

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5230, THE SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5272, PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DEFERRED ACTION FOR ALIENS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 710 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES 710

Resolved, That during further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5230) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 696:

(a) the amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted;

(b) all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived; and

(c) the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except (1) one additional hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After passage of H.R. 5230, and on the legislative day of August 1, 2014, the House shall consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Section 2 of House Resolution 700 is amended to read as follows: "Sec. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of August 1, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to a measure addressing missile defense of Israel."

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, the ranking member from 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. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. The rule provides for expedited consideration of H.R. 5230 and H.R. 5272.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we are facing an unprecedented crisis on America's southern border. Nearly 60,000 unaccompanied alien children have entered the United States illegally this fiscal year, most of whom have come through the Texas-Mexico border, and today, our country faces a threat to our sovereignty and to our rule of law.

The time to act is now. It would be irresponsible for this body to go home for a month without doing our part to help work and solve this problem. I am glad that Members of the House recognize their duty to finish the job. I believe the House has put specific, concrete proposals to act in the best interest of the United States.

Let's take a look at what this crisis on our border is doing. First, the President's catch-and-release program is a big part of the problem. Under this program, nearly 90 percent of unaccompanied alien children have been placed with their families in the United States, many of whom are here illegally themselves.

Second, there is the President's DACA program. DACA is a major reason for the influx of illegal immigrants to the United States. The Director on U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services recently testified to the Judiciary Committee that 700,000 undocumented immigrants have taken advantage of DACA.

Third, there is the 2008 trafficking law, which has allowed so many to effectively skip out on the judicial process and live in our country illegally. Catch and release under the President's proposal is wrong and bad for our country, and only encourages many, many more to continue the trek here.

□ 1745

Combined, these policies, plus signals from the administration, encouraged more illegal immigration and have led to the border crisis that we face today. To stop this crisis, our border must be secured and the tide of illegal immigration should be stemmed. I believe that this rule provides for legislation to accomplish that goal.

H.R. 5230 would provide \$659 million for border security, the enforcement of existing laws, illegal immigration prevention, and humanitarian assistance. Additionally, \$70 million would be provided for National Guard border efforts. This proposal is paid for, which means that it does not result in any new or additional Federal spending this fiscal year.

However, the House will not simply throw money at the problem. This package also makes specific, concrete

policy changes to address the underlying problems that are fueling this crisis. Specifically, it prevents the administration from spending taxpayer dollars to adjudicate any new applications under DACA or any other similar policy. The package also amends the 2008 trafficking law so that all unaccompanied alien children are treated the same as, under the law today, Mexicans and Canadians, and this is for the purpose of removals.

It also provides additional temporary judges to help guarantee that these children get their day in court within 14 days from their initial screening. It also strengthens laws against criminals and those with serious drug-related convictions and those who have them from applying for asylum. It allows for customs and border protection activities on Federal land. Similarly, it authorizes the deployment of the National Guard to our southern border.

Finally, it prohibits the housing of unauthorized immigrants on military bases if housing them would displace members of the Armed Forces or any Active Duty or it interferes with military activity.

These steps come after a series of conversations with members of the majority. We have an obligation to get this bill done. As a Texan, I have pushed and pushed and pushed for us to make sure that we had a bill that could be supported by our Members. It is Texas and those living on the border that are seeing tremendous conditions that are placing our States and local people at a disadvantage.

Thus, I want to thank the Members for continuing to work together on a bill to get 218 votes. I applaud those who spent the time, including today, dedicating themselves to putting the package together. I thank the staff. And as always, I expect and want this body to support this good piece of legislation.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague for yielding, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You would think after 4 years that the majority would know how to run the House, but this week makes us wonder. All we have accomplished this week is to sue the President and de-regulate pesticides into the environment. And in a real embarrassment, canceling a vote because Tea Party Members refused to support a border bill that was tailor-made for them. Actually, I understand it was in their interest to pass it yesterday.

Now, my colleague, of whom I am inordinately fond, said that the time to act is now. But the time really to act was yesterday when the Senate was in town, because there is no way now what we are doing today could ever become legislation because the Senate would have to pass something, and then it would go to the President who said already he would veto it. So we stay an extra day here to make a point.

Instead of going home to our constituents, we are under siege in a choke hold by some Members of the House. This much is true: it costs the taxpayers \$24 million a week to run the House of Representatives, and I am afraid the American people aren't getting their money's worth.

President Truman, it is worth noting, campaigned for President using a quote "do-nothing Congress," which had passed nearly 1,000 bills. And under Mr. Speaker, this Congress has passed just around 120. Mr. Truman was mad because they had not done a health care bill. Fortunately, we got that done 4 years ago.

But this recalcitrant Congress is why President Obama had to act on his own. Nothing is working here, but he was responsible for keeping the country moving. I think we need to describe for the RECORD and for the public exactly what has been done today.

This morning, the majority adopted a martial law rule until September 5, which is most unusual. Martial law usually lasts 1, 2, maybe 3 days at the outside. But we have 5 weeks, which means the Speaker can call us back at any time. We would hope that he would not do that without telling us what we are going to do. But today, we do not even know what is in this bill. We don't understand this legislation because the 40 pages of it we have not had time to look at. So here we are. We do think it is pretty toxic.

But not only was the bill drafted by Republicans only, in a basement room, there are absolutely no Democrat fingerprints or ideas or amendments or thoughts or suggestions or hopes or anything else in this bill. There have been no hearings, no markups, no amendments, nothing of which we are entitled to as Members of the House and sent here by 750,000 Americans.

This bill, we know, does give \$35 million to reimburse the National Guard for activities related to "border security and the current influx of illegal immigrants." Now it turns out that only Texas has spent any money on that, and one wonders if that piqued Senator CRUZ's interest in this bill and what we are doing over here because it looks like that is where the money will be going.

The bill tragically cuts all funding for the DREAM Act, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. We were told there were something like 700,000 children who were involved in that, who came forward on a promise by this government that they would have an opportunity to go to school and they would not be deported. Now the country has their names, their addresses, and they would be easy to deport because this bill puts an end to the DREAM Act.

I related today in the Rules Committee a story about four undocumented young men in high school in the United States that decided to enter into a contest to build an underwater robot, the trouble that they had simply

getting the equipment to do it and the teachers who helped them do it. And they really felt that they had been out-matched and outgunned when they were going to compete as high school students against engineering students at MIT, a premier engineering school in the United States. What happened, those four young men won. They beat MIT. Now, they were part of the DREAM Act. We hope they will not be deported because, more than anything I can think of, the United States needs that kind of thinkers and innovators in what they had to do.

So the Cato Institute agrees. They wrote on July 29, 3 days ago, that DACA, the DREAM Act, was not a primary cause of the surge, and I insert this report from CATO, entitled, "DACA Did Not Cause the Surge in Unaccompanied Children," into the RECORD. I will also submit some statistical findings from Professor Tim Wong, from the University of California, San Diego, into the RECORD, entitled, "DACA Did Not Cause the Influx of Unaccompanied Minors" into the RECORD.

[From the CATO Institute, July 29, 2014]

DACA DID NOT CAUSE THE SURGE IN UNACCOMPANIED CHILDREN

(By Alex Nowrasteh)

In June, 2012 the Obama Administration announced that it had authored a memo deferring the deportation of unauthorized immigrant childhood arrivals in the United States, a program known as deferred action for childhood arrivals (DACA). The memo directed then Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to practice prosecutorial discretion toward a small number of unauthorized immigrants who fulfilled a specific set of characteristics. In essence, some unauthorized immigrants who had come to the United States as children were able to legally stay and work—at least temporarily.

DID DACA CAUSE THE UAC SURGE?

Some politicians contend that DACA is primarily responsible for the surge in unaccompanied child (UAC) migrants across the border in recent years. A recent House Appropriations Committee one-pager stated that, "The dire situation on our Southern border has been exacerbated by the President's current immigration policies." Proponents of this theory argue that DACA sent a message to Central Americans that if they came as children then the U.S. government would legalize them, thus giving a large incentive for them to come in the first place. Few facts of the unaccompanied children (UAC) surge are consistent with the theory that DACA caused the surge.

First, the surge in UAC began long before the June 15, 2012 announcement of DACA. It is true that DACA had been discussed in late May 2012 but the surge was underway by that time. From October 2011 through March 2012, there was a 93 percent increase in UAC apprehensions over the same period in Fiscal Year 2011. Texas Governor Rick Perry warned President Obama about the rapid increase in UAC at the border in early May 2012—more than a full month before DACA was announced. In early June 2012, Mexico was detaining twice as many Central American children as in 2011. The surge in unaccompanied children (UAC) began before DACA was announced.

Second, the children coming now are not legally able to apply for DACA. A recipient of DACA has to have resided in the United

States continuously from June 15, 2007 to June 15, 2012, a requirement that excludes the unaccompanied children coming now.

Third, if DACA was such an incentive for UAC to come from Central America, why are so few Nicaraguan children coming? They would benefit in the same way as unaccompanied children from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. The lack of Nicaraguans points to other causes of the surge.

The timing, legal exclusion of the UAC from DACA, and lack of Nicaraguans indicate that DACA was not a primary cause of the surge. Of the 404 UAC interviewed by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees since 2011, only 9 mentioned that U.S. laws influenced their decision to come to the United States. Other American laws could have influenced the unaccompanied children to come but DACA is not the main culprit.

DETAILS ON DACA

The DACA beneficiaries, at the time of the memo, would have to fulfill all of these requirements to have their deportations deferred: under the age of 31; arrived to the United States before reaching their 16th birthday; entered the United States without inspection or overstayed a visa prior to June 15, 2012; continuously resided in the United States from June 15, 2007 to the time of the memo; physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012, as well as at the time of requesting deferred action from United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS); been in school at the time of application, or have already graduated or obtained a certificate of completion from high school, or have obtained a general education development (GED) certificate, or are an honorably discharged veteran of the U.S. Coast Guard or the U.S. Armed Forces; not been convicted of a felony, significant misdemeanor, or three or more other misdemeanors, and do not otherwise pose a threat to national security or public safety.

Beneficiaries of DACA were also allowed to apply for employment authorization according to the Code of Federal Regulations. There is a debate amongst legal scholars over whether the administration's grant of deferred action was legal. Those who argue that DACA was illegal contend that the President overstepped his constitutional authority to defer the deportation of some unauthorized immigrants. Those who argue that DACA was legal point to the general power of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to defer enforcement action. They argue that the Supreme Court has ruled that decisions to initiate or terminate enforcement proceedings fall within the authority of the Executive—an enforcement power used since the early 1970s. Here is more of their argument. This disagreement has not been settled.

By the end of September, 2013, 580,000 requests for DACA were accepted by the U.S. government and 514,800, or 89 percent, were approved. Seventy-six percent of the requests came from Mexicans. Twenty-nine percent of the requests were filed from California, 16 percent from Texas, and 6 percent from Illinois.

Read the Full Article: DACA Did Not Cause the Surge in Unaccompanied Children

DACA DID NOT CAUSE THE INFLUX OF UNACCOMPANIED MINORS

Statistical analysis from a political science professor, Tom Wong, from the University of California, San Diego shows that violence is causing the surge of unaccompanied children crossing the border.

Central American countries that are experiencing high levels of violence (Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador) have seen thousands of children flee, other countries with lower

levels of violence (Nicaragua, Belize) are not facing same outflow. This takes into consideration poverty levels as well, given that Nicaragua is the poorest country in the Central American region.

Professor Wong analyzed data from the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the CBP apprehension rate of unaccompanied children and found a direct correlation between the homicide rate in Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala and the entry of UACs.

The United States is not the only country in the region experiencing an increase in protection claims from people from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras.

According to UNHCR, the United Nations Refugee Agency, other countries in the region have experienced a sharp increase in the number of asylum applications filed by Salvadorans, Guatemalans, and Hondurans since 2008. From 2008 to 2013, the number of such applications filed in Mexico, Panama, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Belize increased by 712%.

The initial increase in unaccompanied minor entries occurred well before the implementation of the DACA program in June 2012.

If DACA was the cause for the increase in unaccompanied minors, we would see more entries from countries around the world—instead the children are only coming from three countries: Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala. All of these countries have high rates of violence.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. What is really happening here is the most extreme, anti-immigrant voices in the Republican Party using the crisis as a political cover to repeal a commonsense policy like the DREAM Act, and the Speaker has caved once again to those voices. Representative STEVE KING described the underlying legislation as something that he could have ordered off the menu.

Furthermore, the rules are of course closed, setting the record anew for the most closed rules in any Congress. This bill does stop short of catapulting those children into Mexico and then leaving them to walk to their home countries, but it certainly doesn't do very much since the discussion in the House of Representatives for several years now has been what to do about immigration. It really is a sorry path that we have reached the condition we are in right now, a one-House bill, a Senate that is gone, and a President who won't sign it.

If we learned anything this week, we learned from Speaker BOEHNER's comments on his blog that the President should do more, not less, contrary to the reason why they sued him, and we do hope that the President will do that and bring a more humane solution to this, as almost all religions in the United States have asked us to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just say one of the things I learned this week was that the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOX) presented not only her thoughts and ideas at our conference when we met about how we can make our borders stronger, but she was present the entire time at the Rules Committee, had a chance to

forthrightly participate. We had hours and hours of discussion about not only the legislation and what we were doing, but we actually shared ideas among Members on a bipartisan basis today, and I felt like it was a pretty good exchange.

I am delighted, at this time, to yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOX).

Ms. FOX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, young children are being sent off alone or put in the hands of criminal cartels to cross vast, inhospitable spaces in the hopes of eventually reaching our border. This is a humanitarian crisis. Today we seek to address the plight of these children in a responsible fashion.

There has been much discussion in the House this week about constitutional role. The President has acknowledged his constitutional role in immigration policy. In 2011, speaking to a meeting of La Raza, he said:

I swore an oath to uphold the laws on the books . . . Now, I know some people want me to bypass Congress and change the laws on my own. Believe me, the idea of doing things on my own is very tempting, I promise you, not just on immigration reform. But that's not how our system works. That is not how our democracy functions. That's not how our Constitution is written.

If the President's actions had remained consistent with these words, we would not be facing the crisis we are today. Unfortunately, though, the President did take it upon himself to unilaterally rewrite immigration law, and he did so in a way that aggravated the situation. And he knew the potential consequences. In 2010, the President said:

There are those in the immigrants' rights community who have argued passionately that we should simply provide those who are here illegally with legal status, or at least ignore the law on the books and put an end to deportation until we have better laws . . . but I believe such an indiscriminate approach would be both unwise and unfair. It would suggest to those thinking about coming here illegally that there would be no repercussions for such a decision. And this could lead to a surge in more illegal immigration.

Despite his clear foresight on this issue, the President still unilaterally suspended deportation to select illegal aliens. His predicted surge quickly became a reality. Now young border crossers are setting off on harrowing, costly journeys under the belief that, upon arrival, they will receive a "permiso," permission to stay in our great country.

The motivation for illegally crossing the border is understandable. I join my colleagues who have recognized the uniquely generous and welcoming nature of this great country. As a mother and grandmother, I am moved by the plight of these young children. As a granddaughter of immigrants, I am grateful that this country has welcomed generations of tired and poor and given them the chance to breathe free. And as a lawmaker, I recognize

that the foundation of American generosity and freedom is the rule of law.

Today, through a constitutionally prescribed process, we have the opportunity to pass a bill that will give the President the tools to address this crisis.

Today, we can provide resources to secure the border and ensure that those who have already undertaken this journey can be speedily reunited with their families.

Today, we can send a clear, compassionate message that undertaking this border crossing journey is a mistake.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the underlying legislation so that we can begin to solve this problem.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security and an expert on immigration.

□ 1800

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, some have been asking whether this bill repeals DACA and puts the DREAMers back in deportation, and the answer is yes. Page 1, lines 5 through 17 point out that no funds can be used for a new application.

The DACA applications were a granted deferred action for 2 years. They must make a new application—and there is no guarantee that application will be approved—at the end of 2 years. That is beginning now. So this will require that the DREAMers be removed from deferred action and become subject to deportation.

Further, the bill is meant to treat all children the way we treat Mexican children, but it does more than that. Right now, the Border Patrol is required to determine on a case-by-case basis whether a child has the capacity—whether they are old enough—to independently withdraw an application. That is stricken in this bill.

The law says now that a Mexican child who raises no persecution or trafficking concerns may be permitted to withdraw an application and voluntarily return home if the child is able to make the decision. This bill changes the law to say that a child may be permitted to withdraw an application, but, in the event, the child shall be returned. It doesn't matter whether the child has the ability to make a decision. No matter what, that kid is going home. So that is new.

Current law says that even Mexican children can request to see an immigration judge, but this bill says that is not the case. It makes the CBP person performing the screening the judge, juror, and, in some cases, the executioner.

It is worth pointing out that this is not just about kids from Honduras or Mexico. We will be returning the Thai child sex slave back to her traffickers; the Christian child from Syria who has

found asylum here in the United States, that child immediately returned; the Chinese teen fleeing forced abortion from China, that child immediately returned.

This is an outrageously unconscionable bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ennis, Texas (Mr. BARTON), the dean of the Texas delegation.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS. I hope we will yield back some of that time.

First, I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the leadership you have exhibited, not just in the Rules Committee, but on this issue in general. You have been a longtime advocate of substantive immigration reform in a conservative way. You have been active this week in the Conference and in the Texas delegation as we attempt to move this legislation. And, of course, you have been very active this afternoon in the Rules Committee.

I want to also compliment the leadership of the majority as we have tried to craft a compassionate conservative path forward. I happen to be an advocate of comprehensive immigration reform. I have a draft bill that I have been waiting until the right time to introduce, and, hopefully, get bipartisan support. I am not one of these “just say no” Republicans.

Having said that, we have a crisis on our southern border because of some actions the President has taken in the past and some inactions that he is not taking now. We have got this terrible situation where thousands and thousands of young children—some unaccompanied, by themselves, others with adults—who have been flooding the southern border, allegedly some of them paying thousands of dollars to individuals who are allegedly related to the drug cartels. It is an unsustainable situation, Mr. Speaker. It can't go on.

The bill that is going to be before the body later this evening targets funding to add additional judges to review these children on a case-by-case basis. It reverses current law so that children from noncontiguous countries are treated the same as the children from Canada and Mexico who perhaps attempt to come into the country without proper documentation. I don't think it is an inhumane thing to do, Mr. Speaker. I think it is actually the right thing to do.

The bill before us is going to have funds to reimburse the States that have decided to deploy their National Guardsmen to the border. One of those States is my State of Texas. This bill would target funding to reimburse the State of Texas for the cost of deploying the National Guard. I think that is a good thing.

The bill before us is going to be completely offset, taking money that has already been appropriated but not expended. The offsets are not fake, they are not: in the 10th year we will theo-

retically save some money that would have otherwise been spent. These offsets are for funds that have been appropriated and have been obligated but not used. Some of those funds are in the foreign aid accounts of the countries that are sending us some of their citizens, and I think that is appropriate.

We can have a debate at the appropriate time on a more comprehensive package. That is obviously something that at some point I hope this body addresses. I am going to be an active, positive participant in that, Mr. Speaker.

But for today, to solve the current situation on the border, this is a targeted package. It will be better than current law if it is enacted. It will improve the situation, I think, within the next 2 months. If it were to be enacted in its totality, you would basically not have the problem of the unaccompanied minor children or minors with adults that are flooding our borders. It is a conservative approach. I will tell my friends on the minority side, I happen to be proud of that. I believe that the body is going to pass this. I am going to vote for both bills, the appropriation supplemental and then the DACA bill that Congresswoman BLACKBURN has expressed leadership on and done such a good job on, and of which I am a cosponsor.

I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee for giving me some time. I strongly support the rule, and I will vote for the underlying bills.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), my friend, and a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

“Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free.” Those words appear on the Statue of Liberty that stands tall in New York Harbor.

Today, we are here in this Chamber doing violence to a model that has served this country well. We have a humanitarian crisis in this country: tens of thousands of unaccompanied children have fled violence in Central America and migrated to our southern border.

Our response has not been consistent with the notion that America is a country of individuals from all over the world, and a compassionate one.

Lady Liberty is crying right now because of the callous response of House Republicans. Some of the children who have come here may not have a valid legal basis to remain, but some will. If a child has a credible fear of persecution; if a child was abused, abandoned, or neglected by a parent; if a child was victimized by a highly violent criminal act and suffered emotional or physical damage, under current law they have a valid legal basis to remain. House Re-

publicans are threatening to take that away, inconsistent with our values.

That is why I urge a “no” vote on the rule and on the underlying legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tyler, Texas, Judge Gohmert, a former State district judge, now Member of Congress.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman SESSIONS.

This was a different experience the last few days. I remember the fiscal cliff problem when we were told: Here is your remedy, take it and like it. And they didn't have enough votes so it ended up getting pulled, and people were sent home.

But this time was different. We had people who said: Do you know what? Wait a minute, why don't we stay here and work something out? Kind of a refreshing change.

There were numerous Members last night that sat down in a room and worked for quite some time—for hours actually—and came to a conclusion. We had a verbal agreement, and there was a misunderstanding on one provision. Anyway, there were so many great changes, great compromises, people from different, diverse positions took part.

But let me just say, the importance of getting something done now before we get even one day further into August is this. I have spent many days and many nights on the border. When you look at the pitiful, beautiful little faces of people that have come 1,000 or more miles because there was a shiny object being dangled here in the United States, saying: Come on, you may get amnesty, come on, come on now; and adults paid gang members, paid drug cartels, to bring these people through—some got pulled off into sexual trafficking we are told, many were raped, if they were young women, along the way, some given birth control pills so, gee, if they are raped they are not getting pregnant—and all because the law has been violated in an unconstitutional action by the President, who said: I don't like the law that was passed by the House and by the Senate and then the prior President signed into law, so I am passing a new law through my lips. And it created this allure.

I wish the Senate had stuck around to work with us, as many of us stayed last night to work. We could be so far down the road.

I am greatly encouraged by many of the things that are here, by the great compromises.

I want to thank KEVIN MCCARTHY, STEVE SCALISE, PATRICK MCHENRY, Chairman BOB GOODLATTE, the Judiciary staff, but especially Chairman SESSIONS. Thanks for your accorded assistance today.

We could get to a finished product even with the Senate if it wasn't HARRY REID's way or the highway.

Who suffers? Come some night with me and sit out at the border 1, 2, 3 in

the morning, dodge tarantulas scorpions, rattlesnakes, and you may get to see a beautiful face that has gone through hell instead of being accorded the decency of a better way to immigrate into America.

We can do a better job, and we haven't done our job.

I am going to be a "no" because the provision was not pulled out that gives the Attorney General the power to appoint the 40 judges that are going to deal with the issues on the border. I have been assured we are going to work on that in the future to fix it better. I just can't give a guy in contempt the ability to appoint the 40 judges to deal with this issue. But I am so grateful for the process that we are now starting to use.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, there is one really good idea in this bill, and that is the \$40 million that is going to be used to help repatriate kids with their families. This is what ideally should happen. Children want to be with their parents in their own country. I thank KAY GRANGER for her leadership on this.

Regrettably, the rest of the bill is a mess. Just think about it: \$70 million to the National Guard. Why are we seriously thinking that we have to have combat-ready troops at the border to greet 9- and 10- and 11-year-old kids, who, if they made the journey successfully, are famished, exhausted, and terrified?

□ 1815

Also, \$405 million to the Department of Homeland Security—they have got a big budget, and there is not any evidence that this will make a dime's worth of difference.

What this really does is raise the question: Where did this bill come from? Yesterday, we were all on our way home. Some Members were at the airport. There was no bill yesterday, but then people figured out if the House didn't even act on a bill, we wouldn't be able to blame the do-nothing Senate—but, Mr. Speaker, wait.

The do-nothing Senate passed comprehensive immigration reform on June 27, 2013. The do-nothing Senate passed that bill in a bipartisan manner, 68-32. The get-the-job-done House hasn't even taken that bill up, even though it has been here for over 13 months.

This bill has a House designation on it, but bills usually get considered by committees. We had no committee hearing, no consultation with any Democrats, no consultation with the President—basically, no consultation with other Republican Members of the House.

We should kill this bill. We should put our best folks together, like GRANGER, BARTON, GUTIÉRREZ, and LOFGREN, and do the right thing.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 15 seconds for a clarifi-

cation of his remarks, if he would take me up on that time.

I would like to advise the gentleman that I do not believe it is a correct statement to say combat-ready troops. The National Guard that is in Texas is not all combat ready. If I could get the gentleman to correct that, I yield him 15 seconds.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman. I know we are all proud of our Guard. Our Guard in Vermont lost more lives per capita in Afghanistan and Iraq, and many of our Guard members, as you know, played that role. So I do think of our Guardsmen and -women across the country as prepared to do whatever they are asked to do, including combat.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to let the RECORD note that there is no specification for these men and women of the National Guard to be combat ready. In fact, I do not believe that that would be a true statement.

That is not a part of what we have specified in this plan, nor do I believe that it would be a requirement. So I have asked the gentleman, and he chose to answer the way he did, but I would like to state on the RECORD that there are no requirements, there is no precondition for that. In fact, I do not believe that that is a correct statement.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY), one of our newest Members.

Mr. JOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of the newest Members, and I have to tell you it is amusing to find the paradox on the other side of the aisle that, yesterday, we were being criticized for not considering a bill. Today, we are being criticized for considering a bill.

I sat in my office, just like many others today, and watched the President of the United States attempt to admonish the House for working. I want to make something very clear to the American people tonight. The President's plan for the crisis on the border was rejected not just by this body, but by the Senate.

There is not a majority in the Senate or in the House willing to consider and approve the President's plan for the crisis on the border. That plan is dead on arrival, with a majority in the Senate controlled by his own party and a majority in this House, and so the Senate brought up its bill, and it was rejected.

The Senate, controlled by the President's party, left town. This House, this body, this Congress, this caucus, is working.

I am new to this body, and I find it fascinating that the media and the pundits and the consultants can take a set of facts and suggest that, because we are working together, somehow we are dysfunctional.

That is an absurdity. We are working. What is dysfunctional is the other

side of this Capitol. What is dysfunctional is the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue. This body is working.

We are sitting here complaining on both sides of the aisle—some in my own caucus—about what is not in this bill, but the fact is what is in this bill is the right solution. This is a good bill, and I would say to the folks on my side of the aisle, I know a lot of folks have concerns about this.

For conservatives, this is the bill we have been asking for, for years. This is a responsible, commonsense approach that says if you come here illegally, you will be returned into the responsible and caring hands of your government, and frankly, let's put in the hands of everybody a packet that says how to immigrate here legally.

We are a loving and caring Nation, and we are better for that, but we are also a Nation of laws. This bill says enforce the law. It is accountability. That is all it is.

Where the President has proposed nearly \$4 billion, this body has proposed less than \$700 million, fully offset by cuts to other Federal programs. This is a conservative bill. It pays for itself. It is about enforcement. It is about accountability.

Lastly, I will say this as a new Member of this body. I admit my naivete. I am a Pollyanna. I actually believe this body can work. I believe what is good and right about this body. I believe we can work.

Let me tell you why we ended up here today and we didn't get a bill done yesterday is because we have Rs and Ds next to our names. If we drop the Rs and Ds, we had enough votes last night to pass this bill. We know it on both sides of the aisle.

This is a commonsense bill that addresses the priorities of the American people, and if we were here yesterday not as Republicans and Democrats, but as Members of Congress that know what is right for the future of this country, we could have passed this bill yesterday.

So instead of complaining yesterday that we didn't pass a bill and complaining today that we are here working on a Friday night to pass a bill, we can keep it honest, drop the partisanship, and pass what the American people expect, which is responsibility and accountability and commonsense solutions. That is why we are here tonight.

I think we need to pass this bill. I think every Member of Congress should pass this bill. This is a good bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, the influx of unaccompanied children across the southern border is a serious humanitarian situation that requires immediate action. We desperately need Members of Congress to work together in a bipartisan way to develop an effective and humane course of action to address this problem, and I am disappointed that we are playing politics

with this crisis instead of developing solutions.

The rule we are considering today would allow us to consider two bills. The supplemental appropriations bill is an irresponsible funding measure that fails to address the true needs of this crisis while also making irresponsible cuts of over \$400 million to FEMA's disaster relief fund, impacting the Federal response to disasters.

The other bill needlessly punishes innocent children, known as DREAMers, and would do nothing to address the humanitarian situation caused by violence in Central America. This deportation-only and enforcement-only approach to changing our Nation's immigration law is misguided and will do absolutely nothing to prevent our broken system from spinning further into dysfunction.

In my district, there are businesses, farmers, faith leaders, law enforcement leaders, and families who have been asking Congress for years to find solutions to our broken immigration system.

I helped introduce a comprehensive immigration reform bill, H.R. 15, to help these constituents who deserve a functional immigration system that they can rely on; instead, House Republicans have decided to make today's divisive bill a priority. They want to make sure that absolutely nothing is done to improve overall our immigration system.

After more than a year of refusing to act on comprehensive legislation, this is unacceptable, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, someplace I read in the Bible, "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven"—or it could have read the beloved community or the beloved Nation.

Mr. Speaker, at this moment, at this hour, we have a moral obligation, a mission, and a mandate to do the right thing, the humane thing. Today, hundreds and thousands of our children—innocent little children—need our help. They need our support. They are running away from violence, from rape, from hunger. They are searching for a better life.

The time has arrived, Mr. Speaker. We can wait no longer. We have reached a tipping point, and now, we have a choice, a choice to do what is right, what is just, what is fair. Where are our hearts? Where are our souls? We cannot simply turn our backs on these little children and do nothing.

In the final analysis, we are one people, one family, one House. It doesn't matter whether you are Black, White, Asian American, Native American, or

Latino. There is no such thing as an illegal human being.

History will not be kind to us if we fail to do what is right, what is just. We must pass bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform, and we must pass it now.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, who are these young people across America that these Republicans would deny a dream, whose lives they are so eager to disrupt tonight?

Maria Rocha is one of them. She came here as a 3-year-old. I have rallied with this young, articulate woman in San Antonio for reform on several occasions. The first time Maria even knew she was an immigrant was when she was unable to apply for college financial assistance, so she worked three jobs. And because of the President's DACA executive order, she was able to graduate from UTSA. Now, she is teaching kindergarten.

Another is Sheridan Aguirre. He was brought here as a 1-year-old. He told me:

I was encouraged to go to college, but my legal status made it difficult for me to plan. Two years ago, I graduated as valedictorian of my high school and entered UT, where I have a 3.77 grade point average. Because of the President's executive order, I work, I own a car, I pay my rent, I can travel, I am sustainable, and I can live without fear. I need DACA so that I can go to graduate school and fulfill my career goals. Repealing DACA would be a huge step backwards for our country's history.

Republicans would deny the right to learn, the right to work—and they would deny the dream. They would deny the hope for these young people and thousands of others across this country, who pledge allegiance to America, and have so much to contribute.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. You may call this amnesty. I call it a hope for our country. You can call it conservative. I call it wasteful. It wastes talent that this Nation needs.

We need to reject this mean-spirited legislation that would deny rights to these young people who are already contributing to our country and can give it so much more. We can't afford this wasteful bill. I urge its rejection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would notify the gentlewoman from New York that I have no further speakers, and I have been advised that perhaps she has no further speakers.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, that is true. We have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, in the more than a year since the Senate passed bipartisan im-

migration reform, the House leadership has refused to allow a vote on this essential legislation, even though we know it has the votes to pass.

□ 1830

Indeed, over the last 13 months, the majority has not taken one step—not one—to fix our broken immigration system. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 15, our immigration reform bill, already passed by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the 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 gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," defeat the previous question, and vote "no" on the underlying bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I also appreciate the gentlewoman, her team, and all of our staffs who have worked overtime, including our Appropriations staff and our staff from Energy and Commerce who helped us with this, as well as the Judiciary staff.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I have a fundamental disagreement with the President on the question of the border, and that is why we are here today.

You have heard Republican speakers talking about how we believe that the rule of law is important. We believe that America is a great and awesome country and that we are very compassionate, but we take in millions of people each year through a legal process. America is a land of immigrants, but the rule of law is important also. We have problems with our borders. We have had problems with our borders for years, but in particular, after 9/11, the threats that are against this country have placed enormous pressure not only on our law enforcement but on air, land, sea, rail. We feel that the Federal Government should do a better job of not encouraging people to come to this country, bypassing the laws and laying down enforcement and making it easier for our country to be invaded.

That is what is happening right now.

Some 70,000 people have come to our border, and Republicans are standing up and are talking about this in a proper way. We believe that the people who have come here should be allowed to go back home. We should help them, and we should facilitate that. We believe that the rule of law—the processes that we have got to follow to do that—must be followed.

Yesterday, there was an amendment before the Rules Committee asking for almost \$180 million to help pay for these children who, as the guests of the Democratic Party and the President, will stay in this country. We are going

to have to end up paying about—\$180 million was the request, for 60 days for our local school districts.

There are enormous questions that abound about what will happen, who will pay, how this is supposed to happen when, in fact, America at this time has 25 million people unemployed and underemployed. It is a tremendous deficit that we face. Our social systems and networks are burdened already, and we have many people whom, ourselves, we cannot help—but what do we do? We take on more people.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we listen to the American people and that we listen to what we are trying to do here, and that is to face up to what we were sent here to do, which is to make tough choices and tough decisions. I believe what we are doing is correct. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the resolution and “yes” on the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 710 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

Sec. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R.15) to provide for comprehensive immigration reform and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 15.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the

opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 183, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Perry
Amash	Griffin (AR)	Petri
Amodei	Griffith (VA)	Pittenger
Bachmann	Grimm	Pitts
Bachus	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Hall	Pompeo
Barr	Hanna	Posey
Barton	Harper	Price (GA)
Benishek	Harris	Reed
Bentivolio	Hartzler	Reichert
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Ribble
Black	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Boustany	Holding	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rogers (MI)
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Hurt	Rokita
Bucshon	Issa	Rooney
Burgess	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Capito	Jolly	Rothfus
Carter	Jones	Royce
Cassidy	Jordan	Runyan
Chabot	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Clawson (FL)	King (IA)	Sanford
Coble	King (NY)	Scalise
Coffman	Kingston	Schweikert
Cole	Kinzinger (IL)	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Kline	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Sessions
Conaway	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Cook	Lamborn	Shuster
Cotton	Lance	Simpson
Cramer	Lankford	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Latham	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Daines	Long	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Stewart
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Dent	Lummis	Stockman
DeSantis	Marchant	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Terry
Duffy	Massie	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	McAllister	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Ellmers	McCaul	Tipton
Farenthold	McClintock	Turner
Fincher	McHenry	Upton
Fitzpatrick	McKeon	Valadao
Fleischmann	McKinley	Wagner
Fleming	McMorris	Walberg
Flores	Rodgers	Walden
Forbes	Meadows	Walorski
Fortenberry	Meehan	Weber (TX)
Fox	Messer	Webster (FL)
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Westrup
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Gardner	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Garrett	Mullin	Williams
Gerlach	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Gibson	Neugebauer	Wolf
Gingrey (GA)	Noem	Womack
Gohmert	Nugent	Woodall
Goodlatte	Nunes	Yoder
Gosar	Olson	Yoho
Gowdy	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Granger	Paulsen	Young (IN)
Graves (GA)	Pearce	

NAYS—183

Barber	Carney	Crowley
Barrow (GA)	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Bass	Cartwright	Cummings
Beatty	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Becerra	Castro (TX)	DeFazio
Bera (CA)	Chu	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Cielline	Delaney
Bishop (NY)	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	DeBene
Brady (PA)	Clay	Deutch
Braley (IA)	Cleaver	Dingell
Brown (FL)	Clyburn	Doyle
Brownley (CA)	Cohen	Duckworth
Bustos	Connolly	Edwards
Butterfield	Conyers	Ellison
Capps	Cooper	Engel
Capuano	Costa	Enyart
Cárdenas	Courtney	Eshoo

Esty	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Rangel	Buchanan	Holding	Price (GA)	Kilmer	Miller, George	Schneider
Farr	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Richmond	Bucshon	Hudson	Reed	Kind	Moore	Schrader
Foster	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Roybal-Allard	Burgess	Huelskamp	Reichert	Kirkpatrick	Moran	Schwartz
Fudge	Lynch	Ruppersberger	Byrne	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci	Kuster	Murphy (FL)	Scott (VA)
Gabbard	Maffei	Ryan (OH)	Calvert	Hultgren	Ribble	Langevin	Nadler	Scott, David
Galego	Maffei	Sanchez, Loretta	Capito	Hunter	Rice (SC)	Larsen (WA)	Napolitano	Serrano
Garcia	Maloney, Carolyn	Sarbanes	Carter	Hurt	Rigell	Larson (CT)	Neal	Sewell (AL)
Green, Al	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky	Cassidy	Issa	Roby	Lee (CA)	Negrete McLeod	Shea-Porter
Grijalva	Matheson	Schiff	Chabot	Jenkins	Roe (TN)	Levin	Nolan	Sherman
Gutiérrez	Matsui	Schneider	Clawson (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)	Lewis	O'Rourke	Sinema
Hahn	McCarthy (NY)	Schrader	Coble	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)	Lipinski	Owens	Sires
Hastings (FL)	McCollum	Schwartz	Coffman	Jolly	Rogers (MI)	Loeb sack	Pallone	Slaughter
Heck (WA)	McGovern	Scott (VA)	Cole	Jordan	Rohrabacher	Lofgren	Pascrell	Smith (WA)
Higgins	McIntyre	Scott, David	Collins (GA)	Joyce	Rokita	Lowenthal	Pastor (AZ)	Stockman
Himes	McNerney	Serrano	Collins (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Rooney	Lowey	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Hinojosa	Meeks	Sewell (AL)	Conaway	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Pelosi	Takano
Holt	Meng	Shea-Porter	Cook	King (NY)	Roskam	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Perlmutter	Thompson (CA)
Honda	Michaud	Sherman	Cotton	Kingston	Ross	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Peters (CA)	Thompson (MS)
Horsford	Miller, George	Sinema	Cramer	Kinzinger (IL)	Rothfus	Lynch	Peters (MI)	Tierney
Hoyer	Moore	Sires	Crawford	Kline	Royce	Maffei	Peterson	Titus
Huffman	Moran	Slaughter	Crenshaw	Labrador	Ryunan	Maloney, Carolyn	Pingree (ME)	Tonko
Israel	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)	Culberson	LaMalfa	Ryan (WI)	Pocan	Polis	Tsongas
Jackson Lee	Nadler	Swalwell (CA)	Daines	Lamborn	Salmon	Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Van Hollen
Jeffries	Napolitano	Takano	Davis, Rodney	Lance	Sanford	Massie	Quigley	Vargas
Johnson (GA)	Neal	Thompson (CA)	Denham	Lankford	Scalise	Matheson	Rahall	Veasey
Johnson, E. B.	Negrete McLeod	Thompson (MS)	Dent	Latham	Schweikert	Matsui	Rangel	Vela
Kaptur	Nolan	Tierney	DeSantis	Latta	Scott, Austin	McCarthy (NY)	Richmond	Velázquez
Keating	O'Rourke	Diaz-Balart	Duff	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner	McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Kelly (IL)	Owens	Duncan (SC)	Duffy	Long	Sessions	McGovern	Ruppersberger	Walz
Kildee	Pallone	Duncan (TN)	Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Shimkus	McIntyre	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
Kilmer	Pascrell	Ellmers	Ellmers	Luetkemeyer	Shuster	McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters
Kind	Pastor (AZ)	Farenthold	Farenthold	Lummis	Simpson	Meeks	Sarbanes	Welch
Kirkpatrick	Payne	Fincher	Fincher	Marchant	Smith (MO)	Meng	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
Kuster	Pelosi	Fitzpatrick	Fitzpatrick	Marino	Smith (NE)	Michaud	Schiff	Yarmuth
Langevin	Perlmutter	Vela	Vela	McAllister	Smith (NJ)			
Larsen (WA)	Peters (CA)	Velázquez	Velázquez	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (TX)			
Larson (CT)	Peters (MI)	Visclosky	Visclosky	McCaul	Southerland			
Lee (CA)	Peterson	Walz	Flores	McClintock	Stewart			
Levin	Pingree (ME)	Wasserman	Forbes	McHenry	Stivers			
Lewis	Pocan	Schultz	Fortenberry	McKeon	Stutzman			
Lipinski	Polis	Waters	Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Terry			
Loeb sack	Price (NC)	Welch	Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Thompson (PA)			
Lofgren	Quigley	Wilson (FL)	Gardner	Rodgers	Thornberry			
Lowenthal	Rahall	Yarmuth	Garrett	Meadows	Tiberi			
Lowey			Meehan	Meehan	Tipton			

NOT VOTING—23

Blumenauer	Garamendi	Nunnelee
Camp	Gohmert	Ruiz
Campbell	Grayson	Rush
Cantor	Green, Gene	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Hanabusa T.	
DesJarlais	Kennedy	Schock
Doggett	McDermott	Speier
Fattah	Miller, Gary	Waxman

NOT VOTING—23

Blumenauer	Frankel (FL)	Nunnelee
Camp	Garamendi	Ruiz
Campbell	Grayson	Rush
Cantor	Green, Gene	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Hanabusa T.	
DesJarlais	Kennedy	Schock
Doggett	McDermott	Speier
Fattah	Miller, Gary	Waxman

□ 1858

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. MOORE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GOSAR changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 476, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 191, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 477]

YEAS—218

Aderholt	Barr	Black
Amash	Barton	Blackburn
Amodi	Benishek	Boustany
Bachmann	Bentivolio	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Bilirakis	Bridenstine
Barletta	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (IN)

Barber	Cleaver	Frankel (FL)
Barrow (GA)	Clyburn	Fudge
Bass	Cohen	Gabbard
Beatty	Connolly	Galego
Becerra	Conyers	Garcia
Bera (CA)	Cooper	Gosar
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Green, Al
Bishop (NY)	Courtney	Grijalva
Bonamici	Crowley	Gutiérrez
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Hahn
Braley (IA)	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Danny	Heck (WA)
Broun (GA)	DeFazio	Higgins
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Himes
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Hinojosa
Bustos	DeLauro	Holt
Butterfield	DeBene	Honda
Capps	Deutch	Horsford
Capuano	Dingell	Hoyer
Cárdenas	Doggett	Huffman
Carney	Doyle	Israel
Carson (IN)	Duckworth	Jackson Lee
Cartwright	Edwards	Jeffries
Castor (FL)	Ellison	Johnson (GA)
Castro (TX)	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Chu	Engart	Jones
Ciçilline	Eshoo	Kaptur
Clark (MA)	Esty	Keating
Clarke (NY)	Farr	Kelly (IL)
Clay	Poster	Kildee

NAYS—191

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1907

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 476, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

On rollcall vote 477, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

SECURE THE SOUTHWEST BORDER ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 5230 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 710, the amendments printed in part A of House Report 113-571 are adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5230

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, namely: