Thompson (PA)	Walorski	Wittman
Thornberry	Waltz	Womack
Timmons	Watkins	Woodall
Tipton	Weber (TX)	Wright
Turner	Webster (FL)	Yoho
Upton	Wenstrup	Young
Walberg	Westerman	Zeldin
Walden	Williams	
Walker	Wilson (SC)	

NOT VOTING—9

Cohen	Katko	McHenry
DeFazio	King (IA)	Smith (WA)
Frankel	Lowey	Wagner

□ 1530

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 93.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on February 26, 2019 due to my flight being delayed on account of inclement weather. Had I been present, I would have voted no on Roll Call No. 90, no on Roll Call No. 91, no on Roll Call No. 92, and no on Roll Call No. 93.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 26, 2019.

DEAR MADAME SPEAKER: Due to a clerical error outside of our office, I have been mistakenly added to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee roster. I am submitting this statement to remedy this error. I hereby resign from the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Sincerely,

ANDY LEVIN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 148

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Brown of Maryland.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Tonko.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mrs. Craig.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS: Mr. Levin of California (to rank immediately after Mr. Lamb).

Mr. JEFFRIES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, February 26, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Under Clause 2(g) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Ms. Gloria Lett, Deputy Clerk, Mr. Robert Reeves, Deputy Clerk, and Lloyd Horwich, Legal Counsel, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which they would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 116th Congress or until modified by me.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk of the House.

TERMINATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 144, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 46) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 144, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 46

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, pursuant to section 202 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622), the national emergency declared by the finding of the President on February 15, 2019, in Proclamation 9844 (84 Fed. Reg. 4949) is hereby terminated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.J. Res. 46.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

President Trump's decision to declare a national emergency at the southern border to siphon funds for his border wall is an unconstitutional, grotesque abuse of power.

An emergency declaration is not a last-ditch maneuver to employ when all negotiation attempts have failed. The House of Representatives has rejected the President's border wall. The Senate has rejected the border wall. And the American people have rejected this useless wall.

The President does not get to override Congress in a raucous temper tantrum over his inability to broker a deal. The National Emergencies Act was enacted in 1976 to expedite the allocation of resources for real emergencies to save American lives and mitigate damage caused by natural disasters and acts of terror. It was not fashioned to allow a President to deny the will of Congress and the American people.

Both Democrats and Republicans alike should be very concerned about the ramifications of this unprecedented executive action. It is a direct threat to the balance of power that our country was built upon and a violation of our Nation's Constitution.

There is also no factual basis for the emergency declaration. Immigration from the southern border has significantly decreased in the last 10 years. Any attempts to characterize the border as a crisis zone are flagrant abuses of statistics, which have shown that border crossings are at the lowest they have been in 40 years.

President Trump has long proved he is not married to the truth or facts, and he has no proof to substantiate his wild claims about the status of the United States and the Mexican border.

We cannot abandon our commitment to responsible governing and the truth because President Trump is outraged at his inability to fulfill a campaign promise.

There is wide bipartisan support for this measure, and our democracy demands that we condemn this subversion of our Constitution and this misuse of Presidential power.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the President clearly laid out the case for the declaration of a national emergency in his State of the Union Address right here. National

security is obviously the President's highest priority, and I support his efforts to build a wall.

There is a crisis. There is a crisis at the border that could have been addressed much sooner and prevented. Open border policies of the last administration compounded this growing problem.

We have schools, hospitals, and other services that have become overcrowded. American workers have been hurt by reduced job opportunities and lower wages. At the same time, human and drug trafficking has thrived.

In many communities, the notorious MS–13 gang has grown. We have seen tragic cases of crimes committed by illegal aliens who have been deported not once, not even twice, but multiple times.

I want to cite just one example from my home State of Missouri. A man named Pablo Serrano-Vitorino was deported to Mexico after a felony conviction in 2003. He later returned to this country illegally and was arrested again in 2014 and 2015 after several more violent incidents, but he remained in the U.S.

Then, in 2016, this individual, who had no right to be in this country, was charged for murdering five people in Kansas City, Kansas, and Montgomery County, Missouri.

Stories like this are not unique to Missouri, Mr. Speaker. These horrifying events are happening across this country.

This is a crisis. The men and women who put their lives on the line every day to bring order and security to our borders deserve the tools that they need to do the job, and now this President is taking decisive action to finally address the crisis using the authority provided to him by the Congress.

The National Emergencies Act is very clear. The provisions the President will use under title 10 explicitly provide the President with clear authority.

I support the President's efforts. I believe he is well within the law in making this declaration, and I urge my colleagues to oppose H.J. Res. 46.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, about 6 weeks ago, when the rumors began that the President might declare a national emergency to build his border wall, my staff and I began working with legislative counsel to make sure that Congress would have a say in what amounts to constitutional cannibalism by the President.

This is the most consequential vote we will take in a generation on the balance of powers between the legislative and the executive branches of government, whether we will respect the separation of powers enshrined in our Constitution, stand up for Congress, for this country, and for the Constitution, or whether we will stand down, in favor of the President.

The precedent that may be set today and this week, or next week when the Senate votes if Congress allows this President's emergency declaration to stand will not have ramifications only on this matter or the building of a border wall. If the President is successful, he will likely come back for more. He will likely circumvent Congress again, in the same unconstitutional way.

Not only will this President do it, future Presidents will do it.

I ask you this: How are we to tell a future President, if this President is successful, that gun deaths, which number in the tens of thousands, are not a national emergency, that opioid deaths are not a national emergency, that climate change is not a national emergency?

This will allow a President to sideline Congress from much of domestic policy.

Bear in mind, over the years, Congress has already, on its own, I believe, given up a lot of its authority with respect to foreign policy.

It is also clear that there is no emergency at the border. Border crossings are at a four-decade low. The folks who are coming today are presenting themselves to Border Patrol agents seeking asylum, not trying to get around the border.

There are more law enforcement officers at our border—Federal, State, and local officers—than at any time in our Nation's history.

Since its founding, this country has become the most powerful and prosperous on the face of the Earth without a border wall. That is why most Americans disagree with the President usurping the power of Congress to build his border wall.

In fact, not only do they disagree with that, they disagree with using military construction money on this border project. Cities like mine, San Antonio, stand to lose millions of dollars in military construction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear: Congress explicitly authorized the President to undertake certain military construction projects that are not otherwise authorized by law when it passed the National Security Act. The President is working within the legal boundaries that the Congress gave him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri is exactly right. It is the statutes that allow this President to do this.

The statutes don't provide for national emergencies on climate change. They don't allow for national emergencies on gun violence. But they do allow it in terms of this particular issue.

The President is exactly right. There is a crisis at the border, Mr. Speaker. But not only this President recognizes it. The previous President, Obama, in 2014, did as well when he requested $3.7 billion in emergency spending to secure the border.

Where was the outrage then? Where was the outrage from my colleagues across the aisle?

President Obama even went further to say that we needed to secure our border to deter both adults and children from the dangerous journey that they embarked on.

Where was the outrage across the aisle then, Mr. Speaker? It was not there.

Keeping criminals, human traffickers, and drug smugglers away from our communities is paramount.

□ 1545

Yes, indeed, we do have an opioid problem. We have actually appropriated billions of dollars to address that. And yet, somehow, the drugs flowing across our southern border are not a crisis?

Again, President Obama seemed to agree with this and declared a national emergency for transnational criminal organizations, specifically calling out Mexico's Los Zetas gang, and provided more authority for ICE to actually combat that; a national emergency. Where was the outrage across the aisle then?

But we don't even have to look just at the previous administration. President Clinton also declared a national emergency to go after narcotics traffickers.

Mr. Speaker, I just find it just unbelievable that here today, that we have got these newfound constitutionalists across the aisle, wanting to rein in the President's authority.

This is about defeating President Trump. I encourage a ''no'' vote on this resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The American people should know that there are not any statutes that would allow a President to declare an emergency to build a border wall, not one piece of legislation would allow that.

Previous Presidents have declared emergencies, but they have never ventured into the legislative prerogative to allocate funding, and that is the difference that we have here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the chair of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, President Trump's declaration of a national emergency, as an excuse to build a wall that Congress explicitly rejected, is an abuse of his constitutional oath, and cannot be tolerated by a coequal branch of government under the Constitution. We must reject this unlawful power grab and reassert Congress' authority to exercise the power of the purse.

The Constitution could not be clearer: ''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law.'' That command reflects a fundamental principle that is older than our democracy itself: The chief executive cannot unilaterally spend taxpayers' money or redirect a budget set by the people's representatives.

Earlier this year, Congress reached a bipartisan compromise to fund the government, and it was signed by the President. Congress allocated limited funding for fencing in certain areas, but squarely rejected the President's request to build a medieval barrier across the southern border.

Almost immediately, the President decided to rewrite the budget set by Congress, and he told us exactly why. He was not satisfied with what he got from the process that the Constitution dictates, so he did an end run and made it an emergency.

He and his aides have barely even tried to pretend that the so-called emergency is a real one. They know that illegal immigration is at historically low levels. They know that children and families fleeing violence are coming here to make lawful asylum claims, not as some kind of invading army.

They know that illegal drugs overwhelmingly get smuggled through ports of entry, and that a wall would do nothing to change that. But they refuse to let the facts and the law stand in the way of their political agenda.

Even worse, the emergency law that President Trump invoked allows the military to redirect funds only if an emergency ''requires the use of the armed forces.'' And those funds can be used only for construction projects that are ''necessary to support such use of the armed forces.''

But a wall cannot possibly be ''necessary to support'' a military operation on the border because our laws prohibit the military from engaging in law enforcement activities. The military cannot enforce an immigration law, so the President's actions are doubly unlawful. There is no real emergency; and even if there were, the President could not redirect military funds for a purpose expressly prohibited to the military.

Fortunately, the Constitution does not get suspended based on President Trump's preferences about what is convenient or ''faster.'' Our Nation's Founders left it up to all of us, including those of us in Congress, to act as guardians against exactly this type of assault on our constitutional order.

In that spirit, I proudly support this joint resolution, and I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up and do the same.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), who is on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, the President exercised his clear authority under a clear Federal statute, duly-enacted by Congress, to use funds already appropriated by Congress for the purpose of securing our southern border.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad about one thing today coming here. I am glad that, for many of the years I have been here, I came through the Rules Committee, and others, and talked about Article I authority. I am glad now to see that we have others who have now figured that Article I probably needs to be enforced.

What is interesting is it is selective enforcement against a President they don't like, for a purpose they don't want, for a wall that they don't want to have because securing a border is not the top agenda for them.

I get it if you don't like it. But argue with the law. The statute itself and the President's actions, in accordance with it, rest solidly within the separation of powers, and are certainly constitutional.

If you are citing the Supreme Court case of Youngstown against the President's action today during this debate, then I suggest you haven't read the case. That reasoning of the Youngstown case only applies when the President is acting unilaterally and not pursuant to a duly-elected statute by Congress.

Maybe the selective memory here is because the previous President actually did that when he instituted the DACA program under no things that he could have found to actually work on.

Then we discuss the issue of, is there an actual emergency on the border? You know, a President once noted, he said: ''We have seen a significant rise in apprehensions and processing of children and individuals from Central America who are crossing into the United States in the Rio Grande Valley areas of the Southwest border. The individuals who embark upon this perilous journey are subject to violent crime, abuse, extortion, as they rely on dangerous human smuggling networks to transport them through Central America and Mexico.''

Most may think that was from the current President. It was not. It was from President Obama when he was requesting more money for the emergency on the border.

The problem is the factual basis is there. We sat in a hearing today in the Judiciary Committee, and I had to look at the faces of our Border Patrol agents and ICE agents, and others dealing with this on a day-to-day basis while all they get, many times from this body, is hate and derision when they are doing their job that we sent them to do.

My problem comes back here—if we can argue about different things—this was under the law and done by Republicans and Democrats for the last almost 40 years. If you want to fix this, then you have done what you should do under law. You have brought your resolution of disapproval.

But if you really wanted to take Article I authority, then actually look at the law itself. If you actually want to change it that is what this body ought to be doing.

If you don't like the fact that the President can do something and especially my friends across the aisle who don't want this President to do anything, then fix the law. Go into this emergency declaration and say, we will define what a national emergency is. We will do that.

They don't want to do that because they don't want to bind the hands because they know that the law was written for a purpose that has been upheld for over 40 years. This is simply a show. It is a farce.

Let's just get to the political aspect of this and say, Mr. Speaker, we don't like the President. We don't like what he is doing. Oops, we forgot about this law, and the President said, I will act under the authority given to me by Congress.

You can have all the arguments you want, but at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, when you cast this vote, don't hide behind Article I. Don't hide between separation of powers. Go to the law and look at what the law says and vote ''no.''

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri has 22 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Georgia has 22½ minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have heard a lot of cries from the administration about there being a problem on the southern border with caravans loaded with people being human trafficked, and this is just simply unsubstantiated and unfounded. There are no reports that this happening. This is a figment of the imagination of some in the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, the President's emergency declaration is, in fact, a power grab to go outside the bounds of the law and get what he failed to achieve in constitutional legislative process. After failing to convince the American people and Congress to pay for his ineffective, wasteful, multi-billion-dollar concrete wall, the President is now trying a desperate end run around Congress with his unlawful emergency declaration.

The President is declaring an emergency over a crisis that does not exist. The statute only applies to national emergencies that require use of the armed forces for military construction projects ''that are necessary to support such use of the armed forces.'' The border wall is not a military construction project. It does not require the use of the military.

The immigration law is the responsibility of the Federal immigration enforcement agencies, not the military.

The President's declaration violates Federal law and that is the crisis. This is a crisis, a crime against our Constitution. It is an assault; it is a rape, what the President is doing now, against the Constitution, against this legislative body.

I am just in another world that I, as a constitutional, strict constructionist, am on this side of the aisle on an issue like this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I might remind my colleagues that Title 10, Section 2808, explicitly authorizes the President to change the appropriation for military construction. He is operating within the law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), who is also the ranking Republican of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, there is a crisis at the border. Changing demographics have created unprecedented challenges for the Border Patrol.

In the early 2000s, most illegal border crossers were young Mexican men and our laws allowed us to quickly return them back to Mexico. But today, that flow of Mexican men has been replaced with a mix of men, women, and children from Central American countries.

Human traffickers are exploiting the loopholes in our laws and understand how our immigration system is broken. These smugglers tell vulnerable families that their child is like their ''visa'' to stay in the U.S., if they can just get themselves turned in to the border patrol. And these smugglers and their propaganda are effective.

Family apprehensions for fiscal year 2019 are already 572 percent higher than fiscal year 2013. And these traffickers don't care about the people they smuggle. The result is that immigrants of all ages are arriving on our doorstep in terrible health.

Border Patrol projects a 133 percent increase over last year in migrants needing medical treatment after crossing the border. These changing migrant flows force our law enforcement officers to act as paramedics, rather than enforcing the laws that Congress has passed.

We need an ''all-of-the-above'' approach to border security, and that includes manpower, 21st century technology, and barriers. With this approach, we will deter human smugglers and others crossing hundreds of miles of open desert with innocent children.

We know this approach works. In areas where we have built a wall system, such as Yuma, illegal traffic has plummeted by 95 percent. Let's build on this success.

I encourage my colleagues to stand by President Trump's decision to use executive authority to carry out this approach and keep America safe.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am glad that the other side acknowledges that the people approaching our southern border are not men from Mexico, but they are families with children fleeing violence in Central America. That is an important distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN), vice chair of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there is no national emergency on our southern border. There are no terrorists who are being apprehended. There is no invading hostile force, and border crossings remain at a 40-year low.

Pulling resources from military construction projects, as President Trump would do, projects meant to improve readiness and support our servicemembers, impacts our national security. It will hurt military families who are already dealing with military housing with mold and lead poisoning, and outdated schools and medical facilities.

This declaration of national emergency will keep thousands of Active-Duty troops needlessly deployed at the southern border and away from their scheduled training activities and operational readiness.

This is a fake emergency; and for President Trump to claim we need to build a wall to support our Armed Forces, it is absurd and ridiculous. This emergency declaration is just an overreaching and dangerous power grab to push forward the President's anti-immigrant agenda and supposedly boost his re-election chances.

There is no national emergency; only a crisis in the Oval Office.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I might point out to my colleagues just how much of a national emergency this is.

□ 1600

It was President Obama who recognized the crisis at the border. In 2014, President Obama requested $3.7 billion in emergency supplemental funding for what he described as a humanitarian crisis, a humanitarian crisis at the border. He specifically cited an increase in family units trying to cross the border and the lack of resources to accommodate them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the joint resolution to overturn the President's declaration. I think it is very clear that there is a national emergency that exists on our southern border because of the high rate of unchecked, unregulated illegal immigration, illegal immigration that is directly contributing to the flow of drugs, human trafficking, and gang members into this country, not to mention the humanitarian crisis of those who feel compelled to make this journey to illegally enter this country.

I think there seems to be some confusion among many of my colleagues and maybe many across the country about the action of the President.

President Trump is clearly acting within the authority that is provided by Congress to confront a border security and humanitarian crisis that constitutes a national emergency.

The threat to our border security is evident from the sheer number of migrants seeking to gain illegal entry into this country, and especially the number of criminal aliens in the form of cartels, traffickers, and gangs. These people will continue to take advantage of our weak borders for their own gain.

I recognize that Congress has lawfully enacted the authority for the President to use military construction funds to support Armed Forces to engage in accordance with the National Emergencies Act.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to oppose this joint resolution, as the crisis at the border is real.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side keep invoking the mantra, ''Obama, Obama.'' Even though they opposed each and every initiative that he put forward, regardless of merit, now they want to come back and cite him for what he said and what he did. But one thing he did not do was to allocate funding that he was not entitled to. He always requested from the Congress funding authority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, less than 2 weeks ago, after a failed attempt to establish consensus on border security funding, President Trump, a self-proclaimed master negotiator, failed to get a border wall that he originally said Mexico will pay for, so then he fraudulently invoked a national emergency declaration to rob taxpayers of funds from other programs.

The President's brazen decision not only violates Congress' constitutional powers of the purse laid out in Article I, Section 9, Clause 7, it is also a fabricated emergency propped up by fake statistics, racist undertones, and the blatant hypocrisy of a party that had complete control of Washington for 2 years and didn't see fit to fund this useless, medieval wall themselves.

By diverting funds from military projects, the President has determined that national security takes a backseat to his political priorities. Today, in the

Senate, the head of the U.S. Northern Command said that border crossers do not pose a military threat.

Mr. Speaker, there is no emergency.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

When President Trump declared a national emergency, he did so in response to the ongoing humanitarian crisis at our border and with full statutory authority vested in laws passed in this very Chamber.

The majority claims that this resolution of disapproval is in response to a power grab by a President acting out of line. Yet, by merely disapproving of the emergency declaration, they are preserving his statutory powers they claim are inappropriate.

If my colleagues across the aisle are so concerned about separation of powers, why don't they simply reform the laws in title 10 and title 50 that the President is using to respond to this crisis? The answer is because this resolution is not about the division of powers; it is not even about border security. The only reason this legislation is being considered on the floor today is to obstruct the President's agenda.

The President has made it clear that he will use all statutory tools at his disposal to secure the border, and that is exactly what he is doing in declaring this emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire the amount of time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri has 16¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA).

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues make some very good points. They make convincing arguments about executive overreach and the misuse of Federal funds. I thank them for those statements, and I would like to ask a more personal question.

Since when do we call human beings in need a national emergency? Have all of President Trump's other arguments failed? Is he running out of insults for people like me, people who came from Mexico to have a better life in this country?

He used to call people like me bad hombres. When that failed, he turned to other insults. And after they lose their shock value, he calls us rapists, then murderers. At that point, he ran out of insults for people like me, so he referred to us as coyotes.

Now, when all other labels have failed to achieve his central campaign promise to build a medieval border wall, he calls people like me a national emergency?

We must reject this premise as the presence of people like me in this country, of people like my constituents in my district, a national emergency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we must secure our border. We are in the midst of a national security and humanitarian crisis on our southern border which must be addressed.

Earlier this month, Congress secured important and necessary funding to protect over 55 miles of our most dangerous border where it has been so desperately needed. We have also provided funding for over 600 new border officers.

This was a good step in the right direction, but as we see again today, our colleagues from across the aisle remain unwilling to address our intensifying border crisis. With the national emergency declaration, President Trump is taking the steps our country needs to stay safe and secure.

Yes, this is an emergency. Cartels, human traffickers, and drug smugglers take advantage of our weak border for their own gain, and it must be stopped.

We need to stop traffickers from bringing young girls and women into our country where they are sold into prostitution and slavery. As a mother and a grandmother, this breaks my heart.

We need to stop violent gangs like MS–13 from entering our cities and bringing their violence and evil onto our streets.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), our Caucus chair.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this so-called declaration that is anchored in a phony, fraudulent, and fake national emergency.

There is no crisis at the border. There is no basis in law or in fact for this unconstitutional emergency declaration.

Illegal border crossings have not increased; they have decreased. There is no evidence of increased criminal activity on the border. There is no evidence of increased drug trafficking on the border. There is no evidence that terrorists are pouring into the United States of America on the southern border.

This is a fantasy made up by a xenophobic administration to support a medieval border wall that this Article I Congress rejected. That is why House Democrats will work to defeat it.

Mr. Speaker, vote ''yes'' on the resolution of disapproval.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Missouri for yielding, as I want to share my thoughts on this purely political effort by the new Democratic majority.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. and Mexico border is 2,400 miles long. My home State of Texas is half that border, 1,200 miles.

Texas knows something others in this Chamber apparently don't know: We are at war on the southern border with the drug cartels.

I say it again. We are at war on the southern border with the drug cartels from Mexico.

The drug cartels are at the heart of every single problem we have on our southern border. They have a war going with our families, our kids, and our schools with record numbers of heroin, cocaine, and deadly fentanyl.

The drug cartels are at war with our world values by financing modern-day sex slaves or forced laborers.

All of Texas, 254 counties—from Amarillo to Texarkana, to Beaumont, to Brownsville, to Marfa—are impacted. They are at war with these drug cartels.

The majority had better wake up and have no more figments of imagination. It is time to put politics aside and admit we are at war with the drug cartels.

Mr. Speaker, let's fight this war to win and vote against the resolution that surrenders to the drug cartels.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the chair of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution.

I was in west Texas this past weekend and saw nothing to justify the President's designation of a national emergency. There aren't gangs of violent criminals and terrorists overtaking our southern border.

If there were a crisis, it is hard to imagine a worse or less effective response than a border wall, which will take months, if not years, to build.

What I did see there are efforts to harden ports of entry. In fact, just days before I arrived in El Paso, sharp barbed wire was installed in the middle of a busy port of entry. This barbed wire did not give off the impression that this busy port of entry was welcoming commerce or visitors to the United States. When questioned, officials could not say who had signed off on this project or how it fits into border security.

It is time for the administration to stop fear-mongering and accept reality. The only crisis on the border is a humanitarian crisis, one created by this administration, and a border wall will do nothing to alleviate the suffering.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this resolution to

stop the President from stripping Congress of its constitutional power of the purse.

□ 1615

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, we need to stop violent gangs like MS–13 from entering our cities and bringing their violence and evil onto our streets. We need to stop the drug smugglers from devastating our communities and flooding our towns with opioids, like heroin and fentanyl.

My home State of West Virginia has been hit hard by the opioid epidemic and especially from illegal drugs smuggled across the border. Just several weeks ago, Customs and Border Protection seized enough fentanyl to kill every person in West Virginia 32 times over. Imagine how much more is still slipping through the unsecured areas.

Our country cannot afford inaction any longer. We need to build this wall.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader of this House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this issue is not about a wall. It is about the Constitution. It is about this institution. It is about the balance that we say is equal between the Article I institution and the Article II institution.

That is important to remember. That is why this argument is so very important.

It is not about just a single policy. It is about the kind of government that our Founding Fathers instituted, which has been the envy of the world and the example to many.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Congressman CASTRO of Texas, and the Congressional Hispanic Caucus for introducing this resolution.

I was at the border in California and in New Mexico just a few days ago. I was at the border in El Paso with my distinguished colleague, the former executive, called judge, of that area. She will speak shortly. Ms. ESCOBAR will say there is no war at the border and there is no crisis at the border. She will explain that better than I can. She lives there.

At the border, I saw a lot of heartbreak and challenge, but I did not see a national emergency that would justify the President ignoring the Constitution and trying to make funding decisions without congressional approval. That is the issue.

For my colleagues to say this is a partisan issue, let me call your attention to the statements of approximately 20 Members of the United States Senate.

The President admitted on February 15 that this is not a true emergency when he said: ''I could do the wall over a longer period of time. I didn't need to do this, but I'd rather do it much faster.''

Not that he needed to do it much faster, but he would just rather do it much faster. Of course, if the Mexicans were paying for it, perhaps he could have.

Congress has a chance to answer the President and make it clear that he cannot make an end run around the Constitution and claim powers reserved for the taxpayers' representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States needs to have a spine and not lay at the feet of the President of the United States and say, ''Whatever you want, sir.'' That is not what the people elected us to do. We are their representatives, not the President's representative, whether it is President Obama, President Trump, President Clinton, President Bush, or President Reagan, all of whom I have served with—two Bushes.

Our Founding Fathers had enough of King George, so they adopted a Constitution that said: We are not going to have a King George. We are not going to have an authoritarian regime. We are not going to have the executive setting policy. They said the Congress sets policy.

By the way, 300 of us in this body voted for the funding levels for border security. It didn't squeak by, by some partisan advantage—300 of us, which is to say well over 66 percent.

Now, Congress has a chance to answer the President and make it clear. He demanded that the American taxpayers give him billions for the wall that Democrats and Republicans alike say is expensive and ineffective.

Again, this is not about the wall. This is about our Constitution, our institution, and our self-respect.

He has chosen to ignore the will of the American people, as expressed by their representatives. He has opted to set aside the wisdom of our Founders for the expedience of getting his own way.

Constitutional law professor Roger Sloane of Boston University noted, last week: ''To my knowledge, no President has ever tried to use national emergency funding to appropriate funds Congress refused to appropriate.''

Overwhelming Senate vote; overwhelming vote in this body.

He went on to say: ''Politically, it would mean the President would be seeking . . . to override a bipartisan judgment of Congress.''

Have we no self-respect? Have we no sense of the balance between the executive and the legislative branches of government?

We are the Article I branch, the policymakers, the people who raise money and spend money, not the President—any President, Republican or Democrat. And a lot of Republican colleagues, including Senator MCCONNELL, said: Mr. President, don't do this.

Right up until the time Senator MCCONNELL said: I will support you, Mr. President.

First, he was against this, and now he is for it.

The respected Harvard Law School constitutional scholar Laurence Tribe said of the President, on Thursday: ''He is simply trying to do what emperors and kings do, not what a President of the United States should do.''

In The Washington Post this weekend, columnist Max Boot noted why we are now at a pivotal moment for Members of the President's party in the Congress, who are being asked to choose between loyalty to the President and fidelity to the Constitution.

I am sorry the Chamber is not filled. I thought of asking for a quorum call. I didn't.

Fidelity to the President or fidelity to the Constitution, that is the choice we make today. That is why this is a pivotal moment. We choose between the Constitution and its principles, which have made our country the world's envied democracy for almost two and a half centuries.

Boot continued with this: ''Trump's action is an affront to all that Republicans stand for.''

The premise is you continue to stand for this institution and our Constitution.

''They claim to be pro-military, but Trump's action would take money away from the defense budget. They claim to be pro-property rights, but Trump's action would result in the taking of private property along the border. And they claim to be constitutional conservatives, but Trump's action is an obvious violation of Article I of the Constitution: 'No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.' ''

I used to have people coming up here and taking out the Constitution and saying: Have you read this document? Do you know what it says?

Let me repeat it: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.''

Now, I have heard the scare rhetoric, and I suggest to my colleagues, with all due respect, that kind of rhetoric has preceded every despot's takeover of power in the world. There was a crisis. They had to declare military law. They had to suspend the constitution and suspend the laws.

That is how despots take power. We stand at the gate to ensure that doesn't happen. But we will say more with our votes.

If we vote yes, we will say that Congress is still the voice of the American people. We will say that we are still faithful to the oath we took to protect the Constitution and laws of our land. And we will say that America, as our Founders promised, has no sovereign but we, the people—''we,'' not me, not I. We, the people.

We must not allow the President to set a dangerous precedent stripping Congress of its power of the purse. This is the first time. You can say there are a lot of other emergencies. That is correct. But this is unique. We must not

allow him to set the precedent whereby any chief executive, Republican or Democrat, can declare an emergency any time he or she doesn't agree with Congress' funding.

This is not a partisan resolution. It is supported and encouraged by former and current Republican Members who recognize how dangerous it would be for the Congress not to act. A group of 23 former Republican Members of Congress, including former Senators Olympia Snowe, Dick Lugar, Chuck Hagel, and John Danforth have sent a letter to currently serving Republican Members yesterday. In it they wrote this: ''It has always been a Republican fundamental principle that no matter how strong our policy preferences, no matter how deep our loyalties to Presidents or party leaders, in order to remain a constitutional Republic, we must act within the borders of the Constitution.''

Today, a conservative Senator from North Carolina, a Republican conservative Senator from North Carolina, said this: ''I have grave concerns when our institution looks the other way at the expense of weakening Congress' power.''

□ 1630

Senators MURKOWSKI and COLLINS have already said they would support this resolution.

So let us act and do so in one powerful voice—not as Democrats, not as Republicans, as Americans; as representatives; as people who have put their faith in us to make a judgment to protect their country, their Constitution; as Americans who believe in our Constitution and the wisdom of our Founders who gave Congress alone the authority to appropriate funds and gave the representatives of the people and the States a powerful check on the executive.

I ask all my Republican colleagues: How would you vote if Barack Obama were President of the United States today? Think of that. Because if you cannot answer ''I would vote the same way,'' then you are not being true to your country, to our Constitution, and to your oath.

If any Member cares at all about the equal status of the Article I branch of the Constitution, he or she should vote for this resolution. Vote for conscience and Constitution, not party and politics.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), who just came back from deployment down at the southern border.

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

I want to start by saying something: Everybody here in this Chamber means well. Everybody here in this Chamber believes they are fighting for the right thing for this country.

Unfortunately, sometimes with these debates, they get heated and we begin to ascribe bad motives to the other side. I ascribe no bad motives to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and there are no bad motives on our side. It is just a little bit of a difference in how we see it.

We are all passionate about this issue, which is evident by the quality of the debate we are having here. But I am going to tell you why I came to believe that this was a national emergency.

I was sent down to the border with the National Guard. I went down and did 2 weeks with my unit, which is down there for 2 months.

As part-timers, we go down and we fill in and augment different amounts of time. I fly a surveillance aircraft. It is called an RC–26.

We actually work with Border Patrol, and what we would do is, through technology, some of the technology that exists, they would get indications of a group coming over the border. We would have a central authority that would see these groups coming over the border and would take the limited air assets we had and put them on these groups to surveil them and then coordinate with Border Patrol, or whatever, to come in and get them. And what we saw, frankly, was pretty eye-opening for me.

First off, Arizona has some very rugged territory.

I have worked Texas, by the way, three times doing this exact same mission. I am going to give you an opportunity to guess who the President was when I did this mission three other times. It was President Obama, because he understood the need for the guard on the border.

So we would see these groups come over. They would go through this rugged terrain.

By the way, I never worked an area in Arizona where there was a barrier. We never had to. But there is a lot of area that isn't.

We would then respond, and basically, 9 times out of 10, any time these groups got any indication that Border Patrol was nearby or there was an aircraft overhead, they would do what we call a bomb burst. It looks like that on the infrared we are using. They would run in all different directions, and many people would get separated.

But do you know who the first to bomb blast away from that group was? The first people, every time, were the coyotes who they paid their life savings to to bring them over the border—every time.

In fact, one time that exact scenario happened, and a lady was left lost in the desert, hunkered down in a bush. Had Border Patrol not found her—sure, she will be deported for that because she came in illegally. But if Border Patrol had not found her, I believe that there is a chance that she could have been one of the at least 200 bodies that they find every year in the desert because they are abandoned by their drug traffickers, by their coyotes who are paid for and who pay money to the drug cartels.

That is a big part of where these cartels in Mexico get their money, funneling people over the border, human trafficking. We know the statistics of the chance of assault during that. We know that kind of stuff.

It wasn't my mission, but my crew was on a mission, the very first one, where an illegal was apprehended, and he had 70 pounds of methamphetamine on him.

Now, I know there is way more than 70 pounds of methamphetamine out there in the United States, but there are way more people we are not seeing come over that border as well.

People sometimes look at the rugged terrain of Arizona and say, well, with mountains and hills, that is the natural wall.

By the way, I went hiking on those mountains and hills during my time off, I will say that.

But the other interesting thing is a significant amount of the people we were following were actually on those mountains and hills. They were on the mountains and hills because that rugged terrain is just as difficult for Border Patrol to navigate as them.

In fact, I watched as a Border Patrol helicopter followed a man probably 100 feet away. This is on video. Border Patrol can release this video if they want. The man was running. The Border Patrol cannot insert Border Patrol agents to capture him. This guy is still gone today. He had to have been a coyote or a drug trafficker.

Seeing this repeatedly made me realize this is not a national emergency because of immigration. I actually believe in comprehensive immigration reform. I want to work with the other side of the aisle to fix all these problems that I think we really actually all agree on. We just can't admit we agree on all this stuff. I look at this and I say this is an 80 percent solution that we can fix.

But when I came back from the border and I came back from seeing the real issue that makes this a national emergency—drugs, human trafficking—that is when I realized something had to be done.

A wall and a barrier is not compassionless. I think border security and compassion actually go hand in hand. Because what we are saying is: Come over to the United States of America, but do it the right and legal way, because, otherwise, these coyotes in the cartel are going to take advantage of you, take your life savings, and take you through a very dangerous route. And when the going gets tough, they are going to leave you to die, because they did that to 200 of them last year in Arizona.

It was an eye-opening experience.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the passion everybody has in this. I respect everybody's debate in this. This is how I came to the conclusion I did.

Please vote ''no'' on this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it amuses me when my friends on

the other side cause the public to believe that there are people coming across our border, trying to sneak in, when the truth of the matter is the people who are presenting themselves at our southern border, primarily, are people fleeing violence in Central America, families, women, children fleeing violence in Central America, presenting themselves at lawful points of entry, not trying to jump the Rio Grande, but at lawful points of entry, and seeking to apply for asylum. That is the emergency that my friends on the other side tried to make into something that would be such that President Trump is authorized to spend moneys that have not been appropriated, and it is a farce.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), my dear colleague.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Some of you may be old enough to remember when Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., traveled to Berlin in 1964. He reminded those gathered that a manmade barrier could not change the fact that the people on both sides of the wall were God's children.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you today: What does it profit our Nation to gain a wall and lose our soul? North and south of the border, we are one people. We are bound together by our common humanity.

Mr. Speaker, this executive action betrays our values, our democracy, and the very soul of our Nation.

As Members of Congress in a nation of immigrants, we have a constitutional mission and a mandate to preserve the balance of powers and to oppose this monument to hate.

Today, each and every one of us has a moral obligation to do what is right, what is just, and what is fair by passing this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri has 7¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GRAVES) for yielding.

Today, I have heard a lot of amazing things. My colleague on the other side of the aisle, Mr. JOHNSON from Georgia, said, I believe, caravans trying to cross the border are a figment of our imagination. I don't know about you, but I think all we need to do is turn on the news. I have seen thousands of people traipsing thousands of miles to get into our country. In fact, there has been some violence. So I just don't understand that statement at all.

And Speaker PELOSI and CHUCK SCHUMER recently said the crisis at the border is manufactured. I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that I live in the State of Arizona, a border State, and I have visited the border, and I have met with the border agents and border officials at the border.

They have told me, firsthand, there is a crisis at the border. They have told me, firsthand, when I asked do we need a border fence, they said, yes, it is part of the solution.

You know, I am here today to ask for reason. The Republican legislature, the majority last year, tried to pass legislation that would not only secure the border but, as a compromise, would have given legal status to the DACA recipients. Not one Democrat voted for it.

Can we please get together and solve this problem?

It is unfortunate that the President had to resort to this because Congress, the Democrats, would not vote for border security. And so I support the President in his declaration for emergency. I support him in protecting our Nation—his number one duty—and I oppose this resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I recall that the last 2 years have been spent under the unified control of Republicans—both Houses of Congress and the President—yet there was no emergency to construct the $5 billion down payment on a border wall that is going to cost about $30 billion. They didn't do it then; they want us to do it now—or they want Trump to actually be able to do it without the legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the great State of Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, I come from El Paso, Texas, which is right on the U.S.-Mexico border. I live on the border. My family has lived on the border for more than 100 years. I can assure my colleagues that the border has never been safer; the border has never been more secure.

In fact, what I am more worried about today than what is happening on the U.S.-Mexico border, than those vulnerable asylum-seekers coming to our front door asking for help, is I am more worried that people in this Chamber are willing to ignore the oath of office that we took on the day that we were sworn in, that we would violate the Constitution that we promised to uphold.

I am also far more worried about the fact that they are willing to divert funding that is going to our U.S. military in favor of a political prop, a monument to xenophobia, a campaign promise. In fact, Fort Bliss in El Paso, Texas, stands to potentially lose $275 million.

Why didn't they get it done when they had an iron grip over the House, the Senate, and the White House? Because there was no emergency.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we did take an oath of office to defend the Constitution. The Constitution applies to citizens of the United States. It does not apply to people who are not citizens of the United States.

Border security officers have made 266,000 arrests of criminal aliens in the last 2 fiscal years.

These include criminal aliens charged or convicted of assaults, sex crimes, and killings. These are not victimless crimes.

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

□ 1645

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CISNEROS), my good friend.

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, this emergency declaration unconstitutionally attempts to override Congress. The Constitution clearly grants Congress the power of the purse. This declaration took place after weeks of negotiations which resulted in Congress rejecting the President's wall in a bipartisan manner.

This declaration could take billions of dollars of disaster relief aid from families, endanger military construction, and impact our military readiness. There is no national emergency at the southern border, only a humanitarian crisis created by our President.

This President has repeatedly taken actions that undermine our country's ability to defend against real threats to national security.

Congress must act as a check on the President's abuse of executive power. Congress has the opportunity to defend and protect the Constitution and assert its role as a coequal branch of government, and it must do so in order to set a precedent and protect our democracy.

It is absolutely unacceptable that military families and communities across this country should be made to suffer from this unlawful and dangerous action. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this resolution and move forward with ending this fake national emergency.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Missouri has 5¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what we are witnessing is a President who poses a direct threat to both our military families and America's national security.

First, as we have heard, there is no border emergency. That is a fabrication. The administration's own statistics show that crossings and apprehensions are at a historic low. The vast

majority of illegal drugs come in at our ports of entry. A wall will not stop that.

Many who cross our borders are women and children. They are not running from border agents. They are seeking them out for help and for asylum.

Second, this will make life harder for America's military families, and, thus, hurt our national security. Who would ever intentionally make life tougher for the brave men and women who serve our country? It is monstrous, really, when you think about the sacrifices that they already make for this country.

As the chair of the Appropriations Committee Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Subcommittee, tomorrow I will hold a hearing to ask our service Secretaries exactly which projects they previously told us they really needed, but now should be sacrificed for a needless wall.

What will these leaders ask their troops to give up just so Trump can have a useless, wasteful wall? Training or intelligence facilities? Hangars for planes that cost billions? Schools for our military families' children? This is a power grab.

After failing to get his way in a funding dispute with Congress, Trump is throwing an unconstitutional temper tantrum. He is using the tools of an authoritarian, jeopardizing our military readiness to steal himself a wall that he could not get the lawful way. The dangerous precedent he will set is one that I hope all of my Republican colleagues will reject.

The President says a wall will keep Americans safe, but stealing funds from military families makes us all less safe. Bypassing Congress and the Constitution, and starving military families of funding is not patriotism. It is everything that true patriots fight against.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing that most drugs coming into this country are coming in at ports of entry, and I would make a correction: Most drugs that are caught are caught at ports of entry. We don't have any idea what is coming in across the border.

When we say that, this is like saying we are going to reinforce the front door, but we are going to leave the back door wide open. We don't know how many drugs or the amount of drugs that are coming across the border, particularly in rural areas, because we just simply can't patrol it.

As the gentleman from Illinois pointed out, you can't deploy Border Patrol quick enough to catch much of this. So we don't know how many drugs are coming through in other areas. We have a pretty good idea at ports of entry because we catch them there.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is harder for me to imagine how a big, beautiful wall will somehow bestow upon us knowledge that people are jumping over it or going under it.

Those kinds of things do not work across the entire border. That may have its place at some points, and I am sure we have border wall and border fencing in the locations where it is necessary, but in the other locations, we need—in addition to more Border Patrol officers who are paid a living wage—we need the technology and the other assets that can surveil and help with the apprehension of people who are coming across the border at points that are not legal points of entry.

But the point is, today's crisis that faces the people of Central America and drives them to our southern border is driving them to lawful points of entry to seek asylum protection under this Nation's laws, and that is something that they are entitled to.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The only crisis is the constitutional crisis that has been created by the President of the United States by his direct and ill-conceived abuse of power which is noted in the Constitution as a violation of the Constitution.

It is sad that the President has declared a national emergency for the purpose of misappropriating funds from previously designated and important uses to build a wall, uses that would be dealt with in a national emergency in case of war that would then call for the building of direct materials and buildings necessary for troops engaging in war.

The only response to my good friend who has come back from the border and saw people going over the border is to engage more Border Patrol agents and train them to do the job that they are designated to do. We, as Democrats, support that.

Illegal border crossings are at a near 40-year low. Sixty national security personnel, ambassadors, CIA, DNI, and others have indicated that this is wrongheaded. It is wrong.

The President's declaration clearly violates Congress' exclusive power of the purse, and if unchecked, would fundamentally alter the balance of powers, violating our Founder's vision for America. That is unconstitutional.

To quote Thomas Paine in ''Common Sense,'' it says, '' . . . in absolute governments the king is law, so in free countries the law ought to be king.'' This is the abuse, the declaration, and we should vote for the underlying resolution to restore constitutional order.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me also indicate that as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, the numbers of Mexicans from Mexico has decreased.

The numbers coming now are what we call OTMs, other than Mexican. They are coming and fleeing bloodshed in countries where they are being threatened with a decapitation of their head.

Mothers are being told that if you stay, we know you are pregnant, you can have the baby, and we will kill you after the birth. These are the stories that those of us who visited the border are hearing over and over again.

If there is a crisis, it is a humanitarian crisis. We, as Democrats, have no problem with funding the resources necessary for the border, including, as indicated, the increase in personnel, technology, and transportation equipment.

I have been to the border when the need for night goggles and other types of equipment were rendered important. Let us do the right thing. Vote on this resolution, and do the constitutional point of restoring order to this government.

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.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I make a point of clarification because the statement was made that individuals from outside this country coming to ports of entry seeking asylum were entitled to that. No one outside of this country is entitled to anything in this country.

They can be heard, but they are not entitled to asylum in the United States just because they ask for it, just because they seek it. They aren't entitled to anything within this country.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that most learned colleagues in this Chamber understand that under U.S. law, we have granted persons approaching our border the right to apply for asylum. That doesn't mean that asylum will be granted, but they certainly have the right to apply for it.

It is the humane thing to do in a civilized society. This is the law that America has proceeded under for centuries, and now we have a naked power grab by the chief executive of this great Nation, the President of the United States, seeking to do the job of the legislative branch, and his own job. But there is a problem. It is only the legislative branch that appropriates funding for various occurrences.

The legislative branch has not given this President what he has sought; that is, a down payment on a border wall, which is a monument to a campaign promise that he made. This legislature has not given him that authority, and so in a naked power grab, he is seeking to do it by declaring an emergency when, in fact, no emergency exists.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), my friend, and a staunch advocate for the people of Washington, D.C.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I don't even want to speak to the underlying issue. I want to speak to what it is we are doing here with congressional power. The President signed a bill. He didn't have to. He could have retained his power.

Now he proposes to ignore the bill he signed and act as if the Congress did not exist. This is the road to dictatorship. Congress cannot ever agree with an executive that takes our power. That is what Trump is trying to do.

We have gradually given up our power, sometimes for expediency sake, sometimes to avoid controversy. Today, we put all on notice that we will not give the power that belongs only to Congress to the President of the United States.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The gentleman from Missouri has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 1¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of this great House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for the eloquent way that he has presented this legislation to the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to quote from the Constitution of the United States. It begins with our statement of purpose of the Nation, with the preamble.

''We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.''

□ 1700

Immediately following that sacred purpose, it says: Article I, the legislative branch.

Perhaps it is time for our country to have a values-based civics lesson. I applaud our colleague, Congressman CASTRO, for his leadership in ensuring that this House was ready to reassert our responsibility under the Constitution and its systems of checks and balance.

In their wisdom, our Founders rejected the idea of a monarch. They didn't want to live under that. They made that clear. They fought a War of Independence to free themselves from that. Therefore, in their wisdom, they put forth in this Constitution a heart, soul, and core of it: the separation of powers, coequal branches of government to be a check and balance on each other.

They saw the wisdom of that and then, of course, added the Bill of Rights with further freedoms enumerated. But the core of the Constitution is the separation of power.

Today, we are on this floor of the House, and our colleagues have spoken eloquently about the reality or mythology of the crisis at the border that the President contends. They have spoken eloquently about the opportunity cost of the money that the President wants to use for this ill-conceived wall and what it means to our national security.

But we in this House of Representatives, each one of us, and everyone in public service in our country, takes an oath of office to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. It is our oath. We promise.

That Constitution is about the separation of powers that is being usurped by the executive branch. We in the legislative branch cannot let that happen.

In fact, I appeal to our Republican colleagues because I do believe and trust that they are people of their word, and if they take an oath to uphold the Constitution, they will honor it with their vote on the floor today, in keeping, by the way, with, under the previous House Speaker, our colleagues across the aisle placed a high priority on the separation of powers and Congress' constitutional prerogatives.

The Republican A Better Way agenda, which they put forth in 2014, read as follows: ''The people granted Congress the power to write laws, raise revenues, and spend and borrow money on behalf of the United States. There is no power more consequential. . . . Yet for decades, Congress has let this power atrophy, thereby depriving the people of their voice.''

Their Better Way goes on to say: ''The Founders insisted on a separation of powers to protect our constitutional liberties.''

Their proposal goes on to say that James Madison ''warned that the Constitution is a 'mere parchment barrier' unless each branch asserted its powers to keep the others in check.''

That is all in the Republican agenda for A Better Way of 2014, so you would think it would be in keeping with their vote today.

In that spirit, then-Speaker Ryan often lamented that Congress ''keeps forfeiting the game, yielding to the executive branch, giving the President a blank check, not even bothering to read the fine print in some cases.''

We are not going to give any President, Democratic or Republican, a blank check to shred the Constitution of the United States. We would be delinquent in our duties as Members of Congress if we did not overturn what the President is proposing. He is asking each and every one of us to turn our backs on the oath of office that we took to the Constitution of the United States.

I do not believe that the Republicans want to do that. I don't think it is consistent with what they had advocated in the near term and historically.

Is your oath of office to Donald Trump, or is your oath of office to the Constitution of the United States? You cannot let him undermine the strength of your pledge to protect and defend the Constitution.

Again, our colleagues have talked about the opportunity cost of taking money from our national security and spending it in this way.

I was at the border this weekend. We all have our stories and the rest, but whatever you think about the wall, let's just put that aside for the moment. Whatever you think about where you take the money from and where you put it, which is substantial, put that aside for the moment. The question is: What do you think about yourself, your Congress, your conscience, and your oath of office? I trust that our colleagues will be consistent in their beliefs and join us in honoring the oath we all take to support.

The resolution is not about politics. It is not about partisanship. It is about patriotism. It is about the Constitution of the United States, which I hold in my hand here. George Washington on the cover of this says: ''Its only keepers, the people.''

We in the people's House are the keepers of this Constitution. We in the Congress are the keepers of this Constitution. We in this Congress are in Article I, the Congress of the United States, spelled out very clearly in the Constitution that the powers given to the legislative branch are the power of the purse, the power to declare war, powers enumerated very carefully by our Founders.

How can you ignore that? I urge strong bipartisan support of this vital resolution to honor our oath to bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, is the majority prepared to close?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I find it ironic, I guess, and actually it is kind of ludicrous, that we talk so much about how much this wall is going to cost and how inhumane it is and how immoral it is, yet we build thousands and thousands of miles and spend millions and millions of dollars on noise abatement wall, 30 feet high and 20 feet high, in our suburbs and our urban areas all over the country. Yet we can't do something to protect our border.

That is not a crisis, Mr. Speaker. This is a crisis. What we are talking about today is a crisis.

President Obama agreed when he requested emergency funding in 2014 to deal with the crisis on the border, when he declared a national emergency because of transnational drug traffickers.

Since fiscal year 2012, Customs and Border Patrol has seized 4 million pounds of drugs at ports of entry and more than 11 million pounds of drugs between ports of entry. And nearly three times as many drugs are seized between ports, Mr. Speaker.

Many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle recognize the need for a border wall, voting to authorize a wall in 2016 and again under President Obama in 2013. Last year, we passed bipartisan legislation to address the growing impacts of opioids in our communities, drugs that continue to flow into our country through our southern border. We all agreed, on a bipartisan basis, that there was a crisis, but now, suddenly, they are calling this a manufactured crisis.

The National Emergencies Act is clear, Mr. Speaker. The President's authority is clear. The President is acting within the authority that Congress has given him.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in approving the joint resolution terminating President Trump's illegal power grab, the House will make clear that nothing is more fundamental to the functioning of our democracy than the separation of powers among three coequal branches of government.

The facts are clear. President Trump failed to convince a skeptical Congress to pay for an ineffective border wall.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, but I must ask

you to ask yourself this question: Will you allow your solemn vow of loyalty to President Trump to override your oath of office and your vow of fidelity to the Constitution?

Vote to support this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the joint resolution to terminate President Trump's phony declaration of an emergency at the southern border.

Unable to convince Congress to pay for his wasteful border wall, the president has decided to make an end run around the legislative branch, upending democratic norms and creating a dangerous precedent.

To pay for the wall, the Administration intends to rob money from critical military construction projects and from other parts of the Defense Department and the Treasury.

This would threaten national security, undermine the readiness of our military, and could disrupt critical infrastructure improvements that benefit service members and their families—all to prop up a political vanity project.

As a country, we should be focused on real law enforcement needs, not a border wall that will do virtually nothing to keep Americans safe.

Today's vote to block the president's emergency declaration is a critical first step, and I am proud to cosponsor this resolution.

I hope my Republican colleagues recognize that this isn't about politics—it's about defending our democratic institutions and the rule of law from presidential overreach.

It's about protecting our institution and our Constitution in the face of an unprecedented power grab from a president who rejects Congress' authority as a co-equal branch of government.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest power we have as members of Congress is the power of the purse. As we exercise that power, we should invest responsibly in priorities that strengthen and protect American families and communities.

We do not exist to rubber stamp the President. I urge my Republican colleagues to join us in defending our constitutional prerogatives and upholding the rule of law.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today had I been present, I would have voted in strong support of the bipartisan, privileged resolution to terminate President Trump's proclamation ''Declaring a National Emergency Concerning the Southern Border of the United States.'' I was detained due to severe weather and cancelled flights in Oregon.

While there is no doubt that our immigration system is broken, the president's wall and his proposed funding level is an irresponsible waste of taxpayer funds for a structure that would be ineffective and do very little for our national security. The emergency declaration is nothing more than a power grab by the president to fulfill a campaign promise, violating existing law and our constitutional system of separation of powers.

Congress has already rejected the president's proposed border wall, and alternatively, by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote, made robust investments in our border security. These investments include $1.375 billion for approximately 55 miles of physical barrier along the southern border, $564 million for improving equipment at our ports of entry, $100 million for new, additional border security technology, serious investments in the Alternative to Detention program to provide relief to overcrowded detention facilities, and additional funding for attorneys and courtroom expansion to assist with our country's growing immigration court system backlog.

Despite these important investments, the president has proposed taking more than $6.7 billion to build his wall, including $3.6 billion from the Department of Defense's (DoD) high-priority military construction projects. These funds are meant to support much-needed improvements on military bases around the world, and misallocating these funds could undermine the training, readiness, and quality of life for our men and women in the Armed Forces. He has also proposed stripping $2.5 billion from the DoD's drug interdiction program, which could have serious impacts on our ability to combat the flow of illegal narcotics.

Furthermore, the Military Construction Codification Act only authorizes the Secretary of Defense to reallocate funds for construction projects during a national emergency if the project is ''necessary to support'' a ''use of the armed forces.'' Our Armed Forces are not responsible for enforcing our immigration laws and using these funds in this way is in direct violation of existing law.

Of serious additional legal concern is the fact that the administration would need to seize significant amounts of property not owned by the federal government in order to build a wall. Currently, more than two thirds of border property is owned by private parties or the relevant states. In 1952, the Supreme Court held in Youngstown Sheet and Tube that President Truman's declaration of national emergency, even in the midst of an international armed conflict, did not permit him to unilaterally seize private property.

In recent days, more than two dozen former Republican lawmakers and almost 60 former senior national security officials have come out in opposition to President Trump's national emergency declaration. These individuals are united behind the idea that allowing the president to ''ignore Congress'' will deprive the American people ''of the protections of true representative government.''

The bottom line is that the president's national emergency declaration is an abuse of his constitutional authority and an affront to the separation of powers. Congress has the exclusive power of the purse, and the Constitution specifically prohibits the president from spending money that has not been appropriated. Congress entrusted the president with authority to reallocate funds during unforeseen and urgent situations, such as wars and natural disasters. By declaring an emergency when Congress has overwhelmingly rejected his border wall in favor of compromise legislation, President Trump is creating a dangerous precedent for future political disputes. Congress must reject this presidential overreach and assert its constitutional authority.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for this resolution to terminate the President's declaration of a national emergency on February 15, 2019. No such emergency exists on the U.S.-Mexico border. The President is using this declaration as a false pretense to divert taxpayer money, primarily away from the Department of Defense, toward the construction of a wasteful, ineffective wall along the southern border. This declaration is an unacceptable abuse of power that circumvents the constitutional authority of Congress. For these reasons, I am a cosponsor of this resolution to terminate the declaration pursuant to the provisions of the National Emergencies Act.

I support taking action to make sure we have the appropriate personnel, equipment, facilities, and resources to protect our borders from criminal activity like trafficking in drugs or people. Building this wall is not a good investment and it will not stop crime or illegal immigration along our southern border. Instead of building walls, we should instead build bridges to those who are fleeing violence and legally seeking asylum in our country. I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting the President's abuse of power by supporting this resolution.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 144, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 47) to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND DEBATE TIME ON S. 47

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate under clause 1(c) of rule XV on a motion to suspend the rules relating to S. 47 be extended to 50 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.