

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark a monumental occasion for this Chamber. For the first time in decades, this body will take up major legislation to address the epidemic of gun violence in this country. I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 8, bipartisan legislation to require a background check on every gun sale or transfer.

I know the vast majority of my constituents support this step, including Renae Greg, a woman from Carlsbad, who was simply trying to enjoy a country concert when she was forced to dodge bullets at a Las Vegas shooting.

I know that Lonna Leghart, a constituent from Vista, supports this commonsense legislation. Her sister Kimberly, tragically, lost her life as a result of gun violence in my district.

It is on their behalf and on behalf of all Americans who are impacted by daily gun violence in this country that I will support H.R. 8, and I hope all of my colleagues will stand with us.

There is so much more that we need to do to fully address the epidemic of gun violence, but today it is a huge step for Renae, Lonna, and families across this country.

REVERSE PRESIDENT TRUMP'S EMERGENCY DECLARATION

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the President has set a dangerous precedent by crying wolf in the name of national emergency.

I represent parts of the southern Arizona border. My community knows the border. We know the further away from the border you live, the more fictional the border narrative.

Border crossings are down to one-fifth of what they were in 2000, and apprehensions are at their lowest level in more than four decades. Those are facts.

Instead of protecting our national security, the President's declaration makes America less safe. The President is stealing billions from high-priority military construction projects that ensure our troops have the essential training and resources they need to keep the American people safe.

We will not sit by when the President abuses his power. I am confident that my Republican colleagues will regret supporting this false national emergency when there is a Democrat in the White House.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 25, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAME SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has been served with a subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is not consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

FRANK PALLONE, JR.,
Chairman.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 46, TERMINATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY DE- CLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 144 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 144

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 46) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution 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 Transportation and Infrastructure; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 202 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622) shall not apply during the remainder of the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress to a joint resolution terminating the national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), 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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Com-

mittee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 144, providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 46, relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019.

The rule provides for consideration of the legislation under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Additionally, the rule provides that the provisions of section 202 of the National Emergencies Act shall not apply during the remainder of the 116th Congress to a joint resolution terminating the national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019. This provision was included to avoid privileged legislative action on redundant resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, today we must stand up for democracy; we must stand up for the rule of law; and, most importantly, we must stand up for the United States Constitution, the Constitution that we took an oath to defend when we were sworn into office.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution we swore to defend granted Congress the power of the purse. That means Congress decides how we spend the American people's hard-earned money.

Congress spoke when we passed, and President Trump signed, a spending bill that granted him \$1.4 billion for fencing along the border. Now President Trump is acting like a dictator by ignoring Congress and declaring a national emergency. As a result, billions of taxpayer dollars would be taken from high-priority military construction projects that ensure our troops have the essential training, readiness, and quality of life necessary to keep the American people safe.

Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have visited countries where the rule of law takes a backseat to the whims of their Presidents. Just look at Venezuela, where Nicolas Maduro has removed every single obstacle to his power.

When he objected to the rulings of the judges, he ended their terms early and replaced them with his political allies. When the democratically elected congress didn't agree with him, he created a new congress filled with his supporters.

Last year, he even banned prominent opposition leaders from running into the Presidential election. He has demonized the press and even took CNN en Espanol off the air. Last night, he detained one of America's journalists, Jorge Ramos, of Univision.

Fighting with judges, manipulating elections, attacking the press. Mr. Speaker, does any of this sound familiar?

Now you have a situation where food is so scarce that the average Venezuelan has lost 24 pounds in the last year and more than 3 million have fled the country. The Maduro presidency, now that is a true national emergency for the people of Venezuela.

The collapse of democratic institutions is also happening in Nicaragua and Guatemala. The President of Guatemala and his allies in congress are taking the country down the same path, removing every check on their power. They have expelled the international prosecutors who dared to investigate them.

And just as Guatemala's Government has tried to undermine and delegitimize the police and prosecutors who are investigating, President Trump has called Robert Mueller's investigation a "witch hunt" and denigrated the brave men and women of the FBI.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow this President—or any President, Republican or Democrat—to take us down the same path as Venezuela, Guatemala, and Nicaragua, all to build a wasteful and ineffective wall along our southern border.

These women and children coming from Central America do not represent a national emergency. That is why 58 former national security officials, both Republicans and Democrats, issued a statement saying there is "no factual basis" for the President's emergency.

Our call to duty today is to protect, to defend our Constitution. We will vote, and we will see how many in this body have that same respect for the rule of law.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, I urge our Republican colleagues to join us in this effort. It is not too late for my colleagues across the aisle to tell the President that this is wrong, that the Constitution that we swore an oath to uphold really matters.

We stand here today to stop this power grab of our own democracy. A "yes" vote will affirm our democracy. A "no" vote further erodes the trust in our democracy and, again, expands executive power.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues on which side they stand.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want you to know it flatters both me and the gentlewoman from California that you have made it your habit to be down here during Rules Committee time. It is good to know that you respect what we do upstairs as much as the members of the committee do.

I always enjoy coming down for the Rules Committee debate, because it is the only debate on all of Capitol Hill where the Reading Clerk reads every single word of the bill that we are about to consider. Ordinarily, we waive that, but the rules don't let you waive it. You have to read the rule so folks will understand what is happening today.

I happened to time the Reading Clerk today. I didn't put him up to anything special. He read as he always does. It

took him 1 minute and 6 seconds to read the resolution that is before us.

I heard my friend from California talk about the important constitutional questions that are here before us today. I heard my friend from California equate our President to discredited despots around the globe and how we must stand up to prevent that behavior here in America. I heard my colleagues who took to the floor this morning for 1 minutes be sanctioned by the Chair and advised to cease engaging in arguments of personality and attacks against our President.

One minute and 6 seconds it took to read the resolution before us today, Mr. Speaker, and that is 1 minute and 6 seconds longer than this resolution has been considered in total in every committee throughout this Capitol.

I want to say that again. You heard my colleague talk about how critically important this resolution of disapproval is as it relates to our constitutional powers. You heard it described as a power grab equivalent to those of discredited despots. And we haven't talked about it at all in this Chamber. In committees, not one witness has testified.

One minute and 6 seconds is how much we have invested in these nationally important matters.

I listened, Mr. Speaker, as you cautioned Member after Member to cease engaging in personal attacks on the President during their 1 minutes this morning. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that that is exactly what we are doing here today.

If you want to have a debate about Article I and Article II powers and how we ought to retrieve the power that has slid down Pennsylvania Avenue through administration after administration after administration, I am not just your willing partner, I am your enthusiastic partner and passionate advocate. But that is not the bill we have before us today. It is not the debate we are going to have today.

This is another in a long string of measures that have been brought to the floor of this House that could have been brought in a bipartisan way. I don't mean one Republican; I don't mean two Republicans; I mean the majority of Democrats and the majority of Republicans standing together to speak with one voice on behalf of the American people. But time and time again, we are missing that opportunity.

This isn't a constitutional issue today, Mr. Speaker, though you would not know that, because we have not had any witnesses testify. This is a legislative issue before us today.

There is, in fact, a National Emergencies Act that allows the President to do extraordinary things if he or she decides there is a national emergency. That is not unconstitutional. Congress passed the National Emergencies Act; the President signed the National Emergencies Act. Perhaps the Supreme Court one day will decide that was an

unconstitutional delegation of power by the Congress, but the Congress delegated that power in the National Emergencies Act.

The way we talk about this issue, Mr. Speaker, you would think this is the first time you and I have seen this in the few years we have been in Congress. Of course, you and I know that is nonsense.

There are 31 other national emergency declarations in effect today—31 other national emergency declarations. National emergency declarations from the Obama administration are still active today.

If we are so concerned about Article I and Article II power grabs, perhaps these emergency declarations that have been on the books since the last administration, Congress should deal with those affirmatively here on the floor.

There are national emergency declarations still in effect from the Bush administration. There are national emergencies still in effect from the Clinton administration. Mr. Speaker, there are national emergencies still in effect from the Carter administration. This House has made not a single effort to draw back that power from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Those are legitimate questions. Those are important questions. Those are things that bring us together as the people's representatives in this House, not bills designed just to poke a stick at a President who has real passion and real conviction about issues of real importance.

Do you know what is in this resolution today, Mr. Speaker, what is in this disapproval resolution today, that will make a difference on the border in terms of ending human trafficking? Not one thing.

Do you know what is in this resolution today that, if we come together to pass, will make a difference in terms of drug trafficking on the border? Not one thing.

What about if we come together to pass this resolution today for the very serious issue of weapons trafficking across our border? Do you know what we will do today to fix that? Not one thing.

Victims of sexual assault as they are being trafficked into this country, do you know what we are going to do to fix that today? Not one thing.

Do you know how many Dreamers are going to have their hopes realized today with a pathway to permanency here in the United States of America? Not one.

Man, we are good at bringing issues that are designed to poke each other in the eye. We are so good at bringing issues designed to try to embarrass one and boost another. But I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, we are not so great with actually solving real problems.

For the first time in my congressional career just last Congress, Mr. Speaker, we brought a bill to the floor that would have provided permanency

for our Dreamers and that would have provided solutions on our border for human trafficking, for weapons trafficking, and for drug trafficking. You know how many Democratic votes we got on that bill, Mr. Speaker? Not one.

Now, to be fair, it wasn't one bill; it was two bills. Folks said, hey, if this one is not the right one, let's bring another one. Maybe this is going to bring people together.

Do you know how many votes we got on the second bill, Mr. Speaker, from the other side of the aisle? Not one. The only bills that have come to the floor to provide a pathway for Dreamers in my 8 years in Congress, and we got not one vote from the other side of the aisle.

Is that because the other side of the aisle doesn't believe in those solutions? No, that is not why. It is because the other side of the aisle, in its wisdom, deemed that to be a resolution not designed to support the Dreamers, but designed to divide. I disagree with that conclusion, but that is the conclusion that was made. Thus, the only opportunity in a decade we have had to support Dreamers, not one Democrat stood up and said yes.

I call that a failed opportunity, and I am not interested in figuring out who is to blame for that failed opportunity.

This is a failed opportunity today, too, Mr. Speaker. Sadly, it is another in a series of failed opportunities here in 2019.

I believe my colleagues are going to see through the divisiveness of this resolution, through the charade of constitutionalism right down to the very core of partisanism that underlies this resolution.

But just remember, 1 minute and 6 seconds, Mr. Speaker. Before I took to the microphone today, 1 minute and 6 seconds from the Reading Clerk is all the time this new Congress has dedicated to an issue that you are going to hear from my colleagues again and again is one of critical national importance, international importance, constitutional importance. How can those things be true?

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of many other things that we could be talking about that truly, truly, truly call out and scream out for a national emergency.

Homelessness in our communities: Thousands of people in our communities sleep on a street, under a bridge, children sleeping in vehicles every single night.

I think about the opioid epidemic, and how many of our families are simply immune to the issues around drug abuse and how addiction overcomes them?

I think about last year around Christmastime when 800,000 of our Federal workers were going without a pay-

check and went without a paycheck for 35 days. Yet my colleagues on the other side of the aisle could not find 1 minute and 6 seconds to give them a paycheck, to open up the Federal Government, to do their duty.

Instead, in the Rules Committee, we took up an emergency order on labeling of cheese curds. They found that to be more important than the lives and the families of 800,000 Federal workers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from California for her astuteness, and, certainly, the manager of this legislation, and our friends on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to try to craft the importance of H.J. Res. 46 that we will ultimately be debating today. As an original cosponsor, I was quick to try to bring order and to recognize the importance of the Constitution.

Clearly, the statute might be interpreted to be used in a reckless manner. But it is precise in that it deals with the necessity of building military construction and other matters in the course of war that are an emergency.

It might even cover rising gun violence, the fact that we have more guns in the United States than we have citizens.

It might be that if there was a pending war on the southern border, one might determine that that is the case.

It might be that, in 2001, the first sense of terrorism came when an individual crossed the northern border to attack the United States. If that had continued with throngs of terrorists coming across the northern border, the President then might have declared a national emergency.

But we do not have that, Mr. Speaker. What we have is a person's desire.

We understand that the apprehensions at the southern border have actually gone down. The combined 521,000 apprehensions for border and Customs agents for fiscal year 2018 was 32,288 apprehensions fewer.

Those who are coming across the border in the last 6 to 8 months are coming across as mothers and children fleeing the catastrophe of bloodshed in Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. These are people desperate for help. They are coming through legal ports of entry.

How do I know that? I have stood and watched them come. I have spoken to a mother whose baby was 45 days old. She had birthed on her road here, not because she just wanted a vacation, but because they had committed to decapitating her if she did not leave town immediately, meaning leave one of the countries. It was my plea that got her to be able to go to a hospital. I held little Roger in my hands, who is 9 months old. He had been separated at the border from his family.

These are the issues that are being addressed at the border. There is no catastrophe.

Let me be very clear, as my friends always cite illegal immigration, I want to make sure that any criminal, no matter who they are, who does any injury to anyone in the United States, count me as standing on the side of bringing that person to justice. But that is not what is happening at the border.

□ 1245

Therefore, I would ask the administration to attend themselves to the Constitution, to recognize the difficulty or the wrongness of distorting the purposes of the United States Congress, the House, that has the purse strings by calling it a national emergency. My God, if we were to have one, would this Nation even understand how to implement it because they are hearing it being declared in a very foolish way?

I conclude by simply saying that 58 people in national security, Mr. Speaker—58 of them—have indicated this is wrongheaded and jeopardizes our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote for the resolution that I have cosponsored, H.J. Res. 46.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in fiscal year 2018, more than 2,000 illegal aliens were apprehended by Federal agents for homicides committed on American soil. Worse yet, roughly 31,000 Americans die each year from heroin and cocaine overdoses, 90 percent of which floods across America's porous southern border. Hence, we can expect at least 33,000 dead Americans each year until America secures our porous southern border.

For perspective, the 9/11 terrorist attacks killed roughly 3,000 people. In response, America invaded Iraq and Afghanistan at a cost of trillions of dollars and, roughly, 7,000 lost military personnel lives.

Saving Americans should be a bipartisan issue, yet here we are. Republicans seek to prevent another 33,000 dead Americans this year, while partisan Democrats seek to embarrass and stop President Trump from securing America's porous southern border and saving American lives.

For emphasis, no national emergency in history has been prompted by more dead Americans than President Trump's national emergency declaration. As such, I support President Trump's national emergency declaration and will vote accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, how many dead Americans does it take for open border advocates to support border security? How much American blood must be on guilty hands before Congress recognizes the national emergency we face at America's southern border? America's military protects the borders of, and lives in, South Korea, Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan, many other countries, and Europe.

I thank President Trump, as Commander in Chief, for understanding that America, and Americans, deserve no less protection.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by noting that dead Americans, Americans killed by illegal aliens as a consequence of porous borders, had dreams, too. We, as a Congress, should remember and honor those dreams and act accordingly and protect this national emergency to protect American lives by securing our porous southern border.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we can talk about the scary people from our southern border. I am not that scary looking, am I? I think not. The fact is that the number one trading partner for California and Texas is Mexico, a friendly country. For Central America, we are standing up for our responsibility to uphold democracy in the Northern Triangle, to address the root cause of migration. That is where our focus should be.

Do we need an immigration reform package that brings 11 million people out of the shadows? Absolutely. These are the 11 million people who our agricultural partners depend on to deliver fresh food to our table. But we are not doing that here. What we are doing here, what the President has chosen to do, is political theater, political theater for 2020.

In essence, a vote against this resolution means a vote against the families of the military people who are depending on us to provide infrastructure, schools for their children to learn, and quality housing.

Do Democrats think and believe that fortifying our borders is important? Absolutely. We have committed billions of dollars to ensure that we stop the narcotrafficking that happens at our ports of entry. That is where it is happening.

We need to work together on these issues, not relinquish our responsibilities, our legislative responsibility, and the power of the purse that we hold.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of the Rules Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor to urge Members to vote against this ill-advised resolution to disallow the President's declaration for emergency funding on the border.

In 2006, I was in Congress, and Congress voted for the Secure Fence Act. With the Secure Fence Act, under President Bush, 400 miles of border fence was built. Under President Obama, an additional little over 100 miles was built. Now President Trump has asked for a little over 200 miles to be built to provide security for America.

Now, is it a national emergency? I will tell you, I had as my guest to the State of the Union someone who is referred to as an angel dad. This is an individual who went and put on the uniform and fought for his country in Iraq. While he was there, unfortunately, his wife got ill and died, and he came home. Now he is a single dad, and he is taking care of his only child, a daughter. That daughter, unfortunately, was hit by a car on the street that was driven by someone who did not have legal status to be in this country.

Several months later, Chris came to me and said: Congressman, I did my job. I put on the uniform. I went and defended my country. Mr. Congressman, I did my job, and if you had been doing yours, my daughter would be here today.

President Trump has taken that mantle very seriously. It is his goal, it is his requirement, to defend our country at the southern border, and the President will do just that.

If you read the history of emergency declarations in the past, you will find a number of them. Some, perhaps, you might agree with; some, perhaps, you might disagree with. But since the founding of our country, it has been recognized that it has been the purview under Article II powers for the President of the United States to be able to exercise that emergency declaration. It was codified in the 1970s in a law that is now the one that brings this forward today, that brings forward this resolution of disapproval.

If you don't like the law that allows the President to declare an emergency, change the law. You are the majority. You control the Rules Committee. Change the law.

What is interesting about this is, last night, in the Rules Committee, when we considered Mr. CASTRO's resolution, we didn't consider it. We didn't have a single witness. Mr. CASTRO, I felt like sending Capitol Police out to find him. There was no one there to testify in favor of his resolution. The Rules Committee seemed perfectly agreeable to accepting this without any debate whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote against this ill-advised motion to disallow the President's declaration of an emergency. Allow the President to do the job he was elected to do and secure the southern border.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, political theater, political posturing for 2020, that is what we are hearing.

This is the law. This is the Rules Committee moving forward a piece of legislation that will prevent the President from calling a bogus national emergency, from stealing money from our troops, from taking from those who don't have and those who are giving everything that they have to protect our Nation. Political posturing for 2020.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the text of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, if we pass the resolution, as my friends on the other side of the aisle have presented it, we will save not one single life. If we defeat the previous question and move on to H.R. 962, we will, in fact, save lives.

Mr. Speaker, to speak to that issue, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), my friend and a great leader in our conference.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, if we, indeed, defeat the previous question, we will allow consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

I introduced this legislation because the Constitution clearly states that all persons born in this country are entitled to life, liberty, and equal protection under the law. The Constitution does not put age limits on those who are entitled to life.

I am horrified, Mr. Speaker, that many in the United States Senate, many Democrats, flagrantly violated the United States Constitution last night and voted down the Born-Alive Act, embracing, in fact, infanticide.

Pro-abortion politicians used to say life begins at birth. Now it is more unclear than ever when they believe that life actually begins or whether they even believe that living and breathing human beings should be protected under the law.

I would like to commend three Democrats, in fact—Senators BOB CASEY, JOE MANCHIN, and DOUG JONES—who defended the basic rights of newborn children and voted for my legislation last evening in the United States Senate.

I introduced this legislation because it is just common sense. I am shocked that there are prominent American legislators who believe in denying babies lifesaving medical care when they are born.

As a mother, a grandmother, a legislator, and an advocate who came to Congress to serve as a voice for the voiceless, I believe that life begins at conception and that it is wrong to kill a child no matter how many weeks old he or she may be. But I am grieved to find that I now must defend something that I never thought we would have to fight for: lifesaving care for babies born alive.

In response to radical legislators who are promoting not just late-term abortions but infanticide, it is essential that we come together to protect children.

□ 1300

So today, I am here to ask—no, Mr. Speaker, I am here to implore—my colleagues to right the wrong that the Senate has committed and defeat the previous question, and at least allow the debate to support H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Act here in the people's House.

Mr. Speaker, this should not be a partisan issue. Congress must never stop fighting to ensure that every single newborn baby in the United States of America receives lifesaving care, no matter their sex or their race or ethnicity or whether or not they are wanted and cuddled and wrapped into that first warm hug that they deserve.

The Born-Alive Act is the simplest vote any of us can take: Do you support babies receiving lifesaving care after they are born, or would you deny these innocent children that care and allow them to be left to die and be discarded?

This is bipartisan legislation, Mr. Speaker. Last year, six of my Democratic colleagues joined me in voting for the Born-Alive Act.

I hope that we will bring this bill to the floor for debate so that many more of my colleagues can go on the record and vote to stand with America's mothers and children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman for yielding and, also, for her tremendous leadership on the House Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and Congressman CASTRO's resolution to stop President Trump's fake, so-called national emergency at the border.

Let me be clear: This emergency declaration is a blatant attempt to subvert the Constitution and get around Congress' sole power of the purse. Let me remind you also, that this is a democracy, not a dictatorship. We have three branches of government, not one, and Congress has the power of the purse strings.

Also, let's make one thing clear: There is no emergency at the border. The only crisis at the border is the humanitarian crisis that the President created himself through his hateful family separation policies.

And instead of protecting our national security, this President is doing just the opposite: He is stealing money from military construction projects to try to build an unauthorized wall.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I can tell you that we will not allow this President to circumvent

our authority at any cost. I am proud to cosponsor this resolution to put a strong check on this President and terminate his ability to declare this fake national emergency.

I call on my Republican colleagues and the Senate to vote "yes" on this rule and "yes" on this resolution. It is past time to stand up for the Constitution and to stand up for our immigrant communities and to stand up for our three branches of government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to refrain from wearing communicative badges while under recognition.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), an appropriator and ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good friend, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. If we defeat the previous question, we will bring up the text of this important piece of legislation to defend life.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am mystified as to why the majority is loath to actually make this vote. Indeed, they have been doing backflips to avoid allowing the House to actually go on record on this important issue.

This bill is a commonsense approach to protecting our Nation's most vulnerable. It amends the Federal Criminal Code simply to require that any doctor present when a child is born alive following an abortion or attempted abortion must provide the child with the same degree of care as he or she would provide any other child. The bill also requires that any such child is immediately admitted to a hospital.

Mr. Speaker, as we have seen in recent weeks, many people in elected positions do not appear to appreciate the need to provide for protections for our most vulnerable Americans newly born, but it is clear that current law fails to provide adequate protections for newborns who survive an abortion attempt. This bill draws a sorely needed bright line of protection around abortion survivors and requires that they be given the same level of care as any other premature infant.

As stewards of the law of this country, Mr. Speaker, protecting the most vulnerable, including the unborn, should be one of Congress' basic responsibilities.

Since entering Congress, I have made the protection of life one of my highest priorities. I believe that all Members should have that same priority. Today, we can take a step toward making this a reality by defeating the previous question and bringing up the Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the previous question.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I rise in strong support of the rule and resolution to rescind the President's unnecessary and unconstitutional national emergency declaration.

Mr. Speaker, having visited the southern border multiple times in the past year, including just last month when I met with Customs and Border Patrol officials, I can say without any question that there is no emergency at the border.

We as a nation face serious challenges in reforming our immigration system and stemming the flow of illegal drugs into our country. However, a border wall will do nothing to address these challenges.

Research consistently shows that the vast majority of illegal drugs coming to this country through the border are smuggled through legal ports of entry, and most illegal immigration is as a result of people overstaying their visas.

All this declaration will do is divert \$6.7 billion away from critical military construction projects and drug interdiction operations, hampering our Nation's military readiness and making it more difficult to address real challenges. These are funds that would be better used on projects to improve and build new military family housing or make improvements to National Guard and Reserve facilities throughout our country.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be spending a single day wasting time on this ridiculous, misguided executive order from the President. There is no emergency at the border. Illegal border crossings are at a 40-year low. The President's own intelligence community, when they did their worldwide threat assessment, testified and didn't mention the southern border—and certainly did not identify it as an emergency.

Instead of wasting time on this, we should be getting back to the work of driving down prescription drug prices, focusing on rebuilding the infrastructure of our country, and passing H.R. 1 to get government working again for the people of this country and not the special interests.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to approve the rule, vote for the resolution, and end the President's unconstitutional, excessive use of power attempting to circumvent the will of the American people.

The American people decide through their elected Members of Congress how their tax money will be spent. The President is attempting to throw the Constitution away, circumventing that process, and we cannot permit that to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), a member of the class of 2010.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for yielding.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in support of the underlying rule, but also in opposition to the action that is being proposed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

But I will join them in one sentiment: I do believe there is an emergency crisis at the border. I do believe that the President, given the years and decades of delegation of authority from Congress to the President's Office, has the authority to take the action that he is taking in regards to this proposed issue at the border.

But where I agree with my colleagues on the other side is that the Presidential authority is something that we need to take into consideration and reform going forward.

It should not be because it is President Trump; it should not be because it was President Obama; but each and every time the executive branch uses its authority and reaches into areas that go beyond the constitutional limits of that office, we should stand together as Members of Congress to assert our authority.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, there is a bipartisan group of us working over the last few weeks, and we intend to drop a resolution sometime soon, that will amend the National Emergencies Act to make it clear that, when there is a national emergency declared in this country, that we speak as one nation, one body here in Congress with the President.

We have to affirmatively take a vote here in Congress, go on record, and not hide any longer as Members of Congress. We should be held accountable by putting our voting cards in that box to stand before the American people.

When a national emergency is declared by the President, we have to vote whether or not, guaranteed vote, to see if that is something we agree with the President on. That is a fundamental reform that will reestablish Article I of the Constitution.

And to my colleagues who are up today: Where were you when President Obama overreached in his executive office?

So I ask you to remember those days and stand with us who are looking to take on the root cause of this problem and reestablish the congressional authority that rightfully is contained under the Constitution.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying resolution.

We should be absolutely clear: There is no crisis at our border. In fact, apprehensions of illegal border crossings are at a 40-year low. This is a fake emergency being used as a pretext for Donald Trump to build a monument to hate on our southern border.

But this is more than that. This administration's actions would do violence to our Constitution, undermine our separation of powers, and set a terrible precedent for the future. Every single Member of Congress, regardless of party, needs to stand up and make their voice heard.

To all my Republican colleagues who so frequently extolled the Constitution's virtues, I say to you: Make your voice heard today. Now is the chance to show your true colors, to defend Article I, and to stand up for Congress' constitutionally vested powers of the purse.

Vote "yes" on the rule; vote "yes" on the resolution; stand up for the Constitution; and reject this illegal power grab by this President.

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

Mr. Speaker, you just heard an impassioned plea from my friends on the other side of the aisle about the important constitutional questions that are before us today, about how the President's emergency declaration violated those sacred constitutional principles.

Candidly, I don't know if my colleagues are right or not because we have not had one legal expert come to talk about the National Emergencies Act. Most of us were not in Congress when it passed several decades ago, but it is a delegation of authority from Congress to the executive.

□ 1315

You just heard my friend from New York come to the well and say, listen, we have been working in a bipartisan way to offer a bill to rein in those authorities. I think that is important work. I think that is work that we ought to all be able to agree on. We should be doing that work first.

I told you earlier, Mr. Speaker, the sum total of all of the time this institution has spent working on these important constitutional questions is the 1 minute and 6 seconds our Reading Clerk Josef spent reading us the resolution today.

We will vote on this rule today. We will vote on the underlying disapproval today, having never had the committees of jurisdiction hold even a single hearing.

Now, lest you think there is just no time in the calendar, this resolution is referred to the Transportation Committee on which I sit. In fact, I had to leave a Transportation Committee hearing in order to come up here to do the rule today.

We are working on the Green New Deal in the Transportation Committee today. We are working on electric vehicles and how to reduce carbon emissions across the country. Now, I am not saying that is not important work, but I have not heard one of my colleagues talk about the dearth of electric vehicles and how that is threatening the future of our land.

I have heard my colleagues talk about this important constitutional

question that this disapproval brings before us, and, yet, there was not one hearing on it.

Now, lest you think, Mr. Speaker, that if we deal with this today, we won't deal with it again. No. We are going to have some hearings on this resolution. When? Later in the week after it passes.

Now, I don't know if that is a pattern that we are going to get into. I hope that it is not. Having had no hearings and no witnesses testify on this issue, we are going to have an Appropriation Subcommittee hearing later this week to talk about exactly these issues, where the money is coming from, what the impact of that is, and whether or not it is wise.

We are going to have a hearing later this week in the Judiciary Committee talking about the National Emergencies Act, and whether or not it permits this kind of activity, and what kind of changes ought to be made.

This resolution will have already been considered. This vote will have already been taken, but we will eventually get around to having thoughtful conversation about this.

Mr. Speaker, I close where I began. There is more that unites us as Americans than divides us. And even in politics, there is more that unites this institution than divides us. Making sure that 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue only is exercising those authorities delegated to it by either the Constitution or this Congress, is a shared value.

But if you listen to the debate here on the floor, from the Speaker's chair, you had to caution our colleagues against engaging in attacks of personality against the President. We heard debate, not of thoughtful constitutional principles, but of hateful administration policies.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell my friends, I don't believe those words, those actions, or those efforts are going to bring us one bit closer to the shared values that we have in this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the rule today and vote against the previous question so that we can bring up a bill that will save lives. This bill will save not one life; will prevent not one drug trafficker from coming into the country; will protect not one migrant family. It will do nothing, Mr. Speaker, to solve real problems that face this country.

If we defeat the previous question, we can at least take a commonsense step toward doing exactly that. Vote "no" on this rule, vote "no" on the previous question, and let's commit ourselves to finding a way to come together.

If you believe there is more that divides us than unites us, these first 45 days of this session have been just perfect for you. But if you believe, as I do, that we can do better, let today be the end of the partisan attacks. Let today be the end of bringing bills to the floor designed to make a point instead of make a difference, and let's make tomorrow better.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, fact-checking the President is not an attack against the President. The facts matter. As a matter of fact, the President himself at his press conference said: "I didn't need to do this, but I'd rather do it much faster."

What does he mean by that? Last year, Republicans gave him \$25 billion if they read the bill, but I actually brought it to their attention on the floor that the bill actually read \$75 billion that they were allocating for a border wall. The facts didn't matter then for one side of the aisle.

The President himself said it. "I didn't need to do this, but I'd rather do it much faster." That is not an emergency. I was a 911 emergency dispatcher for 17.5 years. I can cite many examples of what an emergency is. Building a wall much faster is not an emergency. That is political theater. That is political posturing for 2020.

Where is the President stealing this money from? Certainly, he is not getting it from Mexico as he promised. Mexico said "no." The President is stealing \$2.5 billion that Congress approved to combat illegal drug activities around the world.

I know that my colleagues believe that fighting international drug organizations is important. I know this because I traveled with Republicans and Democrats to the jungles in South America. We talked about eradication of narcotrafficking.

What about the \$3.6 billion that the President is stealing from military construction? A study earlier this year found that 16 percent of military families had a positive view of their base housing. That means 55 percent had a negative one.

Many families reported unsafe conditions, including lead-based paint, rampant mold, exposed asbestos, faulty electrical wiring, vermin infestations, and gas leaks. Is that not an emergency? Is that not worthy of the bipartisan vote that we took to allocate that money so that they can make those fixes?

I know my Republican colleagues support military families. I know that because I have traveled with them to Afghanistan. I have traveled with them to other countries. I know that this is wrong. This so-called national emergency is wrong, and I know my colleagues know that this is wrong too. This is undemocratic. This puts us at the cusp of a constitutional crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the previous question and the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of our Constitution and in defense of our republic and urge all members to join me in voting for H.J. Res. 46, which terminates the phony declaration of emergency issued by the President on February 15, 2019.

The reason this resolution is before us today is because of the petulant intransigence

of a single person, the current President of the United States.

As a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Homeland Security, I have visited the southern border on numerous occasions in recent weeks and months and can state confidently that there is no national emergency or national security crisis that justifies the President's reckless and unconstitutional decision or compels the Congress to abdicate its responsibilities under Article I to check and balance the Executive Branch.

The President is only pursuing this tactic of declaring a national emergency after realizing that Speaker NANCY PELOSI was absolutely correct when she informed him that he did not have the support in Congress to require the taxpayers to pay for his broken promise that "Mexico would pay for the wall, 100 percent!"

In fact, according to the latest Marist Poll, the most recent polling data available, Americans overwhelmingly disapprove of the President's national emergency declaration by a 61 percent–36 percent margin.

The President's decision is opposed by both men and women in every region of the country, by every income group and education category.

National security experts across the political spectrum are unanimous in their assessment that the situation on the southern border does not constitute a national emergency, an assessment echoed by leading former Republican senators and Members of Congress.

They understand that after failing to convince the American people or Congress to pay for his ineffective, wasteful, and immoral multi-billion dollar concrete wall, the President has now embarked on a course of conduct that is deeply corrosive of the constitutional system of checks and balances wisely established by the Framers and which has served this nation and the world so well for nearly 250 years.

Having failed miserably to achieve his objective in the constitutional legislative process, the President is trying a desperate 11th hour end-run around Congress with an unlawful emergency declaration that contravenes the will of the American people and negates the awesome power of the purse vested exclusively in the Congress of the United States.

The Congress will not tolerate this.

Despite being repeatedly admonished and in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary, the President continues to propagate false information regarding the state of our southern border.

Mr. Speaker, these are the facts.

Net migration from Mexico is now zero or slightly below (more people leaving than coming) because of a growing Mexican economy, an aging population and dropping fertility rates that have led to a dramatic decrease in unauthorized migration from Mexico.

Migrant apprehensions continue to be near an all-time low with only a slight increase from 2017.

The combined 521,090 apprehensions for Border Patrol and Customs agents in fiscal year 2018 were 32,288 apprehensions fewer than the 553,378 apprehensions in 2016.

To put this in perspective, on average, each of the 19,437 Border Patrol agents nationwide apprehended a total of only 19 migrants in 2018, which amounts to fewer than 2 apprehensions per month.

In the last few years, an increased proportion of apprehensions are parents seeking to

protect their children from the violence and extreme poverty in Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala.

But even with more Central Americans arriving to our southern border seeking protection, total apprehension rates are still at their lowest since the 1970s.

The absence of a massive wall on the southern border will not solve the drug smuggling problem because, as all law enforcement experts agree, the major source of drugs coming into the United States are smuggled through legal ports of entry.

The southern border region is home to about 15 million people living in border counties in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas.

These communities, which include cities such as San Diego, Douglas, Las Cruces, and El Paso, are among the safest in the country.

Congress has devoted more U.S. taxpayer dollars to immigration enforcement agencies (more than \$21 billion now) than all other enforcement agencies combined, including the FBI, DEA, ATF, US Marshals, and Secret Service.

The bulk of this money goes to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), with a budget of \$14.4 billion in fiscal year 2018 and more than 59,000 personnel.

CBP is the largest law enforcement agency in the country, and more than 85 percent of the agency's Border Patrol agents (i.e., 16,605 of 19,437) are concentrated on the southern border.

Expanded deployment of the military to the border to include active-duty troops could cost between \$200 and \$300 million in addition to the estimated \$182 million for the earlier deployment by the President of National Guard to the border.

Mr. Speaker, having been soundly defeated legislatively by Congress, a co-equal branch of government, the President wants to finance border wall vanity project by diverting funds that the Congress has appropriated for disaster recovery and military construction.

The funds the President wants to steal were appropriated by Congress to help Americans devastated by natural disasters, like Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria, or for other purposes like military construction.

Congress did not, has not, and will not, approve of any diversion of these funds to construct a border wall that the President repeatedly and derisively boasted that Mexico would pay for.

In fact, the President has admitted he "didn't have to do this," but has opted to do so because "I want to see it built faster."

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday a bipartisan group of nearly 60 national security officials including former secretaries of state, defense secretaries, CIA directors, and ambassadors to the UN issued a statement declaring that "there is no factual basis" justifying the President's emergency declaration.

Instead of protecting our national security, the President's declaration makes America less safe.

The President is stealing billions from high-priority military construction projects that ensure our troops have the essential training, readiness and quality of life necessary to keep the American people safe, directly undermining America's national security.

The President's declaration clearly violates the Congress's exclusive power of the purse,

and, if unchecked, would fundamentally alter the balance of powers, violating our Founders' vision for America.

Opposing the President's reckless and anti-American decision transcends partisan politics and partisanship; it is about patriotism, constitutional fidelity, and putting country first.

That is why nearly two dozen distinguished former Republican Members of Congress are urging Republicans in Congress to vote for H.J.R. 46 and uphold "the authority of the first branch of government to resist efforts to surrender" our constitutional powers to an overreaching president.

To quote Thomas Paine's *Common Sense*: "In absolute governments, the King is law; so in free countries, the law ought to be King."

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members to uphold the rule of law and the Constitution, and reject the President's power grab; I urge a resounding YES vote on H.J. Res. 46.

The material previously referred to by Mr. WOODALL is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 962) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion. 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 the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 962.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8, BIPARTISAN BACKGROUND CHECKS ACT OF 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1112, ENHANCED BACKGROUND CHECKS ACT OF 2019

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 145 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 145

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. 8) to require a background check for every firearm sale. 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 the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-5. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such 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 amendments 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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.

SEC. 2. 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. 1112) to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the background check procedures to be followed before a Federal firearms licensee may transfer a firearm to a person who is not such a licensee. 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 amendments specified in this section 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 bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-6 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and 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 part B of 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 on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), 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.

□ 1330

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 145, providing for consideration of H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, and H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019.

The rule provides for consideration of each bill under a structured rule. The rule also provides 1 hour of general debate on each bill equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019 and the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019 arrived at a time of emergency for America—a real emergency. Every year 120,000 Americans are shot in our country, and 35,000 of them are shot dead. Seventeen thousand of the people wounded or killed each year are children or teenagers, their families devastated, their lives forever changed.

In 2017, gun deaths in America hit the highest level in 40 years, with 40,000 Americans killed.

We have lost more Americans to gun violence in our own communities than to the Vietnam war, the Revolutionary