

federal license to be in the food business. Registration of food processing facilities was originally envisioned as a commonsense way of helping the FDA identify facilities under the bioterrorism act in 2002. This bill turns it into a license to operate, making it unlawful to sell food without a registration license and allowing the FDA to suspend a company's registration. This is the type of government intrusion into commerce that Americans rejected in early November.

Another provision of particular concern would mandate the Food and Drug Administration to set on-farm production performance standards. For the first time, we would have the Federal government prescribing how our farmers grow crops. Farming, the growing of crops and raising of livestock, is the first organized activity pursued by man. We've been doing it for a long time. And we've been doing it without the FDA.

The vast majority of these provisions, along with recordkeeping requirements, traceability, and mandatory recall authority, will do absolutely nothing to prevent food-borne disease outbreaks from occurring, but will do plenty to keep federal bureaucrats busy. And these are all of the sorts of things that can be worked out through the normal legislative process. But only if there's a process.

Mr. Speaker, let me return to where I started: we have the safest food supply in the world. Anyone who follows current events knows that our food production system faces ongoing food safety challenges and I stand ready to work with my colleagues to address those challenges.

Our nation's farmers, ranchers, packers, processors, retailers, and consumers deserve better.

Mr. DINGELL. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of this motion is postponed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Under the rules of the House, when is it proper to request a rollcall vote on the item just debated?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings resume, the question will be put to a voice vote.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. When might that be, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will have to consult with leadership.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 5281, DEVELOPMENT, RELIEF, AND EDUCATION FOR ALIEN MINORS ACT OF 2010

Mr. POLIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-677) on the resolution (H. Res. 1756) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5281) to amend title 28,

United States Code, to clarify and improve certain provisions relating to the removal of litigation against Federal officers or agencies to Federal courts, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1756 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1756

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5281) to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify and improve certain provisions relating to the removal of litigation against Federal officers or agencies to Federal courts, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendments numbered 1 and 2, and that the House concur in the Senate amendment numbered 3 with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

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

Mr. POLIS. For purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Dr. FOXX. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1756.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the DREAM Act is one of the most important pieces of legislation that I have ever discussed on the floor of the House. It means everything to hundreds of thousands of de facto Americans. To them and to all of us, it is supremely important and supremely urgent. We have a choice between forcing a brain drain from our country or retaining the best and brightest to contribute to our country and make it stronger and more prosperous.

The young people covered under this bill are the children any parent would be proud of—our sons and daughters, our neighbors, our classmates, prom kings and queens, football players, and cheerleaders—who stayed in school,

played by the rules, graduated, worked hard, and stayed out of trouble. They are the children of our great Nation.

We, too, should be proud—not proud of the broken and dysfunctional immigration system and lack of enforcement that put them in this situation, not proud of their parents' violations of our immigration laws, no matter how out of touch with reality those laws may be, not proud of the indignities, discrimination and fear that these young people have faced at every turn—but of how these young Americans have overcome adversity and have demonstrated

American exceptionalism, their pluck, ingenuity, ambition, drive, and creativity in pursuit of, as our Declaration of Independence puts it, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. These dreamers embody the very best among our American values, and we should be proud to call them countrymen.

This is a great Nation, and we will be greater still, stronger still, and more prosperous still with the full participation of these young men and women, each with the opportunity to go as far in life as their ambitions and abilities take them.

To be clear: The DREAM Act would provide conditional status to only a very limited number of individuals who meet ALL of the following standards. They must:

1. Have been brought to the United States when they were 15 years old or younger;
2. Have lived in the United States for not less than 5 years before the date of enactment;
3. Have been a person of good moral character, as defined by the Immigration and Nationality Act;
4. Have graduated from an American high school or obtained a GED;
5. Be 29 years old or younger on the date of enactment;
6. Submit biometric information;
7. Undergo security and law-enforcement background checks;
8. Undergo a medical examination; and
9. Register for the Selective Service.

Only after 10 years in this conditional status, could recipients apply for legal permanent residence. In order to adjust their status they must:

1. Have completed 2 years of college; or
2. Have served in the U.S. Armed Forces for at least 2 years and, if discharged, has received an honorable discharge;
3. Demonstrate the ability to read, write, and speak English;
4. Have maintained good moral character throughout the 10-year conditional period; and
5. Pay all back taxes owed.

This debate is about Zandy.

Zandy was brought to the United States when she was four from Zacatecas, Mexico. Zandy grew up in the United States, and found out that her parents took her here illegally when she was 9, because one of her friends was flying to Montana and their family invited her, but her parents told her she couldn't go because she didn't have papers. Zandy went to prom senior year, "it was really cool," she said, "finally my mom let me and I wanted to look pretty for prom, I didn't have a date so me and my friends went to the fair."

Zendy has a passion for law enforcement. As she put it, "I want to help stop the drug cartels." Zendy, who is currently enrolled at the Community College of Denver, wants to be a DEA agent. Our decision today will determine if she engages in law enforcement to protect our laws, or she is pursued by law enforcement in violation of our laws. Will we create an agent of public safety, or will we criminalize a young woman because of actions that were not her own. Will we allow Zendy to become someone who protects us, or someone we must waste money criminalizing.

What benefits America more?

"I want to be in law enforcement and doing what I want to do in my life."

Mr Speaker, we want Zendy as an American.

This debate is about Claudia.

Claudia is 21 years old now, and is a 3rd year college student at University of New Mexico. She attends college in New Mexico because unfortunately Colorado doesn't offer in-state tuition. She was brought here when she was 7 years old. In high school, she was vice president of the Latino Youth Leadership Club and engaged in hundreds of hours of community service tutoring younger kids.

Claudia enjoyed tutoring younger children, and wants to be an early childhood education teacher, teaching preschool and kindergarten.

She has no immediate family in Guadalajara, Mexico, where her family took her from. She was brought up here, doesn't remember much from there.

Claudia is a role model for her 11-year-old younger sister.

"I actually feel discriminated, it is sad that we are looked upon differently than other people even though we've been here long enough to know everything. This law would help me be near my family."

Claudia would transfer to University of Colorado, closer to her family, if the Dream Act passes, and poses the question for us: Put yourself in my situation: What would you do? What's the right thing to do?

Mr. Speaker, we want Claudia as an American.

This debate is about Luis.

Luis was brought to the United States by his parents when he was ten years old in 2001. He grew up as American as anyone else, he was active in French Club and was on the varsity soccer team at Skyline High School. He was accepted into UNC but couldn't attend because of lack of status. He wants to be a psychiatrist but is not in school because of his immigration status, accepted to UNC, went to classes, dorms, couldn't go. There was "never a difference between me and my peers," he says.

Luis wants to be a psychologist. Luis also seems to have a potential career ahead of him as a pundit, or perhaps even in public service or as a, g-d forbid, lobbyist. He said, without any malice, "I might add in truly in the nature of trying to understand motivations and work with them. Many of the Republicans are looking into the money side of things, they won't listen to someone like me, what I would tell them is they should look at us not as a burden but as someone who will brighten their future. We are here and we're not going to go anywhere, and we're going to make this country better, create jobs and make the economy better."

"America", said Luis, is "the place where you can make things happen."

In a day of age in which we suffer from a national malaise of laziness, what better infusion of ingenuity can we attain than under the Dream Act?

Mr. Speaker, we want Luis as an American.

This debate is about Angel.

Angel, is a senior in high school in my district in Colorado. His parents brought him from Zacatecas, Mexico when he was six years old. In High School, he is very active and serves on the student council and in the Theater Club. He won an essay contest a couple years ago, and got a trip to NYC where he told me how excited he was to meet members of the cast of *Wicked*. The four days he spent in NYC helped manifest in Angel a keen interest in the arts, and he wants to go to college for performing arts.

He is 19 years old, and serves as a role model for his brother, who is in the same situation and is 14 years old and was brought here when he was one. Angel has no memories of any other country and has never been back to Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, we want Angel as an American.

This debate is about Michelle.

Michelle was brought to the United States at age 7, her little sister had skin disease caused by pollution in Mexico City. Good life, dad was a lawyer, mom stayed home, now clean homes.

Michelle is now in her 1st semester at Community College of Denver. She attended Fairview High School and was on the Nova girls soccer team as a forward. She also won an award from our Boulder Youth Advisory board, or YOAB, for greatest helper in the Boulder community because of her community service. She credited one of her teachers, Mrs. Carpenter, for helping her get involved with community service including Rotary Club.

Michelle has never been back to Mexico City, and is now 18 years old. She found out was undocumented, in 8th grade, when she wanted to go on a trip to Washington DC with her school, nations capital, school trip.

After completing her requirements, she would like to transfer to study marine biology.

"I would love to study marine biology but am not sure what they wont let me because of my situation," she said.

If not marine biology, then a teacher.

"My life is here now. It's not our decision to come here but we came and we're studying and we're trying make our lives better than our parents and to make a good life for ourselves. They are stopping the dreams for students who don't have papers. I don't know if they want us to work in McDonald's or Wendy's, I don't know what they want us to do, they aren't letting us reach our goals or our dreams."

Mr. Speaker, we want Michelle as an American.

Constituent service is one of the most fulfilling components of our job. Regardless of party, regardless of the ideology of our districts, or our own ideologies, we are fundamentally in this business to help people to a person. When a veteran of a war is wrongly denied their benefits, we go to bat for them and help them cut through the bureaucratic impasse and get what they have earned by serving our country, or when we help a constituent stay in their home by identifying an alternative to foreclosure. What thrill can top that?

And then, Mr. Speaker, there are those who we are unable to help.

Chih Tsung Kao is 24. His story starts when he was 4. He entered the States with his mother with a visitor's visa, which was later changed to a student visa. "I was basically dropped off at my grandmother's in Boulder, Colorado as my mother left back for Taiwan." During his stay with his paternal grandparents, his student visa status expired due to their negligence. Chih was 17 before he learned that his visa had expired. Since then, he's looked for different legal routes to obtain some sort of legal status; all leading to dead ends.

Chih is a college graduate with a Civil Engineering degree from the Colorado School of Mines in Golden, Colorado. He is currently serving in the Taiwanese military due to their conscription policy, and is trying to readjust to his new life there. This is how he describes his new life: I am illiterate in Chinese, which makes simple, everyday tasks here in the military difficult. I am also trying to learn basic spoken Chinese. . . . I can't even understand their basic commands here, and only move when others move. I will see how they will utilize me after my basic training ends and I am assigned a new post . . . but many superiors have told me they're not sure what they will be doing with me.

Chih contacted my office for help, but I was impotent to intervene and America lost this great mind, this great contributor, this engineer. Chih knows that the Dream Act comes too late for him, but told me to share his story with you, because, as he put it, "The Dream Act may not affect me, I know that it will greatly benefit those that are in similar situations as I was. Many of them are students who strive to contribute to the workforce legally. I hope this letter helps paint a small piece of a larger picture for those that don't understand the situation and the feeling of helplessness many students and young people have in the States. It's a hard thing, feeling like the country you consider home, doesn't want you in the country at all."

Visualize the image, Mr. Speaker, of a young man, with an engineering degree from Colorado's premier engineering school, forced to serve in the military of a foreign country where he knows no one, trying to obey orders in a language he doesn't even understand.

This is a waste of human capital, a waste of our public taxpayer money, to spend hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars educating Chih only to force him to serve in a military of a country he doesn't even speak the language of. It's farcical. It's absurd. And it happens every day and the Dream Act will solve it. For all of us in this body, Chih is the one we couldn't help.

We hold their futures in our hands. Mr. Speaker, please don't put us in the position of having to go back to them, yet again, and say not yet, when we all know it is inevitable. And this debate is about how to make our country stronger, more secure, more prosperous. This debate is about our values. This debate is about Zendy, Luis, this debate is about our Country and our future. I encourage my colleagues to do what they know to be the right thing.

Over \$70,000 of taxpayer money was invested in Michelle. Now it's our choice. Do we want her to be a respected marine biologist or an illegal immigrant cleaning buildings for \$6/hour? It's up to us. Which is better for us? For our nation?

What would you do in their shoes?

In our shoes, what do we want them to do to better ourselves and our nation?

In consigning a future scientist who may discover the cure to cancer to clean offices at 2 in the morning at minimum wage, we deprive ourselves of the cure to cancer.

"There is a million-dollar difference, over a lifetime, between the earning capacity of a high school graduate and a college graduate. Research also shows that people who go to college are healthier, are more likely to volunteer and to participate in their community, and are less likely to be incarcerated or rely on public assistance. . . . It is imperative that action be taken in 2010 to finally make college education available to these qualified graduates of U.S. high schools."—Michael Crow, President, Arizona State University.

"The DREAM Act would throw a lifeline to these students who are already working hard in our middle and high schools and living in our communities by granting them the temporary legal status that would allow them to pursue postsecondary education. I believe it is in our best interest to educate all students to their full potential—It vastly improves their lives and grows our communities and economy."—Drew Gilpin Faust, President, Harvard University.

The Dream Act will finally help eliminate the achievement gap in our schools, and inspire other students by upping the ante. Secretary Duncan said it well:

"Passing the Dream Act will unleash the full potential of young people who live out values that all Americans cherish—a strong work ethic; service to others; and a deep loyalty to our country. It will also strengthen our military, bolster our global economic competitiveness and increase our educational standing in the world."

The Dream Act will finally help eliminate the achievement gap in our schools, and inspire other students by upping the ante.

The theme of my service in Congress is human capital issues. Improving our schools, increasing access to higher education. Taking on entrenched interests where necessary to increase our human capital. The flip side of the education aspect of developing our human capital is immigration. Not only do we want to grow the next generation of global leaders at home, we want to import the best and brightest from around the world. And we keep shooting ourselves in our own foot in this regard. We lost Chih, not because of him, but because of us. We turned a highly trained taxpayer-financed engineer into an incompetent enlistee in a foreign military. Brilliant.

The DREAM Act provides students powerful incentives to stay in school, do well and graduate. It is a practical step toward realizing a return on the U.S. public education system's investment in immigrant youths. A 2010 study by the UCLA North American Integration and Development Center estimates that the total earnings of DREAM Act beneficiaries over the course of their working lives would be between \$1.4 trillion and \$3.6 trillion.

We want them working in America. We want these potential high-earning tax payers to stay in our country and boost our economy.

A 2007 study by the Alliance for Excellent Education estimates that each high school dropout cost the nation approximately \$260,000 in lost taxes and productivity. State and local economies suffer when they have

less educated populaces. The nation's economy and competitive standing also suffer when there are high dropout rates.

Failure to pass the Dream Act will lead to a brain drain of our own making, a drain in which the very best of a generation, the college bound, the graduate school bound, the doctors and servicemen, scientists and poets are given a terrible choice: Go to a distant land where you have no connection, or stay here and work in the underground unskilled labor market.

The DREAM Act would also improve our national security. Leaders from the armed services have been nearly unanimous in their support of this bill because they recognize that it would help the military "shape and maintain a mission-ready All Volunteer Force." Former Secretary of State General Collin Powell and military leaders from both parties have spoken up in support of the DREAM Act. Defense Secretary Robert Gates said the DREAM Act would improve "military recruiting and readiness" and the U.S. Department of Defense Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness has gone as far as including the DREAM Act in its strategic plan.

It is difficult to make moral arguments that change minds in this chamber. Members of Congress, like Americans as a whole, come from various faith traditions including Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Buddhism, agnosticism, and atheism, and of course various strains of orthodoxy within their tradition.

However, there is no other area of law in which a young minor, a two year old, is culpable.

A. (Deuteronomy 24:16)—"Fathers shall not be put to death for their sons, nor shall sons be put to death for their fathers; everyone shall be put to death for his own sin."

B. (Ezekiel 18:20)—"The person who sins will die. The son will not bear the punishment for the father's iniquity, nor will the father bear the punishment for the son's iniquity; the righteousness of the righteous will be upon himself, and the wickedness of the wicked will be upon himself."

There is no moral code prevalent in Judeo-Christian thought that suggests that it is moral for humanity to visit the sins of the father upon the son. Our values are reflected in our legal code: When someone dies, their debts are not passed down to the son or daughter. When an adult is pulled over for speeding, no ticket is given to the two year old riding in the child-seat in back. But that is exactly what some are advocating here. Ticket the two year old who was along for the ride, they say. What they were doing was illegal. The child was speeding. Regardless of one's faith, punishing the wrong person for a crime, because of a blood relation, defies our ethical sense.

Ticketing the two year old makes no more sense than penalizing a child for passively being brought here by their parents. A two year old, a five year old, an eleven year old is not only not competent to make such a choice, but even if you assumed that they were, they are in practice unable to economically or socially separate from the family unit that provides for their sustenance. A child must go with his or her parents, there is nothing else a child can do. We don't even go up to 18, the age of majority, with this bill. To eliminate any question, we admit that a 17 year old, a 16 year old, should somehow know better, and leave their parents and home and

support structure if their parents try to take them somewhere illegally. That's a bad assumption. It breaks my heart that we had to make that concession, because I know 16 year olds, 17 year olds, Madam Speaker, and think of some of the 16 year olds you know. Are they really mature and capable enough to leave their parents and survive completely on their own? Perhaps some are, but to make this bill even less controversial we set the maximum age at 15. Which means a 16 year old is supposed to competently make a decision to leave his parents if they choose to immigrate illegally. That's the concession we made to get this bill passed. No one can argue that an 8 year old or 12 year old is capable of what we expect a 17 year old to have done under this bill. The lack of a DREAM Act mechanism is immoral for our nation, and forces underage children to bear the heavy costs of their parents' decisions to violate our laws.

One argument I hear is that the DREAM Act will only encourage more illegal immigration. That argument shows a profound lack of understanding about what brings immigrants here. First of all, the illegal immigrants in question already came here without a DREAM Act. Illegal immigrants will continue to come here and stay here as long as we continue to make a mockery of immigration enforcement, and as long as they can earn more money here. We have no meaningful workplace enforcement. Comprehensive immigration reform, and I'm proud to say I'm a co-sponsor of the House bill, would have solved that. We could have reduced the number of illegal immigrants from around 15 million to close to zero. But we did not. So we are where we are, and we are not talking about comprehensive immigration reform today, instead we are talking about one of the politically easiest, most economically important, and most morally pressing element of immigration reform: recognizing the hundreds of thousands of *de facto* Americans, who were brought here as minors without their knowledge or consent and that our taxpayer dollars have educated 30 and will be living their lives in our nation as legal entities with the potential to eventually attain the full rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

Passing the DREAM Act would reduce the number of illegal immigrants by over 500,000.

Those who oppose the DREAM Act support the ongoing presence of over 500,000 more illegal immigrants within our borders. Opponents of the DREAM Act make a travesty of the rule of law and facilitate the ongoing presence of undocumented foreign nationals inside our country, which hurts the budgets of counties, cities, and so frustrates the states with good reason. Opponents of the DREAM act would make a criminal, rather than a police officer, out of Zandy.

States like Arizona have taken actions against illegal immigration precisely because of the size of this issue, and Congress's failure to do anything about. Well, finally we have a chance to cut illegal immigration by about 5 percent. That's substantial. I'd rather cut it by 100 percent, but 5 percent. It's something we can be proud of—a legitimate first step to show the American people that we are serious about solving this problem. At the same time, it will strengthen our economy, improve our schools, make money for taxpayers, and help restore the rule of law to our nation.

Some opponents of the bill have charged that this bill is being pushed through without

sufficient time to review it. This is hard to understand considering the bill was introduced nearly 10 years ago, and has been introduced into every subsequent Congress. In spite of this, a great deal of misinformation has recently been spreading regarding this bill. In order to set the record straight, let us explicitly address some of these concerns.

Opponents of this bill have claimed it has not received a CBO score, when in fact it has. CBO found that the DREAM Act would reduce the deficit by 1.7 billion dollars over ten years.

CBO SCORE

H.R. 6497 would affect federal revenues in a number of ways. The increase in authorized workers would affect individual and corporate income taxes, as well as social insurance taxes. On balance, those changes would increase revenues by \$1.7 billion over 10 years, according to estimates provided by the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT). Newly authorized workers also would be eligible for some refundable tax credits. CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 6497 would decrease net direct spending by about \$500 million over the 2011–2020 period. That amount reflects changes in spending for refundable tax credits, Social Security, Medicare, student loans, and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). DHS would charge fees to certify legal status under the bill. Homeland Security (DHS). DHS would charge individuals fees to certify their legal status under the bill. The department's costs to implement the bill would be covered by those fees. Under the proposal, DHS also would impose a surcharge on individuals seeking to obtain or renew their conditional nonimmigrant status. DHS would not be authorized to spend those surcharges. CBO has not completed an estimate of the legislation's potential effects on discretionary spending, but any such effects would probably be small.

I expect all Members who are serious about the deficit will enthusiastically vote for this bill.

The DREAM Act would not extend any special benefits to beneficiaries. The bill specifically excludes them during the 10-year conditional period from receiving any government subsidies to participate in the health insurance exchanges created by the Affordable Care Act. Those with conditional status also would be ineligible for Medicaid, Food Stamps and other entitlement programs.

States will still have the authority to decide who is eligible for public higher education benefits based on residency. If a state provides eligibility for in-state tuition to DREAM beneficiaries in the state and they choose to attend a public university outside of the state, they will pay the same rates as other out-of-state students.

Students may only access benefits that they work for, or pay for. DREAM beneficiaries are only eligible for federal student loans (which must be paid back), and federal work-study programs, where they must work for any benefit they receive. Students are prohibited from obtaining Pell or other federal grants.

To be clear: recipients of the DREAM would not be able to receive any federal funds. These concessions were not easy to make. While painful, however, these are fair concessions to ease the concerns regarding this bill. For opponents to continue their obstructionism demonstrates a clear lack of interest in actually solving our immigration challenges.

In my state of Colorado, 46,000 young people will be eligible, according to one study.

These young people are an untapped resource for my state that would boost the local economies of where they live.

Our decision before us today is clear, we can either create a marine scientist to contribute to our country and increase our knowledge, or create an illegal immigrant out of Claudia.

Our nation deserves more scientists and engineers, not more illegal immigrants.

I also want to pose two questions, one is what would we ask of them (what do we want them to do), the second is, what is best for us and our country?

Claudia posed it well "What do they want us to do?" Instead of going to college or serving in the military, Are we telling Claudia and the others to clean buildings at night? Are we telling them to become nannies, construction workers, housekeepers or other occupations available to undocumented immigrants because of our lax enforcement? Or are we telling her to go to a country where she knows no one and has never been in her memory, where she barely speaks the language and would be lost and unable to work? I want Claudia to be the best darn Marine Scientist in the United States and to make great scientific discoveries that benefit humanity and improve our knowledge of the oceans. For those who oppose the DREAM Act, what do you want Claudia to do?

And what serves us best? What serves our interests best? Is it Claudia working illegally as a housekeeper? Is it her leaving our nation after we've invested tens of thousands of dollars of taxpayer money in her education? Wouldn't it be more beneficial to our country to allow her to live up to her potential here with the rights and responsibilities of an American. These stateless young people will be a credit to their nation, let's make it our nation.

Madam Speaker, this debate is about Ray. Ray was brought here when she was two years old. Her parents told her that she was born in the United States so she wouldn't feel the stigma of being foreign born. So Ray grew up not knowing she was foreign born until she was a teenager. Ray wanted to be involved with the fashion industry. Her tough, can-do attitude led her to start her own lace business. Unfortunately, Ray is no longer with us, but don't fret, this immigrant story ends happily. Ray Keller, my great grandmother, passed away at the age of 98 in 1989. Without friendly immigration laws that allowed people to naturalize, I wouldn't be standing here before you today, as a member of the United States Congress. So too, there are future generations of Americans, including I'm sure future members of this body, who are relying on our vote today to recognize their forebears as the excellent Americans that they already are in all but name. Madam Speaker, Ray Keller was a proud American.

I encourage my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding time.

Today, I rise in opposition to the rule for H.R. 6497, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is anyone on our side of the aisle who isn't empathetic to the fact that the

youth brought to America as children did not come here illegally of their own accord. I certainly feel that way.

However, the majority of immigrants come to America because of what our Nation stands for, which is rooted in our foundation—the cornerstone being our rule of law. In order to maintain our liberties and freedom, Congress must always respect and preserve the rule of law. We must exercise our principles in fairness, not inequity; and I would argue that amnesty is not fairness but a direct assault on the rule of law.

Our immigration system is in disarray, and any immigration legislation we consider should begin with securing the border and should go through regular order.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. CASTOR of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding and rise in support of the DREAM Act.

I rise today in support of thousands of Florida students—and families and businesses throughout my community—who will benefit under the Dream Act.

Our great nation is built fundamental principles of liberty, equality and opportunity.

These values apply to all, except for a small group of young people who have been stuck in limbo through no fault of their own and face obstacles to education and productivity.

Young woman from central Florida came to the U.S. from Costa Rica with her family when she was very young. She graduated from an arts magnet school with a 4.2 GPA. She was accepted to every school she applied to, but she couldn't attend any because tuition was too high and she didn't qualify for financial aid. The Dream Act will help.

Armwood High School valedictorian who faced obstacles as he tried to get college financial aid and scholarships. Despite perfect grades, he had a tough time getting the financial help he needed.

Young woman I know who was born in Mexico City. She grew up with only her mother after she was brought to America as a baby. Despite stellar grades in high school, she was ineligible for in-state college tuition.

"It would have given me a lot more opportunities," she says. "It would have made me part of the fabric of this country that I have lived in my whole life and that I have contributed to my whole life."

In Florida, in-state tuition costs about \$5,200 per year, but out-of-state at the University of South Florida, \$16,000. At the University of Florida, it exceeds \$25,000. The Dream Act will breathe new life into the hopes and dreams of young people who only know America as their home. We need to support and encourage higher education, instead of preventing and discouraging these teens from attending college.

The Dream Act would allow students who entered the United States before their 16th birthday, who have lived in the country for at

least five years, who are in good moral standing and who have graduated from high school to be classified as permanent residents and pursue a path toward citizenship. As permanent residents, they would be able to apply for in-state tuition and federal student financial aid, enabling them to pursue the American Dream of higher education.

Young adults could also earn conditional permanent residency status if they complete two years in the military.

I am proud to co-sponsor this vital legislation and look forward to its swift passage so we can help put our hard-working and intelligent students on the road to citizenship.

□ 1730

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank my friend.

I think it's unfortunate the way that the majority leadership has treated this issue when, Mr. Speaker, you see that after bringing the stimulus and the cap-and-trade and the health care legislation and all of the political capital that the President and this majority leadership had has been exhausted; and after receiving that defeat at the polls, after all that they bring this legislation to the floor.

I think the process is most unfortunate. And the way in which they have handled this legislation, Mr. Speaker, shows the lack of interest that they have had in it. That doesn't negate, however, the fact that the legislation is extremely important. If there is anything that distinguishes the United States of America—I think in an appropriate and in an admirable way—it is that we are a meritocracy. You stand or you fall in the United States of America based on your own decisions, not the decisions of your parents or your grandparents or their grandparents. Your decisions determine your reputation in the United States of America.

So what we are dealing with in this legislation is who we are dealing with, number one, the kind of immigration that we work day in and day out to try to attract and retain in the United States, college-educated people who have become so after extraordinary hard work.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, after thinking about what we are trying to do, it all boils down to the decisions. I referred previously to the fact that the United States is distinguished by the fact that the American people stand or fall based on our own decisions. What are the decisions that those students who we're dealing with in this legislation have made in their lives? They didn't make the decision to come to the United States out of status. The only decisions that they have made in their lives have been to work hard, to study hard, to make our communities proud. This legislation seeks to give them an opportunity to make their situation regular, normal so that they

can contribute even more to the greatness of this Nation.

At the end of the day, despite the unfortunate process, we cannot stop thinking about who we are dealing with in this legislation. That is why I have been, for a decade, a sponsor or cosponsor of this legislation, and that is why I am proud to support it this evening. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to my distinguished colleague and soon-to-be chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. SMITH from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I thank my colleague for yielding and a distinguished member of the Rules Committee for giving me time.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule. The so-called DREAM Act is a nightmare for the American people, and this proposed rule is a nightmare for House Members. Once again, we are considering a bill that Members have not had adequate time to review, that has not gone through the proper committee process, and that we cannot amend. This is far from the open and transparent process we were promised.

The majority promised that Members of this body would be able to review legislation for 24 hours prior to a vote. We have only had the text of this bill for a few hours. So much for that commitment to the American people.

If this rule passes, the majority will have prevented Members from offering amendments. And the majority has even eliminated the one possible way the bill could be improved, with a motion to recommit. This undemocratic way of considering legislation stands in contrast to the way Republicans will operate in the next Congress. Come January, the Republican majority will show the Democrats what it's like to have a fair, honest and open debate. We will educate them on the democratic process.

Just over a month ago, the American people rebuked the way that Democrats have run the House of Representatives and the Federal Government in general, so one might think that the majority would change their ways, but it seems that the Democrats have learned nothing and have forgotten everything.

If this rule is adopted, we will be forced to consider a bill that we will have no chance to amend, even though it puts the interests of illegal immigrants ahead of the interests of American citizens. It hurts American workers, rewards lawbreakers, and encourages continued defiance of the most fundamental American value—the rule of law.

Today Americans face an unemployment rate of 9.8 percent. The unemployment rate has exceeded 9.5 percent for 16 straight months, the longest stretch since the Great Depression. The DREAM Act makes illegal immigrants eligible to work legally in the United States. Why are Democrats doing this to American workers? This Congress

should focus on creating jobs for Americans, not promoting policies that cause unemployment.

I am sympathetic to the young, illegal immigrant children who were brought here by their parents. Because their parents disregarded America's immigration laws, they are in a difficult position. However, this bill actually rewards the very illegal immigrant parents who knowingly violated our laws.

Once the DREAM Act's amnesty recipients become citizens and turn 21, if they haven't already they can sponsor their illegal immigrant parents, spouse, or children for legalization, who can then sponsor others, resulting in chain migration that will further hurt American workers and American taxpayers.

As has happened with past amnesties, this new amnesty will encourage more illegal immigration because other illegal immigrant parents will bring their children to the U.S. with the expectation that they, too, will benefit from the DREAM Act.

Also, as soon as an individual files an application under the DREAM Act, the Department of Homeland Security is prohibited from removing them. So there is an automatic stay from deportation for anyone who applies under this bill. And criminals are not excluded. Those with histories of passport fraud, visa fraud, and even driving under the influence will be granted amnesty.

Although the bill enacts disastrous policies, the lack of an open and fair process is another reason to oppose it and this rule.

The majority has brought this bill to the floor without giving Members adequate time to review it. The majority has brought this bill to the floor without holding any hearings on the bill or its impact, thus depriving Members of the ability to learn how the bill would work or not work. The majority has brought this bill to the floor without committee approval, so Members have not had the opportunity to offer amendments. The majority has even eliminated the one way the minority is supposedly guaranteed as a way to address the people's concerns, a motion to recommit.

In addition to the negative impact of the DREAM Act on American citizens and the rule of law, the undemocratic procedures justify strong opposition to the rule.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I have no additional speakers and reserve the balance of my time to allow the gentlelady to close.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to the rule for H.R. 5281, the so-called DREAM Act; in fact, many of those and my constituents who abide by the rule of law would call this a

“nightmare act” rather than the DREAM Act.

This legislation has been misnamed from the beginning as an avenue for young men and women to obtain the American Dream; but let me be perfectly clear, Madam Speaker, H.R. 5281 is nothing short of amnesty for illegal immigrants. According to the Migration Policy Institute, an estimated 2 million immigrants will be eligible for amnesty under this bill. That number is not too difficult to imagine given that H.R. 5281 would allow these individuals, once they are naturalized and become 21 years of age, to exploit our broken system by sponsoring their immediate relatives with no numerical cap.

□ 1740

We call that chain migration. In fact, they could each bring in something like 179 other individuals.

Further, the potential for fraud is exponentially great, considering that one provision of the bill mandates that the immigrant has resided in the United States since they turned 16. My question is simple: How can we verify how long an illegal immigrant has been in the United States? We cannot and should not require ourselves to rely on the word of individuals whose very presence in the United States is illegal.

So, Madam Speaker, we all know that the requirements to become a legalized permanent resident under H.R. 5281 do not actually mandate that the potential naturalized citizens complete any college or vocational degree. They just simply have to show up and go for 2 years. If the bill attempts to integrate and educate the immigrant workforce into America, this legislation certainly will not achieve that goal.

So, in closing, Madam Speaker, H.R. 5281 will open the doors, yes, to criminal aliens obtaining permanent status to the detriment of legal immigrants. This legislation allows an illegal alien to submit an application for legalized permanent resident status; and in doing so, the Department of Homeland Security will no longer be allowed to deport them, criminal or not.

I urge my colleagues, oppose this rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I now would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to both the rule and the so-called DREAM Act.

Madam Speaker, the American people are adamantly opposed to the DREAM Act because they understand that it is nothing more than mass amnesty that will undoubtedly encourage millions more to illegally immigrate into our country. Yes, we are being told by those on the other side of the aisle that this is not amnesty. But if it walks like a duck, if it quacks like a duck, then it is a duck. And this may be a lame duck, Madam Speaker, but it is amnesty.

The DREAM Act specifically focuses on promising young foreigners a bright future if their parents choose to break the law. This will unquestionably encourage desperate parents to bring their children, perhaps millions of them, across our borders illegally. And once the children gain citizenship, their parents and other immediate family members will be put on the fast track to citizenship through family unification and then will be eligible for all the rights and services currently enjoyed by American citizens.

Moreover, if an illegal immigrant happens to be a racial or ethnic minority—the vast majority, of course, of illegals are of an ethnic or racial minority—then that individual will be entitled to all the education, employment, and other preferences for minorities that are written into our Federal and State laws as soon as, of course, their legal status is granted. As a result, the DREAM Act would not only put illegal immigrants on par with American citizens but, in many cases, would put them ahead of most American citizens who are not minorities and ahead of legal immigrants as well.

It is not being coldhearted to acknowledge that every dollar spent on an illegal immigrant is \$1 less for our own children, for our own seniors, and for all those in our society who have played by the rules, paid taxes, and expected that their government was going to watch out for them and for their needs before bestowing privileges and scarce resources on illegals who have not played by the rules.

Yes, this is the DREAM Act, all right. It is the dream of millions living outside our borders to come to our country by whatever means and partake of the health, education, and other benefits that we can scarcely afford for our own citizens. For us, the citizens and legal immigrants, who have played by the rules, worked hard to build a better home and a better life for our families, this is not the DREAM Act. This is the nightmare act.

I am well aware and appreciate our Nation's immigrant heritage. We have more legal immigration into our country annually than all the other nations of the world combined. And we should be proud of this, proud that we are so generous and open. But we must be honest about how many we can absorb without hurting the lives of our citizens and, yes, those legal immigrants who came here within the boundaries of the law.

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

Ms. FOXX. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. We must oppose policies like the DREAM Act that will serve as a magnet to those who would flock here illegally. I urge my colleagues to reject this attempt to rob our children of their dream and to vote “no” on this divisive and irresponsible legislation which will do no more than

bring millions more across our borders illegally, only this time, they will make sure they bring their kids. All of them. I ask my colleagues to join me in opposition to this DREAM—nightmare—Act.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I am just wondering if the gentleman from Colorado has no speakers or is simply going to keep all his time until after our speakers have spoken.

Mr. POLIS. I have already reserved the balance of my time for you to close. I have no further requests for time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I now would like to yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, for 4 years, the Democratic majority has promised to fix our broken immigration system. The President promised to pass immigration reform in the first 12 months of his administration. Just another broken promise. Instead of passing meaningful legislation to secure our borders, to protect our national security and to address the millions of people who are here undocumented living among us, this Congress has refused to do so, Madam Speaker, and now, in the final hours of their majority, they now bring up this bill. Just another example of why the American people overwhelmingly rejected this majority.

Now, on the merits, those who stand to benefit from this bill include thousands of young adults who were raised in our country and really know no other country but America. They simply wish to pursue the American Dream and have the opportunity to study, to work hard, to serve in our Armed Forces. They are exactly the type of people that we want in this United States of America. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support this legislation today.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this rule and the bill, H.R. 5281. I agree with some of the presenters before me. It is not a DREAM Act. It's a nightmare act. It's one of those pieces of legislation that if the proponents actually understood the components of it, some of them would peel off, some of them would change their mind, and some of them would wish they could but they're on record and can't.

The nightmare act is amnesty. Now, we need to come to an agreement on what amnesty is. I have long said that to grant amnesty is to pardon immigration lawbreakers and reward them with the objective of their crime. This legislation seeks to reward those who are, under the law, eligible for being sent back to their home countries.

Now, it's everybody that says they came in on the day of their birth until the last day before they turned 16, but

we don't have any way of verifying this. The certification and the background checks are completely impossible. About 50 percent of the people that come into the United States across our southern border don't have a legal existence in their home country, meaning they don't have birth certificates or a track of their life like we normally have here, so it's impossible to do background checks. They can say who they want to say they are. They can propose whatever they want to propose. They can say they were born in the United States or were brought into the United States. And they can say they had done so when they were 15 years old, they could have come into the United States when they were 29 years and a day old and still be eligible under this bill because there is not a way to verify. So this is the thing that is designed to tug at our heartstrings, and it opens the door for amnesty, and it lays the foundation for a whole series of other pieces of amnesty components.

But truthfully, this process is illegitimate. This is a repudiated, rejected 111th Congress. The American people went to the polls in unprecedented numbers, and they voted an unprecedented number of people out of office and put new faces in here. This lame duck session should never be used for a large agenda, and it has already been invalidated. Keep faith with the American people. Lame duck sessions are to provide the functions of government that can't be legitimately provided until the new Congress is gavelled in on January 4.

□ 1750

This process of no committee hearings, no subcommittee hearings, no subcommittee markup, no full committee hearing, no full committee markup, no access to this legislation that has changed four times—there are four different iterations here on the floor—and now a same-day rule up before the Rules Committee that still is the only committee that I know of on the Hill that meets without cameras, without the public presence knowing what is going on up there. I look forward to an open door and sunlight on the Rules Committee.

But this CBO score that they tout as actually a plus for the government ignores that the CBO score says it is a \$5 billion deficit spending in the second decade and likely for each decade thereafter. It ignores CIS, the Center for Immigration Services score, which scores the cost to local government, State and local government, at \$6.2 billion annually for the cost of providing education to the people that would otherwise be eligible for deportation.

It triples the number of green cards. And it provides safe harbor, safe harbor for "any alien" who has a pending application under the DREAM Act. So if someone comes in, they can be 79 years old or 99 years old, they allege that they are younger than that, file the ap-

plication under the DREAM Act, and now we have to go forward and adjudicate and determine you really weren't 16 or a day before 16 when you came into America, and you really weren't under 30 when you filed this application. But it is certain if this becomes law, there will be people into their late thirties and perhaps into their forties that would be granted citizenship underneath this because it takes that long to process.

There are exemptions for fraud, exemptions that go so far as to reward it in a way that if someone falsely claims citizenship and was deported, they can't be adjudicated under this.

This DREAM Act is an amnesty act, it is a nightmare act, and it must be opposed. There is more to be said in a broader debate, and I hope to engage in that.

Mr. POLIS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for the time.

I stand here, Mr. Speaker, in support of the DREAM Act. The time has come for this legislative body to do what is right and to not punish students for the mistakes that their parents have made.

This legislation will give many bright, talented, and patriotic young men and women the opportunity to stay in this country, a country that they love, and to continue their college education or service in our proud military. These young people are motivated and only want the chance to give back to this country, their country.

The DREAM Act is not amnesty. It will allow eligible students to get on a pathway toward permanent legal status later on. Those who receive conditional legal status will not be eligible for Medicaid, food stamps, or any other government services.

This bill is a sensible and pragmatic compromise that reflects the generosity and the goodwill of this country and its citizens, a country that opened up its arms to me as a refugee child and to my parents as Cuban refugees.

The DREAM Act also makes economic sense. I have had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to meet with many DREAM Act students, or Dreamers. One of the Dreamers with whom I met is Gaby Pacheco. This remarkable young woman's story emphasizes the urgency and the need for this legislation.

Gaby grew up in my district in south Florida and excelled academically. She graduated from high school third in her class and was student government president at my alma mater, Miami-Dade College, where she received a bachelor's in special ed. She received a scholarship to attend a master's program here in D.C., but she had to go back to Miami to revive her immigration status.

What struck me most about Gaby and the other Dreamers with whom I met is their optimism and their determination to give back to their country. They made it clear, Mr. Speaker, that all they want is an opportunity to prove themselves, no more and no less.

I hope my colleagues will do what is right and help Gaby and the other Dreamers get the chance to pursue their American dream in the American tradition.

Mr. POLIS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the gentlelady.

I rise to oppose this rule, Mr. Speaker. What happened to openness and transparency? We are operating here under same day consideration with no opportunity for a motion to recommit. We are in the 11th hour of this Congress, and even if we and even if the American people really had had a chance to read what was in this bill, it doesn't really matter what the seeming requirements are that have been explained here because the bill allows the Secretary of Homeland Security to waive the requirements—to waive the requirements.

Under this bill, any illegal immigrant may apply for an application for cancellation of removal and for conditional non-immigrant status. DHS may not remove any alien who has a pending application for conditional status. This status is valid for 5 years. It can be extended by DHS for another 5 years. All the while, the individual will be allowed to work in the United States and travel outside of the U.S.

With every amnesty, we have had a problem with massive fraud. About one-fourth of those legalized under the 1986 law received amnesty fraudulently. As one former U.S. Citizen and Immigration Service employee told us, the system that exists now can't handle the workload that exists now. There is a backlog now with 3 million people waiting to get their cases decided. What do you think is going to happen when we have millions of new cases on top of that that USCIS has to investigate?

The fact is that right now you can go online and you can buy a fraudulent document. You can buy a fraudulent diploma for \$180, along with a fraudulent GED. There is no additional staffing in this bill, no funding to actually authenticate it. The additional personnel necessary to handle the increase in the number of cases is not in this bill.

So how do we prevent the type of fraud we saw in 1986? How do we deal with the fact that since 1986 we have had three times as many illegal immigrants come into the country as a result of passing that amnesty, many of them coming in fraudulently?

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Thank you, Congresswoman FOXX.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that in my five terms here, this has to take the award for the most creatively misleading acronym that I have ever seen attached to a bill. This may constitute a “dream” for a small number of people who choose to disregard or disobey the law, but it is in fact a sobering reality for America. It is a stark reality for citizens all over the Nation who have obeyed the law and to whom this is an absolute affront.

It is an affront and a stark reality to middle American families who are struggling to pay their bills and send their children to college, only to find their own sons and daughters bumped aside by illegals in the process. It is an affront and a sobering reality to the American taxpayers and their children and grandchildren who are going to pay this bill to the tune of billions of dollars over the future. It is also a reality to the 10 percent of Americans who are unemployed who realize that the effect on the infrastructure of America in this bill is going to be absolutely negative with respect to Social Security benefits, jobs, loans, health care, education and otherwise. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that our national infrastructure simply can’t afford this.

I respect the sponsors of this bill. In fact, my good friend and colleague from Illinois, Congressman GUTIERREZ, is one of the principal movers of this bill. I respect the sincerity of the sponsors. But this is very bad public policy for America, and I would suggest to you that the long-run benefits are far overwhelmed and overrun by what it is going to cost the American taxpayer and what it is going to cost us who believe in the rule of law.

□ 1800

Mr. POLIS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I really appreciate all of my colleagues coming over and making the points that they made. I want to tie into Mr. JOHNSON’s comments, particularly about the rule of law.

You know, we are all, again, sympathetic to the young people who find themselves here illegally, having been brought here by their parents. We are sympathetic to that. But their parents left a place that was not as good a place to live as the United States, and the foundation of what makes us a great country is the rule of law. And if we let the rule of law be undermined, then we will be no better than the places that they have escaped from.

I agree with Mr. JOHNSON, also, that this bill is very misleading. I would like to point out something that’s been said by the proponents of this bill that isn’t accurate.

DREAM Act supporters would have you believe illegal aliens who don’t go to college will earn citizenship through service in the United States Armed Forces. However, we already have leg-

islation that will allow that to happen. We don’t need the DREAM Act to do that, Mr. Speaker. If people want to enroll in the Armed Forces, they generally can become naturalized citizens through expedited processing, often obtaining their citizenship in 6 months. So we don’t need the DREAM Act for that.

Mr. Speaker, again, as my colleagues have pointed out, this bill has not been properly reviewed by any of the five House committees with jurisdiction. This abuse of regular order makes it impossible for Members of Congress and their constituents to review properly and consider legislation prior to a vote. Making substantial changes to our laws through proposals which have not been appropriately vetted and forcing a vote in a lame duck session are both reckless and irresponsible.

Adding insult to injury, earlier today the House passed a martial law rule. Under martial law, the Democrat majority can bring up any bill at any time through December 18 with very little notice. This practice not only perpetuates the chaos that’s consumed the Democrat majority, but is a colossal disservice to the people we are elected to serve.

Mr. Speaker, we need to deal with the people who are here illegally, and most of us want to do that, but this is not the way to do it. We need to secure our borders. And once we secure the borders, then we can deal with all the other issues related to those who are here illegally.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule, vote “no” on the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, those who oppose the DREAM Act support the ongoing presence of over 500,000 more illegal immigrants within our borders. Opponents of the DREAM Act make a travesty of the rule of law and facilitate the ongoing presence of undocumented foreign nationals inside our country which so frustrates our States and cities.

Let me end by simply relating this to common sense. If you are pulled over for a speeding ticket and you have a child in a car seat next to you, that 2-year-old doesn’t get a speeding ticket. If there is a bank robber who robs it with a toddler on their back, that toddler doesn’t spend a life in prison.

I will end with a quote from Deuteronomy 24:16: “Fathers shall not be put to death for their sons, nor shall sons be put to death for their fathers’ sins.”

I urge a “yes” vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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. CAPUANO). The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. FOXX. 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.

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) on the bill (H.R. 3082) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1755, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Ms. FOXX. 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, this 15-minute vote on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 1756, and suspending the rules and passing S. 3998, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 206, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 622]

YEAS—212

Ackerman	Davis (AL)	Hill
Altmire	Davis (CA)	Himes
Andrews	Davis (IL)	Hinchey
Baca	DeFazio	Hinojosa
Baldwin	DeGette	Hirono
Barrow	DeLauro	Hodes
Bean	Deutch	Holden
Becerra	Dicks	Holt
Berkley	Dingell	Honda
Berman	Doggett	Hoyer
Bishop (GA)	Donnelly (IN)	Inslee
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Israel
Blumenauer	Edwards (MD)	Jackson (IL)
Boswell	Edwards (TX)	Jackson Lee
Boucher	Ellison	(TX)
Boyd	Ellsworth	Johnson (GA)
Brady (PA)	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Braley (IA)	Eshoo	Kagen
Brown, Corrine	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Butterfield	Fattah	Kaptur
Capps	Filner	Kennedy
Capuano	Foster	Kildee
Carnahan	Frank (MA)	Kilroy
Carney	Fudge	Kind
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Kissell
Castor (FL)	Gonzalez	Klein (FL)
Chandler	Gordon (TN)	Kosmas
Chu	Grayson	Larsen (WA)
Clarke	Green, Al	Larson (CT)
Clay	Green, Gene	Lee (CA)
Cleaver	Grijalva	Levin
Clyburn	Gutierrez	Lewis (GA)
Connolly (VA)	Hall (NY)	Loebsack
Conyers	Halvorson	Lofgren, Zoe
Cooper	Hare	Lowey
Critz	Harman	Lujan
Crowley	Hastings (FL)	Lynch
Cuellar	Heinrich	Maloney
Cummings	Herseth Sandlin	Markey (CO)
Dahlkemper	Higgins	Markey (MA)