

What is most remarkable about Whompie is that he has spent nearly all his life in the service of others. Not only is he a U.S. Army veteran, but Whompie sat on the Blue Mound Town Board for 4 years, serving as the village president another 4.

He volunteered his time as a Boy Scout troop leader and has been actively involved in the Interchurch Food Pantry since 1984. For the past 29 years, the citizens of Blue Mound have known Whompie as their Pleasant View Township clerk until his retirement this spring.

However, if you ask him, Whompie's greatest accomplishment has been his nearly 69-year marriage to his wife, Nelda. Together, they have three children, six grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren.

Whompie, congratulations on a well-earned retirement. Best wishes to you and your family.

FOREIGN INTERFERENCE IN U.S. ELECTIONS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the 2016 election and its fallout highlighted what many Americans already knew, that special interests bankroll candidates in exchange for expected favors down the road and loopholes allow foreign governments to influence our elections. Look no further than the pervasive impact of Russian-sponsored political ads on Facebook in 2016.

My bill, the REFUSE Act, Repelling Encroachment by Foreigners into U.S. Elections, tightens campaign finance laws and lobbyist disclosure rules to protect our democracy from foreign influence.

First, to stem the bleed of special interest money into our elections, our bill sets a reasonable limit on foreign ownership within corporate PACs and 501(c)(4) nonprofits that spend on our elections. Second, the bill tightens reporting requirements for foreign agents and gives the Justice Department real enforcement authority to go after the bad guys.

Until we repeal Citizens United, which threw open the floodgates for billionaires and special interests to spend unlimited secret money on our elections, we need commonsense legislation like the REFUSE Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in fortifying our democratic Republic against foreign influence.

HONORING OFFICER MATHEW MAZANY

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

Mr. JOYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I want to honor the life and service of a brave constituent of mine, Mentor police officer Mathew Mazany.

Officer Mazany, a 14-year veteran officer, was killed in a tragic hit-and-run on Sunday morning while helping with a traffic stop.

He achieved his dream by following in the footsteps of his father, who also served as a police officer for 34 years in Maple Heights, not too far from Mentor. His coworkers and those who knew him best described him as a happy-go-lucky kind of guy who enjoyed protecting the Mentor community.

Officer Mazany leaves behind a son, brother, father, and countless others who had the pleasure of knowing him. His legacy and dedication to public service will not be forgotten.

My prayers are with Officer Mathew Mazany's family, his friends, the city of Mentor, and the Mentor Police Department during this difficult time.

SUPPORTING OUR MILITARY

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for H.R. 6157, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

Over the last year and a half, our unified government has taken the necessary steps to unleash the economy and foster growth here in the United States. Because of this work, our economy is strong today.

Now we must do the work required to ensure that our military is strong, too, especially after the damaging sequestration cuts and funding limitations placed on our military by the previous administration. As a member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I have been proud to have a seat at the table through this process. I appreciate the leadership of Chairwoman KAY GRANGER as we work to properly fund our military.

I am grateful to serve Alabama's Second District that is home to Maxwell-Gunter Air Force Base and Fort Rucker. I am proud that this bill provides the resources to support their critical missions.

Mr. Speaker, one of Congress' most fundamental constitutional responsibilities is to provide for the common defense. This bill fulfills that responsibility and ensures that our military remains the tip of the spear. I will proudly vote for H.R. 6157 to properly fund our military.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6157, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JUNE 29, 2018, THROUGH JULY 9, 2018

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 964 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 964

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and available pro forma amendments described in section 3 of House Resolution 961. Each further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except amendments described in section 3 of House Resolution 961, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further 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.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from June 29, 2018, through July 9, 2018 —

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July, 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague 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

Ms. CHENEY. 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 gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 964, which provides for the consideration of additional amendments to H.R. 6157, the Department of Defense Appropriations

Act for fiscal year 2019. This rule makes in order an additional 29 amendments: 8 Republican, 16 Democratic, and 5 bipartisan amendments.

Mr. Speaker, as we discussed on this floor yesterday and many times previously, providing funding that our men and women in uniform need to defend this great Republic is by far the most important responsibility we have as Members of the United States Congress. Today's rule gives us the opportunity to get the input and hear the voices of additional Members as we listen to and consider their amendments to H.R. 6157.

In the National Defense Strategy that was released late last year, Secretary Mattis described the situation facing our Armed Forces this way: "Today, we are emerging from a period of strategic atrophy, aware that our competitive military advantage has been eroding. We are facing increased global disorder, characterized by decline in the longstanding rules-based international order—creating a security environment more complex and volatile than any we have experienced in recent memory."

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I would say more than any that we have lived through and any that we have existed in since World War II.

Without the kind of sustained and predictable investment that appropriations bills and the appropriation process needs, we will simply not be able to restore readiness to modernize our military or to maintain our strategic advantage. We will rapidly lose our ability to project our forces as well as our military advantage.

We cannot allow that to happen. The rule and the underlying bill that we are debating today are both crucial steps to continue the progress that we have already made and crucial steps toward ensuring that the commitment that we made in order to provide 2 years of funding for our men and women in uniform is kept.

This bill helps provide the very resources and modernization that the National Defense Strategy said were so crucially needed. We have to make sure that our Department of Defense can provide combat-credible military forces needed to deter war and protect the security of our Nation.

Today's rule, Mr. Speaker, gives us the opportunity to debate this important piece of legislation and get the input from Members of this body who would like to make it even better.

One of the amendments, Mr. Speaker, made in order by this rule was offered by my colleague from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and cosponsored by a bipartisan group of Members. It would allow the Department of Defense to dual buy CVN-80 and CVN-81. These are our next two aircraft carriers. The Navy has stated that this dual buy authority could likely save taxpayers \$2.5 billion on these two aircraft carriers.

This amendment serves two purposes. It helps ensure that we are using tax-

payer resources wisely, and it helps move us toward the Navy's necessary and stated goal of a 355-ship Navy.

There are several other good amendments, Mr. Speaker, made in order by this rule, some that I probably won't support. But the rule takes serious ideas about how we can strengthen the Nation's Armed Forces, how we can make the defense of this Nation our priority, and brings them to the floor of this House for our consideration.

I look forward to considering each amendment and completing the Defense Appropriations process in this House. The work we are doing here is vital, but it is only part of the job, Mr. Speaker. We have to pass the appropriations bill through this body, and then we have to make sure that our colleagues on the other side of this building, our colleagues in the Senate, do the same. We can't hold funding for our military hostage to other priorities, even for additional domestic spending. We simply must provide reliable funding at necessary levels for the men and women in uniform who are putting their lives on the line for all of us.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule that will allow consideration of additional amendments to H.R. 6157.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order 29 amendments to H.R. 6157, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2019. The underlying legislation is the product of bipartisan negotiations, which have been going on for months. Bipartisan negotiations are a really good thing, and I am glad that, on this one issue, we are finding ways to work together.

In particular, I want to recognize the work that Representative AGUILAR, Representative HURD, and many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have been doing to create a path forward and look for a solution to President Trump's self-created Dreamer crisis. That is what we are supposed to be doing here: working together to solve problems.

Unfortunately, this Republican leadership doesn't believe in working with the other side. They are only interested in negotiating with their own. So it is not surprising that it isn't going very well. That is why they pulled their own immigration bill last week.

Maybe the Republican leadership, which has blocked the bipartisan Dream Act time and time again, and which has blocked the bipartisan USA Act time and time again, should trust their Members to craft and vote on compromise legislation.

□ 1230

But they don't have the courage or the vision to do that, do they?

Now we have another crisis, which, again, the President has created, a crisis that has outraged our constituents. Thousands of children, even infants and toddlers, are ripped from their parents at our southern border, children who have done absolutely nothing wrong, children who did not choose to come here on their own, kids too young to know the name of the country that they came from, too young to know what asylum is, too young to know what illegal entry means. Some of these kids only know two words: "mom" and "dad."

We have heard the recordings of these children crying out for their parents while being made fun of. Many of us have visited the detention centers, and it is heartbreaking and it is unnecessary.

So, while I congratulate the Appropriations Committee for their hard work on the defense bill, I have to remind the Speaker that we have 95 days to finish our work for funding the Federal Government. But I would challenge my colleagues to imagine one day, a single day, without their child, unsure if they would ever see them again.

We have some time to do the defense bill, but on the issue of family separation, we cannot afford to wait another day. Congress should be addressing this crisis today. It is not going to be easy. This administration clearly did not think through this policy that they have created.

Right now, we have children in HHS care, but where are their parents? Some are in custody of the U.S. Marshals or ICE, already deported, or maybe some are free on bond.

HHS said yesterday that they were not reuniting kids with their parents who are in detention. What does that mean? Are they going to be free? If not, what is the plan?

Let's look at the best-case scenario: a parent who gets out on bond and goes to HHS and asks for their child is told, "Show us your documents. Prove you are really the parent," and this parent who has been in custody has nothing.

Where is the plan to help these parents obtain their documents? Where are these plans to help these children reunite with their parents?

Does the administration even know where all the parents are and how they are supposed to be reunited with their kids?

How are they keeping track of the babies, the babies who are simply too young to even know their name?

We have many unanswered questions. We should be making sure those kids get to their parents, making sure that every single one of those children is accounted for. That is doing our job.

Instead, we are passing another appropriations bill with the full knowledge that we will probably do what we have done every year that I have been here: We will pass a CR at the end of

the fiscal year, and then we will probably pass another CR, and then another, and then another, and then another, because we can't legislate together.

This rule makes in order 29 amendments, but not a single one of them deals with the issues of the kids. Why not allow a vote on the amendment I offered with Representative SCHIFF to prohibit detaining children at military facilities?

Why not allow a vote on my amendment to block certain Cabinet members from using military aircraft until the children are reunited? Is it more important for Scott Pruitt to get on a plane than for a baby from El Salvador to get back into his mother's arms? or the amendment offered by my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. POLIS? Representative POLIS' amendment would have prohibited the Department of Defense from transferring resources to the Department of Justice to carry out prosecution of migrant families.

Don't our troops need these resources? Shouldn't our military be focused on keeping us safe from ISIS and North Korea, not toddlers and babies?

And why is the Republican leadership afraid to allow us to have a vote? I guess babies are too controversial for the Republican caucus. I guess keeping families together is a poison pill amendment.

By refusing Congress a vote, this House is giving up its responsibility to make immigration laws, plain and simple. This House should be a check on the administration. That is the way the system is supposed to work. But we are not doing that. Instead, by refusing to let us have a vote on the floor, the Republican House majority is endorsing President Trump's family jails.

Mr. Speaker, this House majority owns this crisis. Let me be clear: A vote for this rule is a vote for more of President Trump's cruelty to these babies. It is a vote to keep innocent children from their parents.

This House has the power to reunite these families. This House has the power to end separation. This House has the power to stop hateful immigration policies.

But this House won't act. Because of that, thousands of families may be destroyed forever. We must defeat this rule and give this House an opportunity to act.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that this House actually is going to be taking up a bill that addresses these issues. Mr. GOODLATTE's bill will come up within the next hour or so here on this floor. The bill itself would require that the Department of Homeland Security maintain the care and custody of aliens together, with their children, as well as providing funding for DHS family residential centers.

So I think that it is fair to say that there is bipartisan concern for the plight of these children, the plight of these families. I think all of us who are mothers understand the emotions involved here and understand that we don't want to perpetuate a situation that, in fact, also was occurring when President Obama was in office.

But I think it is also important to note that we have got to secure our border and we have got to be in a position where we are recognizing that people who come here illegally cannot be allowed to stay. People who come here illegally must, in fact, be deported, must, in fact, be apprehended.

We need to end, as we have, the practice of catch and release that we saw during the Obama administration. It is a security issue for us.

The pain and the emotion that we all feel for the families that have been separated I think we all also feel for the angel families, the families that President Trump has met with, the families that have been the victims of violence perpetuated by people who have come to this country illegally.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it is absolutely the wrong thing to do, as my colleague urges the notion that we should defeat this rule so that we can address immigration. It just simply is wrong on a procedural matter. We ought to, in fact, support this rule, pass this rule, not once again hold hostage the men and women in uniform to another issue.

The position of the minority here is apparently that we should stop our bipartisan process and our bipartisan movement on funding the troops so that we can take up an issue that we are already planing to take up. It is not necessary and it is unjustified. I actually would urge exactly the opposite of my colleague from the Rules Committee. We ought to, in fact, pass this rule.

Mr. Speaker, as we think about this issue, we have got to remember that there are families involved not just with respect to the issue of immigration; there are families involved with respect to the men and women who are defending all of us.

I don't think that it is acceptable, I don't think it is justifiable, for us ever to be in a position where we are telling the mother or the father or the spouse of a servicemember that we couldn't get them the funding they needed because our process is broken, that we couldn't get them the funding that they need because we are bickering with each other. I think that is, in fact, absolutely an abrogation of our constitutional responsibilities and duties.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), who is vice chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule to complete consideration of the FY 2019 Defense Appropriations bill.

I thank the Rules Committee and all the Members who submitted amend-

ments to the Defense Appropriations bill. I commend the chairman, Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, Ranking Member LOWEY, Subcommittee Chairwoman GRANGER, and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their leadership on the FY 2019 Defense Appropriations bill. I would also like to thank our dedicated professional staff who have tirelessly worked on this bill.

I have served on the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for many years, and providing for our men and women in uniform is a privilege and an honor. This bill provides vital funding for our armed services, including a 2.6 percent pay raise. This bill is an investment in our future superiority on land, air, and at sea.

Earlier this year, Secretary Mattis released the National Defense Strategy. As we know, our Secretary of Defense is focused on readiness and lethality. This bill meets the demands of the Department to restore readiness levels, invest in lethality, buy the equipment that will maintain superiority, and provide for the health and welfare of our men and women in uniform.

We are at a unique time in history that demands U.S. leadership throughout the world. As we know too well, a power vacuum breeds instability and extremism. A strong U.S. military with our allies creates stability.

After too many years of a budget-driven strategy, this bill reflects the investment needed to maintain and secure U.S. interests around the world. The investment we make here today, about 16 percent of our entire Federal budget, has dividends down the road for many years. The security of our Nation, and the peace of the world, depends on a strong U.S. military.

The last time the House passed a stand-alone Defense Appropriations conference report that was signed into law before the end of the fiscal year was September 2009. Let's turn the page on CRs that cripple the Department and return to regular order.

I again thank my colleagues who crafted this bill, our military leadership, and the men and women of the United States military. I urge passage of the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I absolutely agree that a primary duty of this Congress is to fund the military, absolutely. There are military families serving in our Nation and abroad that deserve to get paid.

So I would like to take this moment of privilege to remind this Congress that, before I got here, my son, who joined the United States Air Force, was going to have his pay withheld. I remember him telling me, Mr. Speaker:

Mom, I signed up to serve our great Nation in the United States Air Force, and I signed up to defend and protect my country. I did not sign up to defend and protect the men of my country, but I signed up to protect all of the people in my country. And I resent Congress withholding my pay or tying my pay to the reproductive rights of women.

So let's keep all of those things in mind when we talk about the priorities of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this Congress once provided a check on excessive executive power. But today, in this House, it is all lapdog and no watchdog. Even terrified toddlers torn from their mother's embrace are not beyond the limit of this Congress.

Until very recently, limitation amendments like those I authored to this bill to protect taxpayers from having funds misused were routinely approved for debate—no more.

□ 1245

Just as Trump undermines our democracy, so too do these House Republicans refusing to permit even the pretense of a fair debate on key national issues.

Having enabled Trump's separation of children from their parents, often with their silence, Republicans have blocked amendments that I and 41 of our colleagues sponsored to prevent our military bases from being converted into internment camps for children and, in some cases, their families.

Our military bases have an important mission. It is to ensure our national security, to ensure the utmost readiness for our troops, who may be called into action in many different parts of the globe at the same time. It is not their job to take care of 20,000 people, as the administration has requested, on two Texas military bases. The function there is a totally different one from that to which we have committed in this defense bill.

These are real people, real children. They are toddlers who have been torn from their parents in places like McAllen, which I once represented; real children who cry themselves to sleep every night, held without their freedom and without their loved ones, while some of my former constituents are shopping right down the street.

My constituents at home now in San Antonio, San Marcos, Lockhart, and Austin care about this. Over 1,000 people have reached out to my office, their hearts breaking for these children.

Trump is truly testing the waters of dehumanization, seeing how many people blink an eye when he calls for suspending due process, guaranteed by our Constitution, for people who don't look like him.

I do believe in a no-tolerance policy. The no-tolerance policy that I support is no tolerance for bigotry, no tolerance for the demonization of foreigners which regularly spews forth from this White House, no tolerance for using cages to hold children as hostages.

No matter how grievous the wrong, how insulting the tweet, my colleagues sit here, idle and silent, silently blocking debate on congressional checks on this authoritarian-loving President who seeks to amass more and more power.

Perhaps what we need in this House is a strong, professional ENT—an ear, nose and throat physician—because Republicans have lost their voice when it comes to standing up to Trump on much of anything. You could say that Trump's got their tongue.

Whatever the reason, they are not there standing up for the children, won't even permit a debate on the issue of whether our military bases should be converted to this perverted purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I will never yield to a President who knows no limits, and we will not yield in raising the issue of these children, their separation, and the detainment of their families indefinitely. We must speak out and use every opportunity afforded in this House to defend their presence and to defend a better policy and the use of our tax dollars for what they were intended, not to detain, indefinitely, these babies.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would thank my colleague very much for her son's service in our Armed Forces, and I would also just note that we agree. We don't think that our military servicemembers' salaries should be held hostage for any issue, no matter the issue. That is why we in this body believe we should pass a stand-alone Defense Appropriations bill. That is why we believe that we ought to pass the rule that we are debating today, so that we can get to the debate and the discussion about the stand-alone Defense Appropriations bill. That is why we believe the Senate should take it up and pass it that way as well.

We shouldn't add any legislation to it. The funding that our men and women in uniform need should not be made a situation where it is held hostage to other political issues. It is simply not justifiable, no matter the issue.

I would note once again, Mr. Speaker, and this is crucially important, that one of the fundamental values that our men and women in uniform are fighting for and defending is the rule of law, and for too long in the previous administration we had policies like catch and release that were sanctioned from the top. We had policies like sanctuary cities that were sanctioned from the top. We had situations, Mr. Speaker, where the laws of the Republic that were passed by this body, passed by the Senate, signed into law by the President, were simply not enforced. That is not a situation that we can allow to continue.

I think it is important that we address the issue of the separation of families at the border. No one wants to see that happen or that continue. I think we need to focus on it. We need to make sure that we come up with solutions for it, like the kinds of solutions that are going to be presented on this floor shortly.

I think, as we do that, we have also got to remember the larger issues involved, including the security of the

Nation. That is not just about the resources that this bill provides; it is also about making sure that our borders are secure.

One of the things that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have refused to deal with and to address time and again is funding for a border wall. President Trump has made clear that part of securing this Nation is providing funding for a border wall. That is something that we have got to make sure we appropriate. That is also something that the bill that we will consider this afternoon does.

I am hopeful that we will see support from the other side of the aisle for a bill that deals with the issue of separating children from families at the border.

I also would point out, Mr. Speaker, that this House has been very dedicated and focused and very active in dealing with the issue of human trafficking. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know very well that many of the situations we are seeing at our border that involve children are not family situations. They are situations where those children are brought here by human traffickers. Those children are brought here to be exploited. That is something we have got to make sure we protect against.

When we as a nation allow sanctuary cities to continue to exist, when we look the other way and say we won't enforce our immigration laws, we are, in fact, perpetuating a system where those children are put at risk, and we are not doing our duty, our fundamental obligation, to protect and defend those children.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that the concern for the children of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were as broad as it needs to be, to encompass, frankly, all of the threats that these kids are facing.

I think it is important that we pass this rule, we pass this underlying bill, and we move on to address and focus on the issue of immigration in a way in which Members on both sides of the aisle can agree.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to add that I absolutely agree with my colleague from the other side of the aisle on one thing, and that is that we should be absolutely focused and work together on the issues on which we agree, such as the USA Act.

Mr. Speaker, why aren't we allowed to have a vote on the floor when that is bipartisan legislation created by a bipartisan group of Members?

If we want to talk about the rule of law, Mr. Speaker, we can't talk from both ends. Either we support the rule of law or we don't. Yet this Republican Congress, time and time and time again, has been complicit with President Trump and his family's conflicts of interest when it comes to dealing

with China, when it comes to dealing with our trade agreements, when it comes to dealing with Russia and now possibly North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration has ripped thousands of children from their parents' arms at the border, sending them all over the country. Separating children from their parent poses ongoing psychological harm and trauma, yet the government has no clear plans to reunite those families. For that reason, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative BASS' bill, H.R. 6236, the Family Unity Rights and Protection Act, which would require the Federal Government to reunite families which have been forcibly separated at the border.

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 California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) to discuss this proposal.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, mothers and fathers who sought a safe haven for their children watched helplessly as their children were being snatched away from them by our government.

These families were fleeing unimaginable violence. They had no idea where their infants were being taken. They had no idea the treatment they would receive. These parents, in many instances, still have no idea where their children are located or how to communicate with them.

The Trump administration established no formal process to return these children. I am terrified at the thought that these parents may never see their children again. If the parents are deported and their children are sent all over this country, how will the parents find their children?

Just imagine the mother from El Salvador who is deported back to El Salvador, who came here dirt-poor to begin with. She gets deported back to El Salvador. Her child is sent off to New York. How is she ever supposed to find that child again?

It appears that the only real plan was to separate families as a deterrent to legal immigration. Coming to America should not mean permanently losing your child, especially if you came to America and it was not illegal. If you came in search of asylum, that is not illegal immigration.

The zero-tolerance policy will have a lasting effect. Pediatricians and health experts agree that child-parent separation will result in neurological damage. I will tell you that I have received numerous phone calls from experts, pediatricians, social workers, and child welfare workers.

The other night, I even received a very long email from a distraught

internationally known psychologist, Dr. Phil McGraw. He shared with me his concerns about the impact child-parent separation will have on children. He highlighted that, when children are torn away from their parents and raised in institutions without a stable caregiver, it disrupts the formation of attachments, that children become anxious and fearful, and that this can last for years, if not a lifetime. Dr. Phil also expressed how this impacts a child's brain development, which can lead to negative health and well-being outcomes.

We did this, and now we must undo this. If our government did this policy of separating children from parents, then it should be our government's responsibility to reunite those parents with those children, whether they remain here in the United States or, especially, if they are deported.

This proceeded without a plan, without foresight, and without a second glance at the law or what we stand for as a nation. This is chaos. That is why I am calling for a vote on my bill, H.R. 6236, Family Unity Rights and Protection Act, to require the Federal Government to reunite the parents with the children, to establish a database of children separated from families, and to make sure that parental rights aren't terminated.

We are told that parents can communicate with their children, but let me ask you how a parent in Los Angeles would communicate with a child who is 6 months old in another State.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, my bill also requires a report outlining the short- and long-term effects on these families and proposed solutions.

As it is, our foster care system is already overrun with over 400,000 children. We know that these kids are in detention right now, but ultimately they will wind up in foster care. Because of the opioid crisis, we don't have enough foster homes for kids who actually need to be in care.

The long-term neurological effects that I describe even apply to children who should be removed from home because their parents have either abused or neglected them. So even when the children should be separated, that separation causes tremendous harm.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, if that is what happens to children who should be removed from home, we must call for an end to State-sponsored child abuse, because that is what this policy is. This is our Federal Government that is abusing children.

That is why I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on ordering the previous question.

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

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

Let me remind this body of a brief history of our Nation.

During World War II, this country chose to round up Japanese American citizens and put them in internment camps across the country.

□ 1300

Some were held in my hometown at the Los Angeles County Fairgrounds, in Pomona, California.

In 1944, the Supreme Court ruled in *Korematsu v. United States* that the government had every right to incarcerate families in the best interest of our national security. It was wrong and immoral then, and it is wrong and immoral now, and we look back at Japanese internment as a dark moment in our history.

Just yesterday, the Supreme Court finally rejected the ruling and admitted that it was clearly unconstitutional to forcibly place Japanese Americans in concentration camps—74 years later. That is how long it took for our court system to catch up with the reality and to right a horrible wrong.

We are facing a similar dark period in our country now with what is happening at our southern borders. How long will it take this time for us to realize that what this administration is doing at our southern borders is morally repugnant, wrong, and illegal?

How long before we realize that what we are doing is causing emotional harm to families, especially to the children? How long before we consider how history will remember this moment and judge us?

What national security threat are we facing today that warrants such a barbaric response towards families and children? They are exactly that: children, families, babies.

They are coming to our borders pleading for help and protection. They are fleeing kidnapping, rape, murder, and threats. They are not MS-13; they are fleeing MS-13. They want to work and raise their children in peace. Is that so terrible?

This administration is deliberately choosing to inflict trauma onto thousands of children, holding children hostage, using child abuse as a scare tactic to deter families from coming here seeking refuge.

There are still more than 2,000 children separated from their families at this present moment. President Trump may have signed his executive order last week, but he failed to implement a plan to reunite these families—no plan to reunite these families.

We are doing nothing to fix this problem today. And let's be clear: Speaker RYAN's bill, which we may or may not consider this week, does nothing to fix this problem either. All his bill does is pave the way for long-term incarceration of families in prison-like facilities. It would be replacing one form of child abuse for another.

I visited some of these detention centers at our borders. The horrendous conditions we are exposing families to are completely unacceptable.

Where are we, as a nation, when we place children in cage-like cells, inside warehouses, with nothing but an emergency thermal blanket and a thin mat between them and the cold concrete floor, with a toilet in the middle of the cell? Criminally prosecuting every individual, every child, who crosses between a port of entry, who poses no threat to our country, is not only inhumane, it makes us less secure.

We have a limited number of prosecutors. We have to make choices. If you prosecute one crime, it means you are not prosecuting another. So when we send our prosecutors after every single border crosser, who benefits? Let me tell you who benefits. The murderers, the rapists, the drug traffickers, the drug dealers, the pimps, the muggers, and the human traffickers, that is who will benefit from this. We are taking away from where law enforcement agencies need the most and are wasting by traumatizing defenseless families. How does this make us safe?

This administration's impulsive zero-tolerance policy is harming our moral credibility. It is harming our national security. Most of all, it is harming innocent babies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague and I agree that the court determination, essentially rejecting the Korematsu decision yesterday, was the right one. And we agree that the episode in our Nation's history, in which we were holding Japanese Americans in internment camps, was a dark one and was something that should not have happened. But I think that it is unjustifiable, and I think, frankly, it just politicizes the challenge that we are all facing to compare the current situation at our borders with Japanese internment camps, or with concentration camps, or many of the other exaggerations and, I think, highly irresponsible language that we have heard throughout this debate.

We all have to come together to solve the problem, but we have to come together to enforce our laws. If, in fact, my colleagues are interested in enforcing the laws, if they are interested in solving the problem for the families at the border, and if they are interested in closing the loopholes in the law that have resulted in the separation of those children, then I assume that they will be voting in favor of Mr. GOODLATTE's bill that will be coming up for consideration today.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker, it is not accurate for our colleagues to say that families seeking asylum are having their children ripped out of their arms. Anybody who is seeking asylum,

who goes to a port of entry, is not going to be subject to prosecution and will not be separated from their families.

I think it is very important for us to make clear that we are talking about people seeking to come into this country illegally, and, in many cases, as I mentioned before, we are talking about children who are being trafficked. We have to make sure, as we deal with this issue and as we come to a resolution and a solution that will help these kids, that, in fact, we do it in a way that addresses the facts.

Mr. Speaker, it is really important that we focus back on the issue that we are here to talk about today, and that is Defense Appropriations.

What we have seen this afternoon is the same thing that we seem to see every time this bill comes up. This is a really important, really good bipartisan bill, and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to talk about everything under the Sun, apparently, except Defense Appropriations.

If we don't get Defense Appropriations right, if we don't get it passed through this House and passed through the Senate and signed before September 30, we are looking at the possibility of another continuing resolution for the Defense Department.

Now, we have seen this happen before. We saw it happen last year. We watched the Democrats in the Senate, for example, shut down the government because they wanted to hold our troops hostage, because they were in a position where they wanted to do everything possible except just pass Defense Appropriations.

Tragically, Mr. Speaker, this isn't just a matter of words like "readiness," "modernization," and "capability." Those words all matter. But there are real men and women behind those words, and families behind them.

So when we are in a situation where we abrogate our duty, and we don't provide the funds that our men and women in uniform need, we end up putting the lives of our servicemen and -women on the line. I don't think that any Member of this body ever wants to be in a situation again where the Secretary of Defense, or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, or the service chiefs come in and say that we, as a body, have done more damage to the military than any enemy has in the field. That is what we have heard consistently and repeatedly over the course of the last several years.

Taking the step of passing this rule and making sure that we pass this underlying appropriations bill is a crucial part of continuing on the path of fulfilling the commitment that we made and fulfilling the commitment that the President of the United States made that he would rebuild our military.

Every man and woman in uniform, who puts the uniform on, as Secretary Mattis has said, is essentially writing a blank check to this Nation, and it is a blank check that is payable with their

lives. We ought to stop spending our time on this floor debating a whole bunch of other things. The Senate ought to stop spending its time stuck in the filibuster rule, stuck in the process of going on and on for hours and hours over matters that, frankly, don't have anywhere near the importance that funding our troops does, and they ought to move to get this bill passed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of both the rule and H.R. 6157.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 964 OFFERED BY
MRS. TORRES

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

SEC. 5. 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. 6236) to require the reunification of families separated upon entry into the United States as a result of the "zero-tolerance" immigration policy requiring criminal prosecution of all adults apprehended crossing the border illegally. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6236.

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.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). 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, I demand a recorded vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

BORDER SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION REFORM ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, consideration of the bill (H.R. 6136) to amend the immigration laws and provide for border security, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. I am opposed.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Espailat moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6136 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In section 1, in the heading, strike "; TABLE OF CONTENTS".

In subsection (a) of section 1, strike the enumerator and the heading.

Strike subsection (b) of section 1 and all that follows through the end of the bill, and insert the following:

SEC. 2. PROTECTING IMMIGRANT CHILDREN FROM GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED ABUSE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, judicial determination, consent decree, or settlement agreement, no officer or employee of the United States may detain an alien who entered the United States with the alien's child who has not attained 18 years of age separately from such child for the purpose of deterring immigration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6136, the Border Security and Immigration Reform Act, has been touted as "the compromise bill." But don't let that fool you. This bill cuts legal immigration by 40 percent. This bill cancels diversity green cards. This bill eliminates most family reunification. And finally, this bill hurts asylum seekers.

This bill is anything but a compromise. It is anything but fair. And it is certainly not pro-family.

We have spent the last few days and weeks watching babies ripped away from their parents' arms. We heard their cries in the middle of the night as they missed their parents, and the American people were truly moved by this humanitarian crisis.

This crisis drew attention from international institutions and organizations, such as the United Nations, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, all of them condemning the separation of children from their families.

This Nation has a longstanding tradition of providing asylum to those who flee death, terror, and natural disasters. We need to continue to be a beacon of hope and aspiration for the rest of the world. Asylum seekers, including women who have been raped, deserve due process, not these massive arraignment hearings, which blatantly go against our democratic traditions.

Let's be honest here, last week's executive order and this morning's tweet where the President admits that this bill is about "strong borders," tells us that this is not about our families or injustice. This is about him getting \$25

billion for a wall and another \$7 billion to hold families in detention facilities. Yes, families in jail or tent cities or maybe even in military camps, similar to the Japanese internment camps used during World War II.

Children really belong in schools. They deserve to be safe with their parents, not to be jailed in cages that look like kennels. Babies as young as 9 months old are being held in my district, in East Harlem, away from their moms.

If Republicans are serious about families, we should pass this motion to recommit and the Keep the Families Together Act. This act is simple. It would protect immigrant children from government-sponsored abuse, and it would keep us in compliance with the Flores decree—yes, a court decree. This decree disallows children to be held for more than 20 days.

It also is in line with yesterday's preliminary injunction, which requires that children younger than 5 years old be returned to their parents within 14 days and older children be returned within 30 days.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, show some basic compassion for these young children, their brothers and sisters, and their parents. Every single Member of Congress should be able to stand behind the simple idea that families, regardless of where they come from, belong together. The separation of children from their families constitutes child abuse.

Mr. Speaker, we need to finally ask ourselves: will we continue to be a country of aspirations or will we continue to be a country of deportation? Will we step up to be the country that allowed me, as a young boy, to find safety next to my mother and father?

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this effort to distract us from the major problems that we are attempting to address in our country. This motion to recommit deals only with a red herring. It fixes nothing, but rather ensures that catch and release will remain in effect.

The American people want a holistic approach to reforming immigration laws that focuses on enforcement first before legalization. The motion to recommit simply does not do that.

H.R. 6136 helps solve the problem with a surge of people coming illegally into the United States by funding the border wall construction and other infrastructure at the border, and it closes the loopholes that require catch and release of aliens who have entered illegally. The bill begins the process of reforming the way U.S. green cards are