

Judge Kavanaugh has outstanding academic credentials and an impressive professional record, including clerking for Justice Kennedy and serving on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia since 2006.

Judge Kavanaugh is a constitutional conservative who will interpret our Nation's laws as our Founders intended and not make laws from the bench.

Judge Kavanaugh offers a sound approach to issues important to Montana. Judge Kavanaugh has defended private property rights from governmental interference, protected landowners from outrageous regulations, and rejected Federal overreach, including from the previous administration's overzealous EPA.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Kavanaugh enjoyed bipartisan support when the Senate confirmed him 12 years ago. I urge the Senate to avoid political games, sideshows, and stunts and confirm Judge Kavanaugh to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court.

#### AMERICANS SUPPORT TRUMP'S IMMIGRATION POLICIES

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to immigration policies, a recent poll shows that the American people are far closer to President Trump than to the liberal media. The results of a Harvard-Harris poll by Mark Penn, a former Hillary Clinton strategist, came up with surprising results, considering what we have heard from the media.

When asked, "Do you think that people who make it across the border illegally should be allowed to stay in the country or sent home?" 64 percent said they should be sent home.

When asked, "Do you think we need stricter or looser enforcement of our immigration laws?" 70 percent said stricter; 60 percent support building a combination of a physical and electronic barrier across the U.S.-Mexico border.

When asked about sanctuary cities, 84 percent of respondents said that cities should be required to notify immigration authorities about taking custody of deportable immigrants, and 69 percent said the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency should not be abolished.

The administration's immigration policies do reflect Americans' views.

□ 1215

#### RECOGNIZING DANISH KHAN AND STEPHEN LOWE

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Danish Khan and

Stephen Lowe from Blue Valley Southwest High School, who became the first Kansas team to win the National Speech and Debate Association's national tournament.

Their tireless work over the past year paved the way for them to win this 5-day tournament, which is the largest academic competition in the world. Danish and Stephen debated government funding and regulation of education, a few topics that we continue to debate here in Congress.

In high school, I, too, was on the debate team and went to State. Although I never won a tournament quite this size, I still use what I learned there today while debating important issues before Congress.

Danish and Stephen's amazing accomplishment speaks volumes about their talents, as well as our amazing schools in the Third District of Kansas and the teachers they have, including their debate coach, Jared Zuckerman.

Mr. Speaker, these students are our future leaders, and we can expect great things. Good luck to Danish and Stephen as they continue their debate careers in college. I look forward to seeing what other amazing accomplishments Third District students of Kansas will make as well.

#### NATIONAL DAY OF CIVILITY

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the second annual National Day of Civility.

This day, July 12, was chosen to mark a verse in Matthew's Gospel, chapter 7, verse 12: "So in everything, do to others what you would have them do to you."

This, of course, is known as the Golden Rule. In fact, it was one of my mother's favorite Bible verses. She had her hands full, I am sure, raising 12 kids—I was number 10—and this was her favorite Bible verse that she would quote to us, the idea that everyone deserves your respect.

Each one of us in this Chamber has the opportunity to live this rule, as do our constituents. We are privileged to live in the United States of America, the greatest country in the history of the world, due in large part to our system of government. It is really an experiment. It is a system of government designed to encourage debate, respect, and resolve differences and rely on citizen input.

Today, there is an alarming decline in our public discourse. People can't even seem to talk to each other, can't come to the table, and can't hear each other out. We urgently need to reverse this trend.

At the beginning of last year, members of the freshman class drafted and signed a commitment to civility, laying out our effort to make the government work more efficiently and effectively, help build consensus and restore

public trust, and serve as a positive influence on society at large.

On this National Day of Civility, let's renew our commitment to civility. Congress may not be able to change the state of public discourse, but we certainly can and should serve as an example to the American people.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6237, MATTHEW YOUNG POLLARD INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 AND 2019

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 989 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 989

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6237) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-80. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered 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, 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 amendments 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 989, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 6237, the Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The rule also provides for a motion to recommit. Additionally, the rule makes in order 12 amendments from Members on both sides of the aisle.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee heard testimony from numerous Members, including Intelligence Committee Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF, as well as Mr. LOBIONDO from New Jersey and Ms. JACKSON LEE from Texas.

In addition to the vigorous debate on this legislation before the Rules Committee, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence held a markup of this legislation on June 27, 2018, where the committee voted unanimously to report the bill to the House floor for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF for their important work on this legislation, and I commend them for the strong demonstration of bipartisanship in moving it forward.

The Intelligence Reauthorization Act is among the most important pieces of legislation we consider in this Chamber. It provides the intelligence community, a community that spans 17 different agencies, with the resources it needs to protect our great country.

Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF approached the task of writing this bill constructively and with a clear understanding of its importance, and their work is evident in the support for this bill we have already seen displayed at the Intelligence Committee markup.

As a result of Mr. NUNES' and Mr. SCHIFF's work, and of the Intelligence Committee, the legislation provided for

by this rule will not only reauthorize programs crucial to the intelligence community, but it will also make a number of critical improvements to the law in support of that community and our national security.

The underlying bill represents an opportunity to pass an important piece of legislation that will enhance our national security in an age of increasingly sophisticated adversaries.

Its provisions include critical functions like deterring nation-state adversaries like Russia and China, countering and defeating ISIS and other terrorist groups, and defending America against cyberattacks, to name a few.

In addition to the critical missions I have listed above, the bill will improve our ability to recruit and retain top cybersecurity professionals, and will provide better benefits to CIA employees injured by acts of terrorism overseas.

Further, the underlying bill will strengthen both internal and congressional oversight over the various components of the intelligence community.

Our government's most fundamental responsibilities are to defend the American people from harm and to protect their liberty. To grasp the weight of these duties, one need only review the preamble of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is that Americans continue to face increasingly sophisticated cyber threats from foreign states and nonstate actors alike. This legislation recognizes the need to ensure that the United States maintains a tactical advantage in the cyber dimension by giving the intelligence community the ability to recruit the very best talent in the field.

This legislation gives the intelligence community the ability to provide increased pay for certain employees who have unique skills to lend to critical cyber missions.

Cyber criminals and other foreign intelligence agencies have increasingly focused on two critical areas of U.S. national security: our energy infrastructure and our election systems. Thanks to the work of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, this legislation will bolster our defense of both areas.

Specifically, this legislation will require the Director of National Intelligence to electronically publish an unclassified advisory report on foreign counterintelligence and cybersecurity threats to election campaigns for Federal office. It will also create an Infrastructure Security Center within the Department of Energy to coordinate intelligence on significant threats.

We must have the tools to combat these threats, and that includes skilled personnel who know how to navigate these challenges. Whether bad actors hone in on our energy resources, election systems, or other strengths, this legislation takes steps to ensure we have the people we need fighting the forces menacing our Nation.

With these improvements in place, those responsible for our Nation's crit-

ical infrastructure will have better intelligence with which to protect it.

To provide for our common defense, the dedicated men and women of the intelligence community work tirelessly to thwart the efforts of our foreign adversaries, which range from terrorists to foreign states to nuclear proliferators.

Many in the intelligence community have seen their work in furtherance of the global war on terror and other missions around the world land them in harm's way. This bill recognizes the commitment of these brave men and women, many whose names we will never know.

Finally, the importance of the intelligence community's work and the inherently secretive nature of its mission necessitate vigilant oversight of these activities. This bill will increase the intelligence community's accountability to Congress by requiring reports on numerous issues, including investigations of leaks of classified information and security clearance processing timelines.

Importantly, it will further bolster intelligence oversight by requiring the intelligence community and the Department of Defense to develop a framework for assessing the numerous roles, missions, and functions of the Defense Intelligence Agency. It will also require the FBI to provide quarterly counterintelligence briefings to the congressional intelligence committees.

This legislation will ensure that America remains safe, and it will ensure that American liberties are protected in the process.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman, my friend from Georgia, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to debate the rule for this measure, the Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019.

Today's bill comes to us through a process that is marginally better than that which we saw last year. As many of you may remember, last year, it took my friends on the other side a couple of tries to get the Intelligence Authorization Act to the floor.

Though that one was, unlike today's bill, cosponsored by the ranking member, Republicans raised the ire of many of us on this side of the aisle by trying to move this bill under suspension of the rules. After that move fell flat, the Republican-led Rules Committee reported the bill under a closed rule, blocking no fewer than 13 amendments. That bill, though passed, never saw sunlight in the Senate.

Today's bill avoids some of those avoidable self-inflicted wounds and is indeed better for it. But unfortunately, drama of some kind or another seems to follow Intelligence Authorization Acts, no matter what.

Last night at the Rules Committee, we witnessed, in my view, the unprecedented silencing of one of our colleagues. Congresswoman NORMA TORRES had just begun her first question of the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Mr. NUNES, when she was gavelled down by the chairman of the House Rules Committee. Subsequently, he abruptly recessed the meeting.

It is, in my view, Congresswoman TORRES' unquestionable right, based on longstanding committee practice, to question a witness. And it is absolutely unbelievable and, in my view, a great shame that she was not able to continue her line of questioning.

When the hearing reconvened after a near 20-minute recess, rather than answering questions, Chairman NUNES was permitted to leave. He had made the request, indicating that he had matters before the Ways and Means Committee.

This was not just unfortunate for Mrs. TORRES, but also for the rest of us on the committee, because during that short recess, the Trump administration issued its Statement of Administration Policy on today's underlying bill. Frankly, the administration's statement raised more questions than it answered.

□ 1230

It would have been helpful to have Mr. NUNES at the hearing so that we could ask him important and relevant questions about the administration's statement and what that statement meant for his bill.

Now, I look forward to our meetings returning to normal next week, and I look forward to them being run as they have been in the past, with witnesses staying before the committee until all of our members have been able to ask all of their questions.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is also not without its laudatory provisions. As my friend from Georgia has mentioned several of them, let me proceed to add to that particular observation of his.

It increases pay for professionals in the intelligence community who have expertise in the cyber arena or have extensive knowledge in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics—all areas that are crucial to the success of the intelligence community's core mission.

Footnote there: I served for 8 years on the Intelligence Committee, and I know full well, firsthand, the importance of this particular aspect of the committee's duties and the agency's duties.

The bill, at the insistence of Democrats on the committee, addresses Russian meddling in our elections by requiring the intelligence community to brief key congressional leaders and committees on threat assessments related to foreign meddling in our Federal elections. The bill also requires the Director of Intelligence to publicly post a report on foreign counterintel-

ligence and cybersecurity threats to Federal election campaigns.

Although these provisions are welcomed, it is beyond any doubt that more must be done to strengthen our defenses against any foreign interference in our Federal and State elections and to rebuild Americans' confidence in the democratic process and in its institutions.

Mr. Speaker, there has also been good bipartisan work on a matter that has been, for years, as it is today, near and dear to my heart, and that is increasing diversity hires and promotions within the intelligence community. Indeed, I have not stopped championing these twin causes since leaving the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence as its vice chair.

Diversity is a mission imperative for the intelligence community. Three of my predecessors, two of whom are deceased—Lou Stokes from Ohio and Julian Dixon from California—as well as my classmate and colleague SANFORD BISHOP, who served on the committee as well, worked assiduously in an effort to increase minorities and give them opportunities to climb the ranks.

We also, in my view, now need to recruit who will be able to blend in, speak foreign languages, and understand the cultures in countries that are now central to our foreign policy interests. At the end of the day, such diversity is achieved through the hiring process; and, therefore, we need to ensure that we are hiring more Arab Americans, Iranian Americans, Pakistani Americans, Chinese Americans, Korean Americans, and many other Americans from diverse backgrounds as we confront a myriad of threats and work hard to better understand our adversaries wherever they may lurk. We do not seek this diversity in the name of political correctness but, rather, in the name of national security.

Mr. Speaker, even with these sensible additions, I can understand why some of my colleagues are reluctant to support today's bill.

When we live in the shadow of a President who is bent on denigrating the brave men and women of the intelligence community in a brazen attempt to undermine the crucial work they do on a daily basis; when we live under the shadow of a President who has, as a candidate for the highest office in the land, compared those in the intelligence community to Nazis; when we live under the shadow of a President who is quicker to take the word of an authoritarian dictator like Vladimir Putin over the studied and sober word of his own intelligence community—all positions, by the way, that not only undermine our own intelligence community, but also the relationships that we have with allies and the world over—one would be right to pause and consider whether he or she should vote in favor of handing over immense and powerful authorities to such a person.

I certainly understand the great cause for concern in handing such au-

thorities over to this administration. In fact, last night at the Rules Committee, I offered a sensible amendment, in my view, that would have reinstated the cybersecurity coordinator on the National Security Council.

As many may remember, in the not too distant past we had such a coordinator. Why? Because this country faces, on an hourly and, indeed, minute-by-minute, second-by-second basis, attempted and sometimes successful attacks on our Nation's cyber infrastructure, both private and public. It made sense to President Bush's and President Obama's administrations to have a person who could coordinate the complicated responses to these myriad attacks.

The now-President and his national security adviser, on the other hand, had the inspired idea to jettison the position of cybersecurity coordinator from the ranks of the National Security Council. Now, the optics alone of the current administration canning a cybersecurity coordinator are enough to make one shake one's head, but the real-world effects of such a misguided and reckless action should be cause for great concern.

My friends on the other side of the aisle will tell us that sacking the cybersecurity coordinator was done in the name of bureaucratic efficiency, when what the Trump administration has really done, in yet another misguided decision, is make protecting our country more difficult and more cumbersome.

It is time that Republicans take these threats seriously and stop aiding and abetting an administration that puts its own personal interests ahead of those of the American people.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), who is my and Mr. COLLINS' distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, although I may be the newest member of the Rules Committee, I know that it is our job to discuss how our committees come up with their legislation and, by extension, how the House should consider these bills in a manner that is orderly and respectful. Unfortunately, we were not given that opportunity yesterday.

I had questions for the Intelligence Committee chairman—tough questions, maybe, but fair questions. Questions like: How do we prevent witnesses from lying in our committees? Questions like: How did the committee come up with their findings on the Russian meddling that differ so much from every other intelligence agency?

I had offered an amendment to this bill to give the House the opportunity to vote on the Senate Intelligence Committee's Russia findings, and I wanted to ask the chairman if he felt

that the House was prepared to vote on such an amendment; and, if not, why not. A tough question, maybe, but a fair question.

However, I never got the opportunity to ask that—any of that. Instead, I was shouted down by a male colleague from across the dais and cut off abruptly before I could even finish the first question. It was incredibly disrespectful and a far cry from the decorum that we should uphold as members of the powerful Rules Committee and Congress.

Never before had a member of the committee majority or minority been cut off from active questioning. That is unprecedented. As a fact, I have observed male colleagues talk to each other and ask each other to yield time to each other; but you see, as the only female Latina in that committee, that respect was not extended to me.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, what this means for our committee and this Congress. What is more troubling to me is that this is the second time a male colleague has yelled at me from the other side of the dais. This is not to be tolerated—not by me, and not by any Member of Congress.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, if our committee is going to function like this moving forward, it will be the Rules Committee in name only. Regular order will be a thing of the past.

Bills are already developed by the majority behind closed doors. The majority already blocks every single amendment. Now we will not be allowed to even speak. The majority has already turned this Congress into the most closed Congress in history. Now they are going to close off important debates in committee, and that is outrageous.

I take my work on the Rules Committee very seriously. As a matter of fact, the last time this happened, I sat there, patiently, quietly, listening to the debate, although I completely disagreed with what my colleagues were saying. I was respectful to them, and I waited for my turn to speak.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can all continue to uphold that standard of mutual respect for not just the male members of our committee, but to extend that respect to the females of that committee.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there are several issues here. And to clarify, in being one of the members there yesterday and one spoken of, I think there is an issue of when there is a concern by a member.

This has been beyond Mrs. TORRES coming to the committee, and has been before and when Mr. HASTINGS and I have been there, many times, when we have issues with the question, the procedure is to stop and to ask the chairman to suspend the question.

This is what was happening yesterday, because there was a concern that the question was impugning the integrity of the chairman. There needed to be clarification. That was a simple—no matter what member may have asked it. That was the discussion that then continued from there.

Also, though, in the past 4 months, there have been 16 times that the chairman has sent a designee from their committee to testify before the Rules Committee and 14 times that the ranking member has sent a designee. Sending a designee from the committee of jurisdiction is common practice, and the chairman stated at the top of the meeting that that was what was going to be taking place.

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

□ 1245

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I invite, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Georgia to show me an example of where we shut down a Member that was asking a question.

And I might add, Chairman NUNES did not send a designee. He came to the committee himself, and then Mr. LOBIONDO, which is not unprecedented, as you have outlined the numbers, took his position at that time.

But I know of no time that we have failed to allow a Member of the committee to ask questions. Can the gentleman give me such an example?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the understanding was not—and my intention at that point in discussing this was not to stop the questioning, but it is in the concern for the integrity of the question.

You and I have talked before in our committee, and when we have said—and you have asked the chairman for clarification, that was my intention in that and that was my entire intention in that, and from there, the chairman took action from there.

I think the interesting thing in here is the chairman did, at the start of the meeting, say that Mr. NUNES would be leaving. That was stated up front and there was no objection at that point for him doing so.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I will take that as my colleague doesn't have an answer. I will take that as my colleague's non-response to my question with reference to show me a precedent in that regard. There was none.

I have been on that committee for 16 years, and we talk all over each other all the time and back and forth, but in an orderly manner, and yesterday's example was not orderly.

If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative NADLER's bill, H.R. 6135, the Keep Families Together Act. This important proposal would prohibit the Department of Homeland Security from separating children from their parents, 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a member of the Judiciary Committee, to discuss our proposal.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this Keep Families Together Act.

Mr. Speaker, over the last month, our country has reeled from the cruelty at the border. And this week we waited apprehensively to see if the Trump administration would meet the court-ordered deadline to reunite at least the children under 5 who have been taken away from their parents, separated for months at a time.

The Trump administration did not meet that deadline. To date, only 57 children have been reunited with their families. Over 3,000 children were separated from their families, and all of this was a self-imposed tragic, tragic set of circumstances that came from Donald Trump's decision to institute a zero tolerance, zero humanity policy at the border for parents who were seeking asylum for their children.

Mr. Speaker, headlines every day are blaring about what is happening in the short term and the long term in terms of trauma caused to children—to children, Mr. Speaker. One headline said that some of the children who were 2 and 3 years old did not even recognize their parents after 4 months of being separated—children who were breastfeeding at their mother's breast, separated.

Mr. Speaker, the American Association of Pediatrics has said that the long-term trauma and consequences to these children is absolutely devastating. And let me be clear about what we are doing. The United States Government—and I say not in my name—the United States Government is separating children from their families, putting kids in cages, parents in prisons.

Why? To deter people who are coming to the United States to do what I, as a mother, and I believe any parent would do, to seek safety from violence, from persecution, from being killed, gang raped, all kinds of stories that I heard directly from the women and the men who fled and are being held in a Federal prison.

Mr. Speaker, the Keep Families Together Act is the only bill that would help prevent these horrors from occurring again and from happening now. It prohibits the separation of children from their parents; it limits criminal prosecutions for asylum seekers; and it requires the Department of Homeland Security to reunite children and their parents.

I have got to say, Mr. Speaker, I hear these things from people who I believe are deeply good people on both sides of the aisle.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there is any Republican or Democrat that would want this kind of trauma to occur. But I ask my Republican colleagues to stand up for who we are as a country. Do not allow America to become this in the eyes of the world. Do not go back to your children tonight and tell them that you allowed for this to continue.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. KIHUEN), who is a member of the Financial Services Committee, to further discuss our proposal for the previous question, and I apologize for botching his last name.

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6135, the Keep Families Together Act.

Mr. Speaker, it is immoral, it is inhumane, and it is un-American to separate children from their parents. You know, I was at the border just a few weeks ago, and I got an opportunity to see firsthand and talk to these children. And these are children who are in jail cells. These are children who should be out in a playground, not in a prison. These are parents who left their home country because they were being persecuted because gangs and cartels were looking to assassinate them, and they were coming to America to say: I need help. Me and my children need help.

They were coming to America, the most powerful country in the world, asking for help, a country that has traditionally been made up of immigrants. Because let's face it, unless you are Native American, we all come from somewhere else. This country is made up of immigrants. These folks, all they wanted was an opportunity to succeed and to achieve the American Dream, and, today, they are in prisons.

These parents are away from their children. That is immoral. It is inhumane. And now we have an administration who made a promise to reunite these families, and the deadline passed, and yet these children are still not reunited with their parents. And those

few children who are having that opportunity to see their parents again, the parents are complaining that their children don't even recognize them anymore. That is inhumane, it is immoral, and it goes against all American values.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6135, the Keep Families Together Act.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is left on both sides of the aisle?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 5¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT), who is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Education and the Workforce, and the Committee on Small Business, to further discuss our proposal for the previous question.

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

Mr. Speaker, I continue to urge my colleagues to find some humanity deep in your hearts. I know America has a huge heart, but I continue to ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to look deep inside of your soul and your heart and find humanity and help us pass the Keep Families Together Act to help reunite mothers like Yeni Gonzalez, who I have been pushing to help reunite with her three children. Yeni brought her three children seeking asylum as they escaped gang violence in Guatemala.

President Trump and Attorney General Jeff Sessions have made it harder for victims of violence to come to the United States by stating—get this—that domestic violence should not be grounds for asylum. And in the fiscal year 2019 budget, the President proposed a \$180 million cut to funding that would address the root causes of this migration, including domestic violence.

The Northern Triangle countries of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras have among the 18 highest homicide rates in the world. We need to be doing more to address these root causes, and we need to be doing more to make sure families are kept together—freely, not in detention centers and facilities. Some of these children are being kept in cages that look like kennels.

This week, the President and this administration once again failed to reunite all these children with their family. This administration is using its agency to demonize immigrants—mothers and their children. We need to save the soul of our Nation. I ask, I implore the other side of the aisle to look deep inside of their soul as they go to church on Sunday.

This time our Nation's history will forever be tainted, the reputation of our Nation, as free and a beacon of hope for the entire world.

I ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question so that we can immediately bring the Keep Families Together Act to the floor and stand with our Nation's children.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, we consider today's important bill as we approach the hour of our President, Donald John Trump's, private sit down with President Vladimir Putin in Russia. We don't know what will come of this meeting, but if past is indeed prologue and we look to the President's handling of his negotiations with North Korean dictator Kim Jong-un, or his steadfast denial of the obvious, namely Russia's meddling in our elections, or his policy of tearing toddlers away from their mothers and fathers, then we can assume that nothing good will come from this upcoming get together.

And I would urge those traveling with him to sweep the room with Vladimir Putin because he will certainly be being listened to.

We can assume that there will be further concessions that benefit Russian interests. We can assume that the President will further insult our friends and allies, as he did yesterday morning in Brussels. We can assume that he will further erode the institutions created by the greatest generation, institutions that have made and kept the United States the dominant power in an uncertain world, institutions that have kept war off of western European soil for more than a generation, institutions that have kept at bay those nation-states that champion oppression and fear rather than freedom and the rule of law.

Finally, I will say this. In the current environment, it is more important than ever to stand united against those forces that wish to see us divided. It is more important than ever that we support the difficult and brave work of those individuals who make up our intelligence community. And the latter can be achieved, quite simply, by Republicans in this Chamber taking a note from our Republican friends on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and learn how to call a spade a spade.

The assessment that the Russians meddled in our election; that the Russians concertedly attempted to undermine Secretary Clinton's chances to be elected the first female President of the United States; that the Russians did this work to favor the election of the current President are all trustworthy and well-founded assessments.

□ 1300

And remember, that it is not ALCEE LAMAR HASTINGS saying that, though I do. That is the assessment of the entire Republican-led Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. That is the assessment of the intelligence agencies of this community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a time when we come to the floor and debate great things. Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, you actually find out things that you did not know, and I now found out that my friend from Florida's middle name is LAMAR as we go forward.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for legislation that does what we came here to do, and that is to protect our Nation and preserve our civil liberties. The underlying legislation goes a step further than simply reauthorizing critical programs. It takes a hard look, and a smart look, at how we can strengthen programs, better respond to new and existing threats, and conduct vigorous, effective oversight of the intelligence community, while ensuring it has the resources it needs to serve American citizens well.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to supporting this rule and the underlying bill to strengthen public safety, protect our Nation and the American people, and to guard our civil liberties.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee report (H. Rept. 115-815) to accompany House Resolution 989 should have included the following summary of amendments:

#### SUMMARY OF THE AMENDMENTS MADE IN ORDER

1. Keating (MA): Adds Russian to the list of the languages in Sec. 1501. (10 minutes)

2. Schneider (IL): Amends Sec. 1503 to include a list of foreign state or foreign nonstate actors involved in the threats to election campaigns for Federal offices. (10 minutes)

3. Jackson Lee (TX): Amends the Sense of Congress already in the bill on the importance of re-review of security clearances held by individuals by adding consideration of whether the security clearance holder's association or sympathy with persons or organizations that advocate, threaten, or use force or violence, or any other illegal or unconstitutional means, in an effort to prevent others from exercising their rights under the Constitution or laws of the United States or of any state, including but not limited to race, religion, national origin, or disability. (10 minutes)

4. Vargas (CA): Adds "the use of virtual currencies" to "section 1505" to ensure it is included in the assessment of threat finance. (10 minutes)

5. Torres (CA), Wagner (MO): Directs Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research and the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Intelligence and Analysis, to produce a national intelligence estimate of the revenue sources of the North Korean regime. (10 minutes)

6. Hastings, Alcee (FL): Directs the Director of National Intelligence to create and implement a plan that expands the recruitment efforts of all intelligence agencies geographic parameters used in recruitment efforts so that rural and other underserved regions across the nation are more fully represented in such efforts. (10 minutes)

7. Schneider (IL), Meadows (NC), Torres (CA), Sinema (AZ): Directs the DNI to report on Iran's support for proxy forces in Syria and Lebanon, including Hizballah, and an assessment of the threat posed to Israel and other U.S. regional allies. (10 minutes)

8. Bera (CA), Connolly (VA), Garamendi (CA), Larsen, Rick (WA): Requires a briefing to relevant Congressional committees on the anticipated geopolitical effects of emerging infectious disease and pandemics, and their implications on the national security of the United States. (10 minutes)

9. Kennedy (MA): Requires the Director of National Intelligence to submit a report on the potential establishment of the "Foreign Malign Influence Response Center," comprised of analysts from all elements of the intelligence community, to provide comprehensive assessment of foreign efforts to influence United States political processes and elections. (10 minutes)

10. Rice, Kathleen (NY), King, Peter (NY): Requires the Director of National Intelligence to report on the possible exploitation of virtual currencies by terrorist actors. (10 minutes)

11. Lipinski (IL): Requires an annual report from the Director of National Intelligence describing Iranian expenditures on military and terrorist activities outside the country, such as on Hezbollah, Houthi rebels in Yemen, Hamas, and proxy forces in Iraq and Syria. (10 minutes)

12. Davidson (OH): Enhances oversight by augmenting existing semiannual reporting requirements regarding disciplinary actions. (10 minutes)

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

#### AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 989 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

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

SEC. 2 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. 3. 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. COLLINS of Georgia. 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. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair



will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 182, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

YEAS—229

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

NAYS—182

Adams	Bonamici	Carbajal
Aguilar	Boyle, Brendan F.	Cárdenas
Barragán		Carson (IN)
Bass	Brady (PA)	Cartwright
Beatty	Brown (MD)	Castor (FL)
Bera	Brownley (CA)	Castro (TX)
Beyer	Bustos	Chu, Judy
Blumenauer	Butterfield	Cicilline
Blunt Rochester	Capuano	Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Peters
Clay	Kaptur	Peterson
Cleaver	Keating	Pingree
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Cohen	Kennedy	Polis
Connolly	Khanna	Price (NC)
Cooper	Kihuen	Quigley
Correa	Kildee	Raskin
Costa	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Courtney	Kind	Rosen
Crist	Krishnamoorthi	Roybal-Allard
Crowley	Kuster (NH)	Ruiz
Cuellar	Lamb	Ruppersberger
Cummings	Langevin	Rush
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Sánchez
DeFazio	Lawrence	Sarbanes
DeGette	Lawson (FL)	Schakowsky
Delaney	Lee	Schiff
DeLauro	Levin	Schneider
DelBene	Lewis (GA)	Schrader
Demings	Lieu, Ted	Scott (VA)
DeSaulnier	Lipinski	Scott, David
Deutch	Loeb	Serrano
Dingell	Loeb	Sewell (AL)
Doggett	Lowenthal	Shea-Porter
Doyle, Michael F.	Lowey	Sherman
Engel	Lujan Grisham, M.	Sinema
Eshoo	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sires
Españat	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Esty (CT)	Maloney, Soto	Soto
Evans	Carolyn B. Suozzi	Swalwell (CA)
Foster	Maloney, Sean	Takano
Fudge	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Gabbard	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Gallego	McEachin	Titus
Garamendi	McGovern	Tonko
Gonzalez (TX)	McNerney	Torres
Gottheimer	Meeks	Tsongas
Green, Al	Meng	Vargas
Green, Gene	Moore	Vela
Grijalva	Murphy (FL)	Velázquez
Gutiérrez	Nadler	Visclosky
Hastings	Napolitano	Walz
Heck	Neal	Wasserman
Higgins (NY)	Nolan	Schultz
Himes	Norcross	Waters, Maxine
Hoyer	O'Halleran	Watson Coleman
Huffman	O'Rourke	Welch
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Jayapal	Panetta	Yarmuth
Jeffries	Pascrell	
Johnson (GA)	Payne	

NOT VOTING—17

Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Black	Harper	Richmond
Cheney	Kustoff (TN)	Sanford
Ellison	LoBiondo	Speier
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Veasey
Gomez	Pelosi	

□ 1326

Messrs. GONZALEZ of Texas, PETERSON, O'HALLERAN, and CUELLAR changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. JONES, MARCHANT, and MARSHALL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. 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 235, noes 178, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 323]

AYES—235

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

NOES—178

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

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

## NOT VOTING—15

Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Moulton
Black	Harper	Pelosi
Cheney	Kustoff (TN)	Perlmutter
Ellison	LoBiondo	Sanford
Frankel (FL)	McNerney	Speier

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1335

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MATTHEW YOUNG POLLARD INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 AND 2019

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 989 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 6237.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1337

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6237) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with Mr. WEBER of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 6237, the Matthew Young Pollard Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019.

Passing an annual intelligence authorization bill is the most important tool Congress has to conduct effective oversight of the intelligence activities of the United States Government.

Today, the Intelligence Committee is bringing its annual intelligence authorization bill to the floor. Once again, the bill is a bipartisan product that reflects contributions from all committee members. It was reported out of the committee by a unanimous voice vote.

The legislation provides the intelligence community the necessary resources and authorities to protect and defend the United States. For example, this bill authorizes a committee initiative to streamline defense intelligence related to the Defense Intelligence Agency. It enhances congressional oversight of intelligence activities by mandating intelligence community reports on threats to Federal elections, leaks of classified information, security clearance processing, and other vital activities. Furthermore, the bill increases pay for employees with unique cyber skills and creates a security center at the Department of Energy to protect our energy infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, the bill authorizes enhanced injury benefits to CIA employees injured overseas due to hostile acts of terrorist activities. Moreover, it reauthorizes the Public Interest Declassification Board, aligns the reporting structure of the intelligence community chief financial officer and chief intelligence officer with statutes that govern other Federal agencies, and codifies longstanding congressional re-

porting requirements regarding the intelligence community information technology environment.

Mr. Chairman, the intelligence community comprises thousands of patriotic Americans who do difficult jobs, sometimes at great personal risk, to keep Americans safe from foreign threats. Today, these threats take many different forms and emanate from various parts of the world.

In the Middle East, the threat from ISIS has not ceased, despite its dramatic loss of territory. In fact, our intelligence professionals now face the daunting task of tracking ISIS fighters fleeing Syria for countries throughout the region and beyond.

Meanwhile, Iran is solidifying its influence, often through armed proxy militias, in its quest to control a Shiite Crescent across a wide swath of the Middle East.

In Asia, China poses numerous security challenges related to its expanding military capabilities, its growing international force projection, and its extensive extraterritorial claims. Additionally, the Chinese regime is engaged in widespread efforts, including licit and illicit means, to acquire critical U.S. national security technologies and intellectual property.

Furthermore, Russia continues to pose a pressing threat to the United States and many of our allies.

This is just a small snapshot of the threats the intelligence community addresses every day.

Additionally, our intelligence professionals confront an array of challenges posed by failed states, cyber warfare, nuclear proliferation, and many other matters.

This bill will ensure that the dedicated men and women of our intelligence community have the funding authorities and support they need to carry out the mission to keep the United States safe, while providing Congress with the tools it needs to provide robust oversight over their actions.

I would like to thank the men and women of this country who serve in our intelligence community. I am honored to get to know so many of them in the course of the committee's oversight work.

I would also like to thank all of the committee's members for their contributions to our oversight over the past year, and especially to our subcommittee chairmen and ranking members for their time and their efforts. The many hearings, briefings, and oversight visits our members carry out during the year provide the input for this authorization and the direction of this bill.

Finally, I would like to thank all the committee staff for their hard work and for their daily oversight of the intelligence community.

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