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

**Previous Question for H. Res. 613. The Rule for H. Res. 612 Expressing the Commitment of the House of Representative to Achieving Victory in Iraq**

Amendment in nature of substitute:

**Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:—**

"Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House Resolution (H. Res. 613) congratulating the people of Iraq on the three national elections conducted in Iraq in 2005. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and the preamble to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

H. Res. 613

Whereas the people of Iraq have consistently and courageously demonstrated their commitment to democracy by participating in three elections in 2005;

Whereas on January 30, 2005, the people of Iraq participated in an election for a transitional national assembly;

Whereas all segments of Iraqi society actively participated in the approval of a new Iraqi Constitution through a referendum held on October 15, 2005;

Whereas reports indicate that the people of Iraq voted in unprecedented and overwhelming numbers in the most recent election, held on December 15, 2005, for a new national parliament that will serve in accordance with the recently-approved Iraqi Constitution for a four-year term and that represents the first fully sovereignly elected democratic assembly in the history of Iraq;

Whereas this remarkable level of participation by the people of Iraq in the face of dire threats to their very lives has won the admiration of the world;

Whereas the Iraqi elections could not have been conducted without the courage and dedication of the members of the United States Armed Forces and the armed forces of other nations in Iraq, including the members of the security forces of Iraq; and

Whereas December 15, 2005, election in Iraq inspires confidence that a robust, pluralistic democracy that will bring stability and a sense of national purpose to all the people of Iraq;

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates the people of Iraq on the three national elections conducted in Iraq in 2005;

(2) encourages all Americans to express support for the people of Iraq in their efforts to achieve a free, open, and democratic society; and

(3) expresses its thanks and admiration to the members of the United States Armed Forces and the armed forces of other nations in Iraq, including the members of the security forces of Iraq, whose heroic permitted the Iraqi people to vote safely.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, today, without a doubt, we should congratulate the Iraqi people for achieving what appears to be a successful, high-turnout election.

For the third time this year, courageous Iraqi citizens have enthusiastically exercised their democratic rights.
Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 621 and the underlying bill, H.R. 4437, the Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005.

Yesterday, this House began consideration of the underlying bill and a portion of the amendment that were made in order. Following yesterday's debate, the Rules Committee completed its consideration of over 130 amendments, and today, upon passage of this rule, we will be able to complete consideration of the bill and the amendments that were made in order.

Mr. Speaker, I again would like to commend Chairman Sensenbrenner and King for working together to give this House an opportunity to debate the issue of border security and to pass meaningful legislation to secure our borders.

As I emphasized yesterday, this debate is, at its core, an issue of protecting the homeland. While the economic and social impact of illegal immigration cannot be denied, the integrity of our borders is fundamentally a matter of national security.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have the luxury to turn a blind eye to our borders and simply do nothing, and this problem cannot be talked away. I believe that today's bill, though not perfect, puts many good ideas into action. Border security did not become a problem overnight and, Mr. Speaker, it simply cannot be solved in 1 day.

Now, I understand that some of my colleagues may have legitimate disagreements with certain aspects of the bill. In fact, I do not agree with every aspect of this bill and would even like to see some additions. However, I remain confident, I remain confident that the underlying legislation will prove essential in beginning to turn the tide on illegal immigration.

H.R. 4437 is a commonsense bill that makes a permanent verification system mandatory rather than the existing voluntary program. It also increases penalties for illegally crossing our border and for businesses that knowingly hire these illegal immigrants. We must mandate detention for all aliens apprehended at the border, especially the so-called OTM, "other than Mexican," category, and deport them back into their country of origin.

Mr. Speaker, if we pass H.R. 4437, we will have stronger borders and will save American lives. And, Mr. Speaker, not just the lives of our own legal inhabitants, but also the lives and the safety of so many of the unsuspecting immigrants left stranded on our side of the border.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my colleagues for their support of the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. CASTINGS of Florida, Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Georgia (Mr. Gingrey) for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at several points during my remarks I am going to refer to Ellis Island, and I am going to begin today by citing Emma Lazarus, who wrote the poem "The New Colossus" in 1883.

"Not like the brazen giant of Greek fame, with conquering limbs astride from land to land; here at our sea-washed, sunset gates shall stand a mighty woman with a torch, whose flame is the imprisoned lightning, and her name Mother of Exiles. From her beacon-hand greens worldwide welcome..."

She goes on to say, "Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp!" With silent lips she cried. "Give me your tired, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden gate..."

Emma Lazarus understood the dynamics of America, as did those who went through Ellis Island and those of us that visit there to draw our strength in the diversity of this Nation.

"Today, we come to put a cover over that torch and a blindfold on that lady who symbolizes freedom..."

Twenty years later, it was engraved on the poem that Miss Lazarus said at the beginning of her poem is, "The Founders themselves decided that when they declared independence and wrote our Constitution. You see, citizenship is not limited by birth or background."

"...a country in which the many gifts they bring and the values they have made more Democratic measures, speaking of the entirety of the session, in order than Republican measures. Well, that does not hold for this particular party in part B, a very confusing process, I might add, which even the majority leader recognized.

Republicans are again allowing important and critical debates to happen behind the closed doors of the Republican Conference rather than on the House floor in the eye of the public.

What did you all talk about yesterday for all those hours that you could not bring this mess out here to the floor?"

Under this rule, 18 of the 115 possible amendments, that would now make 33 of 130, could be considered or actually made in order. Two of those will be offered by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the author of the underlying legislation. As if that is not offensive enough, only four of the 18 amendments permitted in order in the rule will be offered by Democratic Members.

Then again, Democrats should not be surprised that our amendments have again been blocked from consideration. After all, President Bush, a Republican, could not even get his legislation proposal through the House Rules Committee.

President Bush, one day in July of 2001, in remarks at Ellis Island, in part said the following: "The Founders themselves decided that when they declared independence and wrote our Constitution. You see, citizenship is not limited by birth or background." He then had an amendment with that here today. "America at its best is a welcoming society. We welcome not only immigrants themselves, but the many gifts they bring and the values they have made more of it come to the House of Representatives.

Yet on two separate occasions when presented with opportunity to fulfill their empty promises, my friends in the majority balked. I guess old habits die hard.

But we can only hope that encouraging the spread of democracy into the House of Representatives will be the Republican New Year's resolution for 2006. Let us have an amendment to the spreading democracy in Iraq. I hope all of that works, but I sure would like to see more of it come to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have the luxury to turn a blind eye to our borders and simply do nothing, and this problem cannot be talked away. I believe that today's bill, though not perfect, will be able to complete consideration of the bill and the amendments that were made in order.

Mr. Speaker, I again would like to commend Chairman Sensenbrenner and King for working together to give this House an opportunity to debate the issue of border security and to pass meaningful legislation to secure our borders.

As I emphasized yesterday, this debate is, at its core, an issue of protecting the homeland. While the economic and social impact of illegal immigration cannot be denied, the integrity of our borders is fundamentally a matter of national security.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have the luxury to turn a blind eye to our borders and simply do nothing, and this problem cannot be talked away. I believe that today's bill, though not perfect, puts many good ideas into action. Border security did not become a problem overnight and, Mr. Speaker, it simply cannot be solved in 1 day.

Now, I understand that some of my colleagues may have legitimate disagreements with certain aspects of the bill. In fact, I do not agree with every aspect of this bill and would even like to see some additions. However, I remain confident, I remain confident that the underlying legislation will prove essential in beginning to turn the tide on illegal immigration.

H.R. 4437 is a commonsense bill that makes a permanent verification system mandatory rather than the existing voluntary program. It also increases penalties for illegally crossing our border and for businesses that knowingly hire these illegal immigrants. We must mandate detention for all aliens apprehended at the border, especially the so-called OTM, "other than Mexican," category, and deport them back into their country of origin.

Mr. Speaker, if we pass H.R. 4437, we will have stronger borders and will save American lives. And, Mr. Speaker, not just the lives of our own legal inhabitants, but also the lives and the safety of so many of the unsuspecting immigrants left stranded on our side of the border.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my colleagues for their support of the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. CASTINGS of Florida, Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Georgia (Mr. Gingrey) for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at several points during my remarks I am going to refer to Ellis Island, and I am going to begin today by citing Emma Lazarus, who wrote the poem "The New Colossus" in 1883. Twenty years later, it was engraved on a bronze statue in New York in the harbor.

What Miss Lazarus said at the beginning of her poem is, "Not like the brazen giant of Greek fame, with conquering limbs astride from land to land; here at our sea-washed, sunset gates shall stand a mighty woman with a torch, whose flame is the imprisoned lightning, and her name Mother of Exiles. From her beacon-hand grows worldwide welcome..."

She goes on to say, "Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp!" With silent lips she cried. "Give me your tired, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden gate..."

Emma Lazarus understood the dynamics of America, as did those who went through Ellis Island and those of us that visit there to draw our strength in the diversity of this Nation.

"Today, we come to put a cover over that torch and a blindfold on that lady who symbolizes freedom..."

Twenty years later, it was engraved on the poem that Miss Lazarus said at the beginning of her poem is, "The Founders themselves decided that when they declared independence and wrote our Constitution. You see, citizenship is not limited by birth or background."

"...a country in which the many gifts they bring and the values they have made more Democratic measures, speaking of the entirety of the session, in order than Republican measures. Well, that does not hold for this particular party in part B, a very confusing process, I might add, which even the majority leader recognized.

Republicans are again allowing important and critical debates to happen behind the closed doors of the Republican Conference rather than on the House floor in the eye of the public.

What did you all talk about yesterday for all those hours that you could not bring this mess out here to the floor?"

Under this rule, 18 of the 115 possible amendments, that would now make 33 of 130, could be considered or actually made in order. Two of those will be offered by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the author of the underlying legislation. As if that is not offensive enough, only four of the 18 amendments permitted in order in the rule will be offered by Democratic Members.

Then again, Democrats should not be surprised that our amendments have again been blocked from consideration. After all, President Bush, a Republican, could not even get his legislation proposal through the House Rules Committee.

President Bush, one day in July of 2001, in remarks at Ellis Island, in part said the following: "The Founders themselves decided that when they declared independence and wrote our Constitution. You see, citizenship is not limited by birth or background." He then had an amendment with that here today. "America at its best is a welcoming society. We welcome not only immigrants themselves, but the many gifts they bring and the values they have made more of it come to the House of Representatives.

Yet on two separate occasions when presented with opportunity to fulfill their empty promises, my friends in the majority balked. I guess old habits die hard.

But we can only hope that encouraging the spread of democracy into the House of Representatives will be the Republican New Year's resolution for 2006. Let us have an amendment to the spreading democracy in Iraq. I hope all of that works, but I sure would like to see more of it come to the House of Representatives.
Mr. Speaker, this morning South Florida newspapers include a story about 20 Haitians being found last night in a boat just north of the district in West Palm Beach that I am privileged to serve. Upon boarding the boat, which had left Port-a-Prince roughly 10 days ago, in search of safety from political turmoil, customs officials noticed that they had no food or water, and that the day before many of them had fallen dreadfully ill, including the children.

While the 20 hopeful immigrants were all taken into custody and will eventually be deported back to Haiti, I tell this story because it happens too often in the district that I am privileged to serve and in south Florida generally.

In the Southwest of our great country, they come on foot. In Florida, they come by boat. People go to extreme lengths and take enormous risks just to get here. Once before in Boynton when a group of Haitians had washed up on shore, I stepped over the body of a naked pregnant Haitian woman and I thought to myself, my God, what kind of courage does it take to try to get away from political turmoil, to get on a boat and come here the way that she and others that died in that event had done?

In no way do I or any Member of this body, that is Republican or Democrat, condone illegal immigration, but if Congress is going to have this debate, we ought to consider why people are willing to risk their lives to come to the United States. It is not always to bilk our social programs or to steal an American job, it is for all of the things that Emma Lazarus, and President Bush described her emblem being at the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island, and President Bush speaking there, as I quoted earlier. It is for safety and for security and for a better life.

But we hear these stories from around the country, which some have advocated, is not going to deter people from coming here illegally, but reforming a system which requires literally years to process work visa applications will. Authorizing more border security personnel also will not deter people from coming here illegally, but ending double-standard immigration policies will.

Yesterday I talked about how much hypocrisy exists inside our immigration debate. We have wet foot, dry foot, up foot, down foot, all kinds of policies that seem to come at the whim of whomsoever the director is at any given time, be they Democrat or Republican.

The system is broken. Nevertheless, the policy solutions in the underlying legislation will never end these failures because they do not even address them, not to mention the fact that they are not going to see the light of day. They are Black Flag dead in the United States Senate. Instead, they are extreme ideas aimed more at catering to the lowest common denominator of the majority’s political base than providing practical, commonsense solutions to a real issue in America.

‘‘Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp!’ cries she with silent lips. ‘Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free. The wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these to me, you tempest-tossed to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door.’’

What she knows as she puts the new colossus before us is that this Nation’s strength is not in the golden door, and many of the persons that we will talk about today as if they are objects have made more than valuable contributions.

Many of our ancestors who were brought here, others who were forced to come here, others who came of their own volition have gone on to make this Nation the great Nation that it is. I beg my colleagues to reject this restrictive rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida has a great heart, and he in- dexed that, and he knows that. He in his remarks indeed tugs at our heartstrings as he so eloquently quotes poetry and talks about the inscription on Lady Liberty and the men and women over the history of our country who have come to our shores seeking new opportunities.

It compels me to think about and to speak about my own heritage, my maternal grandparents, my grandfather an immigrant, an Ellis Island immigrant, in the early part of the 20th century from County Roscommon in the country of Ireland; my grandmother, Ellen Heron from Scotland. These two young people met in New York City and married and started a family of five children, including one of whom is my precious mother, 88 years old today.

I never knew my grandfather because he died at 25 years of age, literally working himself to death, possibly on buildings like the Twin Towers that were attacked so viciously 4 years ago where over 3,000 people were killed, and not just United States citizens. There were many foreign nationals among those 3,100.

So I certainly share the compassion and the intense feeling that my good friend from Florida has with regard to our love in this country of immigrants, and we do welcome them.

I am sure if my grandparents were living today, they would want to thank God that they had this opportunity to come into our great country to produce a better life for them and their children. In those days, of course, they had to be physically healthy and mentally healthy.

But today, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the times unfortunately have changed drastically, and what we are trying to do with regard to border se-

curity is not just to protect our own citizens, but protect every person who comes to this country legally seeking a better opportunity, the land of free, that they are safe to go to work, to go to school and raise their children.

Mr. Speaker, that is where my legislation is all about. I want to make sure that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand.

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Member from Florida, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak on the floor on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong opposition to this rule. The Sensenbrenner bill is an unacceptable, inefficient and punitive proposal to reform our immigration system. Rather than focusing our resources on apprehending terrorists, fraudulent document manufacturers, and other serious criminals, this proposal hurts hard-working families who want nothing more than to contribute to the economy and to achieve the American dream. These workers help to make our economy the strongest in the world.

Criminalizing and deporting 11 million undocumented immigrants already in the United States is unrealistic and would be very costly to the American Treasury, as much as $230 billion. This legislation places unfunded mandates on our local governments and especially on our first responders who already face serious budget deficits. While I agree that we must secure our borders, enforcement-only legislation is the wrong approach. Our immigration system is broken and severely outdated and should be comprehensively reformed. That is why I am disappointed that this rule does not allow for amendments which would provide real, effective reform, including a path to legal permanency for the undocumented that are already here, a reduction in the immigration backlog so that thousands of separated families can be reunited, and new channels for employers to hire workers to enter safely and legally.

This border security PLUS approach is a comprehensive solution to a complex problem. For generations, immigrant families have journeyed to the United States in search of the American dream. Like the immigrants of the past, today’s immigrants contribute significantly to our country and yearn for that American dream.

As a daughter of proud immigrants, I value America’s history of treasuring the contributions that immigrants have made to this country. My parents came from abroad. My father came from Mexico and came here to this
contribute to making this country great. He bailed his back working on the railroads; helping to pick fruit and vegetables in Texas, in Colorado, in Montana; and eventually met his wife, my mother, from Central America who had to leave her family behind in Central America to find a better life. She and my father raised seven children, and I am proud to be a U.S. citizen born here.

Some of the amendments that you are going to hear about would try to deny a mother who gave birth to a child here that citizenship because she does not have her documents.

How dare the Republican Party begin to try to take apart our very Constitution? How dare the Republicans attempt to try to take away the livelihood of our country, the contributions that immigrants have made and will continue to make?

Give me your tired, your poor. Give me those huddled masses that are yearning to breathe free. We did it a century ago when Italians, Germans and Europeans came to this country. But now when this economy is going down the tubes, we quickly want to point fingers at what I think is a community that has worked very hard, and that is the Hispanic community. I am a very proud to be a part of that community.

I know the residents and constituents that I represent tell me every single day paying taxes, making those beds in those hotels, providing service, janitorial services, and many of them caring for our elderly and our children. What are we going to say to them for harboring the undocumented, that they are also criminals? I think not. This rule and the underlying piece of legislation should be voted down.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the gentlewoman from California.

I want to remind the gentlewoman we are not allowing 11 million illegal immigrants in this country. Indeed, 60 percent are already criminalized from the standpoint from entering this country illegally, and 40 percent are just because they have overstayed their visas, and we are equalizing that in this bill.

The other thing that is important for the gentlewoman to know, given the history of her ancestors, that addressing this issue first and foremost, border security, is protecting, indeed, protecting those 11 million, most of whom are working and supporting their families and are law-abiding except for the fact that they came in illegally. We want to protect them as well.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM).

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding.

My good friend from Florida closed his opening statement with the inscription at the base of Lady Liberty, and that new colossus that was so new and shiny at that time has grown into the great colossus.

That shining city upon a hill that Winthrop commented on and that Reagan resurrected in hiscurring rhetoric. It is still shining city upon a hill that all of us like to speak of and remark upon on a number of occasions on this floor.

Who was that city shining to? Who was it becoming? Who was it welcoming but immigrants? We are still that great city shining upon a hill. We are a nation of immigrants, and they are our strength, and they are our diversity, and they are our source of innovation, and they are what prevent us from being stagnant in the old ways of the old world.

But a key change has occurred since the wave came over from Ireland and Poland and the European nations, and then subsequently from the Latin American nations and the Asian nations, and that is the rise of Islamic fundamentalist terrorism.

And so that immigration policy cannot be unfettered. We have to put in place common-sense, meaningful reforms that it in three parts. We do not disagree about that. There is not an ounce of disagreement between our parties about strengthening our borders.

We all agree that we cannot continue to have a policy that allows hundreds of thousands of people to come across our borders, many of whom are seeking a better life, but a goodly number of whom are not. They are part of MS-13 gangs, they are part of human exploitation or sexual traffickers or even terrorists trying to bring in bombs or other equipment to do our society fundamental harm. So we have to be very careful in moving forward with this legislation and craft a balanced approach.

I commend the authors on their enforcement provisions at the border. That is phase one, to address our border security, to make sure that we have boots on the border, equipment, sensors, all of the technology that our innovation can provide to make sure that we are welcoming those immigrants who are coming here to build a better life for themselves and their family, and stopping those who are not.

The key thing is this: Does it deliver, does it not deliver to a comprehensive way with the other two pieces of immigration policy, which are very sticky, difficult issues, that of what to do with those 11 million people who are already here and that of how we address the temporary worker program. It is incomplete in that sense. But this is an important step.

I would only characterize it as a baby step. But it is an important step forward to moving what I believe will be comprehensive immigration reform that deals with these three key components of this hugely important policy in a post-9/11 world.

I firmly believe that we are a stronger nation because of the diversity that our immigrants have brought us. I feel blessed to live in a nation that women seek to be here so badly that they are willing to put their babies on inner tubes to float across the Florida Straits to be here or to risk everything to come across a wall or a fence or a river to be a part of the freedoms and liberties that we take for granted every day.

But it is important that we recognize what is not in the bill, and before it becomes law, I ask what must become part of it, which is a comprehensive assessment of a temporary worker program and a way to deal with the enforcement of the 11 million people who are here.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlemen from Arizona, Mr. HAYWORTH.

Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend from Arizona for yielding, and I thank my friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for literally a last-second update as I step into the well.

But despite these courtesies, I rise in opposition to the rule. And let me detail the reasons why. There are obviously, to put it mildly, strong differences of opinion on this question. Indeed, I heard my other colleague from Florida just say the key was comprehensive reform, which translates into a guest worker program, which many advocate, though I do not.

The distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, was quoted in a publication this morning, saying this: “First of all, we have to convince the American people that we can secure the borders. And then we also have to be able to convince the American people that we can sustain the laws. We also need to look at the guest worker program, which translates into a guest worker program, which many advocate, though I do not.”

Point well taken, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues. It leads to the following questions. How long then do we wait? Will we wait for the catch-and-release policy to go into effect late in 2006? Will we wait until we have operational control of the borders? The Secretary of Homeland Security says that could take 10 more years.

Will we wait for the worker verification program to be fully implemented? That will not come, in this legislation, until the year 2011. Will we
Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the question if the gentleman is opposed to the basic principles of this bill, the preponderance of provisions that are included in this base bill, or does he have other concerns that he might want to express?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, where do I begin?

Acknowledging that one of the central tenets and challenges of the legislative process is incremental reform, we can all understand that. But also understanding that in terms of truth in labeling, are we in fact engaged in enforcement first or are we engaged in enforcement maybe part of the way, awaiting bureaucratic implementation.

Now, if I can return to my point and to the reason why I must, in reluctance, oppose this rule, I do appreciate the courtesy of my friends, with whom I agree on many issues, but with whom I disagree this morning.

I proposed the following amendment that has been disallowed. It is the sense of Congress that a new temporary visa program or amnesty program shall not be enacted until each of the enforcement provisions in this act have been fully implemented and a measurable enforcement of United States borders and the interior of the United States has been demonstrated. Therefore, we conclude. We do not have any way to measure the progress. Regrettably, I oppose the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the rule, and I am going to support this bill. But there are a lot of things that are not included in this bill that I believe we, as Members of Congress of the United States of America, should include in this bill, representing the citizens of the United States of America.

There has been a lot of talk about unfunded mandates in this bill. Let us talk about the unfunded mandates in the States of our country that are education, that are health care, the judicial system incarcerating them, how much is that costing the economy?

I have been in the construction industry for over 35 years, and I remember in the 1970s through the late 1980s, a man could go out and a woman could go out in the construction industry and make a good living, could buy a house, raise a family.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, especially during the recessions in the 1970s through the late 1980s, coming into this country that some say are just going to work on farms until they get a call from their cousin who works on a construction site, or it might be a drilling company or a manufacturing plant, and says, You can make more money over here than you can over there.

And I have watched the jobs in our construction industry be lost to American citizens because we cut so much that they had to do something else. Now you tell the guys who used to be able to work in this country, who do not want to go to work with a tie and a suit on, that their job went to someone who is not enforcing their labor costs, and they are not paid what they should be, why that has happened to them, why they can no longer afford to own a home, why they can no longer afford to have a family and send them to college.

The wrath of the business people in this country was discussed. I am wondering about the wrath of the citizens I represent who have lost their jobs.

The number one issue I hear about in California every week is illegal immigration, why can you not do something about it? Eleven million people impacting highways, congesting southern California roadways, is that acceptable to the guy sitting on the road spending 2 hours trying to get to work? No, it is not acceptable.

There were some amendments that I offered that my good friend, the chairman, was unable to put in the bill, and I respect that. There are reasons for that. Congressman DEAL had a great amendment that said, on anchor babies, if they come here illegally and have a baby, that baby should not be a citizen of this country. I agree with that 100 percent.

There are countries who advertise to have people come here on vacation, and they provide a house, the medical, the care for their child, to have their baby here so they can become a citizen of this country; then they fly back to their country and the kid has dual citizenship. That right? No, it is not right. It is wrong.

And the people coming from Mexico and other countries are good people. Do not get me wrong. They are here just to better their life. I am not arguing that a bit. That is not the issue here. The issue is what responsibility do we have to the people of the United States of America, that is, are we providing health care, the judicial system incarcerating them, how much is that costing the economy?

I have been in the construction industry for over 35 years, and I remember in the 1970s through the late 1980s, a man could go out, a woman could go out in the construction industry and make a good living, could buy a house, raise a family.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, especially during the recessions in the 1970s through the late 1980s, coming into this country that some say are just going to work on farms until they get a call from their cousin who works on a construction site, or it might be a drilling company or a manufacturing plant, and says, You can make more money over here than you can over there.

And I have watched the jobs in our construction industry be lost to American citizens because we cut so much that they had to do something else. Now you tell the guys who used to be able to work in this country, who do not want to go to work with a tie and a suit on, that their job went to someone who is not enforcing their labor costs, and they are not paid what they should be, why that has happened to them, why they can no longer afford to own a home, why they can no longer afford to have a family and send them to college.

The wrath of the business people in this country was discussed. I am wondering about the wrath of the citizens I represent who have lost their jobs.

The number one issue I hear about in California every week is illegal immigration, why can you not do something about it? Eleven million people impacting highways, congesting southern California roadways, is that acceptable to the guy sitting on the road spending 2 hours trying to get to work? No, it is not acceptable.

There were some amendments that I offered that my good friend, the chairman, was unable to put in the bill, and I respect that. There are reasons for that. Congressman DEAL had a great amendment that said, on anchor babies, if they come here illegally and have a baby, that baby should not be a citizen of this country. I agree with that 100 percent.

There are countries who advertise to have people come here on vacation, and they provide a house, the medical, the care for their child, to have their baby here so they can become a citizen of this country; then they fly back to their country and the kid has dual citizenship. That right? No, it is not right. It is wrong.

And the people coming from Mexico and other countries are good people. Do not get me wrong. They are here just to better their life. I am not arguing that a bit. That is not the issue here. The issue is what responsibility do we have to the people of the United States of America, that is, are we providing health care, the judicial system incarcerating them, how much is that costing the economy?

I have been in the construction industry for over 35 years, and I remember in the 1970s through the late 1980s, a man could go out, a woman could go out in the construction industry and make a good living, could buy a house, raise a family.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, especially during the recessions in the 1970s through the late 1980s, coming into this country that some say are just going to work on farms until they get a call from their cousin who works on a construction site, or it might be a drilling company or a manufacturing plant, and says, You can make more money over here than you can over there.

And I have watched the jobs in our construction industry be lost to American citizens because we cut so much that they had to do something else. Now you tell the guys who used to be able to work in this country, who do not want to go to work with a tie and a suit on, that their job went to someone who is not enforcing their labor costs, and they are not paid what they should be, why that has happened to them, why they can no longer afford to own a home, why they can no longer afford to have a family and send them to college.
themselves, and, God bless them, I am not arguing that, but they took their job. Tell that to those people.

And I am going to say once again not everybody wants to get up in the morning and put a suit and tie on to go to work. They want to get up and work with their hands. They are proud of what they did. They look at their work during the day, and when they go home, they can say, I accomplished something.

We need to do more than we are doing here, but at least we are making a step in the right direction.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

Might I just say that I have started this debate by suggesting that everyone who comes to this floor comes with good intentions and certainly comes charged with the responsibility of securing the borders. Again, there is no division amongst Americans about the importance of securing the homeland. And, frankly, the eloquence of Mr. HASTINGS on reminding us of our original roots that the Statue of Liberty represents to this Nation, that we come in all walks of life. And some have, as we well know, come to this Nation in fishing boats or walked across various lands or may have flown here, and some of us came in slave boats. But we are all Americans now, and we should be united around the concept of security. But we should not be united around the concept of divisiveness.

So when you poll Americans or ask constituents in the district, they again want comprehensive immigration reform because so many of them, short of our Native Americans, can track their historical places away from this soil.

So I would ask my good friends why they would put a rule in that does not bring the diversity of this Congress, four Democratic amendments as opposed to a wide diversity of issues. Why, for example, do they insist on forcing local governments into utilizing hard-pressed resources for doing the Federal Government’s work, immigration work? That is our work to do.

Why do they insist on forcing law enforcement to take precious resources away from fighting children and going after bank robbers and making sure the crime statistics go down by arresting hotel maids in hotels?

And it is important to recognize that they have amendments that would take away of the essence of the Constitution, which abides and believes in due process and the right to access the courts. We cannot dictate what the courts will say, but I think if you will ask any American, they would find it faulty not to allow people to petition to go into the courts.

What about those babies who have come here at 6 months old, and you criminalize them when they are 17-year-old honor students and simply want to be part of the American Dream?

So this legislation is missing because Americans understand the concept of enforced access and the undocumented criminals out of here. We join you in that. Arrest the criminals. Arrest the drug dealers. Arrest the people that are not doing what they should do. But those who are working hard, paying taxes, should have an opportunity to be able to be part of this great American dream.

And, Mr. Speaker, what about the soldiers on the battle line who are seeking citizenship, but have undocumented relatives, offering their lives for America and the undocumented relatives which they seek to bring into status, are now criminalized and arrested and incarcerated simply for their presence in the United States?

So I hope, as we proceed, we will find ways to defeat these amendments. And I ask that we defeat the underlying bill.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Today is not a red letter day for this great and storied institution. Rather than doing what we know has to be done—going forward, we are simply punting the ball to the Senate, hoping that they will have the courage to act in ways that we cannot.

Many of us have wanted an amendment that would allow for a temporary worker program to be established. That was not allowed. In doing so, in not allowing that, we are simply ensuring that we play a diminished role in the eventual bill that will pass this body.

If the denial of this amendment was unfortunate, the removal of language in the manager’s amendment that simply references the role that a temporary worker program would play in enhancing border security is simply baffling. Every member of the Republican leadership has expressed support for a temporary worker program, as has an overwhelming majority of this body, yet the language was removed after threats from a few that the inclusion of any reference to a temporary worker program would guarantee their “no” vote against this legislation.

Gratefully, the Senate doesn’t need to see “sense of the Congress” language on a temporary worker plan from the House to add some provision to their legislation. They know that such a plan is a necessary part of securing the border.

The elephant in the middle of the room is the 11 million illegal aliens who have already entered the country. Without a temporary worker program we will continue to turn a blind eye to their existence. We’re pretending that they aren’t here.

Nobody in this body is advocating that we round up and deport all of those who are here illegally. It’s no wonder. It would be the equivalent of rounding up everyone in the state of Ohio and sending them back to their home country. Yet that is what “enforcing the current law” would require.

We in this body know that, Mr. Speaker. But unfortunately we don’t want to admit it to our constituents. George Washington once famously said “If to secure the ends of Government, we must entirely destroy the liberty of our subject, let them be subject to the power of the despot.” That is the question for us today.

There are some who will vote against this rule and underlying legislation with the hope that we will later do something more comprehensive. Some will vote for the rule and underlying legislation with resignation that all we are capable of is to send a legislative vehicle,
Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), who has an extraordinary amount of experience in the area that we are debating.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this generous amount of time in the context of the deliberations on this bill. I would like to lay a little bit of a foundation for a question which I would like on my time to yield to either Mr. PUTNAM, because we have spoken privately about this issue for so long, or Mr. PUTNAM, who very specifically and straightforwardly addressed the issue on the floor.

And that is, the background, I have said on a number of occasions in the Rules Committee and in the Judiciary Committee and on the floor yesterday that this bill is either an insult to our intelligence or a con on the American people. And I say that, and those are harsh comments, and I do not use that language a lot around here, because one of two things is going to happen: Either the leadership of this House and the Rules Committee is refusing to allow us to address a fundamental and essential question of whether or not to have a program for the adjustment of 11 million or more people now in this country, who would come out of the shadows, be identified, deport the criminal aliens and find a way to condition those who are working in this society into coming out and giving us their true identities; and dealing with those who are working now.

I am sorry for cutting the gentleman short.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

The gentleman from California did not ask me to respond, but he suggested the bill is one of two things, but I suggest to him that, rather, it is a third thing.

This bill, indeed, is a response to the American people who are demanding we secure our borders first.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pretending that we are dealing with the problem is not dealing with the problem. This bill is going nowhere, fast, end of story.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to stay out of this debate, but the tone of the debate has made me angry. It never ceases to amaze me how many men will seize any opportunity to kick people when they are down.

Illegal immigrants have no legal rights in this country.

They have no economic power. They have no political leverage. But, if they did, this bill would not be on the floor today. Sure, we are a Nation of laws, but we are also a Nation of values and ideals, and it is those values and ideals that bond us together as a society and an economy.

Every single one of us, and I can say that because there are no Native Americans among us who are the children of immigrants, and whether they were legal or illegal was largely due to the accident of their birth, what country they were born in, what visa and immigration quotas applied and, the economic status of the people to whom they were born.

There is no sector of this economy that works harder for less compensation than undocumented aliens. There is no single group of workers that believe more in the American ideal than the people that we want to isolate and disown and marginalize today. They are here because they were willing to risk everything to forge a better future for their children, and that is what makes America great, because they believe in the American ideal; they believe that if they work hard enough, even though they will not be paid as much compensation as many of the people working beside them, but if they work hard enough, their children will have a better future, and that is why they are here.

I do not know any other sector of the American workforce that puts more money aside for the future of their children. That is what America is all about. It is not what this bill is about.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I see that my distinguished friend and your fellow colleague from Georgia could not resist. I see he joined us. Maybe I could talk some “Savannah talk” and “Brunswick talk” to get him to understand that people come through those areas, too, as I am sure he is mindful.

I do not know what it is we have here is enforcement, but none of the compassion that President Bush has been speaking about.

Let me tell you what the President said. I quoted him on Ellis Island in July of 2001. But August 24, the same year, here is what the President said in part: “And I remind people all across our country, family values do not stop at the Rio Bravo. There are people in New Mexico who have never been so worried about where they are going to get their next meal from, and they are going to come to the United States if they think they can make money here. That is a simple fact. And they are willing to walk across miles of desert to work that some Americans won’t do, and we have got to respect that, it seems like to me, and treat those people with respect.”

We ought to treat ourselves with respect, and have comprehensive immigration reform, and not some piece meal bumper sticker stuff that is not going to do anything other than give people an opportunity to go home to
Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what we are doing: We are going to create fear and confusion in the realm. And it is not all about 11 million illegal people, it is about a number of circumstances having to do with that knock on the door.

Defeat this rule.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the coast of Georgia (Mr. Kingston).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I thank my friend from Florida for his kind words. He is right, I could not resist the open microphone opportunity, but also the subject matter. The subject matter is important.

Is this rule perfect, and is this bill perfect? Certainly not. I remember and had the honor of serving when we did welfare reform. All kinds of emotions were flying in the air. And forthright it took us a number of different attempts and pieces of legislation to get to where we as a Nation thought we needed to go on welfare reform. As a result, there were 14 million people on welfare. That number was reduced down to 4 million and lots of good things happened with it, but we had to take that first step.

This is now the first step, or second step, if you will. It is overdue, in my opinion and the opinion of most Members on this side of the aisle. Certainly I see why we need to have a guest worker program. That is and how that is not just a logistical area. Certainly I see why we need to do something about immigration reform a long time ago.

Border security is integral to it. I do not live in a border State, where people pour over a river at night or walk across a desert, but I understand from our colleagues what a huge problem that is and how that is not just confined to immigrants from the country that is right next door to us, but other people who do not have anything to do with the U.S. who use it, as a highway, a transit corridor, to come into America. So we need to do something about border security.

But certainly I believe we need to do something about employer sanctions. We always blame illegal immigration on that 20-year-old migrant who is here trying to send money home for his family. We do not ever talk about our own employer, who has also broken the law by hiring. We need to have tools so that we can check the backgrounds of people before they hire them and then have penalties if they do not. I feel strongly about that.

Mr. Speaker, I represent an agricultural area. Certainly I see why we need to have a guest worker program. That is something I think we need to get to on a bipartisan basis, and we are going to have a great debate once we open that up.

But I strongly support this rule, and I am going to support the bill just to get the steps wing. I do not think there is any turning back now that we have done this first very significant piece of legislation. We are in the immigration debate, and we will be doing immigration reform, I think, for very many months to come, and there is plenty of room for bipartisan ideas.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard from the other side, and indeed from some Members on this side of the aisle, question what we are going to do with the 11 million illegal aliens are mostly working hard, supporting their families, law-abiding since they have been here.

As a physician Member of this body, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a medical analogy as to why we are approaching this in the manner that we are approaching it; that is, to secure, first and foremost, our borders. The medical analogy, indeed a surgical analogy, is this: The patient is our country, the United States of America. The surgeon is this Congress. During the surgical procedure, it is discovered that massive hemorrhaging is occurring, massive hemorrhaging. The analogy is the 500,000 illegal immigrants that come through our porous borders every year.

There is lots of blood in the field that the surgeon is concerned about. But does he or she spend their time, we, the Congress trying to mop up the blood before we stop the bleeding? If we do that, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the patient dies.

No. First and foremost you stop that hemorrhaging. And that is what we are doing in this bill. We are addressing with the blood that has been lost, that is in the suction bottle, if you will. And do we take that blood and pour it down the drain? No, Mr. Speaker, we do not, because that blood, and that is the 11 million people here working hard in this country, that has been the lifeblood of this patient, the United States of America, for a number of years.

So what we do, Mr. Speaker, in many instances in a surgical situation, we put that blood back into the patient, because we know that it has served the patient well. Then we restore the patient to perfect health.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are talking about. That is why we are addressing this issue in the timeline first and foremost, stop the hemorrhaging. If we do not, the patient dies.

Mr. Speaker. The Members have a solemn responsibility to protect the integrity of our borders, and inaction would be a dereliction of duty. The American people look to us as the stewards of our Nation’s security, and we must not let them down. I want to strongly support both this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this effort to make the most meaningful changes to our immigration enforcement in a decade. This legislation is long overdue, illegal immigration is spinning out of control, and we must act now to enact a tough and unified policy to effectively curb the influx of illegal aliens entering our Nation.

My district is in southern California. This region bears the brunt of our Nation’s failed immigration policies. California has the highest number of illegal immigrants residing in its borders. In fact, nearly 32 percent of the total number of illegal immigrants in the United States are in California. The tide of illegal immigration increases Californian’s tax burden, while weakening its legal, education and welfare system.

I am an original cosponsor of this bill because it lays a solid foundation to enhance our border security and our immigration laws. This is desperately needed. We must end policies that encourage illegal immigration.

I am disappointed that some of the other creative solutions that Members offered to address our failed immigration policies are not included under this Rule. I firmly believe these are important ideas that should be considered by Congress as we work to enforce and bolster our Nation’s immigration policies.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are doing in this bill. We are doing so to make a mockery of our nation’s security, and we cannot continue to allow illegal immigrants to make a mockery of our nation’s hospitality and our laws.

Conclusion: It is imperative that we close the loopholes that encourage citizens to infiltrate our porous borders. If the war on terrorism is to be ultimately successful, it is more important than ever that we take the necessary steps to tighten security at our borders and provide law enforcement agencies the tools they need to identify those individuals who enter or remain in the United States illegally.

I am pleased this bill is before us today so we can begin to address those failed policies.
which we have ignored for too long. As we move forward, we must reject all proposals that contain any and all forms of amnesty. Regarding lawbreakers will only weaken any proposal aimed at strengthening the system.

There should be no new guestworker program until we better enforce current immigration laws. History has shown that enforcement provisions are ignored and underfunded while guestworker and amnesty provisions are always implemented. The American people need to see that the current laws against illegal immigration are being enforced before any guestworker program can be considered.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Gillmor). The question is on the resolu-
tion.

The question was taken; and the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, I move that meetings of the conference between the House and the Senate on H.R. 1815 may be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information may be broached, provided that any Member of Congress shall be entitled to attend any meeting of the conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.