

At the very least, we need to know more about what the heck is going on here. I have called for the FTC and the FBI to investigate FaceApp to see if private information of millions of Americans could wind up in the wrong hands and used for very bad purposes. We need more than the assurances; we need the facts. The potential for our facial data and the data from all of our friends and families contained in our photos to fall into the hands of something like Russian intelligence or the Russian military is really troubling. I strongly urge the FTC and the FBI to get to the bottom of FaceApp.

## BORDER SECURITY

Madam President, on one more issue, over the last few months, Americans have seen for themselves the awful conditions that migrant children are enduring at the Southern border. Faultless kids—many traveling alone, many very young—are subject to inhumane conditions, without the proper healthcare, nutrition, hygiene, or space. People have different views on immigration—we know that—but no one should want to see these kids treated so inhumanely. All they are doing is fleeing for a better life.

This weekend, I am leading a visit to the border with a number of my Democratic colleagues to investigate, inspect, and evaluate the latest conditions at these facilities. We hope—desperately hope—that the conditions have improved over the last several weeks. We will certainly report to the American people and to the Senate on what we find.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KAINÉ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## BORDER SECURITY

Mr. KAINÉ. Madam President, I rise today to talk about an experience that I had on Sunday. Sunday was the day, July 14, that President Trump had preannounced that massive deportation and immigration raids were about to begin. It looks like those raids maybe didn't start on Sunday, but the communities of immigrants in Virginia and elsewhere, who have been experiencing tremendous fear, had that fear dramatically accelerated by the announcement.

On Sunday, my wife and I, who live in Richmond, went to a town called Kilmarnock, about an hour and 10 minutes away from us, where my wife's parents are in a nursing home. They are 95 and 93 years old. We went down to spend the day with my in-laws and to take my mother-in-law to church at the local Episcopal church where she has long been a member.

I was struck by the readings. It was a day of fear for many immigrant com-

munities, and the readings that occurred in the Episcopal church, which are readings that are delivered in Catholic and Presbyterian and other churches on a set schedule, struck me as I was thinking about the fear in these communities.

For the Old Testament reading, normally, in most churches around the globe, Catholics and Episcopalians read from Deuteronomy, but for some reason, the pastor of this church—it was his goodbye ceremony, and he was leaving after serving for an interim—had switched the Old Testament reading and instead put in a reading from the Old Testament Book of Amos, Chapter 7, verses 7 through 9.

This is what he showed me: The Lord was standing by a wall that had been built true to plumb, with a plumbline in his hand. And the Lord asked me, "What do you see, Amos?"

"A plumbline," I replied.

Then the Lord said, "Look, I am setting a plumbline among my people Israel; I will spare them no longer."

A plumbline is a device used when you are constructing something. It is just a weight on a string, nonmagnetized, and it will show up and down so that you can build something that is square and that has a solid foundation.

It is a reading about principles and values and what is a solid foundation.

The Gospel reading that we heard in our tiny church in Kilmarnock and around the world was the Good Samaritan story. Jesus is being pestered by a lawyer: What do I do to inherit eternal life?

And Jesus said: You know the answer. Tell me the answer.

And the lawyer does. He is smart.

Love God and love your neighbor as yourself.

Jesus says: Fine. You know the answer. Just live that way.

But the lawyer, either to trap Jesus or because he was confused or he was trying to figure it out, says: But who is my neighbor?

And then Jesus tells the story of a person beaten on the road to Jericho and lying at the side of the road. Some passed by pretending not to notice, though they do notice. Some noticed and sort of half go over to help but don't do anything. But one person, a Samaritan—and in the Bible, Samaritans were despised minorities because they didn't worship like other people did—actually is the one who actually goes and helps.

As everyone knows, in the story he takes care of the person who is beaten. He takes him to an inn and pays the innkeeper and says: I will even pay you more. I will settle up. Make sure that you nurse him back to health.

This Samaritan was the one who was the neighbor. When Jesus then goes back to the lawyer and says: Which was the one who was the neighbor to the person who was beaten, the lawyer was so infected by the prejudice of his day that he can't even say "the Samaritan." Again, Samaritans were despised people, much like refugees or migrants

or migrant kids seem today to be despised people. The lawyer couldn't even make his lips say the word "Samaritan." Who is the neighbor to the person who was beaten? He can't even answer the question—the Samaritan. But he does know the answer, and instead he says: The one who showed him mercy.

Those were the readings that we heard—that the Lord will set a plumbline to try to determine whether the nation—in that instance, Israel—was behaving properly or not, and in terms of what the plumbline is, what is the moral standard. The Lord is encouraging us to be neighbors, and not just to the people like us, not just to the people who are our next-door neighbors but even to people who are down on their luck, beaten, despised, and hurting.

Sunday was also another day. It was Woody Guthrie's birthday. Woody Guthrie was a great American songwriter known for "This Land is Your Land" and so many other songs that are part of who we are as a people.

Woody Guthrie wrote a song in 1948 called "Plane Wreck at Los Gatos," and the song is more commonly known by the name "Deportee." We lived this history before.

In 1948 in California, there was an effort to deport so many people. There are times when we desperately want immigrants here to do the work, and then there are phases where they get deported.

Woody Guthrie was listening to the radio. This is a man born on July 14, the day that the President announced that the deportation raids would start. Woody Guthrie was listening to the radio in January of 1948, and he heard a story about a plane that was taking deportees back to Mexico. The plane crashed in Los Gatos Canyon, near L.A., and the pilot and some others were killed, and 32 deportees were killed.

Woody Guthrie was struck that when the story was told on the radio, they mentioned the names of the pilot and the copilot and the others who were working on the plane, but as for the 32 deportees who were killed, their names weren't mentioned. They were "just deportees."

Here are the lyrics to the Woody Guthrie song written based on an incident in January 1948, but our history repeats itself.

The crops are all in and the peaches are rott'ning,

The oranges piled in their creosote dumps;  
They're flying 'em back to the Mexican border

To pay all their money to wade back again  
Goodbye to my Juan, goodbye, Rosalita,  
Adios mis amigos, Jesus y Maria;  
You won't have your names when you ride  
the big airplane.

All they will call you will be "deportees"  
My father's own father, he waded that river,  
They took all the money he made in his life;  
My brothers and sisters come working the  
fruit trees,  
And they rode the truck till they took down  
and died.

Some of us are illegal, and some are not  
wanted,

Our work contract's out and we have to move on;  
 Six hundred miles to that Mexican border.  
 They chase us like outlaws, like rustlers,  
 like thieves.  
 We died in your hills, we died in your  
 deserts,  
 We died in your valleys and died on your  
 plains.  
 We died 'neath your trees and we died in  
 your bushes,  
 Both sides of the river, we died just the  
 same.  
 The sky plane caught fire over Los Gatos  
 Canyon,  
 A fireball of lightning, and shook all our  
 hills,  
 Who are all these friends, all scattered like  
 dry leaves,  
 The radio says, "They are just deportees."  
 Is this the best way we can grow our big or-  
 chards?  
 Is this the best way we can grow our good  
 fruit?  
 To fall like dry leaves to rot on my topsoil  
 And be called by no name except "deport-  
 ees"?

Along with several other colleagues  
 earlier this week, I filed a bill called the  
 Stop Cruelty to Migrant Children  
 Act. It is a bill that has 40-plus cospon-  
 sors. It would do a number of things. It  
 would set safety, health, and nutrition  
 standards in these facilities whose pic-  
 tures we are seeing—pictures that set  
 an embarrassing example of a nation  
 that should want to set a good exam-  
 ple.

It would set minimum standards for  
 food, nutrition, and healthcare. It  
 would guarantee that children in these  
 facilities would receive three meals a  
 day and that the meals would be of  
 adequate nutritional value. It would  
 end the practice of family separation,  
 unless ordered by a court, so the pre-  
 sumption would be that families could  
 not be separated. It would provide addi-  
 tional resources for lawyers so that  
 people can follow the rule of law and  
 present evidence and present a case for  
 asylum or refugee status, if there is a  
 case to be presented. It would allow the  
 restart of programs like the Family  
 Case Management Program, which was  
 a successful program that enabled peo-  
 ple to be placed in community settings,  
 not cages or jails or institutions, and  
 have management to make sure that  
 they then come to court dates on time.

The bill has a number of provisions  
 that I think are worthy, but the thing  
 that is the most important about the  
 bill to me and why I agreed to cospon-  
 sor it is that I just think it puts our  
 country in a position where we are set-  
 ting the right example, not the wrong  
 example. It puts our country in a posi-  
 tion where if the plumbline of right  
 and wrong is applied to us, we are on  
 the right side of that judgment. It puts  
 us in a position where as we are being  
 directed to be good neighbors—including  
 to people who are hurting, including  
 to people who are suffering—we  
 would be able to look ourselves in the  
 mirror and look the world in the eye  
 and say: The United States believes  
 that we are good neighbors, and we are  
 behaving in a neighborly way toward  
 people.

These issues are of massive impor-  
 tance to the individuals involved.  
 There was a story earlier this week  
 about a border agent inquiring of a  
 young girl: You are going to be sepa-  
 rated. Your parents are going to be sepa-  
 rated, and you have to decide whether  
 you go with your mother or your fa-  
 ther.

Why make a child of tender years  
 make that choice? The young girl's  
 name was Sofia. Many of us know the  
 Virginia author, William Styron, and  
 his book "Sophie's Choice." Sophie is  
 forced to make an existential choice  
 between her children in a concentra-  
 tion camp in Poland during World War  
 II. That is the choice. That is the exis-  
 tential choice in the heart of that  
 novel.

When tiny Sofia is being told: We are  
 separating your mother and father, and  
 you have to choose between them,  
 should a child have to do that? None of  
 us would tolerate that for our own fam-  
 ily members. None of us would tolerate  
 that for a member of our community.  
 So is it fair to do that to a child of ten-  
 der years because she happens to be  
 somebody who has come from Central  
 America?

These issues are of immense impor-  
 tance to those involved, to the Sophies,  
 to the father and daughter who tried to  
 get across a river a few weeks ago and  
 drowned as they were trying to do it.  
 They had come thousands of miles, and  
 they were so close. All they wanted to  
 do was apply for asylum legally: Can  
 you accept my application? We are not  
 trying to sneak across. We want to  
 apply legally and have the laws of your  
 country apply to us if we can justify  
 that we should come. Please do that.

When they reached the border, we are  
 taking so few applications now that  
 they waited and they waited and they  
 waited, and they eventually tried to  
 cross a river and were drowned in the  
 process—that heartbreaking picture of  
 them having come so far and being so  
 close that they could touch the bank.  
 They almost got to touch the bank of  
 this Nation they had dreamed might  
 offer them a better life.

Their case, had they been able to  
 apply, may or may not have been ac-  
 cepted. There is no guarantee they  
 would have met the standards, but all  
 they wanted was the opportunity to  
 apply to enter this greatest Nation on  
 Earth.

So I will just conclude and say I  
 hope, in the days ahead—and I know  
 there are discussions going on between  
 Members of this body and between  
 Members of this body and the White  
 House about what we might do. I just  
 want us to do something we can look in  
 the mirror and be proud of. I want us  
 to do something that we can use as an ex-  
 ample for ourselves and for others. I  
 want the plumbline that separates  
 good and bad behavior and foundations  
 that are morally strong versus those  
 that are shaky and weak to judge us  
 fairly. I want us to be neighborly. I  
 want us to be neighborly in the best

traditions of whom we have always  
 been.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The  
 clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk  
 proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LANKFORD. I ask unanimous  
 consent that the order for the quorum  
 call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without  
 objection, it is so ordered.

#### DEBT CEILING

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, ac-  
 cording to the Treasury, since 1960,  
 Congress has acted 78 times to raise  
 the debt ceiling. Let me run that past  
 you again. Since 1960, we have had 78  
 debt ceiling increases, under Republi-  
 can Presidents, Democratic Presi-  
 dents, Republican Congresses, and  
 Democratic Congresses. There has been  
 a steady increase over and over again  
 with the debt ceiling.

The debt ceiling was originally de-  
 signed to provide a moment of fiscal  
 restraint for Congress, a moment for  
 Congress to look at the debt and deter-  
 mine whether to increase debt again or  
 to determine how to restrain ourselves.

Going back to post-World War II, we  
 had an enormous debt left over after  
 World War II. That was the triggering  
 mechanism for them. Throughout the  
 Korean war, for instance, they didn't  
 raise the debt ceiling. They found ways  
 to find fiscal restraint because they  
 had so much debt.

That doesn't even seem to be the con-  
 versation anymore. Now debt ceiling  
 conversations are about what bill will  
 we get it into to make sure it passes so  
 we can just keep going. That moment  
 of determining how we can deal with  
 fiscal restraint seems to be gone.

Let me state just how severe this has  
 become. Right now, our current debt to  
 GDP—that is, gross national product—  
 our debt compared to our gross na-  
 tional product is at 78 percent. That is  
 an enormous number. That means, if  
 you take all of the American economy,  
 every single person in the entire coun-  
 try, group it all together, what they re-  
 ceive in pay, what they make, and put  
 it all together, it would take 78 percent  
 of every single person in the country to  
 pay off our debt for an entire year.

If we were to maintain that debt-to-  
 GDP ratio at 78 percent, just not get  
 worse than where we are at \$22 trillion  
 right now, we asked the Congressional  
 Budget Office how much we would ei-  
 ther have to raise in taxes or cut in  
 spending each year to not make it  
 worse. The answer that came back  
 from the Congressional Budget Office  
 was \$400 billion, but the hard part  
 about that—not that \$400 billion is not  
 bad enough—we would have to cut or  
 raise in taxes \$400 billion every single  
 year for 30 years in a row. That is not  
 the original \$400 billion but a new \$400  
 billion every year for 30 years in a row  
 just to keep us at a debt-to-GDP ratio  
 of 78 percent.

That is not going to happen. There is  
 not the will in this Congress to reduce