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Lee	Peters	Titus
Levin	Peterson	Tonko
Lewis (GA)	Pingree	Torres
Lieu, Ted	Pocan	Tsongas
Lipinski	Polis	Vargas
Loeback	Price (NC)	Veasey
Lofgren	Quigley	Velázquez
Lowenthal	Raskin	Visclosky
Lowe	Rice (NY)	Walz
Lujan Grisham,	Richmond	Wasserman
M.	Rosen	Schultz
Luján, Ben Ray	Roybal-Allard	Waters, Maxine
Lynch	Ruiz	Watson Coleman
Maloney,	Ruppersberger	Welch
Carolyn B.	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Black	Jeffries	Payne
Collins (GA)	Kustoff (TN)	

□ 1207

Messrs. BIGGS and BRAT changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 195, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—226

Abraham	Burgess	Duffy
Aderholt	Byrne	Duncan (SC)
Allen	Calvert	Duncan (TN)
Amodei	Carter (GA)	Dunn
Babin	Carter (TX)	Emmer
Bacon	Chabot	Estes (KS)
Banks (IN)	Cheney	Faso
Barletta	Coffman	Ferguson
Barr	Cole	Fitzpatrick
Barton	Collins (NY)	Fleischmann
Bergman	Comer	Flores
Biggs	Comstock	Fortenberry
Bilirakis	Conaway	Foxx
Bishop (MI)	Cook	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (UT)	Costello (PA)	Gaetz
Blackburn	Cramer	Gallagher
Blum	Crawford	Garrett
Bost	Culberson	Gianforte
Brady (TX)	Curbelo (FL)	Gibbs
Brooks (AL)	Curtis	Goodlatte
Brooks (IN)	Davidson	Gosar
Buchanan	Davis, Rodney	Gowdy
Budd	Denham	Granger
	DeSantis	Graves (GA)
	DesJarlais	Graves (LA)
	Diaz-Balart	Graves (MO)
	Donovan	Griffith

Grothman Marshall
 Guthrie Mast
 Handel McCarthy
 Harper McCaul
 Harris McClintock
 Hartzler McHenry
 Hensarling McKinley
 Herrera Beutler McMorris
 Hice, Jody B. Rodgers
 Higgins (LA) McSally
 Hill Meadows
 Holding Messer
 Hollingsworth Mitchell
 Hudson Moolenaar
 Huizenga Mooney (WV)
 Hultgren Mullin
 Hunter Newhouse
 Issa Noem
 Jenkins (KS) Norman
 Jenkins (WV) Nunes
 Johnson (LA) Olson
 Johnson (OH) Palazzo
 Johnson, Sam Palmer
 Jones Paulsen
 Jordan Pearce
 Joyce (OH) Perry
 Katko Pittenger
 Kelly (MS) Poe (TX)
 Kelly (PA) Poliquin
 King (NY) Posey
 Kinzinger Ratcliffe
 Knight Reed
 Labrador Reichert
 LaHood Renacci
 LaMalfa Rice (SC)
 Lamborn Roby
 Lance Roe (TN)
 Latta Rogers (AL)
 Lesko Rogers (KY)
 Lewis (MN) Rohrabacher
 LoBiondo Rokita
 Long Rooney, Francis
 Loudermilk Rooney, Thomas
 Love J.
 Lucas Ros-Lehtinen
 Luetkemeyer Roskam
 MacArthur Ross
 Marchant Rothfus
 Marino Rouzer

NOES—195

Adams DeLauro
 Aguilar DelBene
 Amash Demings
 Barragán DeSaulnier
 Bass Deutch
 Beatty Dingell
 Bera Doggett
 Beyer Doyle, Michael
 Bishop (GA) F.
 BlumenaUER Ellison
 Blunt Rochester Engel
 Bonamici Eshoo
 Boyle, Brendan Espaillat
 F. Esty (CT)
 Brady (PA) Evans
 Brown (MD) Foster
 Brownley (CA) Frankel (FL)
 Bustos Fudge
 Butterfield Gabbard
 Capuano Gallego
 Carbajal Garamendi
 Cárdenas Gohmert
 Carson (IN) Gomez
 Cartwright Gonzalez (TX)
 Castor (FL) Gottheimer
 Castro (TX) Green, Al
 Chu, Judy Green, Gene
 Cicilline Grijalva
 Clark (MA) Gutiérrez
 Clarke (NY) Hanabusa
 Clay Hastings
 Cleaver Heck
 Clyburn Higgins (NY)
 Cohen Himes
 Connolly Hoyer
 Cooper Huffman
 Correa Hurd
 Costa Jackson Lee
 Courtney Jayapal
 Crist Johnson (GA)
 Crowley Johnson, E. B.
 Cuellar Kaptur
 Cummings Keating
 Davis (CA) Kelly (IL)
 Davis, Danny Kennedy
 DeFazio Khanna
 DeGette Kihuen
 Delaney Kildee

Royce (CA) Perlmutter
 Russell Peters
 Rutherford Peterson
 Sanford Pingree
 Scalise Pocan
 Schweikert Polis
 Scott, Austin Price (NC)
 Sensenbrenner Quigley
 Sessions Raskin
 Shimkus Rice (NY)
 Shuster Richmond
 Simpson Rosen
 Smith (MO) Roybal-Allard
 Smith (NE) Ruiz
 Smith (NJ) Ruppersberger
 Smith (TX) Rush
 Smucker Ryan (OH)
 Stefanik Sánchez
 Stewart Sarbanes

Schakowsky Thompson (MS)
 Schiff Titus
 Schneider Tonko
 Schrader Torres
 Scott (VA) Tsongas
 Scott, David Vargas
 Serrano Veasey
 Sewell (AL) Vela
 Shea-Porter Velázquez
 Sherman Visclosky
 Sinema Walz
 Sires Wasserman
 Smith (WA) Schultz
 Soto Waters, Maxine
 Speier Watson Coleman
 Suozzi Welch
 Swallow (CA) Wilson (FL)
 Swallow (CA) Yarmuth
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)

NOT VOTING—6

Black Jeffries
 Collins (GA) Kustoff (TN)
 O'Rourke
 Payne

□ 1214

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.

PERMISSION TO MODIFY CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6, SUBSTANCE USE-DISORDER PREVENTION THAT PROMOTES OPIOID RECOVERY AND TREATMENT FOR PATIENTS AND COMMUNITIES ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding House Resolution 949, during consideration of H.R. 6 pursuant to such resolution, general debate shall not exceed 1 hour, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member on the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE ACT OF 2018

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 954, I call up the bill (H.R. 4760) to amend the immigration laws and the homeland security laws, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 954, the amendments printed in House Report 115-772 are adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 4760

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Securing America’s Future Act of 2018”.
 (b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

DIVISION A—LEGAL IMMIGRATION REFORM

TITLE I—IMMIGRANT VISA ALLOCATIONS AND PRIORITIES

Sec. 1101. Family-sponsored immigration priorities.

Sec. 1102. Elimination of diversity visa program.

Sec. 1103. Employment-based immigration priorities.

Sec. 1104. Waiver of rights by B visa non-immigrants.

TITLE II—AGRICULTURAL WORKER REFORM

Sec. 2101. Short title.
 Sec. 2102. H-2C temporary agricultural work visa program.

Sec. 2103. Admission of temporary H-2C workers.

Sec. 2104. Mediation.

Sec. 2105. Migrant and seasonal agricultural worker protection.

Sec. 2106. Binding arbitration.

Sec. 2107. Eligibility for health care subsidies and refundable tax credits; required health insurance coverage.

Sec. 2108. Study of establishment of an agricultural worker employment pool.

Sec. 2109. Prevailing wage.

Sec. 2110. Effective dates; sunset; regulations.

Sec. 2111. Report on compliance and violations.

TITLE III—VISA SECURITY

Sec. 3101. Cancellation of additional visas.

Sec. 3102. Visa information sharing.

Sec. 3103. Restricting waiver of visa interviews.

Sec. 3104. Authorizing the Department of State to not interview certain ineligible visa applicants.

Sec. 3105. Visa refusal and revocation.

Sec. 3106. Petition and application processing for visas and immigration benefits.

Sec. 3107. Fraud prevention.

Sec. 3108. Visa ineligibility for spouses and children of drug traffickers.

Sec. 3109. DNA testing.

Sec. 3110. Access to NCIC criminal history database for diplomatic visas.

Sec. 3111. Elimination of signed photograph requirement for visa applications.

Sec. 3112. Additional fraud detection and prevention.

DIVISION B—INTERIOR IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT

TITLE I—LEGAL WORKFORCE ACT

Sec. 1101. Short title.

Sec. 1102. Employment eligibility verification process.

Sec. 1103. Employment eligibility verification system.

Sec. 1104. Recruitment, referral, and continuation of employment.

Sec. 1105. Good faith defense.

Sec. 1106. Preemption and States’ rights.

Sec. 1107. Repeal.

Sec. 1108. Penalties.

Sec. 1109. Fraud and misuse of documents.

Sec. 1110. Protection of Social Security Administration programs.

Sec. 1111. Fraud prevention.

Sec. 1112. Use of employment eligibility verification photo tool.

Sec. 1113. Identity authentication employment eligibility verification pilot programs.

Sec. 1114. Inspector General audits.

TITLE II—SANCTUARY CITIES AND STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT COOPERATION

Sec. 2201. Short title.