

wrongheaded. If the Russians launched missiles at the counties of the United States, we wouldn't say, well, that is just a local issue. We would say, no, that is an attack on the United States of America.

We need to harden our systems and protect our country.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge the adoption of this measure.

I would like to read from a letter that we received just yesterday from the NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice. In their last paragraph, the Catholics say:

In a secular democracy, elections are the closest thing we have to a sacrament. We know that nefarious foreign and domestic actors continue to meddle in our democratic systems, and we have been put on notice that previous efforts were only trial runs, presumably for our next election in 2020. The NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice considers our elections to be sacrosanct and that Congress must pass the SAFE Act to protect them.

This bill is supported by a broad sector of civil rights groups, including the NAACP and Common Cause. It deserves all of our support.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2722 to ensure the security of our Nation's election infrastructure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 460, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2722 is postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3401, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND SECURITY AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER ACT, 2019

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 466 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 466

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-21. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and con-

trolled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I make a point of order against consideration of the rule, House Resolution 466.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the point of order prescribed in section 425 of that same act.

House Resolution 466 makes in order a motion "without intervention of any point of order." Therefore, I make a point of order, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget Act, that this rule may not be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule and the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

Madam Speaker, the bill before us today provides no CBO cost estimate, so we literally have no idea as to whether or not there are additional unfunded mandates being imposed on the States. We do know that the States are already having to use their scarce resources to deal with this border crisis, and the legislation before us today does nothing to alleviate that.

Indeed, my colleague from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) made that very point and offered an amendment, which was rejected by the committee, to consider reimbursing the State of Texas over \$800 million for their expenses. Those same kinds of expenses—probably not to that magnitude—have been undertaken by other States. Madam Speaker, we don't think that we should proceed until we have that information and the House has a chance to consider that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Madam Speaker, what we are trying to do here is bring a bill to the floor to help alleviate the suffering of children who, in my opinion, have been abused

under U.S. custody at our border. Everybody has read the news articles and everybody has seen the pictures. We have a moral obligation to move forward. To try to delay consideration of a bill to help these children I think is a mistake.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, actually, on that, we have a great deal in common with one another. We, too, think we ought to address this matter quickly.

As I am sure my friend recalls, we have tried on 16 different occasions over the last 8 weeks to bring legislation that would alleviate this problem to the floor. Our friends rejected that every single time.

We also have a bill that has been passed by the Senate 84-7: a bill where 35 Democrats—about three-quarters of the number of Democrats—supported, a bill that we know would solve, a bill that if we would bring to this floor we can pass immediately and it would go to the President's desk; it wouldn't have to go back to the Senate. So my friends, by not accepting an overwhelmingly bipartisan bill by the Senate and simply moving it on, are the ones who are actually imposing a delay here.

What they have got in front of us that we will consider later today, if they are successful, frankly, is something we know the Senate is unlikely to accept. I have not heard from the President, but given the scope of the changes inside the bill, these are all changes that, in some cases, failed yesterday in the Senate—reductions in spending for the military and for the Border Patrol—that the administration has already signaled they will reject.

There is a simple solution here. We could simply take the Senate bill up that has passed 84-7—overwhelming support on both sides of the aisle—get that bill down to the President, and the money could start flowing immediately. If we proceed as my friends want to proceed, we are simply going to be playing ping-pong back and forth.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I am surprised that my colleagues on the Republican side hold this institution in such low esteem. We are the House of Representatives. Our voice matters.

On this issue, the House voted first on a measure to try to help provide some assistance to these children at the border. Then the Senate passed a different version. The way it is supposed to work is we have a negotiation and we try to come to agreement and come up with a compromise bill. So the idea that somehow we don't matter in the House, that we shouldn't matter in the House, that we should just accept whatever the Senate does, to me, I find

that disrespectful of the House of Representatives.

What we are doing is we are sending the Senate basically all that they want, plus we are adding things to help protect children and to provide for more transparency. We are strengthening requirements for children's health. We are tightening restrictions for children's safety. We are supporting nonprofits in communities caring for children's well-being. I mean, we are embracing compassionate processing for children's comfort. Again, we are enhancing accountability in transparency and mandating fiscal responsibility.

Who can possibly be opposed to those things? That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to insist that the House's voice matters, and we are trying to make the Senate bill even better.

Again, what motivates us here is the well-being of these children. We are here because we are for the children. We are here because we are outraged at the way they have been mistreated by this administration. We are tired of excuses as to why we can't protect the children. We are moving forward with legislation that will protect the children against any abuse at our border.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1045

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

Madam Speaker, I don't doubt my friend's sincerity and compassion and concern for these young people for one minute. I know him well as a person and value him as a friend. Although, I must say, this would have been much nicer 8 weeks ago when the administration first asked for it.

While my friend lays out some of the changes in the House bill, he neglected to mention that the House bill cuts the administration's request for reimbursement to the military by \$124 million. It cuts the administration's request for money to the Border Patrol, which is probably where the most difficult part is, by, I think, \$89 million. So we have substantive disagreements.

Again, we have a bill that has passed overwhelmingly. Many of the items my friends want to add have already been considered by the Senate and rejected by the Senate. So it seems to me, when we have a bipartisan product that has got substantial support on both sides and that the White House has signaled it would accept, that is the way we should go.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), my good friend and the ranking Republican member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Oklahoma for leading in this discussion.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the question on consideration. We should be taking up the Senate-passed

bill. It has already been mentioned that it passed 84-8.

We don't have a CBO score for the changes made by the House amendments to the bill, and without a CBO score, we don't know the cost this bill would have on State and local governments.

Yesterday, in a budget hearing on matters of immigration, we heard testimony from the mayor of Yuma, Arizona, which clearly demonstrates the economic impacts and costs that States and local governments are incurring due to the crisis at the border.

My friends just said changes made by the House on this Senate-passed bill take tens of millions of dollars away from the Department of Defense for reimbursement and limit the ability of Customs and Border Patrol to adequately pay for the services incurred as a result of this ongoing crisis.

Madam Speaker, Democrats have had many opportunities to advance bipartisan solutions that would provide the kind of relief to these communities and begin to address the crisis at the border, and for nearly 2 months, they have refused to act.

This week has been an unfortunate loss of precious time. This is a situation where Congress clearly needs to come together and act swiftly. I am sorry to say, we are falling short in this basic obligation of the duties of the Congress of the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, again, I rise in support of the question that we have under consideration.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am a little confused. My Republican friends say they want to delay things to have a CBO score, then they say they want to get something to the President's desk right away. They can talk all they want about a CBO score; we are going to talk about the children.

It is an emergency, and what is happening to these children on the border is unconscionable. It should weigh heavily on the hearts of every single person in this Chamber—Democrats and Republicans, alike.

Enough is enough. We need to make sure that we not only provide the necessary resources to alleviate this crisis, but we need to make sure that those resources we provide are provided in such a way that they do go to the purposes that we want them to go to.

And as far as the Department of Defense money, I mean, the bottom line is this administration has been diverting funds from the Department of Defense for this stupid wall, and they have created that crisis.

The bottom line is we are here for the children, and, again, I urge my colleagues to stop the bickering and get down to business. Let us pass this rule; let us go on to pass the legislation; and let us get a deal with the Senate that is better than what is on the table right now.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my very good friend and distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I think folks are going to have a tough time containing their emotions today. We met in the House Rules Committee at 8 a.m. this morning, and folks already had fuses that were running short.

I agree with my friend from Massachusetts, enough is enough.

We had an amendment offered in the Rules Committee this morning. I don't think most folks in this body know because folks weren't at the Rules Committee this morning. We had an amendment offered in the Rules Committee this morning that said, if the gentleman wants to do this new bill that has been crafted by the Democratic majority, bring that new bill to the floor, but let's at least consider the bipartisan bill that passed the Senate, resoundingly, 84-8 yesterday.

I agree with my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), enough is enough, Madam Speaker. We could send a bill to the White House today to start the money going today.

My friend from Massachusetts said: Let the Republicans talk if they want to. We want to talk about the children.

I am tired of talking about the children. Let's serve the children. Let's do it. Let's do it. Let's stop talking about it.

It has been almost 60 days that we have been talking about it, with one tragic picture after another rolling across the national headlines. Let's stop talking about it.

If folks have an alternative view, they can share alternative view as they have, but allow us to vote on what the Senate agreed, 84-8, after roundly rejecting the previously passed House language, was an opportunity to serve the children today.

Madam Speaker, I don't believe the Members of this institution know what happened in the Rules Committee this morning. I don't believe the Members of this institution know we rejected that bipartisan opportunity this morning. With this, under a point of order, we will bring the Members of this institution down here to the House floor where they will hear it themselves.

We have an opportunity to act now, as my friend from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) has offered. The question is: Are we going to take "yes" for an answer or are we just going to continue to talk about the children?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am really puzzled here. Why is it that the Senate can say no, but the House can't say no to something? Why is it that we always have to do what the Senate wants?

If the gentleman is so enamored with the Senate, maybe he should work over in the Senate.

But the bottom line is, those of us in the House deserve to have our voices heard, and what we are saying here is that we want to provide a bill that will alleviate this crisis, that will help the children.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I will not yield. I do not have enough time to yield.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, the gentleman has mischaracterized my statement.

Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would like us to make sure we provide resources to the border that actually alleviate the crisis.

I do not want to be part of an effort to send money to the border to be diverted for whatever this President wants. He has shown us where he is on this issue of the children and on the issue of immigration. And, quite frankly, many of us on this side of the aisle—and, I think, some on the other side of the aisle—are offended by that.

So we want to make sure, when we say we are providing relief to this crisis that is affecting so many children, that, in fact, we are providing relief to those children. And that is all we are saying here.

Madam Speaker, strengthening requirements for children's health, why would anybody in the Senate want to be opposed to that?

Tightening restrictions for children's safety, people are dying in our custody. We should want to prevent that from ever occurring again by supporting nonprofits and community caring for children's well-being.

Madam Speaker, this stuff is something that should not be controversial no matter how you look at it, and yet it is for my Republican friends, and I regret that very much.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I am puzzled as well. I am puzzled why this wasn't dealt with 8 weeks ago when the administration asked. I am puzzled why, for 16 times when we tried to bring this matter up on the floor, our friends in the majority rejected that.

Now we are in a hurry. Well, if we are in a hurry, the way to act is to take the vehicle that has actually passed the United States Senate in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion and send it to the President of the United States.

That is not what my friends want to do. They want to prolong the debate. They have prolonged it for 2 months, for 8 weeks, by not taking the matter up. They are prolonging it today by not taking what has already been passed and moving along.

So, obviously, we oppose this rule, and we want to move on. We will be happy to work with them to move on the Senate legislation. I think it would

pass in an overwhelmingly bipartisan way; the President would sign it; and that aid would begin flowing. What my friends are proposing is quite the opposite. It is a prolonged back-and-forth with the United States Senate.

I have deep respect for the institution, but what is going to come out of here is going to be partisan; what came out of there is bipartisan.

What is going to come out of here won't be signed by the President; what has come out of the United States Senate will be. So if they are in a hurry to get the money moving, that is the way we should proceed.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me remind my colleagues, this is not the House bill that passed. This is a compromise that we have moved forward.

And, again, here is what my friends are saying is partisan: that we put into this bill that for children's health we must ensure a higher standard for medical care, nutrition, and hygiene. That is what they are calling partisan. That is what they are saying, oh, it is awful, we can't move forward on that.

The bill we are putting forward, this compromise bill, will meet the needs of the children. That is all that it does. So I don't know why we in the House can't, in a bipartisan way, stand together and say: Look, we want to improve on what the Senate did, and we want to guarantee that the moneys we send actually go to help the children and not get diverted to other things like we know this administration has a habit of doing.

Madam Speaker, anybody who has seen the pictures in the newspapers recently, anybody who has read the news articles, again, our hearts should ache.

This is not America. This is not what our country is about. We can do much, much better, and that is why we should move forward with consideration.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has ¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close and will yield back the balance of my time at the conclusion of my remarks.

Madam Speaker, we don't think the House bill is a better bill. We don't think reducing the amount the Senate gave to the military by \$124 million is a good idea. We don't think reducing the amount of money that is going to Border Patrol, which is one of the areas that is a problem, by \$89 million is a good idea. We don't think a lot of this effort to micromanage a crisis that is thousands of miles away from us by this body here has good suggestions.

We want some flexibility. We think the Senate bill does take care of the

needs on the border in terms of unaccompanied minors who have crossed over into our territory. So we just don't think this does it, and we think this prolongs the process.

We have a bipartisan bill—a perfect bill? No. Is our bill a perfect bill? No. As a matter of fact, we like the Senate bill on our side better than this bill. Regardless, that one can pass. That one can pass on this floor. That one can be signed into law.

This one that my friends are embarking on, they think it is an improvement. I will just tell them, politically, not passing the Senate, not likely to be signed by the President.

So if we want to get help there immediately, we have a way to do it in the Senate bill. We think this leads us to a political dead-end.

Madam Speaker, I would press for my motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, my colleagues have seen the pictures and they have heard the stories. And if that is not convincing to them to move forward, to increase protections for children who are held in our custody, then I don't know what else to say.

What we are asking for here in this compromise bill that we are moving forward is to make sure that there are stronger protections in here, to make sure that the abuse that we have all read about and that we have all seen stops and never, ever happens again. That is what this is all about.

So I am at a loss because, to me, the evidence is overwhelming that we need to provide stronger protections for these children. If my colleagues disagree, then they can vote against the bill and against consideration, but I would urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" so that we can move forward with this rule in consideration of this bill and get this passed as soon as possible and get on to either urging the Senate to pass it or to continue in negotiation, but we can do better than the Senate bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 188, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

YEAS—226

Adams	Beatty	Bonamici
Aguilar	Bera	Boyle, Brendan
Allred	Beyer	F.
Axne	Bishop (GA)	Brindisi
Barragán	Blumenauer	Brown (MD)
Bass	Blunt Rochester	Brownley (CA)

Bustos	Hill (CA)	Pascarell	Herrera Beutler	McHenry	Smith (NE)
Butterfield	Himes	Payne	Hice (GA)	McKinley	Smith (NJ)
Carbajal	Horn, Kendra S.	Perlmutter	Higgins (LA)	Meadows	Smucker
Cardenas	Horsford	Peters	Hill (AR)	Meuser	Spano
Carson (IN)	Houlihan	Peterson	Holding	Miller	Stauber
Cartwright	Hoyer	Phillips	Hollingsworth	Mitchell	Stefanik
Case	Jackson Lee	Pingree	Hudson	Moolenaar	Steil
Casten (IL)	Jayapal	Pocan	Huizenga	Mooney (WV)	Steube
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Porter	Hunter	Newhouse	Stewart
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Pressley	Hurd (TX)	Norman	Stivers
Ciulline	Johnson (TX)	Price (NC)	Johnson (LA)	Nunes	Taylor
Cisneros	Kaptur	Quigley	Johnson (OH)	Olson	Thompson (PA)
Clark (MA)	Keating	Raskin	Johnson (SD)	Palazzo	Thornberry
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)	Jordan	Palmer	Timmons
Clay	Kennedy	Richmond	Joyce (OH)	Pence	Tipton
Cleaver	Khanna	Rose (NY)	Joyce (PA)	Perry	Turner
Clyburn	Kildee	Rouda	Katko	Posey	Upton
Cohen	Kilmer	Royal-Allard	Keller	Ratcliffe	Wagner
Connolly	Kim	Ruiz	Kelly (MS)	Reed	Walberg
Cooper	Kind	Ruppersberger	Kelly (PA)	Reschenthaler	Walden
Correa	Kirkpatrick	Rush	King (IA)	Rice (SC)	Walker
Costa	Krishnamoorthi	Sánchez	King (NY)	Riggleman	Waltz
Courtney	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes	Kinzinger	Roby	Watkins
Cox (CA)	Lamb	Scanlon	LaHood	Rodgers (WA)	Weber (TX)
Craig	Langevin	Schakowsky	LaMalfa	Roe, David P.	Webster (FL)
Crist	Larsen (WA)	Schiff	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)	Wenstrup
Crow	Larson (CT)	Schneider	Latta	Rose, John W.	Westerman
Cuellar	Lawrence	Schrader	Lesko	Rouzer	Williams
Cummings	Lawson (FL)	Schriener	Long	Roy	Wilson (SC)
Cunningham	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)	Loudermilk	Rutherford	Wittman
Davids (KS)	Lee (NV)	Serrano	Luetkemeyer	Scalise	Womack
Davis (CA)	Levin (CA)	Sewell (AL)	Marshall	Schweikert	Woodall
Davis, Danny K.	Levin (MI)	Shalala	Massie	Scott, Austin	Wright
Dean	Lewis	Sherman	Mast	Sensenbrenner	Yoho
DeFazio	Lieu, Ted	Sherrill	McCarthy	Shimkus	Young
DeGette	Lipinski	Sires	McCaul	Simpson	Zeldin
DeLauro	Loeb sack	Slotkin	McClintock	Smith (MO)	
DelBene	Lofgren	Smith (WA)			
Delgado	Lowenthal	Soto			
Demings	Lowey	Spanberger	Abraham	Huffman	Rogers (AL)
DeSaulnier	Lujan	Speier	Castro (TX)	Kustoff (TN)	Rooney (FL)
Deutch	Luria	Stanton	Crenshaw	Lucas	Ryan
Dingell	Lynch	Stevens	DesJarlais	Marchant	Scott, David
Doggett	Malinowski	Suozzi	Gabbard	Moulton	Swalwell (CA)
Doyle, Michael	Maloney,	Takano	Hastings	Mullin	Walorski
F.	Carolyn B.	Thompson (CA)			
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)			
Escobar	Matsui	Titus			
Eshoo	McAdams	Tlaib			
Espallat	McBath	Tonko			
Evans	McCollum	Torres (CA)			
Finkenauer	McEachin	Torres Small			
Fletcher	McGovern	(NM)			
Foster	McNerney	Trahan			
Frankel	Meeks	Trone			
Fudge	Meng	Underwood			
Gallego	Moore	Van Drew			
Garamendi	Morelle	Vargas			
Garcia (IL)	Mucarsel-Powell	Veasey			
Garcia (TX)	Murphy	Vela			
Golden	Nadler	Velázquez			
Gomez	Napolitano	Visclosky			
Gonzalez (TX)	Neal	Wasserman			
Gottheimer	Neguse	Schultz			
Green, Al (TX)	Norcross	Waters			
Grijalva	O'Halleran	Watson Coleman			
Haaland	Ocasio-Cortez	Welch			
Harder (CA)	Omar	Wexton			
Hayes	Pallone	Wild			
Heck	Panetta	Wilson (FL)			
Higgins (NY)	Pappas	Yarmuth			

NAYS—188

Aderholt	Byrne	Fleischmann
Allen	Calvert	Flores
Amash	Carter (GA)	Fortenberry
Amodei	Carter (TX)	Fox (NC)
Armstrong	Chabot	Fulcher
Arrington	Cheney	Gaetz
Babin	Cline	Gallagher
Bacon	Cloud	Gianforte
Baird	Cole	Gibbs
Balderson	Collins (GA)	Gohmert
Banks	Collins (NY)	Gonzalez (OH)
Barr	Comer	Gooden
Bergman	Conaway	Gosar
Biggs	Cook	Granger
Billirakis	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Curtis	Graves (LA)
Bost	Davidson (OH)	Graves (MO)
Brady	Davis, Rodney	Green (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Griffith
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Grothman
Buchanan	Duncan	Guest
Buck	Dunn	Guthrie
Bucshon	Emmer	Hagedorn
Budd	Estes	Harris
Burchett	Ferguson	Hartzler
Burgess	Fitzpatrick	Hern, Kevin

the bodies of Oscar Alberto Martinez Ramirez and his nearly 2-year-old daughter, Valeria. They were taken on Monday as these Salvadoran migrants tried to cross the Rio Grande after leaving a Mexican migrant camp. Like so many others, they were exercising their legal right to seek asylum here in the United States. They wanted to be free from the violence, gangs, poverty, and inequality that is rampant in El Salvador, just as it is all across Central America.

I visited El Salvador and I visited Honduras recently, and, Mr. Speaker, I saw the unbearable conditions with my own eyes. It is no wonder that organizations like the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime have said this and other Central American countries are more dangerous than Afghanistan and only slightly better than Syria.

Syria, Mr. Speaker, is the site of an ongoing civil war. Let that sink in for a moment.

But, unfortunately, Alberto and Valeria didn't survive their journey. Alberto's wife, Tania, was forced to watch in horror as a current washed her family away.

I am telling their story today because this is what migrants face as they risk their lives to come to this country—not to transport drugs, not to commit crimes, as the President suggests, but to find refuge, to raise their daughter in a safe place, and to have a chance at building a better life, a life that they could only find in America.

Isn't this what each of us wants for our own families?

They came to present themselves at a legal port of entry and to seek legal asylum, as is their right under U.S. law.

And they weren't the only ones to die. Just this past weekend, Border Patrol agents found four more bodies in the river west of Brownsville, Texas: three more young children and a young woman in her twenties.

Every single week, people drown in the river and perish in the deserts, invisible and unknown.

It wasn't too long ago that we celebrated how immigration made our country stronger, whether it was a Democratic or a Republican administration.

I am reminded of President Reagan's final speech in office, where he said:

Anybody, from any corner of the world, can come to America to live and become an American. This, I believe, is one of the most important sources of America's greatness.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration apparently has the complete opposite view of immigration. They don't celebrate it; they demonize it.

Consider what may have happened to Oscar and his family if they did make it to our border, forced to sleep on concrete floors with the lights on 24 hours a day, with no soap, no medicine, maybe not even a toothbrush, Valeria separated from her parents, because that is what migrants are forced to endure at border facilities under this President.

NOT VOTING—18

Abraham	Huffman	Rogers (AL)
Castro (TX)	Kustoff (TN)	Rooney (FL)
Crenshaw	Lucas	Ryan
DesJarlais	Marchant	Scott, David
Gabbard	Moulton	Swalwell (CA)
Hastings	Mullin	Walorski

□ 1128

Messrs. BIGGS, YOUNG, and TIMMONS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, 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. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 466, providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 3401. One hour of general debate has been provided, controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I think, by now, we all have seen the horrific images showing

A physician who visited one recently said: “The conditions within which they are held could be compared to torture facilities.”

Mr. Speaker, when Lady Liberty encourages us to give her our poor, huddled masses, I don't think she means so the administration can turn around and throw them in a cage. I don't think she lifts her torch so their legal plight could be criminalized and crying children could be ripped from the arms of their parents.

But that is what is happening under this President, and, Mr. Speaker, it is sickening. It should tear at the hearts of every single Member of this House, whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

This week, the House passed bipartisan emergency legislation to address this humanitarian crisis at the border. The Senate had its own ideas. So, today, we are back with a compromise to get a bill quickly signed into law.

This is a compromise that lives up to our core values and protects children and families. It adds critical protections for children who were included in the House version of the bill. It includes language to improve care for children by forcing influx facilities to comply with the Flores settlement and capping, at 90 days, the amount of time a child can spend in such a facility.

We are also reducing funding for ICE, while rejecting additional and unnecessary dollars for the Pentagon.

This is a crisis, Mr. Speaker. We cannot treat compromise as though it is a dirty word, not when migrants are literally losing their lives in unsafe, unhealthy, and unsanitary conditions and children are being torn apart from their families. That is what is at stake here.

The horrors at detention centers shouldn't get lost in the latest tweet-athon by the President, just as the plight of migrants shouldn't go unseen by the American people. This should shake our conscience and make clear the urgent need to act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill, and let's send a message to the President and to the world that America is better than this. This is not who we are, what is happening at our border.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say one final thing. In the compromise package today that seems to bother so many people are merely items that would protect the well-being of these children, that would provide more transparency. For the life of me, I don't understand the controversy. I don't understand why we can't make the Senate bill better, why we can't do more for these children.

I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle feel as we do, that what is happening is unacceptable. Let us strengthen that bill. Let us actually give a bill to the President that we all know will help these children.

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

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

I want to begin by thanking my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Chairman MCGOVERN) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, well, we are here for the third time this week and the second time on a supplemental appropriations bill for the southern border.

Earlier this week, I spoke on this floor and expressed my concerns about the House bill. Make no mistake, we need emergency funding for the crisis on the southern border. We needed it 2 months ago, and we need it even more desperately today.

Two days ago, I warned that the bill the House was considering would not pass the Senate and would not become law, and I was proven correct. The House bill failed in the Senate. In fact, it only received 37 votes in support. In contrast, the Senate amendment passed in a bipartisan vote of 84-8.

If the Democratic leadership would allow a vote on the Senate text, I believe it would pass this Chamber today and be on its way to the President's desk—today. But, instead, we are here considering a rule that would further amend the bill, bringing back in provisions that have already failed to garner support in the Senate.

If this bill fails to pass the Senate, as I expect will happen, then we will be leaving town for a week without actually having passed anything to deal with the crisis. And I do remind my friends on the other side we have attempted on our side, 16 times, to bring up legislation to deal with this, and the President asked for this money 2 months ago.

So, I am glad they have a sense of urgency now, because we have not seen it in the past.

My sense is that this is more about maintaining the unity of the Democratic Caucus than it is about pressing legislation that can be enacted into law. But that has been true for this entire Congress, and it is why my friends have, so far, failed to enact any significant legislation during their tenure in the majority.

Mr. Speaker, we are out of time. We desperately need to get these emergency funds to the Federal agencies responsible for managing this crisis. They are out of money and need additional resources to take care of people, many of them innocent children, who are affected by this crisis. We do not have the luxury of time in responding to this emergency.

My friends on the other side of the aisle are about to make the exact same mistake that they made on Tuesday when they pushed forward a partisan bill that would not pass the Senate and that the President would not sign into law.

What I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, is why the majority is so resistant to acting in a bipartisan manner here. Both Republicans and Democrats agree that we need additional funding to ad-

dress the crisis on the southern border. There is a real chance to send a bipartisan bill to the President that will become law. And, instead of doing what will immediately help children and families at the border, the majority is attempting to cut the needed funding from the Senate bill, add partisan riders back into it, and then send it back to the Senate, where it can fail again.

Madam Speaker, we do not have time to waste on purely political exercises. There is still an opportunity to correct that mistake, Madam Speaker, and I would urge the majority to take that opportunity seriously.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished Republican leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, 58 days—58 days—is the amount of time since the administration asked and said there was a crisis on the border, that they needed funding.

Madam Speaker, 18 times—18 times—we had the opportunity to take a vote on this floor, and we did not come to a solution, and it did not pass.

Madam Speaker, two times—two times—The New York Times wrote editorials in those 58 days calling upon this body to put politics aside, that this crisis on the border was greater than the politics that we want to play.

The Mexican Government realizes there is a crisis on the border and just sent 15,000 troops. We have seen the pictures. We have heard the words. On either side they talk of it.

We were in this well just a few days ago having a debate. Many of us said: Why would we take this moment to do a political maneuver that will not go anywhere in the Senate?

Don't take our word for it. Take the votes for it. The bill did not pass.

There is a time for every season. The season to continue to play politics is over. The season to put people before politics is now.

Don't take my word for it. Take the example of the Chamber that is just across the way. It is not far. You can see it if you look out those doors; you can walk it without taking much breath; and you can understand what bipartisanship looks like, Madam Speaker.

The Senate took up a bill to take up this crisis. The vote was 84-8.

□ 1145

Madam Speaker, 84-8. There has been historic legislation that was passed with much less, but there have been very few that have ever been defeated that have gone 84-8.

But today, we are going to take hours to learn the exact same experience that we had just a few, short hours ago. The 84-8—when I listen to the other side and say that this—the Democratic Party, Madam Speaker, wants to do this.

Let me read the names of some of those who voted for this bill to understand what bipartisan sounds like: Senator CHUCK SCHUMER, Senator DICK DURBIN, Senator TIM KAINE, Senator PATTY MURRAY, and Senator DIANE FEINSTEIN all voted “yes.” Every single member of the Senate Democratic leadership voted “yes” to end the crisis on the border.

But why, Madam Speaker, are we on this floor now? Why does the Democratic leadership on this side want to continue to play politics when the Democrat leadership in the Senate says no?

Fifty-eight days is enough. Eighteen votes over there are too many.

But, yes, people are dying. But, yes, the money is out. We have all acknowledged it on this floor.

Madam Speaker, it makes me begin to wonder, how can a few control so many?

On that opening day, when we are on this floor, we all raise our hand individually. We all swear to uphold the Constitution. Our names are individually on the ballot when we are voted to come in here.

This is not a moment to let somebody else control your name or your voting card. This is not a moment to say, my party tells me to go here, because that is not the case.

CHUCK SCHUMER is the leader of the Democratic Party. DICK DURBIN is the leader of the Democrats when it comes to immigration. I have spent hours and months with DICK DURBIN in a room trying to come to an immigration agreement, and we have seen places far, far apart. We have spent months trying to come to a conclusion.

But you know what? We have this time. We have found a more perfect union when we found bipartisanship.

But are we going to allow a few to continue to deny it?

Fifty-eight days. You do not have more. The money is gone. The time is now.

We all know that we are better than this. I do not accuse anybody on either side of what they truly believe about a crisis. I have heard.

I have heard people on the other side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, that said they want to vote for the Senate bill. Can we allow them to vote for the Senate bill?

Can we allow them to join with the 84 Senators out of 100 on the other side that said “yes” to it? Or do we have a few that control what can come to the floor?

Now, I heard in this rule debate that there are some amendments; that somehow they are going to make it better. What makes it better? That we do not fund to pay any overtime costs for Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers, or provide funding for the active duty of the National Guard troops working with them on the front line of the crisis at the border?

Is that making it better?

Is that really what you want to stake your political career on?

Is that really what you want to stand up against bipartisanship for?

Madam Speaker, I have heard a lot of names on the other side say they would vote for it. I think everybody in this body knows that that Senate bill will pass. I think everybody in their heart knows that is where we are going to end up.

But do we have to go through it one more time?

You do not have to worry about what the outcome will be. The leader of the Senate has already said what will happen; because I will promise you this, on this side of the aisle, we will stay here until this is done. We will not leave, and we will stand with the bipartisan vote in the Senate.

If you are worried about getting to 218, do not worry. Put that bill on suspension, I promise you it will pass.

I call upon all of our better angels for this one moment, for this one time, when America is watching, that we rise to the occasion; that we put the partisanship aside; that we have swapped; that the Senate has actually taught us, given us the adult supervision to show that, yes, we have had that fight; yes, you tried to make it and it didn't make it. But there is something better. There is a window, and there is an opportunity.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I do not yield for that purpose. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

I want to assure the distinguished minority leader that I am not asking Members of Congress to vote for what we are bringing before the House today based on their party. I am asking Members to vote their conscience.

And to be totally frank, we want to make sure there are protections built in this legislation so that funds are not misused as they have been in the past; so we don't see any more children being abused; so we don't see the mismanagement that we have witnessed.

With all due respect to the Senate majority leader, and to many of my friends on the other side of the aisle, when children were being ripped apart from their parents, we heard silence. When we read about the terrible conditions that these children were in, being denied soap, and toothpaste, and tooth-

brushes, and not being cared for, we heard silence.

When we saw the picture of Oscar and Valeria dead, trying to seek asylum in this country, there is nothing.

So the bottom line is, we want to get this done, and we will stay here as long as it takes, I assure the minority leader. We are not going anywhere.

But we are going to stand for the children, and that is what our purpose is here today.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I am so glad that our colleagues across the aisle agree that the conditions at the border are intolerable, because they are.

A few months ago, I had the opportunity to go to the southern border, meet with Border Patrol agents and advocates on the ground, including a woman who had been separated from her children, and we toured detention facilities.

The humanitarian crisis then, in February, was undeniable, and it has only gotten worse. But the cause of this crisis has raised serious questions, particularly as to why it has escalated.

In addition to suspending critical aid designed to relieve conditions causing desperate families to flee their homes, the Trump administration is failing to use longstanding lawful processes and available resources to provide relief to children and refugees at the southern border.

The Trump administration's policies are not making our border safer, but they are worsening the situation, at the expense of the health and well-being of desperate children and families.

There are unused beds at facilities in my home State of Pennsylvania and in Texas, and many refugee children have sponsors, family members available here, but they are being denied access.

Prior to coming to Congress, I represented immigrants and asylum seekers who, by definition, lawfully enter this country seeking refuge. I can confidently say that international law is being violated on a daily basis by this administration, and it has abandoned longstanding legal norms for processing asylees, with the apparent purpose of exacerbating the crisis for political gain.

I agree that we need to send additional resources to relieve the inhumane conditions affecting refugees at our border. But we also have a responsibility to make sure that those resources are not misused to worsen rather than relieve this crisis.

Therefore, I urge that we support the border relief bill that is before us, which will provide resources to relieve the crisis and improve the health and well-being of innocent children, while allowing transparency and oversight.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SCANLON. It is important that we allow transparency and oversight on how those funds are used.

To our Republican colleagues in the Senate, especially Majority Leader MCCONNELL, if you fail to work with us to address this humanitarian crisis, not only will your legacy be your legislative graveyard in the Senate, but the deaths of these children and families.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate overwhelmingly. Ten times more Senators voted for this bill than voted against it. That is the essence of bipartisanship.

I ask that we make this House proud. I ask that we make our colleagues proud. And I ask that we pass this bill and send it to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair would advise Members that even though a unanimous consent request to consider a measure is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such requests constitute debate and will become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

We must not adjourn. We will stay and do the people's work and take care of this humanitarian crisis on the border. Send this to the President's desk immediately, today, for signature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for

that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained. Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, as an FBI agent who worked border security on the border, understanding it all too well, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to concur with the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

□ 1200

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes, and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

We must show the American people that bipartisanship is about solving these children's problems.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose.

Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate 84-8 and could be

sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), my friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amount thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), my friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST), my friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MAST. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BERGMAN), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could immediately be sent to the President's desk for his signature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), my friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Judge Carter, my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes. It could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT), my friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unan-

imous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPANO), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), my friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Speaker, for the love of God and this country, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today, so help us, God.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose and therefore

the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Oklahoma.

□ 1215

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles, one from The New York Times entitled: "'There is a Stench': Soiled Clothes and No Baths for Migrant Children at a Texas Center"; the other, "'The Taliban Gave Me Toothpaste': Former Captives Contrast U.S. Treatment of Child Migrants."

[From the New York Times, June 21, 2019]

'THERE IS A STENCH': SOILED CLOTHES AND NO BATHS FOR MIGRANT CHILDREN AT A TEXAS CENTER

(By Caitlin Dickerson)

A chaotic scene of sickness and filth is unfolding in an overcrowded border station in Clint, Tex., where hundreds of young people who have recently crossed the border are being held, according to lawyers who visited the facility this week. Some of the children have been there for nearly a month.

Children as young as 7 and 8, many of them wearing clothes caked with snot and tears, are caring for infants they've just met, the lawyers said. Toddlers without diapers are relieving themselves in their pants. Teenage mothers are wearing clothes stained with breast milk.

Most of the young detainees have not been able to shower or wash their clothes since they arrived at the facility, those who visited said. They have no access to toothbrushes, toothpaste or soap.

[Hundreds of migrant children have now been transferred out of the facility.]

"There is a stench," said Elora Mukherjee, director of the Immigrants' Rights Clinic at Columbia Law School, one of the lawyers who visited the facility. "The overwhelming majority of children have not bathed since they crossed the border."

Conditions at Customs and Border Protection facilities along the border have been an issue of increasing concern as officials warn that the recent large influx of migrant families has driven many of the facilities well past their capacities. The border station in Clint is only one of those with problems.

In May, the inspector general for the Department of Homeland Security warned of "dangerous overcrowding" among adult migrants housed at the border processing center in El Paso, with up to 900 migrants being held at a facility designed for 125. In some cases, cells designed for 35 people were holding 155 people.

"Border Patrol agents told us some of the detainees had been held in standing-room-only conditions for days or weeks," the inspector general's office said in its report, which noted that some detainees were observed standing on toilets in the cells "to make room and gain breathing space, thus limiting access to the toilets."

Gov. Greg Abbott of Texas on Friday announced the deployment of 1,000 new National Guard troops to the border to help respond to the continuing new arrivals, which the governor said have amounted to more than 45,000 people from 52 countries over the past three weeks.

"The crisis at our southern border is unlike anything we've witnessed before and has put an enormous strain on the existing resources we have in place," Mr. Abbott said, adding, "Congress is a group of reprobates for not addressing the crisis on our border."

The number of border crossings appears to have slowed in recent weeks, possibly as a

result of a crackdown by the Mexican government under pressure from President Trump, but the numbers remain high compared to recent years. The overcrowding crisis has been unfolding invisibly, with journalists and lawyers offered little access to fenced-off border facilities.

The reports of unsafe and unsanitary conditions at Clint and elsewhere came days after government lawyers in court argued that they should not have to provide soap or toothbrushes to children under the legal settlement that gave Ms. Mukherjee and her colleagues access to the facility in Clint. The result of a lawsuit that was first settled in 1997, the settlement set the standards for the detention, treatment and release of migrant minors taken into federal immigration custody.

Ms. Mukherjee is part of a team of lawyers who has for years under the settlement been allowed to inspect government facilities where migrant children are detained. She and her colleagues traveled to Clint this week after learning that border officials had begun detaining minors who had recently crossed the border there.

She said the conditions in Clint were the worst she had seen in any facility in her 12-year career. "So many children are sick, they have the flu, and they're not being properly treated," she said. The Associated Press, which first reported on conditions at the facility earlier this week, found that it was housing three infants, all with teen mothers, along with a 1-year-old, two 2-year-olds and a 3-year-old. It said there were dozens more children under the age of 12.

Ms. Mukherjee said children were being overseen by guards for Customs and Border Protection, which declined to comment for this story. She and her colleagues observed the guards wearing full uniforms—including weapons—as well as face masks to protect themselves from the unsanitary conditions.

Together, the group of six lawyers met with 60 children in Clint this week who ranged from 5 months to 17 years old. The infants were either children of minor parents, who were also detained, or had been separated from adult family members with whom they had crossed the border. The separated children were now alone, being cared for by other young detainees.

"The children are locked in their cells and cages nearly all day long," Ms. Mukherjee said. "A few of the kids said they had some opportunities to go outside and play, but they said they can't bring themselves to play because they are trying to stay alive in there."

When the lawyers arrived, federal officials said that more than 350 children were detained at the facility. The officials did not disclose the facility's capacity but said the population had exceeded it. By the time the lawyers left on Wednesday night, border officials told them that about 200 of the children had been transferred elsewhere but did not say where they had been sent.

"That's what's keeping me up at night," Ms. Mukherjee said.

Some sick children were being quarantined in the facility. The lawyers were allowed to speak to the children by phone, but their requests to meet with them in person and observe the conditions they were being held in were denied.

The children told the lawyers they were given the same meals every day—instant oats for breakfast, instant noodles for lunch, a frozen burrito for dinner, along with a few cookies and juice packets—which many said was not enough. "Nearly every child I spoke with said that they were hungry," Ms. Mukherjee said.

Another group of lawyers conducting inspections under the same federal court settlement said they discovered similar conditions earlier this month at six other facilities in Texas. At the Border Patrol's Central Processing Center in McAllen, Tex.—often known as “Ursula”—the lawyers encountered a 17-year-old mother from Guatemala who couldn't stand because of complications from an emergency C-section, and who was caring for a sick and dirty premature baby.

“When we encountered the baby and her mom, the baby was filthy. They wouldn't give her any water to wash her. And I took a Kleenex and I washed around her neck black dirt,” said Hope Frye, who was leading the group, adding, “Not a little stuff—dirt.”

After government lawyers argued in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco this week that amenities such as soap and toothbrushes should not be mandated under the legal settlement originally agreed to between the government and migrant families in 1997 and amended several times since then, all three judges voiced dismay.

Among the guidelines set under the legal settlement are that facilities for children must be “safe and sanitary.”

The Justice Department's lawyer, Sarah Fabian, argued that the settlement agreement did not specify the need to supply hygienic items and that, therefore, the government did not need to do so.

“Are you arguing seriously that you do not read the agreement as requiring you to do anything other than what I just described: cold all night long, lights on all night long, sleeping on concrete and you've got an aluminum foil blanket?” Judge William Fletcher asked Ms. Fabian. “I find that inconceivable that the government would say that is safe and sanitary.”

“THE TALIBAN GAVE ME TOOTHPASTE”: FORMER CAPTIVES CONTRAST U.S. TREATMENT OF CHILD MIGRANTS

(By Deanna Paul)

[June 25, 2019]

The federal government told a panel of Ninth Circuit appellate judges last week that U.S. border detention facilities are “safe and sanitary,” as required by law, even though migrant children are denied soap, toothbrushes and dark places to sleep.

Judge William A. Fletcher called the position of Sarah Fabian, a senior attorney from the Office of Immigration Litigation, “inconceivable.”

Senior U.S. Circuit Judge A. Wallace Tashima told the government attorney, “If you don't have a toothbrush, if you don't have soap, if you don't have a blanket, it's not safe and sanitary.”

Fabian's argument spread rapidly across the Internet—and so did several tweets supporting the notion that the United States treats migrant detainees less humanely than foreign pirates and the Taliban treat their captives.

American journalist Michael Scott Moore, abducted in 2012 while reporting in Somalia, watched Fabian argue that minimal necessities, like toiletries and sleeping conditions, were not essential to meet minimum “safe and sanitary” standards.

“That was—let's say—below my experience in Somalia,” he told The Washington Post Tuesday of his more than two years in captivity.

“The conditions were about as miserable as you could imagine,” he said, describing a barren and concrete prison house. Often there was no electricity, he said, “but we had certain minimum things that kept it from being completely wretched.”

He said he was given toothpaste, soap, a daily shower and a foam mattress.

Recent reports have surfaced describing U.S. border detainees held in cages of chain-link fencing, sleeping on concrete and covered with blankets made of aluminum foil, allegations that Customs and Border Protection officials dispute.

On Tuesday, the agency said that children in custody receive “continuous access to hygienic products and adequate food” while awaiting shelter placement.

Somali pirates gave me toothpaste & soap. <https://twitter.com/novthisnews/status/1142151178177978368> . . .

An executive editor at newyorker.com, David Rohde, contributed to the online conversation, too.

“The Taliban gave me toothpaste & soap,” he wrote on Twitter, drawing from the seven months he spent as a hostage of the Taliban. Rohde said he was not abused in their custody, though the group is known for abusing its captives.

The online thread with former prisoners has been liked nearly half a million times. Washington Post Global opinions writer Jason Rezaian, who was held in Iranian custody for a year and a half and has an ongoing lawsuit against the Iranian government, also responded on Twitter.

“I felt if I didn't chime in, it would be the height of hypocrisy,” Rezaian told The Post on Tuesday, calling U.S. treatment of children at the border misaligned with “what this country stands for.” “The government is treating them like they're statistics, ‘the other’ and not deserving of basic humanity.”

From the first day in captivity, Rezaian was permitted to shower regularly. He was also given a toothbrush and toothpaste. Rezaian asked, “If we're going to treat the most vulnerable people this way, what does that say about our actual values?”

I had a toothbrush and toothpaste—not exactly Aquafresh or Tom's—from the first night. Actually, I had almost nothing else in my cell while I was in solitary confinement. I was allowed to shower every couple of days. <https://twitter.com/yashar/status/1142546005688311808> . . .

The case heard on Tuesday stems from a motion filed under the Obama administration. In part, it argued that Customs and Border Protection was holding children in detention facilities that were not “safe and sanitary,” in violation of a 1997 precedent.

The Trump administration, however, opted to bring the appeal, asking the panel of three judges to condone current custody conditions.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, the last thing I would want to see is a repeat of the other night when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle laughed and jeered as I described the situation at the border and what is happening to the children in our custody.

Madam Speaker, the minority leader earlier asked why are we here again—one word, “oversight”—“oversight.”

We have seen, as Members of Congress, too often, our desire to provide oversight, which is a fundamental responsibility, a fundamental duty of ours, we have seen it thwarted and we have seen it obstructed.

There is no one in this Chamber right now who feels more of a sense of urgency than the Representative from Texas 16, El Paso, where we have had a front row to the atrocities occurring at the hands of this government.

And I will tell you, part of the challenge for many of us who have worked with goodwill and charity has been witnessing the fact that Congress has not been able to provide fundamental guardrails for the treatment of these kids.

What is the main difference between the Senate bill and the House bill? Ours is far more humane. Ours ensures that money will not be diverted for things that have turned a challenge into a crisis.

A few examples include ripping children from the arms of their parents or sending vulnerable populations back into Mexico. In fact, Madam Speaker, in my district, one of the individuals sent back to Mexico under this administration's policy was kidnapped and raped. We have also seen people legally blocked at our ports of entry, sent to more treacherous crossings. That is why Oscar and Valeria died.

So oversight is why our bill is the better bill.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), my very good friend, for the purpose of unanimous consent.

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in this Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill was passed in the Senate with 84 votes, Madam Speaker, and could be sent today to the President's desk for his signature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Kentucky (Mr. COMER) for an unanimous consent request.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and can be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great

State of Idaho (Mr. FULCHER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to concur in that Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and can be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and can be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER), my friend and newest Member of the House of Representatives, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent directly to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Illinois (Mr. BOST) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and

could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD), my very good friend, for the purpose of unanimous consent request.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, my good friend (Mr. RIGGLEMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my good friend from the great State of Tennessee (Mr. ROSE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my good friend from the great State of Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my good friend from the great State of South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendments thereto, and concur with the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and it could be sent to the President for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my good friend from the great State of Virginia (Mr. CLINE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my very good friend from the great State of Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER), my good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk today for his signature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Kansas (Mr. ESTES), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to my good friend from the great State of Ohio, (Mr. BALDERSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BALDERSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and should be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take

from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the United States Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his immediate signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Ohio (Mr. GIBBS), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate 84-8 and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today. Let's vote on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk immediately for his signature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Florida (Mr. DUNN), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. GOODEN), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with only 6 nay votes from Democrats. There is overwhelming support for this in the Senate, and I urge my colleagues to join them in passing this bill today and sending it to the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON), my very good

friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I ask that we do the right thing here. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. This bipartisan bill passed the Senate with 84 votes and could be sent to the President's desk for his signature today to solve this crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, has the gentleman from Massachusetts yielded the floor by taking his seat?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has reserved his time.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG), my very good friend, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 3401, with the Senate amendment thereto. And if we would like to talk about accountability and if we would like to talk about oversight, I would prefer we start right here. Let your Members vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not yielded for that purpose and, therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Time will be deducted from the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I think you will be delighted to hear that I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, it is nice to know that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle now recognize it as a crisis.

The President asked 58 days ago for a supplemental appropriation to deal with this issue. It was ignored. We have tried 18 times to bring up a bill on the floor to deal with supplemental appropriations for humanitarian aid at the border, and it was ignored.

My friends on the other side of the aisle said they want to improve the bill. They want to ignore the fact that the Senate took up the House bill and overwhelmingly rejected it on a bipartisan basis.

Then they passed a bipartisan bill 84-8, which doesn't happen over there very often. We have gone through a list of those who voted in favor, including Senator SCHUMER and Senator DURBIN, yet somehow the House wants to ignore it. At least the majority in the House want to ignore it.

How they want to improve the bill, you may ask? Well, let's start by sim-

ply reducing or eliminating border security, that appears to be optional to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They want to take a hatchet to ICE. These are law enforcement personnel.

My son is a police officer. He puts on a vest every day. If you told me we were going to withhold payroll or overtime when they are doing the job, I would be offended, I would be disgusted, and I am, at this moment in time.

Let me ask how many over there would put on a vest, go out and do the job, and then hear, we may or may not pay you? Do I see any hands raised? I doubt it.

Law enforcement is struggling to do a job, an extraordinarily tough job, and we want to make it harder. So let me suggest, as the UC request was made, that we take up the bill that was passed by the Senate and we pass it.

And I ask for your attention over there, sir, unless, of course, you decided that policy is being made by a fragment of your conference, unless you decided that you are going to turn over the gavel to a fragment of your conference to make decisions for you, which may well appear to be the case. But let's be honest to the American people and tell them that a fragment, a small portion, of your conference is now functioning as a Speaker of the House.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. What we just witnessed was really interesting. In the amount of time that it took my friends on the other side of the aisle to get through those antics, we could have passed this bill. That is what urgency looks like. Not political theater. These kids that we are here to try to protect deserve more than grandstanding. They deserve things like medicine. They deserve things like soap and clothing.

And my Republican friends say they don't want to waste time, but they wasted a hell of a lot of time with what we just saw happen.

And just one other observation. In all the other editorial comments that were made, I didn't hear the word "children" mentioned once. I mean, it is telling, because that is what this debate is all about. It is not about grandstanding, and it is not about more money for cages to put kids in. It is about the children. And I am sorry that the children who are suffering under U.S. custody are such an afterthought.

And to the gentleman from Michigan, I am outraged, too. I am outraged that the terrible conditions that these kids have been forced to experience happened under U.S. custody. I am outraged that that would happen in the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut

(Ms. DELAURO), the distinguished chairwoman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this emergency supplemental bill.

Madam Speaker, the principles guiding this bill were clear from the outset. It is a response to a humanitarian crisis.

By increasing the housing capacity at Health and Human Services to moving these vulnerable children from the detention centers at Customs and Border Protection as quickly as possible to Health and Human Services, because we know what the conditions are at CBP. They are deplorable. In fact, it is government-sponsored child abuse.

We wanted to build in the protections for children that have been nonexistent in the past, and we uncovered those abuses. They have been reported in the press. The Miami Herald just recently said they are "prison-like conditions" at Homestead.

And we wanted to place children with a sponsor in a safe placement, a safe environment, as expeditiously as possible to reverse the administration's policy of frightening sponsors to come forward.

This bill includes strong protections and safeguards for these vulnerable children; it extends to the influx shelters' enhanced standards of care. And, my friends, it is for the first time ever. These protections have never been required of these influx shelters.

It continues to prevent the waiving of core standards and protections after 6 months.

It continues to hold influx shelters accountable by requiring HHS to remove an operator if they do not comply with these core standards.

□ 1245

If the shelter is not in compliance, then HHS is required to award the contract to a new service provider, and the bill continues to protect sponsors and potential sponsors by extending a provision that prohibits funds from being used to put anyone into a removal proceeding based on information from HHS' sponsor-vetting process.

The bill continues to require HHS to maintain the directives that they issued in December that removed bureaucratic barriers and have helped to place these children with sponsors as expeditiously as possible. And the bill continues to require HHS to report to Congress within 24 hours if an unaccompanied child dies in HHS custody.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Connecticut an additional 1 minute.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, a child did die in HHS custody. No one knew about this for 8 months, and it was only the news media that uncovered it. A child died.

This bill continues to ensure that Members of Congress can conduct oversight visits of shelters without being required to provide advance notice, and the bill continues to protect taxpayer funding by prohibiting funds from being diverted to programs outside of Health and Human Services. This bill provides clear direction, legal guardrails, about how our emergency funds should be used, and this bill wages the battle for the vulnerable.

Madam Speaker, I urge every Member of this House to support this bill.

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

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to simply concur in the Senate amendment without further amendment. This will immediately send the bill to the President and deliver the necessary resources needed to respond to this humanitarian crisis.

Madam 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, let me just say again, we can solve this problem now.

I respect that my friends have strong feelings about their legislation. We all do. The reality is that that legislation is not going to get through the Senate; it is not going to be signed by the President.

We have a vehicle that has already gotten through the Senate, that 75 percent of the Democrats in the Chamber voted for, including the entire Democratic leadership, and that could go, if this House would act on it, straight to the President's desk and be signed into law.

Now, my friends are, I know, concerned about resources. And, again, it is nice that they are. It would have been nice if, in the 18 previous times we have tried to bring this matter up before the House, they would have helped. It would have been nice if, 2 months ago, we had actually seen them respond.

We share their concern for these young people. That is why we asked for extra resources. The administration asked for extra resources 58 days ago. So I think, again, this ought to be pretty easy to resolve here.

My friends, with all due respect, have a partisan bill that will pass along partisan lines in this House, that will not be enacted by the Senate, and that will not be signed by the President.

The Senate has a bill they have already passed in a bipartisan fashion. It, frankly, has more money to help the people who are being paid overtime in the Border Patrol to—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gal-

lery in contravention of the law and rules of the House. The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

The gentleman from Oklahoma may continue.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Speaker personally for taking control of a difficult situation.

So, Madam Speaker, just to resume my point, we have a vehicle. It could literally pass on this floor in less than an hour. It could head to the President. It satisfies almost all—not all, but almost all—of my friends' concerns. I would just ask them, in all seriousness, to just consider political reality here and let's get this done and get these resources to where they are needed. We can do that. We can do it in a bipartisan fashion.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles: One from Vox, entitled, "The Horrifying Conditions Facing Kids in Border Detention, Explained," and another from Time magazine, entitled, "Lawyers Say Migrant Children Are Living in 'Traumatic and Dangerous' Conditions at Border Detention Site."

[From Vox, June 25, 2019]

THE HORRIFYING CONDITIONS FACING KIDS IN BORDER DETENTION, EXPLAINED

(By Dara Lind)

On any given day, 2,000 children are in Border Patrol custody, and the problems are hardly confined to one facility.

At any given time, for the past several weeks, more than 2,000 children have been held in the custody of US Border Patrol without their parents. Legally, they're not supposed to be held by border agents for more than 72 hours before being sent to the Department of Health and Human Services, which is responsible for finding their nearest relative in the US to house them while their immigration cases are adjudicated.

In practice, they're being held for days, sometimes weeks, in facilities without enough food or toothbrushes—going days without showering, overcrowded and undercared for.

Late last week, the conditions of that detention in one facility in Clint, Texas, became public when investigators, checking on the US government's obligations under the Flores agreement (which governs the care of immigrant children in US custody), were so horrified that they turned into public whistleblowers and spoke to the Associated Press about what they saw.

The stories they told have horrified much of America. The past several days have seen growing outrage, and the acting commissioner of Customs and Border Protection (which oversees CBP) announced his resignation Tuesday (though officials maintain the outrage didn't cause the resignation).

But the problem goes beyond one official—or one facility.

The story gained even wider traction after Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez's (D-NY) reference to the detention facilities as "concentration camps," and the ensuing debate over whether that term was appropriate.

The US government's response was to move the children out of the Clint facility—and move another group of children in.

On Monday, officials confirmed that all 350 of the children there last week would be

moved to other facilities by Tuesday; about 250 of them have been placed with HHS, and the remainder are being sent to other Border Patrol facilities. But on Tuesday morning, a Customs and Border Protection official told a New York Times reporter on a press call that about a hundred children were currently being housed at Clint.

That's illustrative of the hectic improvisation that's characterized much of the Trump administration's response to the current border influx. It's a problem that is much, much bigger than the problems at a single facility. Indeed, the problems investigators identified at Clint are problems elsewhere as well.

The lone member of the team of legal investigators who visited the El Paso facility in which many children were sent from Clint—called "Border Patrol Station 1"—told Vox that conditions there were just as bad as they were in Clint, with the same problems of insufficient food, no toothbrushes, and aggressive guards.

The problem isn't the Clint facility. The problem is the hastily-cobbled-together system of facilities Customs and Border Protection (the agency which runs Border Patrol) has thrown together in the last several months, as the unprecedented number of families and children coming into the US without papers has overwhelmed a system designed to swiftly deport single adults.

It is apparent that even an administration acting with the best interests of children in mind at every turn would be scrambling right now. But policymakers are split on how much of the current crisis is simply a resource problem—one Congress could help by sending more resources—and how much is deliberate mistreatment or neglect from an administration that doesn't deserve any more money or trust.

Border Patrol isn't prepared to care for children at all. It's now housing 2,000 a day.

According to statistics sent to congressional staff last week and obtained by Vox, between May 14 and June 13, US Border Patrol facilities were housing over 14,000 people a day—and sometimes as many as 18,000. (The most recent tally, as of June 13, was nearly 16,000.)

Most of these were single adults, or parents with children. But consistently, over that month, around 2,000—2,081 as of June 13—were "unaccompanied alien children," or children being held without adult relatives in separate facilities.

In an early June press call, a Customs and Border Protection official said, referring to the total number of people in custody, "when we have 4,000 in custody, we consider that high. 6,000 is a crisis."

Traditionally, an "unaccompanied alien child" refers to a child who comes to the US without a parent or guardian. Increasingly—as lawyers have been reporting, and as the investigators who interviewed children in detention last week confirmed—children are coming to the US with a relative who is not their parent, and being separated.

Because the law defines an "unaccompanied" child as someone without a parent or legal guardian here, border agents don't have the ability to keep a child with a grandparent, aunt or uncle, or even a sibling who's over 18, though advocates have also raised concerns that border agents are separating relatives even when there is evidence of legal guardianship.

Under the terms of US law—and especially the 1997 Flores settlement, which governs the treatment of children in immigration custody—immigration agents are obligated to get unaccompanied children out of immigration detention as quickly as possible, and to keep them in the least restrictive conditions possible while they're there. Barring emergencies, children aren't supposed to be

in Border Patrol custody for more than 72 hours before being sent to HHS—which is responsible for finding and vetting a sponsor to house the child (usually their closest relative in the United States).

That hasn't been happening. Attorneys, doctors, and human rights observers have consistently reported that children are being held by Border Patrol for days or longer before being picked up by HHS. And in the meantime, they're being kept in facilities that weren't built to hold even adults for that period of time, or in improvised "soft-sided" facilities that look like (and are commonly referred to as) tents.

The detention conditions crisis doesn't just affect children. But conditions for children are under special legal scrutiny.

Since late last year, US immigration agents have been overwhelmed by the number of families coming across the border. The US immigration system, which was built to quickly arrest and deport single Mexican adults crossing into the US to work, doesn't have the capacity to deal with tens of thousands of families (mostly from Central America) who are often seeking asylum in the US.

The length of time migrants are spending in Border Patrol custody (and the conditions there) have attracted some alarm before. In April, pictures of migrants being held outside under a bridge in El Paso, fenced in and sleeping on the ground, attracted outrage and led Border Patrol to stop holding migrants there. And in May, the DHS Office of the Inspector General released an emergency report about dangerous overcrowding of adults in two facilities: with up to 900 people being held in a facility designed to hold 125.

Because of the Flores settlement, lawyers have the opportunity to investigate conditions for children to see if the government is complying—and possibly ask a judge to intervene if it is not. That's what spurred the fact-finding mission that led to last week's stories.

The reports about Clint broke at a time when the Trump administration was already playing defense about its compliance with the Flores settlement. (While the administration is working on a regulation that would supersede the terms of the agreement, that regulation isn't expected to be published in final form until fall, and may well be held up in court.)

In a 9th Circuit Court of Appeals hearing earlier last week about whether the administration needed to allow a court appointee to monitor conditions for children in ICE and CBP custody, Department of Justice lawyer Sarah Fabian told judges that children didn't necessarily need towels or toothbrushes to be in "safe and sanitary" conditions—a clip that looked especially bad when the Clint stories came out showing the children were being denied just that.

The court hearing was not specifically about the Clint facility—it wasn't about what investigators found last week at all. And as Ken White explained for the Atlantic, Fabian's cringeworthy "safe and sanitary" argument came from the awkward stance the Trump administration has taken in this litigation: In order to challenge the court appointment of a special monitor, they argued that there's a difference between a promise to keep kids in "safe and sanitary" conditions (which the government has agreed to for decades) and a guarantee of particular items like toothbrushes.

The court appeared unimpressed. And the stories about Clint and other facilities that have come out in the ensuing days certainly bolstered the case that the Trump administration has either willingly violated its agreement to keep kids safe and healthy, or has been unable to keep it—or a mix of both.

The problem isn't Clint.

The problems that investigators identified at Clint—too many people, not enough food, no toothbrushes—weren't inherent to that facility. They were indications of an overloaded (or neglected) system.

And it's already clear that those problems go beyond Clint.

ABC News obtained testimony from a doctor who visited another facility for children in Texas—the Ursula facility—and witnessed "extreme cold temperatures, lights on 24 hours a day, no adequate access to medical care, basic sanitation, water, or adequate food." She said the conditions were so bad that they were "tantamount to intentionally causing the spread of disease."

The children are now being sent from Clint to a facility that is just as bad, according to Clara Long of Human Rights Watch, who was the only member of last week's investigative team who visited it.

Long told Vox that when she was there, the facility in El Paso known as "Border Patrol Station 1" was mostly being used as a transit center where migrants were staying only a few hours before going elsewhere. But she spoke to one family who had been held in a cell there for six days, and who voiced the same concerns that children in the Clint facility did.

The mother of the family, Long said, was so ashamed of not having clean teeth—the El Paso facility, like Clint, wasn't providing enough toothbrushes—that "when she was talking to you she would put her hand up in front of her mouth and wouldn't take it down." The teenage son said he was afraid of the guards because when he'd gotten up to go to the bathroom in the middle of the night, a guard had shoved him back into his cell and slammed the door on him. For two nights, the family had had to sleep on the cold floor without blankets.

The fundamental question: Why is it taking so long to get kids out of custody—and is it happening on purpose?

Most of the children who were at Clint when the team visited last week—about 250 of the 350—were set to be sent to HHS custody by Tuesday.

Questions remain about what is happening to the other 1,750 or so children who were in Border Patrol detention on Thursday if levels have remained static since mid-June, and why the government was able to place only 250 children over five days with the agency that's supposed to take responsibility for all children within 72 hours.

It's not clear where the bureaucratic breakdown really is—and whether it's the result of resource constraints or choices about how resources are used.

The Trump administration definitely has made a choice to keep single adults in detention, even if it could release them. Border Patrol chief Carla Provost has told Congress that "if we lose (the ability to keep and deport) single adults, we lose the border." That does raise questions about whether the overcrowding in adult facilities could be avoided.

But it doesn't address the issue of unaccompanied children, who can't simply be released with a notice to appear in immigration court. While children with parents in the US could theoretically be placed with those parents, the government is supposed to vet potential sponsors to make sure it's not placing children with traffickers—but that's the job of HHS, and the vetting doesn't begin until children are released from Border Patrol custody.

Observers and policymakers agree that HHS simply doesn't have the capacity to take migrant kids in. One Democratic Hill staffer compared it to a "jigsaw puzzle": Not only are there only so many spaces available to place a child, but the facilities available

might not match the child's particular needs. (You can't put an infant in an HHS shelter for teens, for example.) But another Hill staffer told Vox that HHS claims it's never refused a transfer for space reasons, muddying the waters.

Then there's the question of whether CBP is really doing all it can to care for kids in the time they're in CBP's care.

One of the Clint observers told Isaac Chotiner of the New Yorker stories of cruelty from some guards, indicating that they were deliberately punishing children for the sin of coming to the US without papers. But she also said that many guards were sympathetic, and told the observers that children shouldn't be in their custody—implying that they were doing the best they could and simply didn't have the resources to do more. (Advocates also say they've tried to donate supplies to Border Patrol facilities but had their donations rejected; it's not clear if this was a Border Patrol decision, or if there's a legal complication banning outside donations.)

Congress is considering a package right now to give the Trump administration billions more dollars to deal with migrants coming into the US. To Democratic leadership, including the appropriators led by Rep. Lucille Roybal-Allard (D-CA), who drafted the House version of the supplemental package, the solution to poor conditions in custody is to provide more money specifically to improve those conditions. They emphasize that the bulk of the funding will go to HHS to increase capacity for migrant kids and that funding for ICE and CBP will be strictly limited to humanitarian use.

But to some progressives, led in Congress by Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, giving any money to immigration enforcement agencies right now is an endorsement of the current state of affairs.

The not-one-more-dime camp, in part, is taking a bright-line stance against the detention of children. But in part, they're demonstrating a lack of trust in the administration to adhere to any law or condition. And they assume that any money given to ICE for transit of migrant kids will, in some way or another, encourage ICE to detain more families and arrest more immigrants in the United States.

The "smart money" camp, on the other hand, believes firmly that without funds to improve conditions in detention, the conditions will only get worse.

That's especially relevant in the case of kids deemed "unaccompanied," who have to remain in custody until a sponsor is found. The past few days have demonstrated that those children are extremely vulnerable and that much of the American public wants their situation to change. It just may not be clear how.

[From Time, June 20, 2019]

LAWYERS SAY MIGRANT CHILDREN ARE LIVING IN 'TRAUMATIC AND DANGEROUS' CONDITIONS AT BORDER DETENTION SITE

(By Ccedar Attanasio, Garance Burke and Martha Mendoza)

CLINT, TEXAS.—In a tiny Texas town about a half-hour drive from El Paso, a nondescript Border Patrol station operated for six years primarily as a hub for agents on patrol, drawing little scrutiny from immigration attorneys who have been loudly advocating against mass U.S. detention camps that can hold more than 2,000 teens at a time.

And so attorneys visiting the Border Patrol station in Clint, Texas, this week said they were shocked to find more than 250 infants, children and teens inside the complex of windowless buildings, trying to care for each other with what they described as inadequate food, water and sanitation. "This facility wasn't even on our radar before we

came down here," said law professor Warren Binford, a member of the team that has interviewed 60 detainees in Clint.

Binford's group warned that because Customs and Border Protection facilities are overwhelmed with migrants, they feared similar situations could be unfolding elsewhere.

Attorney Toby Gialluca, who visited teens and their babies last week in a McAllen, Texas, Border Patrol station, said everyone she interviewed was very sick with high fevers, coughing, and wearing soiled clothes crusted with mucus and dirt after their long trip north. Fifteen kids at Clint had the flu, another 10 were quarantined. "Everyone is sick. Everyone. They're using their clothes to wipe mucus off the children, wipe vomit off the children. Most of the little children are not fully clothed," she said.

Migrant teens in McAllen told her they were offered frozen ham sandwiches and rotten food, Gialluca said. In both stations, the children told attorneys that guards instructed girls as young as age 8 to care for the babies and toddlers.

Border Patrol stations are designed to hold people for less than three days, but some children held in Clint and McAllen have been in there for weeks. Legally, migrants under 18 should be moved into Office of Refugee Resettlement care within 72 hours.

But federal officials have said they have hit a breaking point, with too many migrant children and nowhere to put them. That's in part because over the last year, migrant children have been staying longer in federal custody than they had historically, meaning there are fewer shelter beds in the separate Office of Refugee and Resettlement program where kids are sent from the Border Patrol stations.

Unlike privately contracted child detention facilities, Border Patrol stations are federal facilities, exempt from state health and safety standards, according to Texas Department of Health and Human Services spokesman John Reynolds. Child abuse and neglect investigators are not allowed to investigate the stations because they not licensed by the state.

In Clint, Binford described that during interviews with children in a conference room at the facility, "little kids are so tired they have been falling asleep on chairs and at the conference table." An 8-year-old taking care of a very small 4-year-old with matted hair could not convince the younger girl to take a shower, Binford said.

The lawyers inspected the Border Patrol facilities as part of a President Bill Clinton-era legal agreement known as the Flores settlement that governs detention conditions for migrant children and families.

Neha Desai, director of Immigration at the National Center for Youth Law, said Friday that the U.S. government, attorneys involved in the Flores settlement and an independent monitor appointed by the judge overseeing the Flores settlement are in conversation about the situation of children held in McAllen and Clint.

The Clint facility opened in 2013 with little fanfare on a country road not far from the town's water tower, a liquor store and the sandwich shop where Border Patrol agents eat lunch and dinner. The advocate lawyers who negotiated access to the complex said Border Patrol officials knew of their impending visit three weeks in advance.

Customs and Border Protection officials had no immediate comment, but have said for months that the agency is at its breaking point for housing migrants, calling the situation in the El Paso area a humanitarian and security crisis.

In an interview earlier this week with The Associated Press, Customs and Border Pro-

tection John Sanders acknowledged that children died after being in the agency's care, and said Border Patrol stations are currently holding 15,000 people—more than three times their maximum capacity of 4,000.

He urged Congress to pass a \$4.6 billion emergency funding package includes nearly \$3 billion to care for unaccompanied migrant children.

A migrant father, speaking on condition of anonymity because of his immigration status, said he did not know where his daughter was until one of the attorneys visiting Clint this week found his phone number written in permanent marker on a bracelet the girl was wearing. "She's suffering very much because she's never been alone. She doesn't know these other children," her father said.

Republican Congressman Will Hurd, whose district includes Clint, said "tragic conditions" playing out on the southern border were pushing government agencies, non-profits and Texas communities to the limit. "This latest development just further demonstrates the immediate need to reform asylum laws and provide supplemental funding to address the humanitarian crisis at our border," he said.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, before I yield to our next speaker, I would remind my colleagues that a vote to defeat the previous question really isn't a vote to bring up the Senate bill. It is a vote to give control of the House floor to the Republicans.

They say they would bring up the Senate bill, but there is absolutely no guarantee that they would. They could bring up a bill to fund a wall, for all we know.

Madam Speaker, we are here to find a way to alleviate the suffering of these children at our border and not to play political games. So I would urge my colleagues to make sure that they vote "yes" on the previous question.

And, by the way, I just say to my colleague from Oklahoma, a lot of us aren't satisfied with the Senate bill the way it has been drafted because there are protections that we want to see in that bill because, quite frankly, speaking for myself, I don't trust this administration.

I don't trust this administration to do the right thing, an administration that separated—knowingly and deliberately separated—children from their parents at the border, an administration that tolerated the conditions that have horrified the entire country.

So I want it clear that the moneys that we are appropriating are going to help children, not to continue this insane inhumane policy that has horrified this Nation.

I won't trust this administration to tell me the correct time, at this particular point. So, no, we are not satisfied. We want more protections in here for the children. We want more transparency. The American people, I think, expect that. We should provide them that information.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), the distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

Yes, indeed, we have a responsibility to act. As Speaker PELOSI has said, we

must do this for the sake of the children, and I thank her for not capitulating to the Senate demands for a blank check.

When I reflect on the number of deaths that we have seen at the border, when I reflect on the horrific conditions in facilities where children are being held in ice-cold cells with no one to care for them but a child stranger—conditions in these facilities are horrific—I ask myself: Is this the America that I came to as a young child? Is this the America that my son swore to protect when he joined the U.S. Air Force? This surely isn't the country that welcomed me as a young child from Guatemala.

But we must work toward that American ideal that we all share. We cannot simply allocate funds to agencies where we have seen numerous children die in their custody.

No blank checks.

No more torturing of babies.

No more separating infants from their mothers.

This legislation brings funds to the children that are urgently needed.

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

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. It brings more transparency to CBP and ICE and HHS, and it contains important provisions to protect children. It ensures that the emergency funding that Congress provides is spent on what it is intended for and not the President's deportation force.

So I look forward to supporting this rule, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in doing so.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my very good friend and distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, well, here we are again, and I talked on this before.

I am from the State of Arizona, so border security is top and center of the discussion in Arizona and it has, quite frankly, been for years.

We have all known there has been a crisis at our border for many, many years, and that is why I am at least hopeful and inspired a little bit that my Democratic colleagues are actually admitting—finally—that there is a crisis at our border. So that is good.

The thing that is bad about this rule today is that I just don't understand. I guess some of my Democratic colleagues are just being stubborn because, on the one hand, you have the Senate that already passed an overwhelmingly bipartisan bill, where Senator SCHUMER voted for it. You have a President who said we are not in favor of this House version of the bill.

So here you have a President who, seemingly, is willing to sign the Senate bill; you have a Senate bill that has vast bipartisan support, even with the

top leadership in the Democrat Party; but, yet, here we are in the House, and I guess Members just want to make sure they have what they want in their bill, even if it is not going to pass and even if the money isn't going to actually get to solving the problem.

And so I ask my Democrat colleagues to put your stubbornness a little bit aside, because if we all have the goal, as has been said on both sides, to help solve this problem, to help with the children who are dying at the border, you know—what was it? Yesterday we saw the picture of the father and the daughter, and then June 14, we had a story in Arizona of a young 7-year-old girl who died, and the Arizona Air National Guard helped find and rescued other members of the party. I think we are united in trying to solve the problem, and I am glad that my Democrats finally say there is a crisis, to have acknowledged it.

But if you really want to help, let's stop this. Okay. Let's stop what you are doing, because I don't think you are going to win. You have the President on one side, the Senate on one side with bipartisan support, including Mr. SCHUMER, and yet we are here today, right before the July Fourth recess, and instead of giving in and saying let's just put up the Senate bill that we know is going to pass, that we know is going to help, you continue to, I guess, try to make a point.

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

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Arizona an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I sincerely hope the Members have made their points, have made their talking points. Now let's get down to the business of doing what we are supposed to do in Congress: Pass a bill, pass the bipartisan Senate bill, but, also, let's work together on actually reforming our immigration laws, the root of the problem that is causing this problem, so we are not back here in 6 months or 1 year doing this again.

□ 1300

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would like to remind the gentlewoman that we are members of the Democratic Party, not the Democrat Party, and I would appreciate it if we were characterized correctly.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL).

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule.

Right now, there are thousands of children detained in temporary facilities, facilities like the ones in Homestead, which is right in the middle of my district. We have no answers. We have no idea of when these kids are going to be released. It is an overcrowded facility, with kids who are sleeping in warehouse areas on bunk beds, of more than 144 kids.

They are living in prison-like conditions. Many have been there for months. These kids should not be detained without their freedom and their rights. What we are asking from the Senate are reasonable requests for the safety and for the well-being of thousands of children.

We have to pass these provisions put forth by the House. We must put in writing that no child can be held and detained in a temporary facility like Homestead for more than 90 days.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, many of the children have families living right here in the United States that they could be reunited with. But those who are running the facilities have no incentive for reuniting them.

The Senate bill does not have a timeline. The Senate bill is inadequate. We must pass the House-amended bill.

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

I know my friends are aware of this, but the Senate bill is actually—well, I certainly would vote for it. I think it would have overwhelming support on our side. The President, in the past, has expressed some concerns, and that is an important thing, but the Senate has really worked through a lot of these differences.

The bill that we would like to see put on this floor and that we know would pass with overwhelming, bipartisan support is a product of compromise, so much compromise that the entire Democratic leadership felt comfortable voting for it.

With all due respect to my friends, their bill is not the product of compromise. It is not going to get very many Republican votes here, if any. I would be surprised, frankly, if it did. It is not going to get accepted by the United States Senate. It absolutely won't be signed by the President of the United States.

We are all concerned about the conditions. We have been expressing that concern for 8 weeks. We never called this a manufactured crisis. We never said that this was made up for political purposes. The administration recognized it 8 weeks ago.

We have tried multiple times to get this House to focus on it. I am very pleased that we finally reached a point that both sides are focusing on it. But we also ought to focus on what is possible to achieve in a limited timeframe.

We know we are running out of money. We know there are real-life consequences to that. They are starting to unfold right now. There are services being cut back. For a lot of these conditions, frankly, we ought to look in the mirror, as Congress, and ask why we didn't get these resources there a long time ago.

Frankly, the House rule that we are discussing on the House bill, that bill

actually reduces resources at the border. It doesn't expand them. It reduces them. It reduces them also for the American military. That is part of it.

The Senate bill, in my view, frankly, is much superior to my friends' product, but it has one virtue above all: All we have to do is put it on the floor and pass it, and it goes to the President of the United States to be signed immediately. Resources begin to move to where they are desperately needed immediately.

That is not true with my friends' bill. All it does is reopen the dialogue with the Senate, where it has very little prospect of passing. Then, frankly, if it did pass—not likely—it would be vetoed.

I am befuddled, Madam Speaker, that they are pursuing a goal that they know will not work, but we have seen this time and time again. It is more important to get a bill across the floor in a partisan fashion than it is to put something on the floor that is bipartisan, that can pass the Senate and come into law.

Now, my friends know we live in an era of divided government, and we have wasted 6 months, in my view, dealing with a lot of things that we knew would never pass. But I respect my friends' right to bring their agenda to the floor.

This is different. This is a national emergency. It has to pass. We have one vehicle where it can be passed and be signed so that help can go immediately. We have my friends' vehicle, which I know they believe in passionately, and I respect that, but it can't pass.

It is pretty simple. Sooner or later, I hope we get to the obvious answer and pass the Senate bill and send it to the President.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I take offense to my colleague from Arizona saying we are not going to win. This is not a game. These are people's lives.

When my colleague says we need to try, we have tried. I am asking them to try harder because we are creating a whole generation of children, Madam Speaker, who will remember what we did. They will remember that we caged them up like animals. We ripped them away from their parents and pumped them with drugs to make them stop crying for their mothers.

No amount of apologizing and no amount of debating in this Chamber will make it better, Madam Speaker. I am asking my colleagues to be more humane, to debate real policy change that will address the crisis at the border, like comprehensive immigration reform.

We must do better for these children. Again, no amount of apologizing, no amount of debating, no amount of politicking will make it better.

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

I will just make the same point I have been making for days on end. We have something that can pass versus something that can't. I don't doubt for a minute that my friends are sincere in their concerns, but I also respect my colleagues on the other side of the rotunda in the United States Senate. I think they are sincere, too.

They have worked through and found a way to get something that got 84 votes. Three-quarters of the Democratic minority in the Senate voted for it. The entire Democratic leadership voted for it. The President has signaled that he will sign it.

We can continue the debates on some of these other things at a later point. My friends might want to come back with another piece of legislation addressing some of their concerns that they think are not appropriately addressed in the Senate bill. But the reality is that is the bill that can pass. The bill that they want to bring to this floor cannot.

We all agree there is a crisis. We all agree we need resources there. I think my friends know, if they would just put the Senate bill on the floor, it could pass, and it would go to the President.

We can continue to have this debate. We can even end it, launch some vehicle over to the Senate, and waste more time. That is all it will be, a waste of time.

I would hope we have all had our say. We all feel strongly about our points, but let's agree on the one thing we know can pass and the President would sign, which would get us resources and relief immediately on the border where we desperately need it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the gentleman from Oklahoma, but I am an optimist.

More importantly, I stand here in the name of Mr. Ramirez and his little, baby girl who were found on the shores of the Rio Grande. The question is: How did they wind up there? They wound up there because of this administration's policies that rejected them as they stood on the Brownsville-Matamoros International Bridge.

There was no reason to say the bridge was closed. They had a legal right to claim asylum, fleeing from the horrible violence of El Salvador. Yet, they could not stand there, and so this is their end.

I am supporting this bill because I believe we should not settle for just anything. This bill particularly provides for the requirements that have additional resources for these children so that they don't die, so that they do have toothpaste, that they are clean, that they are living in clean places. It acknowledges that children cannot be

held like cattle in one place beyond 90 days, that you must find their family members, and, yes, there are family members.

This is a process that has been the law of the land and the international law for decades. It is an asylum that can be sought so the Nation can address it. It takes no one's place. It does nothing to hurt this Nation.

I support the underlying legislation because, in the name of Mr. Ramirez and his child, we must do what is right.

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

I personally thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), for the professional and very patient manner in which she handled the Chair and presided over this body. I wanted to recognize that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO), my very good friend.

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I, too, want to recognize my colleague from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for having the coolest scarf in the House today, the American flag.

Bipartisanship has broken out in the Senate. They passed H.R. 3401, as amended, 84-8.

I am now happy to report to the House that bipartisanship has broken out on the floor of the House of Representatives, for I am announcing that 23 Democrats and 23 Republicans from the Problem Solvers Caucus have just issued the following statement: "Given the humanitarian crisis at the border, the Problem Solvers Caucus is asking for the immediate consideration on the House floor today of H.R. 3401, as amended by the Senate."

We now are certain that H.R. 3401 will pass. I ask us to let the bipartisanship spread to the rest of this House and put an end to this now, once and for all, and get the help to the border that is so badly needed.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 8¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I have the honor and privilege to be born as an American citizen. There are billions of people around the world who don't have that privilege, that honor, and that blessing.

Today, I get to exercise my privilege as a Member of Congress to bring my two grandchildren, ages 1 and 3, to the floor of the House of Representatives. It is a very emotional moment for me because when I see their beautiful brown eyes, I see their grandparents who were born in another country, and I see their great-grandparents born in another country, just like many people on this House floor whose grandparents

and great-grandparents came from Germany, Guatemala, Mexico, or any other place on the planet.

We are fighting to do what is right, to do what is right for the gold standard that the world has seen in the United States of America, a place of hope and a place of future for people who are fleeing persecution for religious reasons or otherwise to be able to come to this country, kiss the ground that they walk on, and start anew.

My beautiful grandkids get to be American citizens because somebody made the journey sometime before them.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I will close by saying this: The United States of America has always been the gold standard, and that is the argument that we are making here today.

This is not a game. We are fighting for the lives of human beings who should have the opportunity to be just like every person on this floor: to be allowed the freedom to be who they choose to be, who God made them to be, by being in the greatest place on the planet. That is why we are fighting today.

□ 1315

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), who is my good friend.

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. We have a crisis on our southern border, and H.R. 3401 with the Senate amendments gets resources to give humanitarian assistance to those seeking asylum.

It also adds judges and judge teams to hear the claims of asylum. Many people have to wait up to 3 years to get their hearing. That is too long. I have twice in the last 2 weeks attempted to offer an amendment to add judge teams. Both times, the Rules Committee has failed to include it.

My amendment this week would have included the amount that was in the Senate bill, but it is now in the bill because we have the Senate bill sitting at the Speaker's desk.

I urge my colleagues to take up the bill with the Senate amendments that include judge teams. That is the only way to solve this real crisis: adjudicate the claims of these people who want asylum, reunite families, and stop people from being held in detention as long.

Mr. GONZALEZ from Texas and I have worked together on this. It is a bipartisan effort. This is a no-brainer. We need to add judges. The Senate bill does that.

Madam Speaker, I hope we can take up the Senate bill and make it happen.

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

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

Madam Speaker, in closing, I urge opposition to this rule. Once again, the majority is making the exact same mistake it made earlier this week. We have a bipartisan bill already approved by the Senate. The House should simply take it up and work its will on that bill.

Frankly, we all know, if that bill were allowed to come to the floor, it would pass overwhelmingly with a majority of each side voting in favor of it. Then it wouldn't have to go back to the Senate. It would go immediately to the President of the United States. He could sign it, and these resources would begin to flow.

Now, again, we have had a robust debate today, and I respect the passions on both sides and every point of view about this. Actually, I see a great deal of common agreement. We agree, which we did not 8 weeks ago, that there is an emergency on the southern border. We agree it is a humanitarian crisis. We agree there need to be resources that go there immediately. We agree that time is short.

We are also all elected officials who are privileged to be in this Chamber, and my experience with my friends on both sides of the aisle is that they are basically pretty practical people. They came here to solve problems. They have different viewpoints, but they are almost always very practical and try to get something done.

We know the Senate bill is not everything that my side would want. We certainly know it is not everything that my friend's side would want. But we know it is bipartisan. We know three-quarters of the Democrats in the other Chamber voted for it. We know it will pass.

With all due respect to my friends, they have clung so tightly to their bill, which I know they believe in. It will pass here, but it won't pass the Senate, and it certainly won't be signed by the President.

Where will we be if we continue down the road that they are laying out in front of us?

I know they are sincerely concerned about children on the border, but we are better off with a bill that passes so we have billions of dollars moving to where they are supposed to go, and a bill, by the way, that the entire Democratic leadership thought was appropriate and good enough.

Let's not sit here and make the perfect the enemy of the good. Let's be practical and deliver to the American people what they want, which is a solution, a solution that both parties will vote for and a solution that the President will sign.

How many times do we go home and hear that from our own constituents: Can't you guys get together and do anything? Can't you work together? Can't you put aside your differences and put the American people first?

It pains me as a House Member to admit it, I suppose, but the United

States Senate did that in this case before we did. We can accept that and move on, and my friends can continue to fight for the things they believe. It is not as if, for these things that are in this bill that the administration won't accept, they can't wrap them up again and put them back in another bill and start the process.

If we do not act, the resources will not get to the border where they are needed, and these conditions that concern us all will continue.

I urge us to step back a little bit, accept that in this case the Senate has a bipartisan solution that will work, and for goodness' sake, just put it on the floor to see what happens.

We know what will happen. My friends will vote for it in overwhelming numbers. My friends on my side of the aisle will vote for it in overwhelming numbers. It will go straight to the President of the United States.

That isn't going to solve the problem, but it is going to ease the problem, and that is going to move us in the right direction and provide our very hard-pressed people—who are working this problem by caring for the migrants, trying to protect our borders, and trying to provide justice—the resources they need to continue to work on this problem while, frankly, we continue to try to arrive at a legislative solution.

Madam Speaker, I want to end with a point I made just a little bit earlier. I thank the Chair for the patient and professional manner in which she has allowed us to conduct this debate. I thank her very much for making sure that when we had an outside disturbance, it was quickly dealt with.

I urge my friends to reconsider and, hopefully, come together around a bill that neither of us thinks is perfect but both of us could probably vote for and the President could sign.

Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for his participation in debate. It is always helpful and always enlightening. He is a good friend and a person I admire a great deal, even when we differ on a particular issue.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I think what is so frustrating to so many of us is that there is controversy around language to guarantee the protection of these children. The reason we think that is important is because this administration has ignored all the warnings.

We have had whistleblowers talk about the abuse at the border and how these children were being mistreated, and they did nothing.

This administration oversaw a policy of literally tearing children away from their parents. As a dad, I can't imagine what that must be like for any of those parents, and yet this administration thought it was fine.

We have a crisis at the border largely as a result of this President's policies.

We need to deal with it, and we need to deal with it now. But we want to make sure we are actually dealing with the crisis and not giving him more money to create other crises.

I appreciate what the gentleman from Oklahoma said about the need for us to continue to work together, and while these negotiations are continuing.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is withdrawn.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 866. An act to provide a lactation room in public buildings.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 528. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide a lactation room in public buildings, and for other purposes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1530

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CÁRDENAS) at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3401, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND SECURITY AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER ACT, 2019

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 466 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 466

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-21. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be