

The Hammonds aren't from my district. They are from Mr. WALDEN's district in Oregon, and I commend him for his work to help make sure this clemency has happened for these people. They are good citizens who are well-known in Oregon. They have relatives and many friends in my northern California district as well.

Their case is a prime example of the previous administration's overbearing regulation and enforcement on the users of public land, while, at the same time, their poor stewardship has caused these dangerous conditions.

It is too bad they will never get the time back that they served. But I am, indeed, glad for President Trump granting clemency to the Hammond family.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 11, 2018, at 9:13 a.m.:

That the Senate agrees to Conference with the House of Representatives H.R. 5515.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 11, 2018, at 11:20 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. Con. Res. 41.
With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 50, UNFUNDED MANDATES INFORMATION AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3281, RECLAMATION TITLE TRANSFER AND NON-FEDERAL INFRASTRUCTURE INCENTIVIZATION ACT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on

Rules, I call up House Resolution 985 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 985

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 50) to provide for additional safeguards with respect to imposing Federal mandates, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3281) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to facilitate the transfer to non-Federal ownership of appropriate reclamation projects or facilities, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any 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 Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Resolution 985, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Rules Committee. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act, and also H.R. 3281, the Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate for each bill, equally divided by the chair and ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and the Natural Resources Committee, respectively. It also provides for a motion to recommit for each bill.

Last night, the Rules Committee had the opportunity to hear from the sponsor of H.R. 3281, Mr. LAMBORN from Colorado, about his bill and its importance for improving the management of water and water-related facilities. We also heard from my friend and a former Rules Committee member, Chairwoman VIRGINIA FOXX, on H.R. 50, which she introduced.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, both of these bills are, at their core, about promoting effective government and enhancing the cooperation and collaboration between the government and non-Federal entities.

The Federal Government has its hands in a lot of things. That is not always a bad thing, but we see far too many instances where Federal involvement does more harm than good. That is why Republicans in this Chamber are committed to reining in the Federal Government where it needs to be reined in, to increasing its efficiency and transparency, and to giving the American people a louder voice in the decisions that impact them.

H.R. 3281, the Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act, empowers water users and seeks to reduce the administrative paperwork and liability Federal taxpayers bear by streamlining the process through which some Bureau of Reclamation projects are transferred to non-Federal entities.

Today, the Bureau of Reclamation is the Nation's largest wholesale water supplier, providing one out of five Western farmers with irrigation water and delivering trillions of gallons to people annually.

Under the current law, the BOR is allowed to transfer day-to-day operational and maintenance responsibilities to project beneficiaries, but the Bureau cannot transfer title or ownership of any of these facilities unless

Congress specifically enacts legislation authorizing such a transfer.

This legislation recognizes that Federal bureaucracy is not doing any favors for water users or for aging infrastructure projects. That is why this bill focuses on empowering local water users and incentivizing non-Federal investment in water infrastructure. This bill helps reduce regulatory paperwork and the Federal backlog on water infrastructure repair, while increasing efficiencies for water users.

Where Congress can streamline Federal operations and increase local control to the benefit of taxpayers and end users, we should act. H.R. 3281 is a step toward accomplishing both of these goals on Bureau of Reclamation projects.

On the next bill, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 50, the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act. As I mentioned earlier, this bill continues the trend of empowering State and local governments and lightening the grip of the Federal Government.

In 1995, Congress acted through the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act to prevent the imposition of burdensome and costly Federal unfunded mandates on State and local governments. That was a worthy goal 23 years ago and remains so today.

As a former appropriator at the State level in the State of Georgia, I understand, many times, what good-intentioned work from up here can do, actually, on impacts to State budgets and local budgets, and this is a worthy goal for us to take up.

It has become clear, however, unfunded mandates are slipping through the cracks or, perhaps more accurately, flooding through gaping holes in the system. In fact, according to an Office of Management and Budget report, unfunded mandates and Federal regulations cost States, cities, and the public between \$44 billion and \$62 billion annually. Even in a town used to throwing around big numbers, that is a big number.

Mr. Speaker, I know the communities in my home of northeast Georgia often struggle to make ends meet. Local governments are rarely flush with cash, and they have to make tough decisions about what priorities receive funding, and in what amounts, in order to best serve their communities. Unfunded mandates, particularly the unexpected ones, can significantly hamper those efforts.

In fact, in recognition of this problem and in pursuit of a solution, those who are most affected by the issue of unfunded mandates—State and local governments—overwhelmingly support this legislation.

The so-called Big 7 organizations representing the State and local governments and officials—the National Governors Association, the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, the United States Conference of Mayors, the Council of

State Governments, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and the International City/County Management Association—sent a letter earlier this year urging enactment of H.R. 50.

The Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act represents the type of action Congress is supposed to take. It identifies a problem, it acknowledges the need for policy updates, and it incorporates stakeholder feedback in order to solve that problem.

The bill provided for by this rule closes loopholes in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and applies the requirements of that law to independent agencies. The bill provides for expanded input from State, local, and Tribal governments, as well as from the private sector, by requiring agencies to consult with the government and with the private sector when they are developing significant regulatory mandates.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of this update to the law cannot be overstated. I believe that the men and women eking out a living or building a business on the ground know what problems exist and how to remedy them better than the people who are currently residing in cubicles in Washington, D.C.

When bureaucrats are writing regulations that impact northeast Georgians, they need to consult with and glean insight from northeast Georgians. They also need to understand that what works for northeast Georgia might not work for southeast Georgia, Alabama, Nevada, Maine, Ohio, or anywhere else besides where they are.

If the Federal Government is going to implement regulations that impact private entities—which they do far too often, with far too little benefit, in my opinion—those entities need to have and deserve a voice in the process.

H.R. 50 helps give the private sector that agency. It also requires rules that aren't preceded by a notice of proposed rulemaking to undergo a UMR analysis if the effects on State, local, and private sectors total \$100 million or more. The bill codifies longstanding regulatory principles regarding cost-benefit analysis and when to regulate, and supports more accurate economic analysis.

Mr. Speaker, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act was designed to promote informed decisionmaking throughout the legislative and regulatory process, in consultation with the entities affected by those processes. Those goals are just as important, if not more important, today as when the UMR was originally signed into law in 1995.

Congress needs to take responsibility to help reduce the burdens regulatory agencies have placed on State and local governments, as well as private entities. Without question, Congress must work to close these loopholes and reduce bureaucracy.

These are the simple concepts, Mr. Speaker: Unnecessary, burdensome

Federal regulations should be identified and reconsidered, and the people and businesses impacted by regulations should have a voice in the regulatory process.

I believe government can operate more efficiently and effectively when we give local stakeholders a voice, when we seek to increase efficiency and remove unwieldy mandates, and when we work to reduce the Federal bureaucracy.

The bill provided for by this rule takes steps in doing just that. I believe that they are steps that we in the House should support to help American communities, citizens, and consumers.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This rule makes in order two bills and four amendments: H.R. 50, Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act of 2017; and H.R. 3281, Reclamation Title Transfer and Non-Federal Infrastructure Incentivization Act.

H.R. 50 amends the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. This is a bill that Congress already voted on in 2015 in nearly a party-line vote in the House before dying in the Senate.

I understand my colleagues think that this is a very important issue. As a former mayor and council member, I know how difficult Federal regulations can be to implement. This legislation, however, does nothing except grind progress to a standstill, blocking improvements to our Nation's health, safety, and environmental protections.

Perhaps that is why this rule also makes in order H.R. 3281, which assaults our Nation's environmental and health standards in a different way. This legislation, which I opposed in the Natural Resources Committee, would authorize a de facto privatization of Federal infrastructure across the Western U.S., all while stiffing our taxpayers.

The bill does not require that taxpayers be compensated for the loss of publicly owned land and mineral interests. Imagine, once again, this Congress is putting the interests of private business ahead of our hardworking taxpayers.

This legislation is a proposal from President Trump's infrastructure plan, which largely seeks to enrich developers and private businesses at the expense of our hardworking taxpayers and the general public as a whole.

I could understand spending time on these bills if we had finished the pressing work before us, but with thousands—and I mean thousands—of children still separated from their parents due to the cruel actions of this administration, is this really what we are spending time on? Where are the moral priorities and family values of this Congress?

I have spoken with the Department of Homeland Security, and I have spoken with the HHS Office of Refugee Resettlement, and there has been one constant answer from both of them: They have absolutely no idea what they are doing, no idea where the parents of these children are, no idea how many children have been put into foster care, no idea when these families will be reunited, and no idea what comes next.

Congress has a responsibility to act, not next week, not next month, not next year, but today. Once we leave for August recess, let me remind you, it will be 39 days before we come back. That means 39 more days that we are going to allow children to be held in detention, in cages, in cold cells, without their parents.

The Trump administration has already missed the first deadline to reunite families. What assurances do we have that they won't miss the second deadline, or the third one, or possibly the fourth one? How many more deadlines does this Congress, this administration, need before we realize that we are complicit—complicit—in separating children from their parents who care about them?

And while we have them in our custody, we are complicit in not properly taking care of them. "Full of dirt and lice," that is how an immigrant mother described her 14-month-old baby son who had been returned to her after 85 days of separation.

We must act because this administration chooses not to. Failure to do so will mean more families are broken forever, more families like Yasmin's.

On May 22, Yasmin and her two teenage daughters entered the United States and were immediately apprehended and then separated. The mother was transferred to the McAllen holding center—also known as the dog pound, as they call it—with a group of other separated mothers.

After 7 days, the mothers were told that they would be deported without their children. Many of the mothers fainted when they heard this news. One mother had a seizure in a cell. After appearing in court, Yasmin was handcuffed, shackled, and given no information on the status of her children. Family values.

After being transferred to another detention center, Yasmin was informed that her daughters had been reunited with their father. But Yasmin still remains in a detention center, where she has gone more than a month separated from her children. She has received absolutely no information about when she will see her children again and must simply wait and pray. Family values.

These people are fleeing for their lives to the promise and safety of the United States, and we aren't even considering their asylum cases.

Let me tell you another story, Mr. Speaker. A woman from El Salvador decided to flee to the U.S. with her two

young boys, ages 4 and 10, after receiving grave threats from MS-13 gang members. Prior to fleeing to the U.S., she had sought protection from Salvadoran authorities through the legal process but had not received any protection.

In March of this year, she presented herself to the border officials, after making a conscious decision not to enter the U.S. at an official port of entry. She had learned that CBP officials are turning away asylum seekers in direct—direct—violation of the United States and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The mother and her two boys were apprehended and taken to a Border Patrol processing station. The mother was sent to an adult detention center in Laredo, and the boys were sent to a shelter for unaccompanied children under the Office of Refugee Resettlement within Health and Human Services.

At one point, the brothers were separated from one another and placed into two separate foster homes, but were eventually reunited and released to family on the East Coast.

Under current law and procedure—something this Congress could change today—the children have absolutely no right to an appointed lawyer. Without their mother to speak on their behalf, the 4-year-old and the 10-year-old boys must make a case for asylum on their own in separate court cases.

□ 1245

This is what we could be doing today: One, fixing the broken laws that have toddlers, toddlers who are barely out of diapers, representing themselves in court and fixing the root causes of these issues with the Central American Family Protection and Reunification Act, legislation I have offered with Ranking Member ENGEL.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule so that we can use our limited time here to act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.J. Res. 31, sponsored by Representatives DEUTCH and MCGOVERN and RASKIN, which would reserve Supreme Court decisions like Citizens United by enshrining in the Constitution of the United States a democracy for all amendments, establishing the right of the American people to enact State and Federal laws that regulate spending in public elections.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) to discuss this proposal.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, and, Mr. Speaker, this proposed constitutional amendment will overturn Citizens United and will put voters back in charge of Washington.

Over 90 percent of American voters want background checks on gun sales; three-quarters want aggressive action on climate change; 85 percent want guaranteed paid sick leave; and 75 percent of the people in our country think we ought to raise the minimum wage.

The problem is these are the priorities of voters instead of the priorities of donors, and right now, in this House, donors call the shots. Ninety-three percent of Americans believe that we don't hear their voices. The cynicism is deep and it is bipartisan.

Only 5 percent of Republicans and 6 percent of Democrats believe that their views are heard by their elected Representatives. Why? The Supreme Court's disastrous Citizens United decision held that unlimited election spending doesn't corrupt our political system.

The Citizens United decision was wrong. To American voters, our Congress and our government institutions look like they are bought and paid for.

In recent elections, just 150 wealthy families and the corporations that they control have flooded our elections with hundreds of millions of dollars. That money buys something. Unlimited money in our elections too often determines who can afford to run and sets the legislative agenda here in Washington.

Here is what needs to be asked: If your family can't answer a politician's phone call when they ask for a donation, if they can't afford billboards and television ad buys, how are their voices being heard?

It doesn't matter whether a wealthy donor supports policies on the left or right. Each side has its billionaires. Let's be clear about that. But none of them should be able to spend unlimited resources in our election.

Unlimited spending doesn't produce more speech. It produces louder speech. It compromises the free speech rights of everyone else in America. It corrupts elections when people are sent to Washington to work on behalf of corporate interests rather than voters' interests. And it leaves our elections vulnerable to attacks from foreign adversaries.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to get big money out of politics; it is time to get secret, dark money out of our elections; and it is time to get foreign money out of our campaigns.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, for the sake of our democracy, it is time to overturn Citizens United and put voters back in charge of Washington.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules, who has been a leader

on this issue of money and politics for years.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues to urge Members to vote “no” on the previous question so we can bring to the floor the Deutch-McGovern-Raskin bill and so we can at long last have a debate on campaign finance.

The fact of the matter is there is too much money in our politics. The fact of the matter is that this money has a corrupting influence on our politics.

Look at the bills that come before this House of Representatives. It is not about empowering people. It is always about a giveaway to a big corporation, changing the rules on who can sit on scientific advisory boards to include corporate cronies.

The tax bill that my Republican friends brought to the House floor that they voted on and that they take such pride in, basically 85 percent of those benefits went to the top 1 percent income earners in this country.

The bottom line is this place is becoming a place where money can buy anything. There is a culture of corruption that exists in this House of Representatives. There is a culture of corruption that exists in this White House, and people are sick of it.

When I talk to audiences back home—they could be liberal audiences or conservative audiences—the two issues that I mention where everybody nods approvingly are when I say that there is too much money in politics, everybody says “yes.” And then when I say that Congress is dysfunctional, they all nod their heads approvingly.

Enough. We need to change this system. People all across the country, an overwhelming majority, want us to change the way we do our politics. They believe that they should have the power, not corporate special interests, not people who are the wealthiest in this country.

Let’s give the people of this country what they want. Let’s have their voices matter more than the special interest groups.

We have tried time and time and time again to bring these issues to the floor, and we are constantly rebuked. Look, we shouldn’t be surprised, because this is now the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America: more amendments routinely get denied in the Rules Committee; more bills have come to the floor under a completely closed process.

We debate bills, again, that benefit the well-off and the well-connected. We ought to debate some bills that help regular people. And having a real debate on campaign finance reform, having a real debate on how we get big money out of our politics is an issue we should be dealing with right now. It is what the American people want.

Let’s do, for once, what the American people want; let’s do what our con-

stituents want; and, Mr. Speaker, let me just finish by saying we can have that debate by voting “no” on the previous question.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that to my colleagues, especially those on the Republican side.

If you vote “no” on the previous question, we can have this debate. We can have a debate about how we get big money out of politics. We can have a debate about how we drain the swamp, how we clean this place up.

You can go around and say you want to drain the swamp. That is just rhetoric, because what you are really doing is you are helping the well-off and the well-connected.

The people who give the most money, they get their legislation to the floor. Regular people routinely get their interests blocked in this Chamber. It is time to clean up this place.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGU) to speak on the continuing horror stories about what has happened at our Nation’s border.

Mr. GALLEGU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of a young mother. Her name is Rosa. Just like my mom, she came to America in search of a better life.

Rosa’s home was in Trujillo, Honduras, where she lived with her aging parents and her son, Juan. Violent gangs controlled the town, and Rosa feared her young son would be targeted like so many others in her neighborhood.

Under these desperate circumstances, Rosa did what any loving mother would do. She took her modest life savings and her son and fled north in search of safety. When they finally made it to the U.S. border near Yuma, Arizona, Rosa and Juan were met by American authorities who asked her an ominous question: Don’t you know we’re separating children from their families here? She told them no, but it was too late. Rosa and Juan are still separated.

Mr. Speaker, the administration is now reuniting a small number of these families due, in part, to Donald Trump’s orders. But let’s be clear. This isn’t happening out of concern for their welfare. As usual, Donald Trump is only doing the right thing because a court is making him do it.

Trump still wants to set up tent camps in our military bases. He still wants to eviscerate legal protections for migrant children, and he still wants to lock up families. Donald Trump’s goal is to present mothers and children fleeing unspeakable violence with an impossible choice: immediate deportation or indefinite detention. That is appalling.

On the other hand, the Members of this body have an easy choice: make excuses for Trump, or take a stand against the state-sponsored mistreatment of children. It is not a tough decision. We know what we need to do.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, as you know, many of us in Congress and the Nation are working hard to reunite children with their parents. Family reunification should be a time of joy, but, sadly, that is not always the case.

One mother waited for 4 months to wrap her arms around her little boy. Another mother waited 3 months. These should be moments of joy, yet, when the children did not recognize their parents, this became a troubling situation.

As a father of four, I know what it is to be loved by your children. As a father of four, I know what that parent-child relationship is like. To have children that fail to recognize you after a number of months because you haven’t seen them, well, that is just not right.

The separation of immigrants from their children is just unconstitutional, un-American, and simply wrong, and I demand that all families be united immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

One final story to remind all of us what is at stake here.

Earlier this year, a Honduran father was separated from his wife and child just days after President Trump’s zero-tolerance policies went into effect. Marco Antonio Munoz crossed the Rio Grande with his wife and 3-year-old son on May 12 near the tiny town of Granjeno, Texas. Soon after Marco and his family were taken into custody, they arrived at a processing station in nearby McAllen and said they wanted to apply for asylum.

Border Patrol agents told the family that they would be separated. That is when Border Patrol officials literally ripped Marco’s child from his arms. At no point did Marco attempt to attack or assault the Border Patrol staff, but due to his anguish, he was placed into a padded isolation cell.

Marco began to pray, pray for his family and pray for their safety. Hours passed, and the next morning, after receiving no information about where his family was or when he would see them next, Marco took his life.

Family values.

This is the law and order President Trump has no respect for either. He is disrespecting the rule of law and violating court orders by detaining children, babies, and he is creating

hysteria among families and confusion among Border Patrol and HHS officials.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule because we can do better than this. We have family values that we must stand for, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this.

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

□ 1300

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

Mr. Speaker, I will close by paraphrasing a comment that the Honorable Chairwoman FOXX made yesterday evening in the Rules Committee.

By the way, I want to bring it back: There is a lot of discussion that we are going to have, but, actually, the rule is about two bills that my friends didn't discuss at all. I hope they vote yes on that, so we can move legislation that has helped move the bureaucracy out of the way, so that things can actually, with common sense, get done. We don't choose to talk about that.

We have a lot of issues. I am in agreement on a lot of things that we need to do. We need to fix our immigration system. But today, let's remind ourselves on the floor what we are doing. It is a rule to deal with two specific bills dealing with regulatory issues.

Ms. FOXX said this yesterday in far more eloquent words than I am offering right now, that those opposed to the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency Act are those who support unbridled regulations.

I do not support unbridled regulations. I think there are some good regulations, and I think there are some regulations that are necessary. Far too often, we see the Federal Government flooding our community with regulations that do little to achieve their intended benefits, yet come with massive bills, and Washington expects the American people to foot the bill.

Maybe my friends across the aisle enjoy that. Maybe my friends across the aisle want that to continue to happen. Maybe my friends across the aisle who want to vote no on this want to continue to see this happen. We don't. We believe that there is a better way.

The bills provided for by this rule recognize the role of the Federal Government, but they take needed steps to magnify the voices of those closest to the issues.

I support this rule, and I support the underlying bills. I encourage all to do so and look at it honestly from the perspective of those who pay our bills, the people who pay the bills for this government, the ones who go to work every day, who pay their taxes, who want their government to do what the government is supposed to do and stay out of the areas where they are not supposed to be.

This is what this is about, Mr. Speaker, plain and simple, bringing it back

to the truth of the rule that we are debating, and that is what I believe is important.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. TORRES is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 985 OFFERED BY
MRS. TORRES

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

SEC. 3. 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 joint resolution (H. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections. The first reading of the joint resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the joint resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 joint resolution, 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 joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 31.

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. Fitz-

gerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida). 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 200, STRENGTHENING
FISHING COMMUNITIES AND IN-
CREASING FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES
MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 965 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 965

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant