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

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 619, THE RULE FOR H. RES. 612 EXPRESSING THE COMMITMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 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 the 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 sovereign, 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 the December 15, 2005, election in Iraq inspires confidence that a robust, pluralistic democracy that will bring stability to Iraqi society is emerging: Now, therefore, be it

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 heroism permitted the Iraqi people to vote safely.

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

For the third time this year, courageous Iraqi citizens have enthusiastically exercised their democratic rights.

But successful elections do not, and cannot, obscure the devastating national tragedy that is the Iraq war.

It doesn't change the fact that over 2,100 Americans have died for weapons of mass destruction that never existed.

It doesn't change the fact that this war has turned Iraq into a hotbed of terrorist activity.

It doesn't change the fact that our troops are sitting ducks for the insurgents, who have been emboldened—not deterred—by our military presence in Iraq.

Here's the bottom line: a successful Iraqi election should, at the very least, reinforce the imperative of bringing our troops home. If Iraq is truly able to self-govern, then we have no business occupying their country and meddling in their affairs.

I've argued all year long that it's time to restore Iraqi sovereignty and give Iraq back to the Iraqi people. If the election is a watershed moment as the White House claims . . . then what is the continued justification for having our troops over there in harm's way?

Now is the time to enlist the support of the international community to establish an interim security force for Iraq. But that's just the start.

As I've written to the President in a letter signed by 61 other members of the House, the United States must also launch a ''diplomatic offensive,'' recasting our role in Iraq as reconstruction partner rather than military occupier.

We must also lead the way in establishing an international peace commission to oversee the post-war reconciliation and coordinate peace talks between Iraq's various factions.

The majority of the American people aren't behind it. Our global allies aren't behind it. The Iraqi people aren't behind it. Even Iraqi leaders—Sunni, Shiite and Kurdish alike, who agree on practically nothing—have united around a call for the United States military to leave.

With the Iraqi people having voted once again, let's offer the ultimate vote of confidence in their democracy. Let's reward the self-sufficiency they've demonstrated—by giving them their country back and bringing American soldiers home.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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.

□ 1030

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4437, BORDER PROTECTION, ANTITERRORISM, AND ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION CONTROL ACT OF 2005

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 621 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 621

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4437) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to strengthen enforcement of the immigration laws, to enhance border security, and for other purposes. No further general debate shall be in order, and remaining proceedings under House Resolution 610 shall be considered as subsumed by this resolution. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIll, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 621 is a structured rule providing for further consideration of the bill. It provides that no further general debate is in order, and the remaining proceedings under House Resolution 610 shall be considered as subsumed by this resolution. It makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying this resolution.

This resolution provides that the amendments printed in the report accompanying the resolution may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

It waives all points of orders against the amendments printed in the report and provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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 amendments offered 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 Chairmen 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 the 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 the employment 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 we will save and protect 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. HASTINGS 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 glows worldwide welcome.''

She goes on to say, ''Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp!'' With silent lips she cried. ''Give me your tired, your poor, 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 door.''

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 and toss all of those magnificent notions of diversity and this great golden door right out into the Hudson. Or maybe it is the Potomac River that we do so today.

I rise to express my strong opposition to this restrictive rule, the second in as many days, for a xenophobic bill masked in catchy phrases, such as ''border control'' and ''homeland security.''

This restrictive rule blocks all but a select few from offering amendments to the underlying legislation. The chairman of the Rules Committee was in here a minute ago and said that 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 them 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.''

We have an amendment dealing 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 live by. Hundreds of thousands of immigrants take the oath of citizenship every year.''

And I have had, me, I have had the pleasure of seeing them in tears, with their hands raised, on numerous occasions when I served in the Federal judiciary. And my colleagues in the Federal judiciary will tell you there is no greater feeling, except perhaps when we, in other roles as judges, are helping people to adopt a child, than to see a person adopt this country as their own.

''Each has come not only,'' President Bush says, ''to take, but to give. They come asking for a chance to work hard, support their families, and to rise in the world. And together they make our Nation more, not less, American. Immigration is not a problem to be solved, it is a sign of a confident and successful nation. And people who seek to make America their home should be met in that spirit by representatives of our government. New arrivals should be greeted not with suspicion and resentment but with openness and courtesy.''

I hope throughout the debate people hearken to the great commander in chief of this country.

At 6 a.m. this morning, 6 a.m., Mr. Speaker, those of us on the Rules Committee with our colleagues in the majority voted along party lines against the President and rejected an amendment that would have made the Kolbe-Berman-Gutierrez-Flake guest worker visa amendment in order.

Less than 24 hours ago, the chairman of the Rules Committee, my good friend from California, stood on this very floor noting that the Republican leadership was committed to debating the President's proposal during consideration of the underlying legislation.

□ 1045

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

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. Later we are going to vote on 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-au-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 despotism, 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.

Building a fence 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 measures. We have wet foot, dry foot, up foot, down foot, all kinds of policies that seem to come at the whim of whomever 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, the homeless, 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 comes through that 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 indeed is my friend, 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 security 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 what this 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.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and privileged to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) that doubtless has significant wisdom with regard to the matter we are debating.

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 future 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

country under the Bracero program to work to make this country great. He busted 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 poverty 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 lifeblood 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 toil 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 criminalizing 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.

□ 1100

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 his soaring rhetoric is still a 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 beckoning? 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 so that we address 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 bill is incomplete in that it does not deal in 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 become 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.

I fundamentally feel blessed to live in a nation that everyone else strives so hard to join. And we have to have an immigration policy that meets the needs of our economy and welcomes those people who want to bring positive, meaningful developments to our Nation and help them find a better life for themselves and their families; and this bill puts us on the path toward doing that.

But it is important that we recognize what is not in the bill, and before it becomes law what must, 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 3¾ minutes to the gentlemen from Arizona, Mr. HAYWORTH.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend from Georgia 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 this guest worker issue so we can fulfill the need for jobs, but I do not think that is something we should do right away.''

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 5 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

wait until the fence is completed on our southern border?

Fair questions to ask, fair questions to be debated.

I heard from my friend from Florida that he favors comprehensive reform. I would invite the leadership of this House to come to this floor and affirm that they would not support a conference report that includes a guest worker plan.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

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.

This is not included. 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. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule and I am opposed to this legislation. I do not think any of the Members here disagree that strong and safe borders are vital and important to the security of our country.

Throughout my career, I have consistently supported strengthening our borders. And while the Sensenbrenner bill does address part of our problems, it is not the comprehensive solution we must have. It does not solve or even acknowledge the problems of illegal immigrants. Therefore, this bill is half a loaf at best.

We can secure our borders and keep out illegal immigrants, and we should. But what about the 11 million-plus people here illegally who are, by and large, law-abiding members of our community? What about the 11 million-plus people who keep the hotels, restaurants, and construction sites and farms running in every State of this Union?

This bill is no solution for them and it is no solution for our country. Denial is more than a river in Egypt, it is alive and well here in the House of Representatives in the form of H.R. 4437.

If we continue to delay facing the reality of this challenge, the reality of the importance of immigrants who are not here legally to our economy, then I urge those of you who decide to vote for this measure to be prepared to face the wrath of business people in your towns and cities throughout this country.

They will want to know why you voted to place the financial liability of document verification on them. They will want to know why you have made them a de facto agent of the Federal Government. They will want to know why you voted to require them to follow a system that makes them liable for thousands of dollars of fines when they are simply trying to run their businesses.

They will want to know why you voted to cripple tourism industries, home construction and farms, by refusing to confront the undeniable evidence that 11 million immigrants here illegally are making a difference.

My colleagues, we all acknowledge that the status quo of illegal immigration is unacceptable. Therefore, I implore you to act on a comprehensive solution, not the politics of division. This should not be a wedge issue. After all, lest we forget, we are a nation of immigrants.

I am the grandson of immigrants. Our failure to act now is not responsible. Therefore, I must oppose this measure.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlemen from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER).

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am going to support 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 educating illegals, that are 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 1990s, that changed. You had labor 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 wages were 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 else who is willing to undercut 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.

□ 1115

The wrath of the business people in this country was discussed. I am worried 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 our highways and freeways, 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. Is 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, what responsibility we have to the workers of the United States of America who have lost their jobs or, instead of being paid $22 an hour are now having to work for $11 an hour? Tell that to that carpenter.

I go to job sites in this country, and the guys are pouring concrete, they are framing, and nobody on the job site, except the foreman, speaks English. Now, you tell that to the carpenter who lost his job or had his wage cut in half. You tell that to the electrician or the plumber or the framer or the roofer who have had their wages cut in half and lost many benefits because somebody is willing to come here to better

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 divide 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 from many 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 history from 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 protecting 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 the very 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 that they do not 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 earned access to legalization. Get the 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 Americans 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 regarding immigration reform, 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 here wanted an amendment that would be made in order 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 and virtually every Member of this institution has expressed the need to have a temporary worker program at some point in order to secure the border. Yet some said they would vote against the legislation if it was included here. Gratefully, the Senate will not need a ''sense of the Congress'' resolution to understand what they have to do, and that is to include a temporary worker program.

The elephant in the middle of the room, of course, is the 11 million illegals who are here. Without a temporary worker program, we will continue to turn a blind eye to their existence, to pretend that they are not here. Nobody in this body, not one, is advocating that we round up and deport those who are here illegally now, but unless we have a program for them to go into, we simply will not enforce the law. And that is the dirty little secret here. We ought to at least be honest with our constituents in this regard.

There are some who will vote against the 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 doing is to send this legislative vehicle, however flawed, to the Senate with the hope that they will act with the maturity that we lack.

One would be justified in either approach.

Mr. Speaker, today is not a red-letter day for this great and storied institution. Rather than do what we know must be done regarding immigration reform, we are punting the ball to the Senate—hoping that they will have the courage to act in ways that we cannot.

Many of us in this body asked for an amendment made in order that would make this legislation comprehensive, in other words, an amendment that would provide for enhanced border security, increased interior enforcement, and would provide a legal framework for foreign workers to enter the country and then return home.

It is unfortunate that this amendment was not made in order. In doing so we ensured that this body will play a diminished role, at best, moving ahead immigration reform.

If the denial of this amendment was unfortunate, the removal of language in the manager's amendment that references the role that a temporary worker program will 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 such a 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'll pretend 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 to rounding up the entire population of 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 please the people we do what we ourselves disprove, how will we then defend our work?'' That is the question for us today.

There are some who will vote against this rule and underlying legislation in the hope that we will later do something more comprehensive. Some will vote for this rule and underlying legislation with resignation that all we are capable of is to send a legislative vehicle,

however flawed, to the Senate with the hope that they will act with the maturity we lack.

One would be justified in either approach.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), who has an extraordinary amount of experience in the area that we are debating.

Mr. BERMAN. 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. DREIER, 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 where they 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 future shortages and a temporary guest worker program, particularly for seasonal industries. The refusal to do that tells me that J.D. HAYWORTH is right.

There is one of two agendas here. One agenda is the agenda that Mr. PUTNAM and that Mr. FLAKE hoped for, and that is we will pass a bill with a number of really some very silly and harsh provisions; the Senate will clean those up, turn it into a comprehensive approach; and the people here who have been screaming the word ''amnesty'' for any effort to solve this problem will now be forced to come back and cast a vote for it.

I do not think that is what is going to happen. This bill will probably pass today, and we will never again in this Congress see the immigration issue. And guys will go back to their districts, and they will talk about how they tried to get tough on the border and they tried to do something.

This is not a border enforcement bill. There is a case that we could try to do some things on the border to be more effective than we have been. When this bill tries to deal with employer verification in the context to our 11 million people in this country who are working without documents or without work status, we know it can never go into effect. We have to either deal with that and then do employer verification, which is the critical component of a comprehensive approach, or we are never going to pass this bill into law.

So what I would like to do is have Mr. DREIER or Mr. PUTNAM, and I do not know how they want to do it, if they would be willing to, explain to me what the fairness is of not letting this body decide, and J.D. HAYWORTH has one view, HOWARD BERMAN has another view, but decide whether or not on a critically important issue that the President has spoken of the need for, others have denounced, why we cannot have a debate and a vote on that kind of a program.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank my chairman for allowing me to respond.

The gentleman made the statement that this is not a border enforcement bill, and I would disagree and say that it is a border enforcement bill. It is not a comprehensive immigration reform bill.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, just to clarify, there are provisions about border enforcement in this bill, but when you implement, as this bill pretends to do, a massive comprehensive verification system, that has nothing to do with border protection. That is about ensuring that no one gets hired who is here without status. We cannot do that with 11 million people in this country, many of whom 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.

□ 1130

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 in this body, every single one of us 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 parents 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.

Mr. Speaker, basically what 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, and he was eloquent 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 Mexico who have got children who are 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 do 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 piecemeal bumper sticker stuff that is not going to do anything other than give people an opportunity to go home to

say that we did something about immigration.

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. GINGREY. 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 flowing back and forth, and 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 people. Lots and lots of positive 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 a bipartisan basis. We should have done 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 that country, 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 employers 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 going. 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 or so illegals who 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 great 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 continue to 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. Then you deal 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 that are 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, we in the Congress 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 encourage my colleagues to support both this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. 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 enforce our current 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.

For example, Representative NATHAN DEAL's amendment to deny citizenship to children born in the United States to illegal immigrants was not made in order. Providing automatic citizenship to the children of illegal aliens is an incentive for illegal immigration and we must close this loophole.

Three amendments that I offered, but were not made in order under this Rule, would have discouraged illegal crossings by eliminating incentives and providing tough interior enforcement.

Allowing all counties to be reimbursed for detaining and transferring illegal aliens: One amendment I submitted would allow all counties to be promptly reimbursed for the costs associated with assisting Federal immigration officials. Immigration affects all counties in the United States, not just those within 25 miles of the southern border. All counties absorb the costs of detaining, housing, and transporting illegal aliens.

Prohibiting illegal aliens from obtaining mortgages: Another amendment I submitted would require lenders to verify that mortgage credit applicants are U.S. citizens or legally present in the U.S. Allowing individuals who are here illegally to participate in the homebuying process only incentivizes illegal immigration. White picket fences shouldn't go to those who break down our fences to get in.

Outlawing birth tours: The last amendment I submitted would prohibit any alien from entering the United States with the intention of giving birth. It is truly disturbing that an entire industry has built up around the U.S. system of birthright citizenship. Each year, thousands of near-term pregnant women come to the United States from countries across the world for the sole purpose of giving birth so their newborns can become U.S. citizens. 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. Rewarding 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 resolution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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.

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 1815, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006, WHEN CLASSIFIED NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION IS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Mrs. DRAKE. 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 sitting Member of Congress shall be entitled to attend any meeting of the conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, the motion is not debatable, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to close conference meetings will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1815; the motion for the previous question on H. Res. 619; adoption of H. Res. 619, if ordered; adoption of H. Res. 621; and the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Con. Res. 294.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 12, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 642]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—12

Blumenauer
DeFazio
Hinchey
Kucinich
Lee
Lewis (GA)
McDermott
McKinney
Olver
Stark
Waters
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—12

Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Davis, Jo Ann
Diaz-Balart, M.
Hyde
Istook
LaHood
McCarthy
Napolitano
Payne
Pearce
Sweeney

□ 1206

Mr. BUYER and Mr. ACKERMAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1815, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 1815 offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 187, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 643]

YEAS—228

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza