

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. 12) to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, 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 among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, Science, Space and Technology, Veterans' Affairs, Oversight and Government Reform. 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. 12.

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: "Al-

though it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

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

□ 1345

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

#### SUPPORTING UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 990) supporting the officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 990

Whereas the national security interests of the United States are dependent on the brave men and women who enforce our Nation's immigration laws;

Whereas abolishing United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) would mean open borders because it would eliminate the main agency responsible for removing people who enter or remain in our country illegally;

Whereas calls to abolish ICE are an insult to these heroic law enforcement officers who make sacrifices every day to secure our borders, enforce our laws, and protect our safety and security;

Whereas abolishing ICE would allow dangerous criminal aliens, including violent and ruthless members of the MS-13 gang, to remain in American communities;

Whereas during fiscal year 2017, ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) arrested more than 127,000 aliens with criminal convictions or charges;

Whereas ICE ERO made 5,225 administrative arrests of suspected gang members in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas criminal aliens arrested by ICE ERO in fiscal year 2017 were responsible for more than—

- (1) 76,000 dangerous drug offenses;
- (2) 48,000 assault offenses;
- (3) 11,000 weapon offenses;
- (4) 5,000 sexual assault offenses;
- (5) 2,000 kidnapping offenses; and
- (6) 1,800 homicide offenses;

Whereas ICE Homeland Security Investigations made 4,818 gang-related arrests in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas ICE identified or rescued 904 sexually exploited children;

Whereas ICE identified or rescued 518 victims of human trafficking;

Whereas abolishing ICE would mean that countless illegal aliens who could pose a threat to public safety would be allowed to roam free instead of being removed from American soil;

Whereas abolishing ICE would mean more dangerous illegal drugs flowing into our communities, causing more Americans to needlessly suffer;

Whereas ICE plays a critical role in combatting the drug crisis facing our Nation;

Whereas ICE seized more than 980,000 pounds of narcotics in fiscal year 2017, including thousands of pounds of the deadly drugs fueling the opioid crisis;

Whereas ICE seized 2,370 pounds of fentanyl and 6,967 pounds of heroin in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas ICE logged nearly 90,000 investigative hours directed toward fentanyl in fiscal year 2017;

Whereas abolishing ICE would leave these drugs in our communities to cause more devastation;

Whereas abolishing ICE would mean eliminating the agency that deports aliens that pose a terrorist threat to the United States;

Whereas ICE was created in 2003 to better protect national security and public safety after the 9/11 terrorists exploited immigration laws to gain entry into the United States;

Whereas the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks found that many of the 9/11 hijackers committed visa violations;

Whereas ICE identifies dangerous individuals before they enter our country and locates them as they violate our immigration laws; and

Whereas abolishing ICE would enable the hundreds of thousands of foreign nationals who illegally overstay their visa each year to remain in the United States indefinitely: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its continued support for all United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of ICE;

(2) denounces calls for the abolishment of ICE; and

(3) supports the efforts of all Federal agencies, State law enforcement, and military personnel who bring law and order to our Nation's borders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H. Res. 990, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H. Res. 990 introduced by CLAY HIGGINS to express our support for the men and women of the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Recently, Democrats nationwide, from the mayor of New York City to Senators GILLIBRAND and WARREN, have recklessly called for the abolishment of ICE, the agency within the Department of Homeland Security charged with enforcing Federal immigration laws within our Nation's interior.

They have used rhetoric that is both bewildering and deeply troubling. New York gubernatorial candidate Cynthia Nixon has gone so far as to call ICE a "terrorist organization." The Democratic candidate for the 14th Congressional District of New York just yesterday stated: "We have to occupy all of it. We need to occupy every airport. We need to occupy every border. We need to occupy every ICE office. . . ."

What is remarkable is that these calls would undo what has been our singular bipartisan achievement on immigration over the last two decades—the creation of ICE, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services.

The late Barbara Jordan was one of the most distinguished persons ever to serve in this body. She was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom and NAACP's highest honor, the Spingarn Medal for highest and noblest achievement by a living African American. She was appointed by President Clinton to be chair of the U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform. Her commission found that:

Immigration law enforcement requires staffing, training, resources, and a work culture that differs from what is required for ef-

fective adjudication of immigration benefits. Separating enforcement and benefits functions will lead to more effective enforcement.

The commission is particularly concerned that although the removal system produced more than 100,000 final removal orders each year, the system did not have the corresponding capacity to remove the individuals subject to those orders.

It noted that:

The system is bogged down with increasing numbers of aliens who are put into removal proceedings, released due to a lack of detention space, and never appear at their hearings, or are never deported after a final order of removal is issued. We must enable the immigration system to deliver better on its commitment to actually remove those who are issued final orders.

Those are the words of Barbara Jordan's Commission.

Following upon the Barbara Jordan Commission's recommendation, SHEILA JACKSON LEE introduced the Immigration Restructuring and Accountability Act establishing an Office of Immigration Enforcement to:

Implement the removal of deportable and inadmissible aliens from the United States.

Ms. JACKSON LEE has stated:

I have been a champion for years when it comes to restructuring the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I have been arguing for years that we need to separate out services and enforcement functions of the INS.

In 2001, then-Judiciary Committee Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER introduced the Barbara Jordan Immigration Reform and Accountability Act which proposed to abolish the INS and established separate offices for immigration enforcement and the provision of immigration benefits. The bill was a bipartisan juggernaut. It passed the Judiciary Committee by a vote of 32-2 and this body by a vote of 405-9.

ALCEE HASTINGS stated during floor consideration that:

I want to commend the authors of this bill. They have produced a bipartisan bill that is sure to improve performance and accountability. I think Mr. Sensenbrenner and Mr. Conyers have done an outstanding job.

The Barbara Jordan Immigration Reform and Accountability Act was, in effect, enacted into law as part of the Homeland Security Act. In creating DHS, it transferred over the INS's functions and placed responsibility over Immigration and Customs Enforcement in the same directorate. President Bush placed the final piece of the puzzle in 2003 when he submitted a DHS reorganization plan that created the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement with the primary mission of:

Enforcing the full range of immigration and customs laws within the interior of the United States.

In that bygone era, House Democrats were committed to effective enforcement of our immigration laws. This was further evidenced by the fact that in 1996, a majority of Democrats voted for LAMAR SMITH's omnibus immigration enforcement legislation that was to be enacted as the Illegal Immigra-

tion Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act.

That commitment has inexorably withered away. By 2005, only 36 House Democrats voted for JIM SENSENBRENNER's Border Protection, Anti-Terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act. Just a few weeks ago, not one Democrat voted for either of two bills that would have resuscitated immigration enforcement—the Securing America's Future Act or the Border Security and Immigration Reform Act.

House Democrats once worked collaboratively with Republicans to improve the effectiveness of Federal immigration enforcement. I hope that we will resume that soon. Now it appears that they are outraged when ICE has the audacity to actually enforce the laws that we have enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote on both sides of the aisle for H. Res. 990. Let's honor the work of Barbara Jordan and our Republican and Democratic colleagues who joined together to create ICE, and the brave men and women of ICE to whom we owe so much.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is the legislative equivalent of fiddling while Rome is burning. Our President takes to the world stage to side with a hostile foreign power over his own intelligence services. Here at home he engages in government-sponsored child abuse in the form of a family separation policy that continues to terrorize children as young as 6 months.

This nonbinding resolution before us would do nothing to bring about a fair and just immigration system. In fact, it would do nothing at all. It is just a meaningless political stunt to change the subject from the international and domestic shame unleashed on us by President Trump.

The President imposed the family separation policy, and his administration never even considered how to ensure that the children would eventually reunite with their families. Now, nearly 3,000 children remain separated, and they do not know when, or even if, they will ever see their parents again. Many of these children were ripped from the arms of their mothers and fathers, and their anguish is unimaginable.

But this bill would do nothing to reverse this disastrous and cruel family separation policy. It would do nothing to ensure that parents and children are accurately tracked so that families can be reunited, and it would do nothing to address the horrendous conditions separated children are being subjected to.

For example, 14-month-old Baby M—we must use a pseudonym—was separated from his mother for 85 days at 14 months and he returned so full of dirt and lice that it appeared he had not been bathed the entire time he was in Federal custody. His mother Olivia

says that he is not the same since they were reunited, and he cries whenever he does not see her out of fear that he might be left alone again.

Mr. Speaker, this is a humanitarian crisis. We do not have the time to waste with political stunts like this bill while the moral fiber of our country is torn apart.

I will be voting “present” on this bill, because I have no desire to play the Republican’s immoral games right now. We have much more important things to do.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS), who is the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, for weeks now, the abolish ICE movement has been growing in popularity on the left with many Democrats embracing this radical policy stance.

I find it extremely ironic that calls to abolish the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency come only 1 year after 159 House Democrats voted to pass landmark legislation introduced by my colleague, Chairman MICHAEL MCCAUL, reauthorizing ICE and other DHS agencies for the first time since their inception after 9/11.

Mr. Speaker, calls to abolish ICE are reckless, dangerous to America’s national security, and threaten the well-being of our ICE agents. As a member of the thin blue line, this attack on ICE is personal to me.

The men and women of ICE serve as America’s frontline defenders against human, drug, and weapons traffickers. ICE agents locate, arrest, and deport violent gang members and criminal aliens who threaten public safety.

Last year alone, ICE arrested more than 127,000 criminal aliens responsible for: 76,000 drug offenses, 48,000 assault offenses, 11,000 weapons offenses, 5,000 sexual assault offenses, 2,000 kidnapping offenses, and 1,800 homicide offenses.

Further, ICE agents made more than 4,800 gang-related arrests, rescued 518 victims of human trafficking, and seized 1 million pounds of narcotics last year.

The campaign against ICE is the latest rallying cry for open borders, the latest call to prioritize illegal immigrants over American citizens, and the latest shrill cacophony from the left to vilify and demonize frontline law enforcement in America.

Democrats are making it very clear to the American people that they stand against efforts to secure America’s borders. Americans overwhelmingly support law and order. I speak for a coalition of conservative Members of Congress as I introduce this resolution affirming support for ICE personnel and condemning the dangerous call from the left to abolish ICE.

Let me state further that affirming support for ICE should not be the end

of our efforts. We should be doing more to secure our borders and provide frontline defenders with the resources necessary to accomplish their mission, and we should end dangerous sanctuary policies.

Today the House will vote on our resolution formally stating congressional support for ICE personnel and their mission.

□ 1400

Despite the rhetoric being pushed by the left, the American people support Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Their service should be respected. Very soon, we the people will know where every Member of this Congress stands.

Mr. Speaker, it saddens me to say it has been brought to my attention that some of my colleagues across the aisle plan to vote “present” on today’s resolution. I would remind them that our constituents elected us as their voice in the people’s House. We were not elected to be silent. The American people deserve to know where every Member of this body stands. To vote “present” on this resolution reflects fear. The American citizenry deserves a courageous vote.

I urge my colleagues to look into their hearts, vote on this resolution reflective of your own deepest belief, and, as you do so, remember that we all have been elected to serve American citizens, American interests, and America’s future.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the ranking Democrat on the Immigration and Border Security Subcommittee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I support fair and humane enforcement of our immigration laws, but that is not what this resolution is about. It is nothing but a ploy to distract us from critical issues facing our country.

A most urgent issue now is the need to reunify thousands of children, including babies, who were forcefully torn from their parents’ arms at the border. Despite court orders requiring reunification, more than 2,000 remain separated from their parents.

This bill does nothing to address that humanitarian crisis, a crisis created by President Trump’s so-called zero-tolerance policy.

The bill does nothing, for example, to more quickly reunify children like Jefferson, a 6-year-old boy taken from his father after traveling together from Guatemala, seeking asylum. They were kept apart for almost 2 heart-wrenching months.

When they were finally reunified 3 days ago, the traumatic effects of the separation were clear. Jefferson was unemotional, with a vacant look in his eyes. He thought, for those 2 excruciating months, that his father no longer loved him or that he was dead.

Jefferson had a cough, bruises, and a rash all over his body. It is not clear whether Jefferson will ever fully recover emotionally.

There are many more kids like Jefferson who remain separated from their parents.

As Members of Congress, we can’t sit on the sidelines as witnesses to government-sponsored child abuse. We must take concrete steps to end this tragedy and pass legislation to prevent it from ever happening again, and this resolution doesn’t do that. This resolution does not even acknowledge the plight of babies separated from their mothers, nor does it make any recommendations for family reunification.

This resolution is nothing more than a feeble attempt at political gamesmanship. The resolution shows the Republican majority is unwilling to solve our immigration crisis, just as they are unwilling to tackle rising healthcare costs, wage stagnation, a pending trade war, and the President’s lovefest with Russia.

With a little more than a week left before the August recess, the Republican majority is more interested in political games than actually governing.

Rather than doing anything meaningful for the American people, we are wasting our time on a political stunt. It is just shameful. I refuse to play this game. I intend to vote “present” on this meaningless resolution and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the former chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the selfless men and women who serve at Immigration and Customs Enforcement. These brave individuals risk their lives every day to protect our Nation and enforce our laws. They deserve our admiration and support, not a “present” vote.

It is disgusting and unconscionable that Members of the political left, Members in this very Chamber, continue to denigrate these patriots. One prominent gubernatorial candidate declared ICE a terrorist organization. A House Member called ICE fascist. Another Member of this body said that ICE agents, who were just doing their job, were cowardly.

I wish that I was making this up. Talk about shameful statements, talk about inflammatory statements to a law enforcement agency that is responsible for the internal enforcement of both our immigration and customs laws.

Mr. Speaker, these attacks are utterly despicable. While #AbolishICE might make for a catchy bumper sticker for radical leftists, it is harmful to our law enforcement.

Today, I join with my colleagues in supporting this resolution and commending ICE agents for their hard work.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, what is disgusting is for Congress to sit idly by while children are ripped from the arms of their parents and abused.

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, this is what it takes to have a debate on the floor about family separation.

It is outrageous that my Republican colleagues are playing pure politics with a resolution that does absolutely nothing to address the most pressing crisis before us, which is the separation of 3,000 children from their parents. It is about putting kids in cages and parents in prison who are seeking asylum.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of court orders, this administration still has yet to reunite these children with their families, and I will tell you that these are parents who even have been denied the opportunity to speak to their kids for more than 10 minutes twice a week.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does nothing to prevent President Trump from again ordering enforcement agents to rip breastfeeding babies from their mothers' arms. This isn't just rhetoric. This happened numerous times under Trump's zero-tolerance, zero-humanity policy.

In one case, for instance, an asylum seeker from Honduras reported that Federal agents took her daughter from her while she was breastfeeding in a Texas detention center. When she resisted, as any mother would—because I am a mother, I can say that, from the bottom of my heart—this mother was handcuffed, handcuffed for wanting to feed her baby.

Stripping babies from the arms of their mothers is cruel and inhumane, and this body should be debating that policy, should be fixing that policy, instead of putting forward a ridiculous, do-nothing, political resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to put their attention on real issues, instead of continuing to play games with children's lives.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to point out to my Democratic colleagues that every single one of them had the opportunity and every single one of them voted against H.R. 6136, which addressed this issue and a solution for DACA recipients. Every one of them voted against it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the House majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Virginia for yielding. I especially want to thank my colleague Congressman HIGGINS from Louisiana for his leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor.

And what does the resolution do? It simply says that we stand behind our ICE agents, those brave men and women who are keeping America safe. These are the people on the front lines of removing terrorists from our country. These are the people who, by the way, last year alone, removed 100,000 criminals from our country.

And they want to vote "present"? My colleagues on the other side are talking about voting "present."

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the numbers, last year, ICE agents rescued

or identified 518 victims of human trafficking. What if those ICE agents would have voted "present" that day instead of rescuing those victims of human trafficking? Luckily, Mr. Speaker, they didn't vote "present." They showed up and did their job to keep America safe.

What if, last year, Mr. Speaker, those ICE agents who rescued or identified 904 people who were sexually exploited children voted "present" that day, instead of rescuing those 904 sexually exploited children? Luckily, they didn't vote "present," Mr. Speaker. They showed up and did their job.

We need to stand up for them. We need to stand up for what is important at keeping this country safe.

Are we for open borders? Absolutely not.

On this resolution, there is one choice, one button to hit if you support these men and women who are keeping us safe, who are keeping us from open borders. That vote is "yes." Any other vote than a "yes" vote is for open borders and somehow not supporting these men and women.

Let's look at what is resolved in the resolution. We express our continued support for those ICE agents. We denounce calls to abolish ICE. And we support efforts of all Federal agencies—State law enforcement, military personnel—who bring law and order to our Nation's border.

The only vote on this resolution is "yes."

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Yes, every Democrat voted against H.R. 6136, which provided for indefinite detention of entire families, among other obnoxious provisions. So did many Republicans, thank God.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the ICE agents for being present.

It is unfortunate that our Republican colleagues are not present doing the business that cries out to be done.

I am voting "present" on this resolution because it is a sham and a distraction. It is an outrageous attempt to hide the continued suffering of children behind a partisan attack on Democrats.

This is exactly the kind of gotcha vote that alienates Americans from our government. It is as shameless as it is inappropriate. It is inappropriate because Republicans are not doing a single thing to address the crisis of children still separated from their parents, even after a court ruled that they need to be reunited.

Democrats refuse to play the Republicans' game when it comes to children's well-being and the safety of those who come here seeking asylum. We are not falling for this trap, and you can say we are doing it as much as you want. Democrats support secure borders and honor the service of all

whose lives are at risk in protecting our country and our people.

I take a back seat to no one in the House over the years in supporting our law enforcement personnel, but we will neither be silent nor will we cease fighting to bring an end to the dangerous and inhumane policies of the Trump administration that are traumatizing families and children at our borders, which Senator MCCAIN correctly called "an affront to the decency of the American people."

Shame on the Republican House majority for putting such blatant partisanship ahead of the children. Shame on you for using our law enforcement agents as pawns in your political games.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The gentleman from Virginia has 6¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), chairman of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the men and women of ICE who courageously serve our country every single day.

Recently, ICE agents have been the targets of vicious name-calling and partisan attacks. Some have even described ICE as a terrorist organization. To make matters worse, some politicians in Washington are now calling on Congress to abolish ICE.

But just last year, Mr. Speaker, an overwhelming bipartisan majority in the House, including Leader PELOSI, voted to authorize ICE into law for the first time. This kind of dishonest double standard is politics at its worst.

□ 1415

Abolishing ICE is a reckless and dangerous idea that jeopardizes the safety of American communities.

ICE was originally formed after 9/11 to help secure our homeland.

When I was a Federal prosecutor with the Joint Terrorism Task Force, ICE was instrumental in deporting potential terrorists on immigration violations. Today, ICE agents stop drug smugglers, murderers, human traffickers, and dangerous gangs like MS-13 along our border.

In 2017 alone, ICE agents stopped almost 1 million pounds of narcotics, including opioids, from entering our country. This included 7,000 pounds of heroin and 2,400 pounds of fentanyl. They arrested nearly 5,000 gang members and identified or rescued over 500 victims of trafficking.

These are not just hollow statistics. These numbers represent the great work and positive impact that ICE has on people's lives.

John Kennedy, the great President, a Democrat, talked about profiles in courage. I would argue a "present" vote is hardly a profile in courage.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ), the distinguished gentleman and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, when Democrats talk about immigrants, refugees, and asylum seekers, this is the mom and her children whom we are talking about. She is fleeing Central America to save the life of her children from violence, systematic corruption, extortion—yes—rape, and kidnapping.

But the other side wants to change the subject. On every TV screen this fall, Republicans will show pictures of tattooed gang members flashing gang signs, looking like murderers. We know. We get your strategy.

You take your marching orders from Laura Ingraham and Tucker Carlson quicker than the President takes his marching orders from the Kremlin.

In the same week that the President insulted the intelligence community of the United States, we are not going to let you insult the intelligence of the American voter. Immigrants, refugees, outsiders and outcasts, freed slaves, and survivors, just like this woman and her children, built this country.

Some of us had our land stolen; some of us were stolen from our land; and some of us made a very smart decision that we had to get away from the land we were in so that we could survive. That is who we are. That is what America is.

Every generation of Americans has had to withstand people in positions of power labeling the poor, the weak, the outsiders, and people of different races and ethnicities as criminals, threats, and the cause of all our problems, as the majority does today. Every generation of Americans has had to stand up to bullies and racists and power-hungry politicians and overcome their efforts to divide us as Americans.

That is also the story of America's greatness: our resilience and our ability as a nation to overcome the worst instincts of some of our leaders. That is the story of America, and that is what we are doing today.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, when a magician performs, they often utilize misdirection as a way to deceive an audience. Wikipedia defines "misdirection" as a form of deception in which the attention of the audience is focused on the one thing in order to distract its attention from another.

Today, the Republicans are performing a cruel trick on the American people. The Nation is repulsed by President Trump's directives that have forced the separation of over 3,000 children from their parents at the Nation's border, placed children in cages, and terrorized children. As one 9-year-old victim said, he was treated like a prisoner and a dog. This is cruel, inhumane, and un-American.

Rather than have Congress take up a directive to reunite children with their parents, the GOP is performing some misdirection to another issue, hoping that you won't notice that they will not stand up against the GOP's policy of family separation and putting kids in cages at our Nation's borders. Why? Because many of the GOP Members support the President's shameful actions.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. POCAN. Now they want to play politics and misdirect your attention.

I won't be complicit in their attempts. I will vote "present" today to be present for the children and parents separated at the border.

Shame on you for terrorizing children and ignoring pleas to help them.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 990.

The issue is not the law enforcement agencies or the personnel, but, rather, it is the administration's policies regarding enforcement.

ICE has become a lightning rod for the anger, quite honestly, about President Trump's hardline immigration policies. Our number one goal is to defend our homeland. ICE officers and special agents perform a vital role each day to keep our country safe. I want to make sure that we clear up some confusion about what ICE does, what their functions are.

ICE is split into two primary functions: one is the enforcement and removal operations, which is the one that enforces the Nation's immigration laws; the other, which is very, very important, is it investigates all types of cross-border criminal activities, which include financial crimes; money laundering; bulk cash smuggling; commercial fraud; intellectual property theft; cyber crimes; child pornography; human rights violations; human smuggling and trafficking; information, document, and benefit fraud; narcotics and weapons smuggling and trafficking; transnational gang activities; export enforcements; and international art and antiquity theft.

Again, as has been mentioned, the good work that ICE has done in FY 2017: 4,818 transnational gang members were arrested, over 11,000 narcotics criminal arrests were made, and 904 sexually exploited children were identified and rescued. I know that for a fact because my brother has worked with ICE, the sheriff down there, Martin Cuellar, and they have saved some of the kids there.

Again, the issue is not law enforcement agencies or personnel. It is not the men and women who are working there very hard every day, but it is, rather, the policies of the administration regarding this.

Again, I would ask Members to please look at this legislation and support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, immigration is one of the more important issues that we must face around here. It is one we take seriously. This debate, sadly, is more about politics, in my view.

Our decisions affect people's lives and America's future. We must stop these partisan "gotcha" bills, empty-messaging resolutions, and ideological hijacking of our policy discussions. Rather, we must come together and do our work and create a fair and effective immigration system, one that reflects our values.

We must have and we need bipartisan, comprehensive immigration laws to fix our broken immigration system, much like was done in 2013. Unfortunately, it didn't pass. Then we must smartly enforce it.

We have big challenges. We must take care of the Dreamers stuck in DACA limbo; we must reunite families who are separated, secure our borders—yes, we must—using every effective means possible; and we must bring undocumented neighbors out of the shadows.

I will vote for this resolution, but it is not about abolish or support ICE.

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

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this resolution, but it is not about abolish or support ICE. I respect the need for interior and immigration enforcement, and I have concerns about how this administration is doing it.

Enough of political games, catering to the loudest and most extreme voices in both parties. Let's check our ideology at the door. Let's get to work on bipartisan, commonsense immigration reform. That is what the people want us to do.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains for each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 6¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, here, the height of hypocrisy, the depth of duplicity. While this administration relentlessly, baselessly, and desperately attacks Federal law enforcement officials—the FBI, the Justice Department, our intelligence agencies—again and again, these same Republicans, so proud of law enforcement in one narrow area today, are silent. They stand by tweet-addicted Trump,

our President who, even this very day, has again denied that Russia poses any threat.

Where is your resolution to defend the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Where is your resolution to defend NATO, which has been disparaged by this shameful President?

No. What we have today is a shameless, spineless group of Republican congressional enablers who are enabling Trump, who totally ignore those dedicated to defending our borders from Russian aggression.

These Republicans claim that we have so much more to fear from little infants and toddlers who come across our southern border and seek to escape gang and domestic violence and, yet, are torn by ICE from their mothers' embrace, than from a murderous Vladimir Putin.

Of course we need immigration law enforcement and secure borders, but this resolution ignores many wrongs of ICE: hundreds of claims of harassment, sexual harassment, child separation, and an unresponsive bureaucracy. At the same time that they ignore those wrongs, they ignore the wrongs of Trump in impairing other Federal law enforcement.

Trump's own intelligence chief, a lifelong Republican whom he appointed, warns that our democracy is under sustained Russian assault, yet they are silent.

Trump is impotent in the face of Putin. We need to reject this complicity, the Trump child abuse, and the abuse of Federal law enforcement.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is really a very sad day in the Congress of the United States because we are ignoring the needs of children. As a mother of five children—I had five children in 6 years, so lots of little babies all around the house all the time, lots of joy—and understanding the connection between parent and child, and being a grandmother of nine now, I can't even imagine why the Republicans think it is a good idea to move forward with a bill that does nothing to unite families, to stop the separations, and to have the reuniting of families in a way that is humane—not to reunite and detain in prison, in detention, but to unite in a way that honors the humanity of America.

In church on Sunday, the sermon was about not being an enemy of humanity. Some of the activities that are happening now in relation to these children are actions that qualify as enmity to humanity.

What we have: 2,000 children remain separated from their parents, locked away in Federal custody and living in a state of terror and trauma.

This is a picture of a little boy being confronted by an armed official. Do we have any idea what the impact is on that child?

Republican leadership pushed multiple antifamily bills that would have made the horrific situation worse for children by enshrining the President's outrageous mass deportation agenda as the law of the land with his zero-tolerance policy. We should have zero tolerance for that policy.

My Republican colleagues have voted again and again against actions to force a vote on a bill that would require the government to reunite families, and now you are promoting a new political stunt, wasting the country's and the Congress' time with a meaningless vote on a nonbinding resolution that does nothing to protect the children and end the cruel crisis that President Trump has created.

□ 1430

This resolution does nothing to prevent the separation of babies from their mothers. You are parents. You know, in the night, if you hear a sound from the room down the hall, that connection is something beyond material. It is spiritual. It is about parent and child, mother and child, father and child, and now we are going to rip that apart.

It does nothing to prevent the separation of children with disabilities from their parents and caregivers. It does nothing to provide legal counsel to children in immigration court, including little babies who cannot even yet verbally communicate.

For example, Johan. Earlier this summer, a 1-year-old boy named Johan appeared in court without his parents—1 year old. He played with a toy. He drank from a bottle. Then he cried hysterically, because he did not have his mother or his father there to comfort or care for him. The immigration judge even reported that he was "embarrassed to ask" if little Johan could understand the proceedings. The judge is asking a 1-year-old child taking a bottle if he can understand the proceedings.

What sort of administration sends a 1-year-old child into a courtroom alone to make his case? This resolution is an assault to little children like Johan.

Congress should be working day and night to protect these traumatized children. Do you know the toll that you are taking on these children? I wish you would listen to the representatives of the Society of Pediatric Doctors and what they have to say about this, pediatricians, what they have to say about this.

We should be working day and night to ensure the President can never again enable children to be ripped from their parents' arms. Democrats will continue to fight for families.

Here is the thing I found very sad, because it was almost a year ago, say, 10 months ago, when I was informed by the administration that they were going to separate children from their parents. This is not something that has emerged. This is a decision that was made.

They said, these parents, especially the moms they were talking about, are unfit mothers because they have chosen to take their children across the desert, which is very dangerous. That makes them unfit.

Unfit? Really? If their choice is to stay home and be murdered, be raped, be victims of gang violence, and they are coming to find solace or refugee status? They are unfit, I was told by the administration, and we know better what is good for the children. We are going to take the children and send them to foster care or whatever—or whatever—foster care or whatever, taking children from their parents, as a decision of national policy.

Around that same time, we had a hearing—well, it was earlier. It was on the Muslim ban, so it was more like over a year ago, and the American Association of Evangelicals testified in that hearing. It was a Democratic hearing, because the Republicans would not have that hearing. They said that the U.S. refugee resettlement program is the crown jewel of American humanitarianism, the American Association of Evangelicals—the refugee resettlement program, the crown jewel of American humanitarianism.

So how is it that it can be so obvious to so many people that we are humanitarian, that all of these children are God's children, that all of them have a spark of divinity? Mr. President, they have a spark of divinity, and you do, too.

So let us all act on our and their spark of divinity and treat them with the level of respect that they deserve and not use children as a political shield for some other agenda.

This isn't about whether you support ICE or not. By the way, I will just close on this. On this subject, I want to remind our Republican colleagues that Democrats have been strong on protecting our borders all along. You recall after 9/11, a commission was formed, the 9/11 Commission. It took a couple of years to make recommendations. It took a while to make recommendations—a distinguished nonpartisan, bipartisan commission. It presented its recommendations in the summer of 2004.

The Republicans in Congress controlled the Congress at the time, and they would not take up those recommendations, which were about protecting our country.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York may remember it, because he has been a champion on this issue for such a long time, and since his district was affected by 9/11, in the forefront of that fight for us, to form a commission to begin with but also to



fit—it took us, until the Democrats took control of the Congress, in 2006—the first bill that we put on the floor, H.R. 1 in the new Congress, was to adopt the 9/11 Commission recommendations to keep the American people safe, protect and defend, which is our oath of office.

So don't make it look like you are either for protecting the border or not. This is about being enemies of humanity, by taking children away from their parents, keeping them separated, and when they unite them, to keep them under detention. It is not the crown jewel of our humanitarianism.

I urge a “no” vote. I am going to vote “present” on it, because they will use it politically, use it politically, use it politically. Vote “present” or however anyone wants to vote, but understand what it is.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women of ICE work every day to make our country and our communities safer. They secure our borders. They enforce our laws. They protect our safety. And I stand with them.

America's borders have been too open for too long. Drug cartels, dangerous gangs, and human traffickers exploit our weak borders and bring crime to our Montana communities. As America and Montana face an epidemic of drug abuse and addiction, ICE agents seized nearly 1 million pounds of illegal drugs last year, including nearly 2,400 pounds of fentanyl and 7,000 pounds of heroin.

ICE agents arrested more than 127,000 criminal aliens last year. These criminals were charged with weapons offenses, drug crimes, gang-related activity, sexual assault, kidnapping, and murder.

Now, some of my friends across the aisle have called for abolishing ICE. Abolishing ICE is a reckless idea. Abolishing ICE would embolden violent criminals, like members of the vicious MS-13 gang, intent on doing us harm. Abolishing ICE would jeopardize the safety and security of our Montana communities.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose abolishing ICE. And, Mr. Speaker, I proudly stand with ICE agents who are dedicated to making our Nation and Montana safer and more secure.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. NADLER.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. GIANFORTE and with Mr. CUELLAR. We have outstanding men and women in Immigration and Customs Enforcement. I am not going to do anything to disparage the many good men and women that we have, but I will never, never support these abominable policies coming out of the Trump administration that tear families apart, that

these men and women are having to implement because the White House has decided they are going to go into the immigrant communities and tear them apart.

This is a piece of legislation that is not necessary, and I say that to my friends on the Republican side. We support the good men and women in law enforcement as Democrats, but I will not support any of these policies or even look like I am supporting any of the immigration policies of this President. They are terrible, and they are hurting this country.

I urge a vote of “present” on this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from New York has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have only one speaker remaining to close the debate for our side. I believe we have the right to close.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to close. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of many Americans, enough—enough of cruelty disguised as border security, enough of inflicting pain on children to make their parents stay away, enough of picking on the weak to show that you are strong.

The people in this Chamber, who are the sons and daughters of immigrants from all over the world, should know the history of this Nation, and the fact that when the Irish came here, they were greeted with signs in New York and Boston that said: “No Irish need apply.” Those of German descent were said to be too dirty to be Americans. Italians were interned during World War II.

Are we a Nation that learns from our mistakes, or are we not? Are we a country that adheres to our Constitution and strives to achieve the words inside it, or are we just pretending?

This is a special Nation, a Nation that has been blessed by people who have come here from all over the world, yet the policies of this administration denigrate the history of this country and denigrate its future.

These families must stop being separated. Just because you come up to a border or cross a border does not make you nonhuman. They should be treated as human beings, most especially by a country that is supposed to be a moral beacon for the world over.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, last week, Democrats introduced a bill to abolish ICE. That is the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency. In doing so, I think we should first review the agency's record.

As it turns out, ICE agents are on the front lines in the battle against crime.

In 2016, they arrested nearly 2,000 human traffickers, criminals who are involved in modern-day slavery. You wanted to abolish that.

Last year, they arrested more than 4,800 gang members, including more than 800 members of the MS-13, one of the most vicious gangs operating today. But you wanted to abolish that and put it into our communities.

They intercepted more than 1 ton of fentanyl that was headed for our communities. Now, we all should know what fentanyl will do, because we just debated more than 50-some bills on this floor, because 172 people who are Americans will die today because of an addiction. Fentanyl is so deadly that just a few grams will kill you. But you wanted to abolish that, to allow it into our communities.

Still, the Democrats say, not only will they want to introduce it, people will cosponsor it. But there is a problem, and I actually think there are two problems with this.

The first problem is that most Americans disagree with you. They actually support ICE. According to a recent poll, just one in four Americans thinks we should abolish it.

The second problem is that Democrats don't even agree with their own bill they introduced. They lack the courage of their so-called convictions, because when we offered the ability to bring up the bill, abolish ICE, that they put into the hopper and cosponsored, Democrats said they would vote “no.”

They wanted the glory of introducing a bill to the far left of their own party, but they didn't have the guts to accept the consequences. That is the kind of leadership that the Democrats have to offer.

□ 1445

Mr. Speaker, I am even more confused listening to the Democratic leadership. I was here. I was on the floor. I listened, Mr. Speaker, to the leader on the Democratic side when she said: I recommend voting “no,” or maybe vote “present,” or vote however you want.

I am not sure what position she was requesting when she said all three. And I am not sure exactly what the author wanted to do when he put his bill across the aisle and asked the other Members of his own conference to cosponsor it, when he said he would vote “no,” when he had the offer to bring it up on the floor. Does that mean that every bill Democrats put across they really don't want to support? I am just not sure.

Now, we are about to vote on a resolution of the opposite. We want to support the law enforcement officers of

ICE and will renounce the activist campaign against them.

The danger these officers face is no joke. So for those in the back who would like to speak, Mr. Speaker, during this, I would ask that they get quiet for one moment, because six officers of ICE lost their lives defending those.

The danger to these officers is real, and it is not a joke. Six officers have died in the line of duty:

Special Agent Brian Beliso;  
Special Agent Timothy Ensley;  
Special Agent Lorenzo Gomez;  
Special Agent Scott McGuire;  
Special Agent David Wilhelm; and

Special Agent Jaime Zapata, who was killed by cartel hitmen in Mexico.

These agents gave their lives in the line of duty. Thousands more of these agents risk their lives every day on our behalf.

I want you to pause for one moment and I want you to think about those agents, think about those families, but think about those thousands of agents who are defending our border. What do they think about a bill that comes across the desk that says you want to abolish them? How much support do you want to give them? How much support do they feel when the leadership, Mr. Speaker, of the Democratic Party says: Vote “no,” vote “present,” just vote how you want?

Well, do you know what? When they risk their lives and they stop another human trafficker of modern-day slavery and they save another child, I will vote to support them. Or when they stop an amount of drugs coming across and they save American lives, I will support them. Or when they stop MS-13 gang members from coming into any of our communities, I will support them. If only for this reason, agents deserve our gratitude and support.

Mr. Speaker, I am confused. I understand there is this growing socialist movement in the Democratic Party, but when does this socialist new Democratic Party believe we should have no borders? I guess it is today.

Mr. Speaker, that is not what the Americans have asked for, and that is not what America supports. But then again, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I understand what the other side supports when they offer a bill and they ask people to cosponsor and then they won't even vote for it.

That is why I am happy to offer Congressman HIGGINS' resolution and stand with the women and men of ICE, because I want a safer America. And for those who gave their life for us, I will stand with them, even if it means standing up against a new socialist Democratic Party.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for personal reasons, I cannot be present for the vote on H. Res. 990. If present I would point out that if Republicans were really serious about assessing the efficiency of ICE, they would have heeded the multiple calls from me

and my Democratic colleagues to hold hearings on President Trump's dreadful family separation policy that has resulted in thousands of families being ripped apart, including the isolation of children and babies. As to the resolution's language that states “supports the efforts of all Federal agencies, State law enforcement, and military personnel who bring law and order . . .”, I strongly support that and the important agency missions including of money laundering, narcotics investigations, cyber crimes, terrorism prevention, and customs enforcement. If present, I would have inquired of my Republican colleagues if they could get the same statement of support of Federal law enforcement agencies from President Trump, given his behavior and statements in Helsinki and the same disdain he has expressed for Federal law enforcement and intelligence agencies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 990, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2, AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct conferees at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Peterson moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2 (an Act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes) be instructed to insist on section 11101 of the House bill (relating to animal disease preparedness and response) with an amendment to section 10417(d)(1)(B) of the Animal Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 8316(d)(1)(B)), as proposed to be added to such Act by such section 11101, to strike “2023” and insert “thereafter”.

Mr. PETERSON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of anxiety out in the countryside because of trade, because of RFS, because of low prices, and because of weather in my area. What we are trying to do here is avoid another potential problem, and that is what can happen with an animal disease outbreak in this country.

In Minnesota, we suffered the biggest animal disease outbreak we have ever seen in this country when we got avian influenza in our turkey flock. It was devastating. The producers lost \$113 million. We lost \$3 billion in the country, and we saw the effect of not being prepared.

This isn't just a poultry problem. This also relates to foot-and-mouth disease, to PEDv, to cattle fever tick that Congressman VELA has informed me about, and to other diseases that present a serious threat for the viability of the livestock operations in the communities and supply chains across the country that depend on them.

In the House bill, we have a provision for \$450 million of permanent funding over 5 years for programs, including the National Animal Health Laboratory Network, the National Animal Disease Preparedness and Response Program, and the National Animal Vaccine Bank. The Senate provides an authorization for appropriations, but there is no permanent funding in the Senate bill.

While the appropriations committees deserve credit because they have put some funding into these programs over the years, the problem is that APHIS and the people who deal with this at the State level can't depend on it because you never know what it is going to be from year to year because the appropriators are the ones who have to decide. We want to make this permanent, and we are hoping that the Senate will accede to our ideas.

Animal disease programs are important investments in the health of our Nation's animals, our people, and the security of our food supply. As part of their work on the farm bill, conferees should insist on 10-year mandatory funding for animal disease preparedness and response programs to provide the certainty for both the farmers, for the consumers, and for the people who deal with this at the regulatory level.

Mr. Speaker, I include my full statement in the RECORD.

The mood in farm country is bad. It's bad because of the Administration's trade war; it's