

Johnson, Sam	Moolenaar	Sensenbrenner	Cheney	Hunter	Rice (SC)	Loeb sack	Panetta	Sewell (AL)
Jones	Mooney (WV)	Sessions	Cole	Issa	Roby	Lofgren	Pascrell	Shea-Porter
Jordan	Mullin	Shimkus	Collins (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Roe (TN)	Love	Paulsen	Sherman
Joyce (OH)	Newhouse	Shuster	Collins (NY)	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)	Lowenthal	Pelosi	Shuster
Katko	Noem	Simpson	Comer	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)	Lowey	Perlmutter	Simpson
Kelly (MS)	Norman	Smith (MO)	Conaway	Johnson (OH)	Rokita	Lujan Grisham,	Peters	Sinema
Kelly (PA)	Nunes	Smith (NE)	Cook	Johnson, Sam	Rooney, Francis	M.	Peterson	Sires
King (IA)	Olson	Smith (NJ)	Cramer	Jones	Rooney, Thomas	Luján, Ben Ray	Pingree	Smith (NJ)
King (NY)	Palazzo	Smith (TX)	Crawford	Jordan	J.	Lynch	Pocan	Smith (WA)
Kinzing er	Palmer	Smucker	Culberson	Joyce (OH)	Ross	MacArthur	Polis	Soto
Knight	Paulsen	Curtis	Duffy	Kelly (MS)	Rothfus	Maloney,	Price (NC)	Speier
Kustoff (TN)	Pearce	Davidson	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (PA)	Rouzer	Carolyn B.	Quigley	Stefanik
Labrador	Perry	Davis, Rodney	Duncan (TN)	Kinzing er	Royce (CA)	Maloney, Sean	Raskin	Suo zzi
LaHood	Pittenger	DeSantis	Dunn	Kustoff (TN)	Rutherford	Massie	Reed	Swalwell (CA)
LaMalfa	Poe (TX)	DesJarlais	Emmer	Labrador	Sanford	Matsui	Reichert	Takano
Lamborn	Poliquin	Donovan	Estes (KS)	LaHood	Scalise	McCollum	Rice (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Lance	Posey	Duffy	Fleischmann	LaMalfa	Schweikert	McEachin	Richmond	Thompson (MS)
Latta	Ratcliffe	Duncan (SC)	Flores	Lamborn	Scott, Austin	McGovern	Rohrabacher	Titus
Lesko	Reed	Duncan (TN)	Fortenberry	Latta	Sensenbrenner	McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Tonko
Lewis (MN)	Reichert	Dunn	Fox x	Lesko	Sessions	Rodgers	Rosen	Torres
LoBiondo	Renacci	Emmer	Gaetz	Lewis (MN)	Shimkus	McNerney	Roskam	Tsongas
Long	Rice (SC)	Estes (KS)	Gallagher	Long	Smith (MO)	Meeks	Roybal-Allard	Turner
Loudermilk	Roby	Fleischmann	Garrett	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)	Meng	Ruiz	Upton
Love	Roe (TN)	Flores	Gianforte	Lucas	Smith (TX)	Moore	Ruppersberger	Valadao
Lucas	Rogers (AL)	Walberg	Gibbs	Luetkemeyer	Smucker	Moulton	Rush	Vargas
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (KY)	Walden	Goodlatte	Marchant	Stewart	Murphy (FL)	Russell	Veasey
MacArthur	Rohrabacher	Walker	Gowdy	Marino	Stivers	Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Vela
Marchant	Rokita	Walorski	Granger	Marshall	Taylor	Napolitano	Sánchez	Velázquez
Marino	Rooney, Francis	Walters, Mimi	Graves (GA)	McCarthy	McCauley	Neal	Sarbanes	Visclosky
Marshall	Rooney, Thomas	Weber (TX)	Graves (LA)	McCauley	Tenney	Newhouse	Schakowsky	Walz
Massie	J.	Webster (FL)	Graves (MO)	McClintock	Thompson (PA)	Noem	Schiff	Wasserman
Mast	Ros-Lehtinen	Wenstrup	Griffith	McHenry	Thornberry	Nolan	Schneider	Schultz
McCarthy	Roskam	Westerman	Grothman	McKinley	Tipton	Norcross	Schrader	Waters, Maxine
McCauley	Ross	Williams	Guthrie	McSally	Trott	O'Halleran	Scott (VA)	Watson Coleman
McClintock	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)	Handel	Meadows	Wagner	O'Rourke	Scott, David	Welch
McHenry	Rouzer	Wittman	Harper	Messer	Walberg	Pallone	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
McKinley	Royce (CA)	Womack	Harris	Mitchell	Walden			
McMorris	Russell	Woodall	Hartzler	Moolenaar	Walker			
Rodgers	Rutherford	Yoder	Hensarling	Mooney (WV)	Walorski			
McSally	Sanford	Yoho	Herrera Beutler	Mullin	Walters, Mimi			
Meadows	Scalise	Young (AK)	Hice, Jody B.	Norman	Weber (TX)			
Messer	Schweikert	Young (IA)	Higgins (LA)	Nunes	Webster (FL)			
Mitchell	Scott, Austin	Zeldin	Hill	Olson	Wenstrup			
			Holding	Palazzo	Westerman			
			Hollingsworth	Palmer	Williams			
			Hudson	Pearce	Wilson (SC)			
			Huizenga	Perry	Wittman			
			Hultgren	Pittenger	Womack			
				Poe (TX)	Woodall			
				Poliquin	Yoder			
				Posey	Yoho			
				Ratcliffe	Young (AK)			
				Renacci	Young (IA)			
					Zeldin			

## NOT VOTING—2

Jeffries

Payne

## □ 1404

Messrs. WEBSTER of Florida, SAM JOHNSON of Texas, ROE of Tennessee, GOSAR, and BOST changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. CUELLAR, LAWSON of Florida, Mses. CASTOR of Florida, JACKSON LEE, Messrs. BEYER, NOLAN, AL GREEN of Texas, and LARSON of Connecticut changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NADLER. 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 193, noes 231, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

## AYES—193

Abraham	Bergman	Brooks (IN)
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Allen	Bishop (MI)	Buck
Amodeli	Bishop (UT)	Bucshon
Arrington	Black	Budd
Babin	Blackburn	Burgess
Bacon	Blum	Byrne
Banks (IN)	Bost	Calvert
Barletta	Brady (TX)	Carter (GA)
Barr	Brat	Carter (TX)
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Chabot

## NOES—231

Adams	Crist	Green, Gene
Agullar	Crowley	Grijalva
Amash	Cuellar	Gutiérrez
Barragán	Cummings	Hanabusa
Bass	Curbelo (FL)	Hastings
Beatty	Davis (CA)	Heck
Bera	Davis, Danny	Higgins (NY)
Beyer	DeFazio	Himes
Biggs	DeGette	Hoyer
Bishop (GA)	Delaney	Huffman
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Hurd
Blunt Rochester	DelBene	Jackson Lee
Bonamici	Demings	Jayapal
Boyle, Brendan	Denham	Johnson (GA)
F.	DeSaulnier	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (PA)	Deutch	Kaptur
Brown (MD)	Diaz-Balart	Katko
Brownley (CA)	Dingell	Keating
Bustos	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Butterfield	Doyle, Michael	Kennedy
Capuano	F.	Khanna
Cardenas	Ellison	Kihuen
Carson (IN)	Engel	Kildee
Cartwright	Eshoo	Kilmer
Castor (FL)	Españillat	Kind
Castro (TX)	Esty (CT)	King (IA)
Chu, Judy	Evans	King (NY)
Cicilline	Faso	Knight
Clark (MA)	Ferguson	Krishnamoorthi
Clarke (NY)	Fitzpatrick	Kuster (NH)
Clay	Foster	Lamb
Cleaver	Frankel (FL)	Lance
Clyburn	Frelinghuysen	Langevin
Coffman	Fudge	Larsen (WA)
Cohen	Gabbard	Larson (CT)
Comstock	Gallego	Lawrence
Connolly	Garamendi	Lawson (FL)
Cooper	Gohmert	Lee
Correa	Gomez	Levin
Costa	Gonzalez (TX)	Lewis (GA)
Costello (PA)	Gosar	Lieu, Ted
Courtney	Gottheimer	Lipinski
	Green, Al	LoBiondo

## NOT VOTING—3

Jeffries

Payne

Yarmuth

## □ 1411

So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## □ 1415

# PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6136, BORDER SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION REFORM ACT OF 2018

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 953 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 953

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6136) to amend the immigration laws and provide for border security, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time

as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the House Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 953, providing for consideration of H.R. 6136, the Border Security and Immigration Reform Act. This legislation demonstrates a pivotal moment in our Nation's history, one in which we can choose to, for the first time in decades, make significant improvements to our Nation's broken immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in this body for just about 3½ years, and throughout that period of time, and even before as I was working to become a Congressman, I have always been clear with the people of the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington that fixing our broken immigration system is a top priority and one that I believe my district, my State, and the entire Nation desperately needs.

With the rule that we bring forward today, I can look my constituents in the eye, and, with certainty, I can tell them that I believe that this legislation, the underlying bill, this consensus legislation that we have before us, is the best opportunity this body has had in many, many years—in fact, decades—to get something signed into law to make a true, lasting, substantive difference to improve our broken immigration system.

While it may not be perfect—few bills are—H.R. 6136, the Border Security and Immigration Reform Act, includes several main tenets to addressing our immigration crisis, and, I should add, it is the only bill that we are considering that includes all four pillars that the President, on numerous occasions, has stated must be a part of any legislation that he will sign into law.

First, this legislation includes desperately needed appropriations for border security. The bill appropriates funding for further construction of the border wall, as well as technology, personnel, and modernization of our ports of entry.

Our border security system is broken and must be fixed, so I would look to my fellow conservatives and say: This is our one shot to get this done. This is our one opportunity to live up to the commitment we gave to our constituents when we said we would secure our border.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that this is our only chance, and we can't waste it. We can't squander it. Let's get our border secured once and for all, and keep our commitment to our people.

It also includes a desperately needed solution for the DACA population. I have shared with many of my colleagues time and time again that I have the second highest number of DACA recipients in my district in the State of Washington out of the entire Republican Conference. A full third of Washington State's DACA population lives in my district of central Washington.

I can tell you that I have met with literally hundreds of them, including just this week. Monday afternoon, I met with about half a dozen of these young people. They are smart, hard-working, respectful, caring members of our community, people that you would be proud to call your own constituents. I am proud that this legislation provides them with the certainty that they need so that they can continue moving forward with their educational and professional endeavors, and continue to be productive, upstanding members of society.

Do you know what they told me that they wanted and that they need? They would like hope. We can give it to them with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also, importantly, addresses the terrible situation that we have all been witnessing regarding family separation at the border. Children should not be taken away from their parents. We can enforce our laws and enforce our border while also keeping families together.

This situation has shown one more broken piece of an immigration system that is not working for anyone, and another example that shows why reform is so desperately needed. It makes clear that minors at the border must remain with their parent or legal guardian.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share an excerpt that comes from an interview that I just watched with one of our Border Patrol agents, a Mr. Chris Cabrera, and if I may quote him, Mr. Speaker.

"We've had this situation going on for 4 years now, and for some reason, we haven't fixed it. I don't think you can necessarily blame it on one administration or the other. It started under one and is continuing under another. It hasn't been fixed, and it needs to be fixed.

"Right now, we have this beacon of, 'We'll leave the light on for you and let you come illegally into the country.' If you've seen some of the stuff we've seen down here, you would understand just how important it is to have a tough stance to divert people from coming here. When you see a 12-year-old girl with a Plan B pill—her parents put her on birth control because they know getting violated is part of the journey—that's a terrible way to live. When you see a 4-year-old girl traveling completely alone with just her parents' phone number written across her shirt, something needs to be done.

"We had a 9-year-old boy last year have a heat stroke and die in front of us with no family around. That's be-

cause we're allowing people to take advantage of this system.

"Let's be honest here, if we want this law changed, then that's on Congress. That's on nobody else but Congress. They need to get to work and change this law."

So I would respectfully challenge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, but on the other side of the aisle especially, do not join Senator SCHUMER, who says there is no need for a legislative solution. There is a need. I urge you to reject much of the rhetoric that I have heard on the floor just today rejecting funding for border security.

It can be easy to make this political and refuse to move a solution forward that actually has a chance of being signed into law in an effort to score political points. That is really easy. But this is just too important. Congress can legislate on this. Congress must legislate on this. And with this bill before us, we can fix this.

Now, to me, something important this legislation does not address is the desperate need for a reliable, efficient, and fair program for American farmers to access a legal, stable supply of workers. Our broken H-2A and guest worker program has hobbled much of the agricultural industry from attaining a reliable workforce.

Chairman GOODLATTE of the House Judiciary Committee has been a steadfast advocate for reforming this system, and I thank him for his dedication to this matter over the years. I am heartened by the commitment the Speaker, as well as the majority leader, have given to me and others for a stand-alone vote on agricultural workforce legislation before the August recess. And I pledge to Chairman GOODLATTE to work with him and all of my colleagues on that legislation.

So while this bill does not fix every broken aspect of our immigration system, it does take a major consensus-based step toward addressing several main components, including providing certainty for DACA recipients and finally securing our border once and for all.

Honestly, Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents are asking me a pretty hard question: Why isn't this bill bipartisan? Why aren't any Democrats supporting it? I don't know the answer to that, but it may be just as simple as this: Because it is actually something that the President will sign into law.

Even though it provides certainty for the DACA population, which we all want, even though it addresses the terrible situation of family separation at the border, which I hear is something everybody wants to fix, anything that actually fulfills the President's goal of securing the border my Democratic colleagues seemingly refuse to vote for.

Now, I don't engage in hyperbole, but I do not think it is hyperbolic to say that my Democratic colleagues may not want to secure our border or enforce our immigration laws. That is what I see. It is clear to me their desire

to not give the President a “win” is more important than their desire to actually fix and find a solution to these issues.

Mr. Speaker, compromise is hard. It is tough stuff. Consensus is always difficult. Both of these things seem to have become four letter words. The same goes for cooperation and negotiation. But these are values that I, and many of us, have tried to espouse as we have worked together with colleagues from both sides of the aisle for these many months to find a solution to DACA while also securing our border.

□ 1430

But at the end of the day, we should all be operating under one reality—one thing that maybe some people do not want to accept or admit—whether you like it or not, the President has made it clear what must be included in any bill in order to be signed into law, he has told us what he needs. Now, I have acknowledged this, and I admit, it may be easier for some of us to admit than others, but that is the reality. If my colleagues refuse to accept that the President's top priority is securing the border, then consensus, Mr. Speaker, is just not possible.

I believe our President has shown good-faith willingness to compromise on the issue of DACA. He has come a long way.

Unfortunately, we have not seen that same good-faith effort coming from all of our colleagues. It is disappointing, my friends on the other side of the aisle refuse to work with us to try to find a solution here.

Mr. Speaker, history will be our greatest judge. It is always easy to be a no, but I will always strive to get to yes for the betterment of our Nation's future. There is simply too much riding on this legislation for us to not work as hard as we can to get to yes. The people of this country deserve nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am strongly against this rule and the underlying legislation. We have a human rights catastrophe on our hands. In less than 90 days, the Trump administration has ripped 2,500 children out of their parents' arms.

I am the father of a 3-year-old and a 6-year-old. I can only imagine what it would mean to have them taken to parts unknown, perhaps even locked in a cage, not knowing, not being able to find out what is happening to them.

This was a conscious decision that President Trump and Attorney General Sessions made to separate children from parents. It was not the congressional intent of the law. It was not the way that President Obama implemented the law. It was not the way President Trump implemented the law

until 90 days ago. But then President Trump made this mean-spirited decision to literally take little children, even babies, away from their mothers in our country, to place innocent children in facilities that have mats on the floor or thermal blankets for warmth, away from the loving embrace of a mom or a dad.

The President called this a zero-tolerance policy. It was simply the only reason that these families that are fleeing to the U.S., who are trying to keep their children safe, are being treated like criminals and having their young children taken away from them.

Children are being moved around this country faster than the Office of Refugee Resettlement can even track. We already know that the Office of Refugee Resettlement has a history of literally losing children, losing track of them while they are in custody, and now they are responsible for even more young, innocent lives.

Young children are being placed with host families as far away from the border as Michigan and Washington State. Parents don't even know where their children are. And young children are simply terrified about what happened to their loving mom and their loving dad, and how our country, the United States of America, could be complicit in separating them from the only parents they know.

This is an embarrassment for our Nation, and it must end.

And it is offensive when these bills before us are talked about as consensus or compromise, when no Democrats were involved. It may be a consensus between far-right Republicans and rightwing Republicans, but it is not a consensus among moderates, independents, or a single Democrat.

And when it comes to caring about these kids, I know my Republican colleagues care as well. So show it by supporting a true compromise bill, like the Dream Act, like other bills that we have had before us, like comprehensive immigration reform that, of course, will get votes from both sides of the aisle because they are the right thing to do for our country.

There are long-term consequences for this shortsighted policy. The very act of separating a family has traumatic and long-lasting impact for young girls like this, taken away from their mom and dad, their culture, their support system. They don't even have the tools at a young age to process what is going on or the trauma or the reality of the situation.

One Colorado pediatric emergency doctor treating children removed from their parents said: “The children clung so tightly and completely to their foster mothers, both at the emergency department and at home, that they were literally unable to put them down. They were terrified that their world would be broken for a second time.”

The Trump administration is creating a generation of thousands of kids, many of whom will grow up in

our country, whose first and sometimes most formative memories is of somebody wearing the badge or the flag of our country tearing them apart from their mother or their father while they are screaming, while they are crying out in the void of a fluorescently-lit warehouse funded by your taxpayer dollars.

According to the Office of Refugee Resettlement, responsible for the care of these kids, many children remain in these shelters for 57 days on average.

It is further disturbing that President Trump would willingly pull families apart and not have any plan for reuniting them even with his executive order, no plans to unite the over 2,500 children who have been torn apart from their parents.

According to the former director of ICE, these family separations may become permanent, literally leaving hundreds of kids here in the U.S. left in an already stressed and underfunded child welfare system, where they literally have a mom or dad fully capable of giving them care and loving them that has been forcibly separated from their own young children.

My office has been flooded with calls—I know yours has too, Mr. Speaker—some callers crying on the other end, demanding that we do something.

Yet, instead of ensuring that we provide resources families need and reunite them and heal the trauma, the Republicans are bringing to the floor partisan bills that would detain families indefinitely and criminalize even more immigrants. But this is what happens in a broken, failing, unaccountable immigration system. On that, we agree.

So, please, begin the discussions of compromise, of consensus. And that doesn't mean yourselves, Republicans. You control this body. You get to say what we vote on. It means involve caring independent, unaffiliated, Democrats, moms and dads, the faith community, the law enforcement community. Don't just have this discussion behind closed doors and come out with even more draconian measures that tear even more families apart.

So instead of bringing two bills to the floor that have widespread opposition, even in your own party—Republicans failed to pass their own bill—there are bipartisan solutions that would not only pass the House, but would get a large majority of the House. We could probably get to two-thirds of this House voting for compassion and love if we only were willing to try, bills that truly balance and include border security and safety and the values of our country, so we know that we, as Americans and as taxpayers, are not complicit in tearing a young girl's world apart.

Look, in Congress we often argue on policy issues. And I respect Mr. NEWHOUSE, my friend from Washington. And I would tell him that what a compromise means, Mr. NEWHOUSE, is not

you compromising with Stephen Miller; it means you compromising with LUIS GUTIÉRREZ or ZOE LOFGREN or me or the faith community. It is not a compromise when reasonable people like Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. CURBELO go into a backroom and have the reason beaten out of them by hateful fearmongering that is, frankly, un-American.

Look, I urge my Republican colleagues to imagine that these children were theirs, because they are ours, they are our wards, they are in our country. This cannot be allowed to continue. We need to reject this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this heartless, inhumane bill and begin a true process of compromise and consensus that can secure our borders, fix our broken immigration system, unite families, restore the rule of law, and reflect our values as Americans.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the gentleman that the Dream Act that he says is supported by many people in this Chamber would do nothing to address the issue that is happening at the border right now. The only piece of legislation before us today is the bill that we have in front of us, H.R. 6136, that if we pass that would solve that situation now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years, we the American people have been presented with false choices: between following the rule of law or showing compassion to people in need.

I have had the privilege of being born in the United States, but I grew up with parents who faced the hardships of living under a dictatorship. They came to America hoping that the peace and the opportunity they heard about really did exist. They worked hard jobs, scrubbing toilets, they learned our language, studied our history, learned our system of government and our Constitution. And after many years, when they finally had the privilege of taking the oath of citizenship and pledging their allegiance to the American flag, they knew exactly what they were saying and they meant every word of it.

They were not just enjoying the blessings of what this country had to offer, but they were willing to take on the responsibilities that came with it. They gave me an appreciation for this great Nation and told me every day that I was blessed to be born in it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to attend a naturalization ceremony and see the journey and the sacrifices that people have made to achieve citizenship. I think every American should take that oath of allegiance.

The goal of any immigration reform should be about family, safety, economic and community stability. The

practice of separating loving families from their children at the border is heartbreaking to watch, which is why we should support this bill.

We are a Nation of laws. We should provide laws that create certainty about the fate of these families.

Although H.R. 6136 is not a perfect bill for everyone, it does end the policies that make it easier to be here illegally than it is to be here legally. And it hits the sweet spot, allowing us both to follow the rule of law and show compassion to those who seek freedom and the blessings this country has to offer.

We cannot hide behind procedures and posturing. We must take a vote. We must be accountable to the people who we represent. It is our turn and our time to follow what the Constitution says in Article I, Section 8, to create a uniform rule of naturalization.

I am a daughter of immigrants. We are a proud American family of patriots. We believe that this country is worthy of all of our greatest efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, all of us, to support the rule for this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from Reuters today titled: "U.S. Centers Force Migrant Children to Take Drugs."

[From Reuters, June 21, 2018]

#### U.S. CENTERS FORCE MIGRANT CHILDREN TO TAKE DRUGS: LAWSUIT

Immigrant children are being routinely and forcibly given a range of psychotropic drugs at U.S. government-funded youth shelters to manage their trauma after being detained and in some cases separated from parents, according to a lawsuit.

Children held at facilities such as the Shiloh Treatment Center in Texas are almost certain to be administered the drugs, irrespective of their condition, and without their parents' consent, according to the lawsuit filed by the Los Angeles-based Center for Human Rights & Constitutional Law.

The Shiloh center, which specializes in services for children and youths with behavioral and emotional problems, did not respond immediately to a request for comment.

The lawsuit was filed on April 16, days after the introduction of the Trump Administration's "zero tolerance" policy to separate children from parents who crossed the U.S.-Mexico border illegally. Trump abandoned the policy on Wednesday.

"If you're in Shiloh then it's almost certain you are on these medications. So if any child were placed in Shiloh after being separated from a parent, then they're almost certainly on psychotropics," said Carlos Holguin, a lawyer representing the Center for Human Rights & Constitutional Law.

Officials at the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR), which oversees such centers, were not immediately available for comment.

Taking multiple psychotropic drugs at the same time can seriously injure children, according to the filing, which highlights the need for oversight to prevent medications being used as "chemical straight jackets," rather than treat actual mental health needs.

ORR-run centers unilaterally administer the drugs to children in disregard of laws in Texas and other states that require either a

parent's consent or a court order, the filing said.

The lawsuit seeks a shift in ORR policies to comply with state laws and prevent the prolonged detention of children.

Some youths at Shiloh reported being given up to nine different pills in the morning and six in the evening and said they were told they would remain detained if they refused drugs, the lawsuit said.

Some said they had been held down and given injections when they refused to take medication, the lawsuit said.

One mother said neither she nor any other family member had been consulted about medication given to her daughter, even though Shiloh had their contact details. Another mother said her daughter received such powerful anti-anxiety medications she collapsed several times, according to the filing.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, "Immigrant children," quoting from this article, "are being routinely and forcibly given a range of psychotropic drugs at U.S. government-funded youth shelters."

Taking multiple psychotropic drugs can seriously injure children. And many youths in Shiloh detention facility are being given nine different pills in the morning, six in the evening. You are paying for them all, Mr. Speaker. Taxpayers are paying for pills and injections and drugs for 2-years-olds and 4-year-olds that have been stripped from their parents.

One mother said she nor any other family member had even been consulted about their daughter being given powerful drugs.

Many kids are being held down, forcibly given injections when they refuse to take the medication that our tax dollars are paying for.

We need to stop this, Mr. Speaker.

You don't need a bill to stop it. President Trump needs to stop it. He wasn't doing it till 90 days ago; then he started to do it. It is not the will of Congress. It is not the letter of the law. It is a policy that is un-American and far outside the intent of Republicans or Democrats in this body.

□ 1445

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Ranking Member NADLER's bill, H.R. 6135, the Keep Families Together Act, which I am proud to cosponsor. This thoughtful proposal would prohibit the Department of Homeland Security from separating children from their parents, of course, except in extraordinary circumstances, and limit the criminal prosecution of asylum seekers.

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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, the Keep Families Together Act is the only bill that is a real solution to the human tragedy of abuses of children, of family separation at our border. This bill prohibits the separation of children from their parents; limits criminal prosecutions for asylum seekers; and requires DHS to reunite children and parents, something that the Trump administration has no plan for.

Mr. Speaker, the Keep Families Together Act is the bill we should be sending to the President's desk for signature, not H.R. 6136. H.R. 6136 does absolutely nothing to address the abuses of children, and I want to make it clear that it actually makes things worse.

Does anybody really believe that incarcerating children with their parents is the solution to family separation? or making children more vulnerable to trafficking? or eliminating basic requirements for confinement, like clean water and toilets?

Mr. Speaker, 11 days ago, I met with mothers detained in a Federal prison after cruelly being separated from their children, and one of the mothers told me how she made the devastating decision to leave her blind child behind and take her other child to safety because she knew that the blind child would not be able to make this journey.

These mothers and fathers are making impossible choices to come here to this country seeking safety, and H.R. 6136 does nothing to reunite these children, screaming "Mama" and "Papi," with their parents. The best case scenario is that they would be incarcerated in a family prison camp.

The President is responsible for this tragedy, and he has not reversed this policy. DHS has said that they don't even know where this child is.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6136 does not even address the crisis of Dreamers. I believe my colleague from the great State of Washington when he says he wants to fix that.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlewoman from Washington an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. JAYAPAL. But, in fact, this locks 82 percent of Dreamers out of citizenship, while dismantling the family immigration system and revoking approved petitions for 3 million family members who have paid fees and waited for years.

This is not a moderate bill. It is wrong.

Let's stand up for these children. Let's bring the Keep Families Together Act to the floor for a vote. Let us stand up for America.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could use that picture that my colleagues had up because we are debating a solution to an issue that Congresses for decades have not addressed.

Immigration is a difficult issue. It invokes strong feelings on both sides. But it is an issue that is long overdue. This vote today is important for showing the American people that we can govern.

The President supports it because it is strong on border security, provides a permanent solution for the DACA population, supports merit-based legal immigration, and codifies the law to allow families to stay together.

Frankly, these are all issues I have heard Republicans and Democrats talk about fixing. I hope some of my friends on the other side of the aisle will vote for this bill, and I think, if we were in a different time, many would.

But I am not sure that is going to happen. That is why we need every Republican to be with us.

It is not an easy issue, but we were elected to lead. By passing this bill, which has the best chance of making it through the Senate and being signed by the President, we could be the leaders who finally secure our borders, provide certainty for people who were brought here as children through no fault of their own, move our legal immigration system to a merit-based process, and keep families together—all issues that both sides have talked about solving, but today, with this vote, we could be the ones who solve these problems for decades.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" because it is a vote to govern. Governing is hard, but I am confident that we can get it done.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), the chair of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, we were so close, so close. Some Republicans were finally willing to work with Democrats on a bipartisan way forward to give certainty to Dreamers, young people who want to be able to work and go to school here free from fear. We needed just three more Republicans to tell their party enough is enough, just three more Republicans to support our bipartisan effort to hold votes on an array of proposals and let the most popular one win the day. But sadly, when the time came, they abandoned that effort. They abandoned the Dreamers.

They caved because the Republican leadership twisted their arms because the most hateful elements within their party don't want to fix these problems. They thrive off of them.

They don't want these people who deserve citizenship to get it. We do.

They don't think families deserve asylum or protection. We do.

They don't think these people deserve a chance at the American Dream. We do.

The bills we have before us today are a disgrace. They do nothing to stop the Trump orphan-creating machine, taking children from their parents and doing nothing to reunite them. And ultimately, they won't fix any of the

problems we have because they won't become law.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are wasting time—wasting time—while people and children suffer.

The American people won't stand for this. They won't stand for corrupting the law and twisting the Bible verses to justify splitting up families. They won't stand for torturing, psychologically torturing, refugee children. They won't stand for cowardice and callousness. That is not what America is made of.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I have heard so many interesting words on this debate. The last gentleman, whom I respect, said how the Democrats care so much for these individuals, and yet let's be perfectly clear. They had ample opportunity after ample opportunity to solve the problem.

In 2009, they promised that they would do it within 100 days. Then the President said that he would do it. Democrats had 60 percent of the votes in the Senate. They had huge majorities in the House, and they had a bipartisan bill ready to go, and yet they refused to do it.

But this is not a moment to point fingers, as my colleague just spent all of his time doing. This is a moment to find solutions.

Look, if you believe, like I do, that these folks who are here—no fault of their own—should have an opportunity to stay here, to be part of society, to be legalized and to, yes, obtain citizenship, this may be the best—it is the best and, potentially, the last chance for a long time to get that done, and this bill does that.

If you believe that minor kids should not be separated from their families, and if you believe that the best way to guarantee that is through legislation, this is the best and, potentially, last opportunity to get that done because this bill does that.

And if you believe that the United States has the right—no, the obligation—to determine who comes in and who leaves, this is, then, also the best and, potentially, last shot to get those three things done.

So, again, a lot of rhetoric, but this bill does three things: It allows Dreamers to stay here and allows them to become part of society forever and with pathways to citizenship; it stops, legislatively, the separation of minors from their parents on the border; and it secures the border.

That is what this bill does. Everything else, Mr. Speaker, is cheap rhetoric.

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

To my friend Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. NEWHOUSE and so many others, we stand ready to work with you, but instead, you chose to work with STEVE KING, LOUIE GOHMERT, Stephen Miller.

Come talk to us. We are ready. Democrats, to a person, are ready to support something that we don't fully agree with because we understand the Republicans control this body.

So come talk to us, and stop talking to STEVE KING, LOUIE GOHMERT, and Stephen Miller.

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

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, this bill also authorizes \$24 billion to build a stupid wall.

This bill also says it is going to be harder for family reunification by repealing two laws that already allow it.

This bill also says that 3 million people who have done the right thing and are in line to become citizens are now going to be shunted aside.

Don't kid yourself about what this bill says and what it doesn't say.

This bill also is a sham. You know it and I know it.

Now, previous speakers said that history is going to judge us. You are right. It will.

On this issue, God is going to judge you as well. When you go to those gates and there is a little thing in there that says you went out of your way to use children for your political purposes, you really think that is a good mark to have in your book? I don't think so.

When you talk about compromise, it takes a little bit more than just looking in the mirror and compromising with yourself. It actually means you have to deal with people who sometimes don't agree with you.

This bill is a lousy bill. You know it; we know it; and America knows it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

The previous speaker just made the point I was going to. If you are going to negotiate in good faith and arrive at consensus, you have to accept who the President is and what he requires in order to sign legislation whether you like it or not. And one of the priorities that he has made as clear as day is that there will be border security and a wall. Refusing to accept that fact pretty much closes the door on the opportunity or any possibility of negotiation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am relatively new to this body, but I have been following politics in this country for quite some time. For many years, I have been hearing Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, but more so on this side, promising the country that we would secure the border, that we would disrupt the drug traffickers who are poisoning our people, and that we would disrupt the human traffickers who abuse and rape small children and others as they take them across the desert.

This is the opportunity to fulfill the promise of securing our country's border, because this country, just like any other country in the world, has the right and the responsibility to secure its border and enforce its immigration laws.

For a long time, I have also been hearing people talk about Dreamers, the victims of a broken immigration system, young immigrants brought to our country as children, who grew up here, went to school with our own children, pledge allegiance to the same flag, and today are contributing to this great country. A lot of people in this Chamber, on both sides, more so on the other side of the aisle, have been promising a solution for Dreamers for 17 years, with nothing to show for it.

This is our opportunity to make sure these young immigrants are treated fairly and guaranteed a future in America with a bridge onto the legal immigration system. We take the exact criteria that the Obama administration laid out in the DACA program. That is in this legislation.

This bill will also help us end family separation, which I think there is a great deal of bipartisanship for in this Chamber. Our country should have the ability to enforce its laws and to keep families together, which is exactly what the Obama administration was attempting to do until the courts got in the way. We can fix that here.

And lastly, we need to modernize our immigration system. We are a nation of immigrants. I am the child of immigrants, and I am so proud of it. But our immigration laws are outdated. Our immigration system has to be modernized so that it is better aligned with our economy so that immigrants who come to this country have the best opportunity to grow, to prosper, and to contribute.

□ 1500

The alternative is the status quo. A vote against this legislation is the status quo.

What is the status quo? A porous, wall-less border; uncertainty for Dreamers; young people who could lose their status within months; families separated at the border; and an outdated immigration system that dishonors every American.

So this is our chance to come together. Is this legislation perfect? Every Member of this House could find an excuse to vote against this bill. But that is the problem with immigration, that nothing has ever been good enough. When nothing is good enough, you get nothing. And that is not fair to the American people.

That is why I sat at the table, and I have been at the table for weeks, not just with Republicans, with Democrats, good colleagues like Mr. POLIS. We sat long hours trying to reach a compromise, and it is always elusive. Let's change that now.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I also remind my friend from Miami that we have reached several compromises.

He and I are both members of the Problem Solvers Caucus. I am proud that the Problem Solvers Caucus—more than 25 Democrats, 25 Republicans—we agreed. We reached a compromise bill—border security, addresses the needs of the Dreamers. I think it would get 60, 70 percent of the votes on the floor of the House. Let's bring that bill up.

Unfortunately, Republicans chose to set Mr. CURBELO's work and my work aside and proceed with a spiteful bill that makes the problem worse.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, last September, President Trump took our Dreamers, those incredible young people who are contributing so much to America, he took them hostage.

Then, this month, he added to the hostages by ordering that babies, literally, be yanked out of their moms' arms. Today, with his Republican enablers, he is basically saying: Give me my \$25 billion wall ransom, and give it to me paid in full. But I am not promising to release the hostages.

Today's bill is wrong for Dreamers. It is wrong for taxpayers. It is wrong for those families who have been torn apart by this government-sanctioned child abuse.

How great that, with his latest U-turn today, the President is dispatching his wife, a mother herself, to the Texas border.

I just happen to feel that the kids that are tied up in those cages don't want to see a mother. They want to see their mother.

Tonight, they will cry themselves to sleep again, because the self-described "stable genius" didn't bother to include anything in his executive order to reunite those families.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would say, instead of taking these hostages and passing this bill, they need to build a great mirror and look in it to see how they have become willing accomplices to this wrongdoing. I bet Mexico would pay for that.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and would just like to respond to one thing that was said previously.

All of us have been using examples of young people and how they are being treated at the border. I take exception to the implication that we will all be judged accordingly by our Maker for doing so, in a negative way.

Let me just repeat what I said in my opening remarks, quoting a Border Patrol agent, Mr. Chris Cabrera. He told us that: "If you've seen some of the stuff we've seen down here, you would understand just how important it is to have a tough stance to divert people from coming here. When you see a 12-year-old girl with a Plan B pill—her



parents put her on birth control because they know getting violated is part of the journey . . . something has to be done.”

That is exactly what we are doing here with this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

If we pass this today, that will help solve this problem today. That is what we, as Congress, need to do. We need to be responsive to the plight of people trying to get here, as well as to the citizens of our own country.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article entitled “Pentagon Asked to Make Room for 20,000 Migrant Children on Military Bases.”

[June 21, 2018]

PENTAGON ASKED TO MAKE ROOM FOR 20,000  
MIGRANT CHILDREN ON MILITARY BASES

(By Dan Lamothe, Seung Min Kim and Nick Miroff)

The Trump administration is considering housing up to 20,000 unaccompanied migrant children on military bases in coming months, according to lawmakers and a Defense Department memo obtained by The Washington Post.

The Pentagon's notification to lawmakers said that officials at Health and Human Services asked the Pentagon to indicate whether it can provide the beds for children at military installations “for occupancy as early as July through December 31, 2018.”

Sen. Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.) addressed the issue on the Senate floor Thursday morning.

“The Department of Defense has been asked whether it can house 20,000 unaccompanied children between now and the end of the year,” he said. “How will that work? Is it even feasible?”

The plan would seemingly have similarities to 2014, when the Obama administration housed about 7,000 unaccompanied children on three military bases. The Pentagon, in its congressional notification to lawmakers, said it must determine if it “possesses these capabilities.” As required under the Economy Act, the memo said, the Defense Department would be reimbursed for all costs incurred.

The sites would be run by HHS employees or contractors working with them, the memo said. They would provide care to the children, “including supervision, meals, clothing, medical services, transportation or other daily needs,” and HHS representatives will be present at each location.

The memo was sent to lawmakers Wednesday after President Trump reversed his administration's unpopular policy to separate children from their parents as they arrived at the southern U.S. border.

The president's executive order directed Defense Secretary Jim Mattis to “take all legally available measures” to provide Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen with “any existing facilities available for the housing and care of alien families,” and the construction of new facilities “if necessary and consistent with law.”

Lt. Col. Jamie Davis acknowledged Thursday that the Pentagon received the request, and said the department is reviewing it.

The Trump administration spent months planning, testing and defending its family separation system at the border, taking more than 2,500 children from their parents in the six weeks prior to the president's executive order Wednesday bringing it to a halt.

The U.S. government has been examining for weeks whether it can use military bases to house migrant children. Representatives from HHS visited three bases in Texas—Fort Bliss, Dyess Air Force Base and Goodfellow Air Force Base—last week to review their facilities for suitability, and were scheduled to review Little Rock Air Force Base in Arkansas on Wednesday, Davis said.

The Obama administration temporarily set up temporary centers in 2014 at three U.S. military bases: Fort Sill in Oklahoma, Lackland Air Force Base in Texas and naval Base Ventura in California.

Asked about the possibility of military bases being involved again, Mattis said Wednesday that the Defense Department would “see what they come up with” in HHS, and that the Pentagon will “respond if requested.”

Mattis dismissed concerns about housing migrants on military bases now, noting that the Defense Department has done it on several occasions and for several reasons.

“We have housed refugees,” he said. “We have housed people thrown out of their homes by earthquakes and hurricanes. We do whatever is in the best interest of the country.”

The secretary, pressed on the sensitivities of the Trump administration separating children from their parents, said reporters would need to ask “the people responsible for it.”

“I’m not going to chime in from the outside,” he said. “There’s people responsible for it. Secretary Nielson, obviously, maintains close collaboration with us. You saw that when we deployed certain National Guard units there, so she’s in charge.”

Sen. Jack Reed (D-R.I.) and Rep. Adam Smith (D-Calif.), the leading members of the armed services committees, wrote a letter to Mattis on Wednesday requesting assurances that members of Congress would have access to any migrant facility established on a military base. The letter, sent before Trump dropped his family-separation policy at the border, said that it was essential to have access even in cases where only short notice is provided.

Mattis has approved temporarily detailing 21 military attorneys to the Justice Department to help with the glut of immigration cases that have emerged on the border. The order, issued earlier this month, calls for 21 attorneys with criminal-trial experience to assist as special assistant U.S. attorneys for 179 days, Davis said. They will help in prosecuting border immigration cases, he added, “with a focus on misdemeanor improper entry and felony illegal reentry cases.”

The possibility was raised in a congressional hearing in May, and first reported as underway by MSNBC on Wednesday night. U.S. law permits a judge advocate lawyer to be assigned or detailed to another agency, including to provide representation in civil and criminal cases.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration is now looking to house up to 20,000 children taken away from their parents at military bases. They are looking to take 10 times as many children away from their parents as they already have.

It is time to stop President Trump.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, this bill wouldn’t end the separation of children from their parents, but it would also provide that the parents could be put in jail with their children.

The alternative, which is false, seems to be to put the mother in the cage

with the toddler or they run free and we will never see them again. It is not true.

There was something called the Family Case Management Program—100 percent attendance rate at the immigration hearing. Those are not my figures. Those are figures from the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General.

One hundred percent of the people showed up at their hearing, either to get relief or to be removed, at a cost of \$36 a day, as compared to \$711 a day to keep a child in a temporary tent facility.

We don’t want to see the equivalent of internment camps, as we saw in World War II, for these asylum seekers.

We need the orderly administration of the immigration laws. This bill will lead to mass incarceration of mothers and their toddlers.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, isn’t that amazing? Republicans can’t even find elected Representatives willing to come down here on the floor and defend taking kids away from their parents.

They are out of speakers because Republicans are embarrassed. They know that they cannot face the American people, no less their Maker, knowing that they are complicit in tearing innocent children away from mom and dad.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the President created a humanitarian crisis that inflicts lasting trauma on children when he mandated that they be taken from their parents at the border.

The President’s executive action just trades one trauma for another by locking up children indefinitely.

This is about the lives and the wellbeing of children. There are more than 2,000 kids who were taken from their parents. I want people watching this to think about those children. The President chose to put them through this to push his harmful and abusive immigration policies.

The Speaker could allow a vote on bipartisan immigration bills today to reform our immigration system and to put an end to the President’s policy of traumatizing these kids.

Congress needs to stand up and fix our broken immigration system and put an end to the deplorable tactics of this administration.

Mr. Speaker, this isn’t who we are as a Nation. We need to fix our immigration system and save these kids.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I am proud to represent my conference and stand here with this piece of legislation that will provide the certainty and the hope for more than 1.8 million DACA recipients and Dreamers in this country. If you vote “no” on this bill, you will be denying those individuals what they for so long have been wanting.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be here representing my conference to do just that, to give them that hope, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. NEWHOUSE may be proud, but there are no other Republicans who have come to the floor to join him.

We have so many Democrats who want to speak about how you can unite families that I don't even have enough time to give.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleague Mr. NEWHOUSE if he will yield me the balance of his time. Well, I wish he would, because no Republicans are willing to face the American people, because they know they are not working to solve this issue. They are working to tear more families apart. And they are lying about it, Mr. Speaker. They are lying about it.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the rule and the shameful Border Security and Immigration Reform Act.

I am dismayed and embarrassed that the Republicans are attempting to claim that this bill is a compromise. This partisan anti-immigrant legislation is the opposite to the idea of compromise.

If Republicans were serious about compromise and protecting the Dreamers, they would have allowed the bipartisan discharge petition and queen-of-the-hill rule to move forward. Instead, Republicans have spent the last 10 months ignoring the will of the American people and holding Dreamers and young immigrant children hostage to implement their hardline agenda.

This legislation does not provide a path to citizenship. It eliminates asylum protections, drastically cuts legal immigration, removes basic requirements for safe and humane detention, fails to end family separation, and does nothing to reunite the children who have been separated from their parents.

Some of these children are being held 2,000 miles away from their parents, including in my district in New York, without any idea where their parents are or if they will ever see them again.

This is cruel. What we need is a compassionate solution with a path to citizenship and reunification of these families. Instead, this bill is an attack on family values and an insult to our country's heritage as a beacon of freedom and opportunity for all.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Washington, a member of the Rules Committee, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I really came down here to take part in this debate because, yesterday, for 7 hours, we were at the Rules Committee laying out what are

known as Goodlatte 1 and Goodlatte 2, these two bills.

This is the rule on what might be called Goodlatte 2. This is a rule and a piece of legislation that represents several years' worth of work that was done by Members of the Republican majority to approach an issue that is known as DACA. It is to take some 700,000 young people, and slightly older, who came to America not because they did it on their own fruition as even a young adult, but as a child, where they could not make a decision. They came with their parents to this country.

We have been struggling for years to find the right answer on how to answer the question of how to deal with these Dreamers.

It is the Republican Party that was challenged by our President who said: I would like for Congress to tackle this issue. It was the President of the United States that began debate and discussion on a bipartisan basis with Republicans and Democrats, Senators and House Members, down at the White House.

It found itself at a point where, then, Members came back here and began working together. It did fall apart, but it did not end. It did not end because the Republican Party in our majority have groups of people who are from all across this country, as we have a Congressman CURBELO from Miami, Florida, as we have a DAN NEWHOUSE from the State of Washington. Each of these Members have care and concern about people who live in their district and who have come and petitioned them: Please, Congressman NEWHOUSE, do something.

What did they ask for? They asked for two things, very simply. They asked: Please allow us to come out of the shadows and recognize us. And, secondly: Give us legal status.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we are out of time.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what these bills do. They address the issue in a compassionate, fair way.

□ 1515

They address the issues of coming out of the shadows, and they are given permanent legal status that gives them options for the rest of their life.

I think that what we have done, Mr. Speaker, is more than what we were asked, and to not be a part of taking a vote on this today and voting "yes" is another opportunity that we are given here today.

I hope the Members understand the importance.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. POLIS, for his leadership on the Rules Committee.

I respect the chairman of the Rules Committee, but I respectfully disagree. He has presided over a Rules Committee that has the most closed rules in the history of the Congress of the United States. Competing ideas, opposing views were not allowed to be considered in either of the two bills the Republicans are going to put before the Congress. One we have dispensed with already.

I oppose the rule and I oppose the underlying legislation. We are facing multiple immigration crises of the President's own making, and we must not be fooled by plans designed to cover that up.

This is not the fix we need for migrant families separated at the border. President Trump's inhumane and morally repugnant policy to forcibly separate children from their parents as they seek refuge in America is beyond the pale. We cannot rely on the President's sudden change of heart. We must forbid this barbaric policy by passing the Keep Families Together Act, not this bill.

This is not the fix we need for Dreamers, despite what Mr. SESSIONS, my good friend from Texas, just said. There are nearly 800,000 Dreamers, including 2,400 in my district. They need an opportunity to work, to attend school, to contribute to our communities, and to become the Americans they, in fact, are.

I had a Dreamer as my guest at the State of the Union address. She came to this country at the age of 1. She has never been back to her country of birth. She thought she was an American until she applied for a driver's permit at the age of 16. She is a proud American, and we would be proud to have her.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule, and to oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, we have got so many Members coming wanting to speak. How much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in support, not only of this rule, but on the underlying bill.

It is time to get something done around here. Both parties have failed to address this issue for decades now; we finally have an opportunity, for the same kids that are in your district that talk to me in mine.

The kids are just looking for the certainty of being able to have a job, being able to go to school, and, yes, some of them even want to sign up for the military and show their greatest act of patriotism.

These are kids just looking for a path forward. This bill protects them on day



one, the day that this bill is signed into law. It not only protects the DACA recipients that signed up under President Obama's executive order, but some of them didn't trust that executive order. Some of them didn't trust that their information would be secure. This protects them, too.

Now, there is another group of people here that did not qualify. They were not of age at the time. This will protect them, too. If you care about the Dreamers, 1.8 million will be protected on day one. You should support this bill, too.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to go to the definition of the word compromise, because I think that there needs to be education regarding what these words mean that are being tossed around. A compromise is an agreement or settlement of a dispute that is reached by each side making concessions.

It doesn't mean looking at yourself in the mirror and conceding to yourself. It doesn't mean Republicans going into a closed-door meeting and coming out with a bill that makes things worse. It means Republicans and Democrats working together, each giving up some things, each living with what they can accept.

I have worked hard on compromise with many of my Republican colleagues through the Problem Solvers Caucus to solve and provide a pathway to citizenship for Dreamers while securing our border.

This bill makes things worse. It guts legal immigration. It eliminates two family immigration programs: married children of U.S. citizens, and siblings of U.S. adults. It doesn't even grandfather in people already in the system waiting to be reunited with their families, meaning that it will eliminate the current legal way that families can be reunified.

This bill raises the credible fear standard for asylum seekers to begin the process by raising the standards to more probably than not. This bill does nothing to prevent the Trump administration's grotesque policy of separating parents and children at the border. In fact, it simply removes protections for those families who are currently not separated at points of entry.

And now we are hearing that President Trump is preparing military bases to house up to 20,000 more kids that he plans to snatch from their moms and their dads.

We can do better. This humanitarian crisis is entirely President Trump's making. He didn't do it before the last 90 days. He just started a misinterpretation of the law. His recent executive order is not a solution. Over 2,300 kids have already been separated from their parents and there is no plan to reunite them.

This order doesn't even require any families be detained together, and the order doesn't contain any prohibitions barring family separation. We know

that separating kids is wrong. I hope Americans agree that this is bad for kids.

But let's also look at science.

The American Academy of Pediatrics said that the incarceration of families and separation of families has long-term consequences for the health and wellbeing, mental and physical, for children and parents. Separation consequences include: post-traumatic stress disorder, developmental delays, and poor psychological adjustment.

I dare say that these policies of the Trump administration, who on their own decided to tear 1- and 2- and 3-year-old kids away from their parents, is going to create even greater needs for these next generation of kids, many of whom will grow up here legally, those who successfully pursue their asylum claims.

And while those immigration claims are being adjudicated, some might have to return to their native country. Some will be able to stay. Families should be together. No parent should have to see their own child stripped away.

This bill is hemorrhaging support. I have an article that I include in the RECORD from Politico stating that the Koch network won't support the House immigration bills, entitled: "Koch network raps Trump, won't support House immigration bills."

[From POLITICO, June 19, 2018]

KOCH NETWORK RAPS TRUMP, WON'T SUPPORT HOUSE IMMIGRATION BILLS

(By Maggie Severns)

The political network founded by the Koch brothers is taking a stand against both President Donald Trump's policy toward separating families at the border and two immigration bills due for votes in the House this week, dealing a blow to GOP leaders who are marshaling support for their version.

"It's encouraging that the House will have a debate this week on immigration bills that include protections for the Dreamers," said Daniel Garza, president of the Koch network's LIBRE Initiative, referring to a group of undocumented immigrants who came to the U.S. as children. "Unfortunately, in their current form, both [House leadership's bill and an alternative immigration bill] expected to receive a vote fall short of the solution we need."

Garza also called on Trump to "take immediate action to end the separation of families at the border by rescinding the 'zero tolerance' policy."

The Kochs' push for a more moderate approach toward immigration legislation complicates the thorny debate in Washington. Lawmakers have called on Trump to stop his administration from splitting up immigrant families, which has drawn public outrage since he implemented a zero tolerance policy of prosecuting everyone who crosses the border illegally. Trump has refused to act alone, saying Congress needs to pass immigration legislation.

The Koch brothers have pushed the Republican Party to create a path to citizenship for Dreamers, who were extended protections under the Obama administration that Trump has tried to withdraw. The Kochs also have urged the GOP not to make severe cuts to the flow of immigrants into the country, even launching a seven-figure ad buy supporting their efforts.

House Republicans were coalescing around an immigration bill supported by House leadership that would, among other things, give some protections to Dreamers. Its path forward was already complicated: Trump blasted the measure last week, but later Tuesday he was expected to travel to Capitol Hill to rally Republicans behind it.

The Kochs' opposition to the GOP leadership bill could make it even more difficult for House Speaker Paul Ryan to unite his caucus behind it. Conservatives favor a second bill, also due for a vote this week, from Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.).

Garza said in a statement that "it's clear there's strong support in Congress and among the American people to provide permanency to the Dreamers," but neither bill "affords the Dreamers the certainty they need to make a full contribution to American communities," and both "include arbitrary cuts to legal immigration."

Mr. POLIS. I don't agree with the Koch network on much. I do know that they fund many Republicans, but maybe now that the Republicans are taking children away from their parents, the Kochs will stop funding Republicans, because I am glad to hear that they are people of principle.

The article says they "push for a more moderate approach toward immigration legislation," and they have "called on Trump to stop his administration from splitting up immigrant families," which this bill does not do.

In fact, this bill ends those who are waiting for family reunification today. So there is a legal way to unite families. This bill eliminates that and will lead to more families being apart.

This is a false crisis entirely of President Trump's making. I hope that even he has recognized that the American people will not stand for 3- and 4-year-olds literally being put in cages, strapped down while they are given drugs and medicated and injected, with Americans complicit in this atrocity.

It needs to be reiterated one more time that the votes we take on the rule today are more than procedural. They have a significant impact on young lives of innocent children.

They will show which Members of Congress care about fixing our immigration system and are willing to compromise and work in a bipartisan way, and which Members of Congress vote to make all of the problems outlined here today worse and more widespread.

We need to reject these bills, reject this rule. We need to keep families together. We need to begin the sometimes challenging work of compromise and consensus building between Republicans and Democrats, between Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. CURBELO, and me and Ms. LOFGREN and others—not with Stephen Miller, STEVE KING, or LOUIE GOHMERT.

Reject these bills. Keep families together. Let's work together on border security, on fixing our broken immigration system, on uniting families, on a permanent solution for Dreamers, to ensure that this horror and affront to our American values ends and doesn't repeat itself ever again.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, don't believe me. I would say don't believe Mr. POLIS either. Believe the border security guard that I quoted earlier who said that the situation we have at the border happened under the previous administration as well as this one.

Mr. Trump, our President, did not manufacture this crisis, but this bill before us will solve that situation, which is why we need to pass this rule.

That whole issue takes away from one of the most pressing issues of our time, immigration reform. We will solve that, but we can also address immigration.

I am proud of the bill we have before us. I am proud that we have had so many speakers come and speak on its behalf. This is the only bill in front of us that has any potential chance of becoming law. The President will sign this bill because it addresses his four main pillars: it provides for border security, which the American people want. And, certainly, as we have talked a lot today, it provides for those 1.8 million DACA recipients and Dreamers. It is a good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this closed rule and the sham underlying legislation.

As the Ranking Member on Homeland Security, one truism that I hear is that you do not negotiate with terrorists.

Yet, that is exactly what the House Leadership is asking us to do today.

When the President said, in September, that he has "a great heart" for Dreamers, we were hopeful that a deal could be reached.

However, since that time, the Trump Administration has executed a "campaign of terror" in furtherance of one objective—getting Congress to pay for a border wall.

On September 5th, the President announced the repeal of DACA.

Then, on September 18th, he announced the end of the TPS program to give safe haven to Sudanese nationals.

On November 6th, it was ended for Nicaraguans.

Two weeks later, it was canceled for Haitians.

In January, Salvadorans also lost these immigration protections.

Arguably the cruelest, most inhumane tactical maneuver of the Trump Administration came on April 6th, when the "Zero Tolerance policy" was announced.

The "DACA crisis", the "TPS crisis", and now the "Family Separation crisis" are all crises of the President's own making.

And it is people—it is children—who suffer. Make no mistake, the measure before us today will not end the suffering.

Instead of family separation, it offers family detention, an approach that DHS' own advisory committee has stated is "neither appropriate nor necessary for families" and is "never in the best interest of children."

For these reasons, I urge a "no" on this rule and H.R. 6136, an Anti-Family Values bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 953 OFFERED BY  
MR. POLIS

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6135) to limit the separation of families at or near ports of entry. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6135.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and House Resolution 905, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motion to reconsider the question of passage of H.R. 2;

Passage of H.R. 2, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 953;

Adopting House Resolution 953, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

#### AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on the