

I just can't imagine your discussion, G.T., with the family that bought their own business three times. You can see why people get a little hot under the collar.

And then what are we using the money for? That's another big question. To bail out the California teachers' pension when they can't manage their pension? That makes me mad. In the State of Missouri, we've got teachers too. They've got a pension, and they're expected to manage the pension properly. If they don't, it goes bankrupt and they don't get their pension money. So why are we bailing out the teachers of some State that can't manage their own pension? I don't understand that. That's why I don't like that great big old bailout. It was a scam, and it didn't work and a whole lot of people are hurting.

□ 2240

I was asked by a very liberal talk show host, What are you going to say to somebody that lost their job? I told them, I can't say anything. These are the policies that this liberal Congress allowed to happen, and this isn't what we need to be doing. We need to be getting back on to some good solid economic footing.

I think we've probably got about 3 or 4 minutes, but I would be happy to yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania. Congressman THOMPSON, if you would like to add a couple of finishing comments.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Sure. Just real briefly, you had a chart there that showed a lot of different spending schemes, health care, IMF bailout, the bank bailout, the omnibus. We're talking billions of dollars are being spent and all in the name of supposedly good causes. I question many of those as being very ineffective.

Mr. AKIN. You've got your Wall Street bailout here, economic stimulus. Boy, that was a doozy. Here's that socialized medicine at \$1 trillion. That's the Optimist Society's version. They are not going to get by with \$1 trillion on that. And the IMF bailout. Yeah, there are some winners there.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I think the absolute best economic stimulus that we could have is extending these tax cuts. I think that what happens as a result of that is it provides some certainty back into businesses, especially those 2.1 million small businesses that create 60, 70 percent of our jobs that you referenced, Mr. AKIN. And I think if we create that certainty, we're going to see a lot of business plans take off. And what we're going to see is unemployment will go down because jobs will be created, and people will have more prosperity, and that will solve a lot of problems that we're experiencing currently.

Mr. AKIN. Yes. We're saying, Jobs and a paycheck beat bureaucrats and food stamps.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman from Missouri would yield, and I thank him very much.

I am going to ask him to give me permission to speak and to shift gears just a little bit. I know we're talking about the economy, and that's the main point of the Special Order hour this evening. But we had another vote this afternoon that was pretty important as well, barely passed on the House floor maybe an hour or so ago, the so-called DREAM Act.

Mr. AKIN. The nightmare act.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. The DREAM Act which people in the 11th district of Georgia, northwest Georgia think is a nightmare. It may be a dream if these students want to go back to their own country and attend one of their great universities. But bottom line is, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say, and I will put in the RECORD, that I came to the floor and, with my electronic vote card, voted a resounding "no." I had to step out quickly, only to come back in and find out that it wasn't recorded. That was very disappointing to me because I think that vote was to allow about 2.5 million people in this country illegally to ultimately be granted amnesty, and I think it was a very boneheaded wrong vote.

And with that, I will yield back to my gentleman friend from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. Well, you brought up a tender topic here basically. And I appreciate you gentlemen joining us. I appreciate your commitment to the American Dream. And God bless you and the American public.

IT'S NOT A ZERO-SUM GAME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives and the opportunity to express some things that are on my mind, perhaps while others are sleeping and perhaps while others are having trouble sleeping, for they see what happens around this Congress.

I am very, very grateful to the C-SPAN cameras and the transparency that exists here in the House. And I think back those years now, maybe as far back as almost 20 years ago, maybe even more, when I sat in my living room, and I watched what was going on in this room. And I listened to the speeches, and I analyzed the presentations that came from the various Members of Congress on either side of the aisle.

As I sat back, as an American who was busy building a business and creating jobs and meeting payroll for 1,440 consecutive weeks, trying to build capital where there was none that existed and shape that together so that we could take care of the longevity of my family and that of the families of the people that I had hired that worked for me and did so well to help build the business with us all together, while all

that was going on, I was watching what was going on in Washington, DC, in Des Moines, Iowa. And I saw and heard the voices of the people that came forward to tell America there was something wrong in this Congress. And as I listened to them, they inspired me. They inspired me to get more involved in public life, to get engaged in politics, that there were a lot of decisions that were being made in this city and in the capital cities in the States across the land that were affecting the very lives of the American people down into their families. And a lot of folks didn't know it. They weren't paying attention.

So I started to pay attention. And from those years forward, I saw what was going on. The irresponsible spending that was taking place and the dysfunctional Congress that had rolled itself up into a point where it no longer represented the American people, but it seemed to exist for its own purposes and not for the purposes of serving the American people. And as this unfolded, personalities that were here on the floor—Newt Gingrich and Dick Armey and a number of others that stand out in my mind and cause me to think that I might be able to make a contribution at some level, whether that be the State level or the Federal level—but they convinced me that there was a broad philosophical disagreement in America. And on the one side of the aisle, you have people that believe in growing government, that government is the solution and that higher taxes are necessary in order to fund this growing government. And if there's a problem that exists out there, even if it's for a single individual, there is somebody over on this side of the aisle that will try to pass a law to fix that problem for a single individual, and government grows. And they won't look at empirical data, by the way.

I offer study after study, and they turn a blind eye to those studies. They simply want to try to reach out and touch people's heartstrings and tell the anecdote, the single anecdote. And with 300 million people, we always have someone who got the short end of the stick. That's this side of the aisle. The case of the people with the "poor me's," the ones that think that these greedy capitalists are victimizing the poor proletariat, and that it's a zero-sum game, and the glass is half empty, and it would have been maybe three-quarters or maybe, let me say, it would have been not as empty as half empty if these people that went out and got out of bed and went to work every day and produced something hadn't been taking from that glass. It might have been full from them, they wouldn't have had to do anything.

But truthfully, Mr. Speaker, it's not a zero-sum game. And anybody that thinks their glass is half empty, their resolution of that is to go to government and ask government to tax the person whose glass has got the same level in it. But theirs, over here on this side, this is the half full side of the

aisle. These are the people that believe and understand that it's not a zero-sum game, that this is a growing economy, that we don't have all of this capital that we have in the United States of America because it was a zero-sum game. We built things. We produced goods and services that had a marketable value to each other, yes, and to the rest of the world, certainly. We exported a lot of that, and America became more wealthy, and we developed our skills.

This idea of a zero-sum game that's over here on the Democrat side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, is a self-defeating philosophy from which you could never build a great Nation. It's already a self-defeating philosophy. If you get up every day and you think you have a bad case of the "poor me's," and somebody is out there working industriously and taking from this pool that you have some right to for not earning it—if you have that attitude, you're not going to be contributing to the whole. And our job—and it should be our job on both sides of the aisle—is to increase the average annual productivity of all of our people.

Now, it doesn't mean that we won't have some people who aren't producing at all. Some can't, and we need to take care of them. Some won't, and they need to take care of themselves. And some aren't doing enough, and they need to do more. But if we increase our overall productivity, that increases our average annual productivity, that increases our gross domestic product, that strengthens us economically. It puts us in a position where we're no longer borrowing 41 cents out of every dollar we spend from somebody—often the Chinese. It puts us in a position where we can balance a budget. And, by the way, the people that are out there working and producing every day, every working day, at least—and hopefully taking Sunday off to worship—those folks aren't putting pressure on government for services.

□ 2250

They just say, Take the taxes you have to take from me and don't take any more than you have to take, and leave me otherwise alone. I will take care of myself and my family. That's the American spirit. That's the American way. It's part of the American Dream.

And so as I use that word, Mr. Speaker, "dream," the American Dream, we saw a bill come across this floor today, turned through this system with lightning speed. Who says the House of Representatives can't move quickly if the Speaker of the House determines it shall move quickly? Let's take the word "American" off of it and call it the DREAM Act. They can't call it the American DREAM Act, because that would be a high level of hypocrisy. They just called it the DREAM Act, which we described as the nightmare act.

This is an act that's been churning through the public here for a good

number of years. And what it is, it's designed to give a path to citizenship to young people that came into this country before their 16th birthday, who have resided in the United States for perhaps as long as 5 years, who are willing to enter into an institution of higher learning or sign up for the military, and it would give them a path to citizenship, give them a green card right away. It would triple the number of green cards in America right away.

And these young people, they were young maybe when they came here, but still it's an amnesty bill. And amnesty, to grant amnesty is to pardon immigration lawbreakers and reward them with the objective of their crime. Now, somebody comes into the United States illegally on the day before their 16th birthday, this DREAM Act gives them amnesty.

We have lots of people that sneak across the border that aren't 16 years old. Some of the accomplished coyotes are under 16 years old. Some of the accomplished drug smugglers are under 16 years old. You have got a murderer down in Mexico that was reported in the news who is—I will call him a serial contract killer that's just been arrested that apparently—I mean, it's alleged, and he is not yet convicted, that multiple times he has executed people in the drug wars, and he is 14 years old.

So this DREAM Act would give everybody that came into the United States illegally, whether it was on the first day of their life, perhaps they were born across the border and they came into the United States on the first day of their life and were nurtured here and went to school here, gives them—the result is an in-State tuition discount to go to college or perhaps go off to the military in the United States on a path to citizenship and the ability to bring all their families in on the family reunification plan. All of that offered to somebody that maybe was brought into the United States on the first day of their life.

But it also is the same reward for somebody who came into the United States on their own illegally, as well, on the day before they were 16 years old. And that's good up until such time as they are 30.

So let's see. We can do the math on this. Fourteen years, and if this bill becomes law tomorrow, and it's possible, because it passed the House in lightning time. The Senate may or may not take it up. There is a cloture vote apparently that's scheduled. I don't think they have the votes. They should not have the votes.

But in any case, if someone comes into the United States the day before their 16th birthday and this bill becomes law the day of their 30th birthday, they would be covered under the DREAM Act. They would be able to apply for an application—that's presumed that they would have entered into an institution of higher learning. So you don't have to be going into a 4-year college to go off and become a

brain surgeon. You could simply be entering into a tech school to become a plumber or an electrician or a barber or a beautician or whatever it might be that would be a 12-month study or more. Enter into it.

You don't have to get a degree. You have to have a high school degree, which can be gotten. A GED can be picked up, and then you could have never gone to school. You could pick up your GED and then apply to go off to beautician school. Those things are all that's required, and you would get approval for your permit that would give you immediately a green card, access to the welfare system, and the ability down the line in a little ways to bring in, through family reunification, all your family members. They could number in the scores, of your family members, all come in. This reward for somebody that next week might turn 30.

And the chairman of the Judiciary Committee tells me never fear, because they have good background checks and they have good, solid biometrics that they are using—checking out his word here—biometric information that's there with a good background check with the FBI doing this good background check, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I will tell you that it doesn't do a lot of good to ask the FBI to do a background check on somebody that came into this country before or after their 16th birthday that doesn't have a legal existence in their home country. If they were not born in a hospital in Mexico, for example, it's almost all the time there is no birth certificate. And about half of the time they are not born in hospitals.

So with no birth certificate, there is often not a record of their existence. And they could be anybody saying they were anybody coming here, declaring that they came here at any time without a record to back it up. All the way to 30. And they will say, well, I came into the United States. My parents brought me in against my will the day before my 16th birthday, and next week I am going to be 30. I am qualified. I am signing up. And they will give them protection under the DREAM Act.

That's what they have passed off the floor of the House of Representatives tonight. It is a reward for lawbreaking. And it isn't for kids alone. These are old kids, a lot of them. Old kids that are in their twenties, kids that are in their thirties, kids that will perhaps be as near as—very close to or even possibly in their forties by the time that they would receive the citizenship that's promised to them under this DREAM Act.

Would we do something like that? Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once said that large initiatives should not be advanced on slender majorities. Well, this was a slender majority here tonight. It came very close. The vote was tied up on the rule, within one vote for a long time. There were 37 Democrats voted "no" on the rule.

Thirty-eight Democrats voted “no” on the bill, almost all of them Blue Dogs.

A lot of the Blue Dogs have been defeated in the election last November 2, and they are here for this week and next week. And for most of them, and possibly all of them, it will be the last time they serve in the United States Congress. And most of them are pretty good people, and they were pushed into this hardcore leftist agenda by Speaker PELOSI. They had that San Francisco agenda shoved at them over and over again—to use the Speaker’s expression, I believe it was—made them walk the plank.

Well, the Speaker tried to get the Blue Dogs to walk the plank one more time tonight on this DREAM Act, this not aptly named, the wrongly named nightmare named the DREAM Act. It’s a nightmare act. Tried to get the Blue Dogs to walk the plank, and they said “no.” They said “no” in numbers of 37 on the rule, 38 on the bill, because they are not going to go out of this town having handed the Speaker another victory that goes contrary to the best wishes of America and contrary to the American Dream.

Now, I believe in an immigration policy that’s designed to enhance the economic, social, and cultural well-being of the United States of America. I believed that for a long time. And I think that American leadership has believed that, perhaps not articulated that the same way, but believed that for a long time.

And I reflect upon my grandmother coming over here through Ellis Island. And as I went through that tour at Ellis Island, it would be about 4 years ago—not quite—3½. I learned a good number of things. They gave everybody a very quick once-through physical. They watched them walk. They watched how they moved. If anybody was obviously pregnant, they put them back on the boat. If there were people that weren’t good physical specimens, they went back on the boat. If they had signs of disease, back on the boat. If they had signs of not being mentally stable, back on the boat.

They screened them before they got on the boat in Europe and looked them over and gave them all those same kind of tests before they even let them board, because the United States of America, even at the height of our immigration heyday, at the peak of Ellis Island—in fact, the peak of Ellis Island was April 15, 1905—excuse me. I have got to get this year right. Think about it. April 15, 1907, when they had the largest processing of legal immigrants in the history of the country poured through Ellis Island on that day. April 15, 1907, 11,557 were brought through into the United States across the floors on the Great Hall.

□ 2300

On average, you could do the math, cut it down 2 percent, went back on the boat and went back to Europe, wherever they came from, because, they

didn’t meet the standards. Even though they had been screened before they got on the ship, they were screened before they could get off Ellis Island. And I don’t know how many were screened out before they boarded, but I do know that 2 percent got sent back.

Why do we do that? Because we had it in the immigration system that was designed for America. It was designed to improve the economic, social and cultural well-being of the United States of America. Because we believed in something then that the folks on this side of the aisle believe today.

We believe, and I believe, in American exceptionalism. We are an extraordinary country, Mr. Speaker. We are extraordinary for a lot of reasons.

There are a series of pillars of American exceptionalism, beautiful marble pillars, stable, solid pillars that have been carefully cut and hewn and polished and our Founding Fathers understood that and they set them in place. And I think God moved the Founding Fathers around like men upon a chess board to shape this Nation.

When I look out across the world, and I think down through the heritage of nation after nation, and I look for a country that has a history that’s even similar to the history of the United States—and I don’t mean that as far as the chronology of the events that took place, the wars, the depressions, those things that happen—the foundation of our country. The foundation of the United States of America is absolutely and completely and utterly unique to any of that in the world.

If you look over the last 250 years or so, the most successful institution in the world, part of it, has really been our religious institutions. But arguably the most successful institution has been the nation state, nation states that emerged out of city states when they were merged together.

What did they come from? Peoples that had a common language banded together from city states into nation states and that’s what brought about all of the myriad of nation states in Western Europe, for example. That’s what has set up the boundaries of our nations across the globe.

If you speak Russian, you lived in Russia. If you speak German, you lived in Germany. It’s not true, Mr. President, if you speak Austrian, you don’t actually have—no one speaks Austrian. But if you speak German in Austria, chances are you are home. And Czech in Czechoslovakia and the list goes on. French in France, Spanish in Spain—it’s not too implicated when you think about it.

But why do we have the nation states? Because people with a common interest, commonalities, banded together, protected their interests, defended their boundaries and their borders and made sure they took care of each other and they built their nation states.

England, you speak English. United Kingdom, they spread their language

throughout the United Kingdom all the way into Asia and out into the Pacific and over to the Americas. They believed in their culture and they did glorious things for the world. Wherever the English language went, freedom accompanied the language.

But still no nation has been founded upon these principles of liberty and freedom like the United States of America. And you could say that we had a continent that needed to be settled, and you could argue that it was the quirk of history that brought this about, but, Mr. Speaker, it’s far more unique than that.

If we look around and we could think South America was a continent to be settled, so was Central America. And what’s the difference between the United States and Canada? I could give you a few, they are pretty close to us.

And then we could roll our vision down to Australia and see a continent there that’s about the size of the United States that had to be settled, settled with a Western European influence. Still, they don’t have the rights, they don’t have the liberty that Americans have. The dynamics of their country, however good they are, they have been very good to us as allies, don’t match that of the United States.

The things that bless this country are completely unique. We are founded on a core of our Judeo-Christian principles. The settlers that came here came here for freedom of speech and religion, freedom to worship as they saw fit. They wanted to get away from King George, and they wanted to come to a place where they could be free to worship God in their way.

It’s true that Old English common law and these concepts of Western Civilization and the English-speaking component of the age of enlightenment were established there in old England. And that old English common law arrived here in the New World.

In fact, there is a plaque down here at Jamestown, Virginia, I think I will get the year right, and may well have been 1607, or really close to that—that old English common law arrived in the New World, Jamestown, Virginia just down the coastline here a ways. All those things, gifted to this Nation, blessed this Nation, made us unique, is American exceptionalism.

And the rights that emerged in the Bill of Rights, freedom of speech, religion, the press, freedom to peaceably assemble and petition the government for redress of grievances, the right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, the Fifth Amendment property rights, the right to be protected from double jeopardy, the concept of federalism that pushes those rights, rights of government that are granted to government by the people and rights that come from God. Now those are new concepts. Those concepts still don’t exist in the world in the way they do here in the United States.

So when we get into these debates where people want to undermine the

rule of law and tell me that their version of compassion is worth risking these beautiful marble pillars of American exceptionalism, that we ought to have enough compassion that we could just, for the moment, set aside these values that made this a great Nation. How can people think like that?

The thing that we should protect the most is our core faith and these beautiful, marble pillars of American exceptionalism. We must protect them. That's our oath. We take an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. That's our commitment.

You can't take an oath to a Constitution that's living and breathing. You can't take an oath to what some activist judge might decide it's going to be in a year or two or five or ten. The very last nine people on the planet that should be amending the United States Constitution are those nine Supreme Court justices. But occasionally they, in effect, do amend the Constitution. And I don't believe there should be anybody sitting on the bench that doesn't adhere to the deepest conviction that the Constitution means what it says and it means what it was understood to mean at the time of its ratification or the ratification of the succeeding amendments.

That's what the Constitution is. It's a contract. It is a guarantee. And our Founding Fathers made it very clear, our rights come from God. We hold these truths to be self-evident.

Our rights come from God, and the rights come to the people and the people grant the right to govern to their elected representatives and the Constitution guarantees us not a democratic form of government, not a democracy, as some would say. The United States Constitution guarantees us a Republican form of government, and I mean that as a representative form of government that's not designed to put our finger into the wind. It's designed to elect representatives who owe their constituents and everybody in this Nation their best effort and their best judgment, and we have to keep that oath to uphold the Constitution.

These are just some of the foundational principles of this great Nation, and its concepts of American exceptionalism, which is at risk because of what we saw happen here tonight, the people that would undermine the rule of law and reward people for breaking it and give them a free college education at the expense of people who are having to pay for it and don't have the access to that benefit are undermining the rule of law. They are damaging the concept of American exceptionalism and rewarding the people that have undermined our rule of law itself, American exceptionalism, and it comes from these things that I said.

They are the Bill of Rights, most of them. All of these rights, freedom of speech, religion, right to keep and bear arms, property rights, no double jeopardy. The list goes on. The Bill of

Rights has most of them. It leaves a couple of them out.

One of those is free enterprise capitalism, the ability to be able to—and I mentioned property rights, Fifth Amendment property rights. But the ability to own property and know that if you pay the property tax on that property, government can't come take it away from you and that the assets of that can be used as collateral to leverage, to invest in businesses and start jobs and do the things we choose to do.

There are a myriad of individual decisions. That's another foundational concept. The free enterprise component of this, why is it, Mr. Speaker, why is it? At country after country, they don't form capital. They might start businesses, but they are in a little subsistence business where they are selling trinkets or selling snacks. But they are hard to mouth, getting by, not investing that capital, not building let's just say if you have the hot dog cart out there, they just go every day and sell the hot dogs.

□ 2310

But they're not turning it into a franchise. They're not building a restaurant, not building a chain of restaurants, not getting an idea on now I have all this equipment in here; I can start a stainless steel shop that will build all this restaurant equipment and market it to the world.

Americans are full of ideas. We're a dynamic people. We're not suitable to live under any other form of government because we are a robust, vigorous society. And since I've gone through this list of reasons for American exceptionalism, and it's not exclusive, I have this other piece, Mr. Speaker, and it's this: Americans are full of vigor. We're the cream of the crop of every donor civilization on the planet that sent legal immigrants here. We're the cream of the crop.

The reason we are, when I say "we," I'm a descendant of, but the biggest reason we are is it was hard to get here, but there was a great reward that you could earn when you got here. And some people came here believing the streets were paved with gold, and others came here and paved their own streets with gold because there was room to achieve in the United States. And the people that came here had an extra vigor because their dream drove them to do that.

And so there's a filter that's been set up worldwide. It sets up at the borders of the United States, this the sovereign Nation, with our borders, and you can't be a nation state if you don't have borders and you can't call them borders if you don't defend them. But our borders were set up and people had a hard time getting here and getting through the system.

They had a hard time, like my grandmother, walking across the Great Hall at Ellis Island, and getting, being granted entrance into the United States of America, but they had vigor

and they had a dream. They had things they wanted to build, and they didn't waste time. They didn't let grass grow under their feet. They went to work, and they committed themselves so much to this country, that they expected that the first one of my family that passed away here, the rest of them will be buried around her, and to a certain extent that seems to be the case. And I don't know the whole history of it and so I'm cautious about speaking it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker. But I do know that my grandmother came here and sent some of her sons back to Europe to fight in the war against the fatherland. She was committed to America. She directed my father, who went to school, not speaking English, to never speak anything but English in the home so she could learn it because she said, I came here to become an American, and you shall go to school and learn English and bring it home and teach it to me.

English needs to be the official language of the United States of America. A common language is what binds us together. And this vigor of Americans that comes from every country in the world and every walk of life, this unique vigor, because of this filter, kept the slackers out. The doers got here because it was hard to get here and it helped to be inspired by a dream, and they came.

And so every donor civilization contributed to America, their vigor, the cream of their crop. And now here we are. We are—some people will disagree with this, but I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, we're a race of people. There is an American race of people. We're not just sometimes what we look like, all of these colors and different configurations of God's creation in his image. We're more than that. We're a lot more than that. We have common interests. We have a common bond. We've experienced a common history. We have common rights, common privileges and a common dream, and that's to leave the world a better place than it was when we came and pass it along to our children so they can do the same. It's in our culture. It's part of our being. It's who we are. We are a common race of people as far as looking at us as Americans, but we are uncommon as compared to the rest of the world because of all of these reasons that I have said.

And we need to understand that. We need to understand what made us great. We need to preserve and protect and defend and polish those beautiful marble pillars of American exceptionalism. We need to understand what made us great and protect it and preserve it and enhance it.

And these things that go on here in this House of Representatives, in this lameduck Congress still being driven by the repudiated majority, that can take a bill that they call the DREAM Act that's been rejected by the American people over and over again, at least in the polls and of those that understand what it is, and suspend the

proper function of this Congress and bring a bill like that to the floor, how?

Well, here's the proper way first, Mr. Speaker, in case that's not something that you've had an opportunity to evaluate. The proper order is this: some Member of Congress comes in, writes up a bill, says I think we need this in the law of the land. They go down here and file the bill here at the well at the Clerk's location here at the well, and then that bill is referred to a committee. Now, if it gets enough legs, if it gets enough cosponsors on it where you think it has some substance, there can be a hearing before a subcommittee or two or three or four.

The subcommittee then can take action on it and perhaps vote it and pass it into the full committee. The full committee can then hold one or two or three or four hearings also to inform all the other members of the committee. And they can then, when I say pass the bill, at each point of committee action it's an unlimited number of amendments that are germane and in order, but an unlimited number of amendments that can be offered to seek to perfect the legislation.

That's how it's been set up. It's got to be set up in such a way that you can actually fix a bad bill before it gets to the floor. And so a bill that's introduced goes through a hearing and markup process in the subcommittee. Then it goes through a hearing and a markup process in the full committee. Then it goes up to the Rules Committee, the hole in the wall up here on the third floor, where sometimes they run into a little trouble because those folks don't work out in the light of day. They work sometimes at night. There's no television camera in there. Reporters don't go up there; they think it's a little boring and maybe it's not really news. If they'd come up there more often I might go up there and make some news, Mr. Speaker, because I think it would be nice to let the American people know what's going on.

So then the Rules Committee passes a rule that sends the bill to the floor. Actually, it sends a rule to the floor. We debate on whether we want to accept the rule. If we vote the rule down, it goes back up to the Rules Committee and we say get it right and send it back to us again. So we deport the rule back up to the Rules Committee in the hole in the wall, just to keep it descriptive in my language, and they come back and try again. It doesn't happen very often that a rule comes down, but once a rule is there it sets the parameters by which we debate a bill.

And our Speaker-designate BOEHNER has told the world, and I'm very glad that he has, that we are going to have far more transparency and far more open rules on our bills. So that allows Members to offer amendments and try to perfect this legislation. That's how it's supposed to work.

So a bill would come to the floor, in theory, under an open rule that would allow any Member to offer an amend-

ment, debate it here on the floor, force a vote, force a recorded vote, or require a recorded vote. I shouldn't use the word "force." It should be a process that people in this Chamber are willing to go through and are actually eager to improve legislation that otherwise might not be as good as it can be.

And then, once the amendments are all heard and voted on and resolved, then the bill can be certainly debated in its form, final form, and placed upon its passage or, if the House passes that legislation, we message it to the Senate, right down that hallway, and they either take it up or kill it. If they take it up, they go through a similar process. That's how it's supposed to work.

The DREAM Act, this nightmare act, had an entirely different experience than I've just described, Mr. Speaker, because it didn't really exist in this House of Representatives anywhere in the form that it came to the floor today.

It worked out like this: Speaker PELOSI decided that she wanted to go along with the majority leader in the Senate, HARRY REID, and they would force a vote on the DREAM Act, whether it could ever become law or not. And so, instead of going through the hearing process and the markup process, subcommittee, full committee up to the Rules Committee and down, they just went to the Rules Committee. At some 3 this afternoon, this bill that I don't know that anybody had an opportunity to read it before it was presented to the Rules Committee. I know that I didn't, but I maybe could have caught up with it a couple of hours earlier.

In any case, all these versions floating around, nobody can figure out what's going to move. Down from the Speaker's office comes a bill, dropped into the Rules Committee. They take this up. A little e-mail goes out to some of our staff to let us know that they're going to be hearing testimony on the rule. No amendments allowed. Some Members, myself included, go to testify before the Rules Committee. We know they're going to say no to any suggestions that we make, including any amendments that we might try to offer, even though there wasn't really time to configure them upon notice.

They report out a same day rule that says, this Congress is going to hear this bill right away. So the Rules Committee meets on a bill we haven't seen at 3 in the afternoon. A few hours later it's here on the floor for a vote on the rule. A few hours later it's here on the floor for 30 minutes of debate on this side, 30 minutes of debate on this side. And an amnesty bill that's twice the size of the 1986 amnesty bill passes off the floor of the House of Representatives.

□ 2320

Now it is messaged to the Senate where HARRY REID has asked for it. And this sunlight? This is a responsive Congress? No, this is an act of a Con-

gress that has been repudiated for the same reasons. There is a reason why so many Democrats are going home. And I for one feel a little bad that some of the best are the ones who are going home. Some of the Blue Dogs are some of the best to work with. They reflect American values in my view more than a lot of the others. They have been defeated because of these kind of she-nanigans, these kinds of tactics, these kind of acts that close the system down, lock the Members out so the franchise, and there are 435 Members of the House of Representatives, and there is not anybody who sits in these seats whose constituents deserve less representation than anybody else. Everybody's franchise deserves to be heard, and the will of the group should be brought up through the leadership and should be manifested in legislation here on the floor, sent to the Senate. If it comes back and it doesn't match, we should have our say as well. That is not what has been happening. The right way is around the corner—I think we take it up in January.

But we Americans, we Americans that believe in American exceptionalism, we Americans who take an oath to uphold the Constitution, we Americans that adhere to and uphold the rule of law, which I believe is implicit in our oath to the Constitution, reject the idea of this nightmare act that I believe turned into an affirmative action amnesty act for 2 million or more people that could be tripled.

And our immigration policy that we have here, Mr. Speaker, is already so bad. It doesn't reflect the best interest of America. It doesn't reflect the economic, social and cultural well-being or enhance it in the fashion I believe it should. Existing immigration law is set up in such a way that merit is almost out of the question. To evaluate the people coming across Ellis Island and turn 2 percent of them back after they had already been screened and filtered on the European side before they got on the ship tells you there was at least a merit system.

But here in the United States, if you look at the legal immigration, and the legal immigration number will range up to 1.5 million a year, there is no country that is even close to as generous as we are with legal immigration. But of all of that, some place between, and this is testimony before the immigration committee, some place between 7 and 11 percent of our legal immigration is based on merit. The balance of it is out of our control.

So that means that between 89 and 93 percent of our legal immigration is in the hands of the people who are deciding they are going to come here rather than in the hands of Americans who would decide which people would come here. It is completely out of sync with the values of a lot of the other Western civilization countries like Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia. They have immigration policies that are designed to bring the best people into

their country and not put burdens on the taxpayers and their society.

I can't make the grade to go to Canada because I'm too old. I would be relying on the government to feed me too soon, and my education level is not high enough. I don't know about my years left to work, but you put it into the score system they have, I can visit but I cannot go live. That is how they would be. So if they reject STEVE KING in Canada, we should be able to say no to some folks that want to come to the United States, especially those who broke our laws.

This legislation, this DREAM Act, this nightmare act, has a number of things in it that the American people need to know. It is a hardcore, leftist, liberalism piece of amnesty legislation. It provides for protection for people who have broken the laws in this way: They would still get a DREAM Act registration that would protect them from deportation even if they had been alien absconders, people that were set for deportation hearings and skedaddled and didn't show up, those people who were going to be adjudicated for deportation, alien absconders, they will be protected. They can sign up under DREAM, and then they are shielded from being prosecuted and deported. Even if they were an alien absconder, even if they were guilty of document fraud, no problem, we will give you a college education, sit you at a desk. If you have false claims of being a United States citizen, that is no problem either. You are still eligible under the DREAM act. We will give you a college education, too, even though you have lied about your citizenship. Even aliens who have been deported who would sneak back into the United States and the deportation records are there, they sign up for the DREAM, they will not be deported either. What a reward.

So there will be all kinds of people who will sneak into the United States who will go ahead and sign up right away for this DREAM Act because they will be protected from deportation. Even though it requires that they be no older than 30 at the time of enactment and that they came into the United States before their 16th birthday and they have been here for 5 years, who is to know? Who is know whether it is valid or whether it isn't? Who is to know how old they are if they don't have a real birth certificate? Who is to know if they have a high school education, a GED? Who is to know if they have completed a 2-year education at a tech school?

But I know that I did receive in my email a Web site tonight that is in the business of selling these false documents, these false diplomas, helping people be in a position where they can qualify already where the States have made these provisions.

It is a big business. Fraud and corruption is a big business. It is a big business in the countries they are coming from, and it is becoming a bigger business in the country they are coming to, the United States of America. We have been a clean country that re-

spects the rule of law. We are a proud nationality. We are a race of people. We have a common cause, a common belief system. We believe in the rule of law. It is our job to uphold that, and this bill, this DREAM Act undermines it.

And it costs a lot of money. The Congressional Budget Office, the CBO, put out a score that has been touted by the other side that somehow it turns into a plus for the U.S. budget because some people will get a better education, and they will earn more money and pay more taxes. I don't think this thinks this through very far, but I can tell you in the second decade even the Congressional Budget Office says that it is going to be a cost of \$5 billion to the taxpayer. And I can tell you that the Center For Immigration Studies, CIS, has done a study on the cost for State and local government, and that would be \$6.2 billion a year. That is each year. That doesn't necessarily project out over a decade, a couple of years perhaps, maybe longer. They only did a couple of years: 6.2, so \$12.4 billion is pretty close to what I think they will commit to.

And the tripling of the number of green cards, the billions of dollars in debt, the people who get a safe harbor who are alien absconders, any alien who has a pending application will be protected from deportation. And this amounts to a de facto scholarship for those who, if ICE were required to deliver that de facto scholarship and before they handed it to them, they would have to apply the law and make sure that they woke up in a country that they were legal in within a few mornings. Those are the facts.

And, furthermore, the most egregious aspect of this is this: this is going to provide for in-State tuition discounts for people who are today illegal in America. And they didn't all come in because their parents brought them. Many of them came in on their own, coming across the border at age 12, 13, 14, 15, turning 16. Many of them will be up to 30 years old saying they were brought into the country when they were 10 or 12. There will be no records to prove that. Here is what happens. Those people who are here illegally that are eligible for removal are today and would be under this act sitting in college classrooms with a taxpayer-funded college education, sitting at a desk. And in California, a resident of California, zero tuition.

But if my son or daughter-in-law wanted to go to California to go to college, they would have to pay out-of-State tuition. Out-of-State tuition for California institutions annually would be \$22,021 a year. Can you imagine writing a check for \$22,021 a year to go to college in California, and sitting in a classroom at a desk next to someone who is unlawfully in the United States who is getting a free education paid for by the taxpayers? How much that would burn you if you are an American citizen in good standing, a taxpayer, an individual and a family that has funded and contributed to this government in the way that most of us do.

□ 2330

There is no justice or equity there, and it cannot be reconciled. I would add to this that it gets even worse, and if this bill passes, I am convinced it will exist all over this country.

People who are illegal here in America will have their taxpayer-funded and, in some States, free education. In Iowa, it costs them about \$3,000 a semester, and it costs the out-of-State people about \$9,000 a semester; but in some States, it's a free education. They'll be sitting at desks in a classroom, next to a grieving widow, who has lost her husband in Iraq or in Afghanistan and who has elected to go across the State line in order to go to college out of State, and she is paying out-of-State tuition. It's \$22,021 in California. A grieving widow of an American patriot, who gave his life defending our liberty and our national security, a grieving widow who maybe has children who have lost their dad, maybe now is going back for training because she knows she is now the principal breadwinner in that family. She is paying out-of-State tuition, and is sitting at a desk next to someone who is unlawfully in the United States, someone who is getting a free college education that is paid for by the taxpayers.

That is what this DREAM Act sets up. It is irreconcilable. It is an impossible conundrum that should not be visited upon the American people. This DREAM Act must be killed. We wounded it here in the House: 37 Democrats voted "no" on the rule, and 38 Democrats voted "no" on the bill. Due to health reasons, we had some Republicans who weren't able to vote. Otherwise, it would have been closer. I actually look out and think we were close to mustering enough votes to defeat this poorly named "DREAM Act," which really is the "affirmative action amnesty act in America."

We should know better. We can do better. I am hopeful that the United States Senate will step up, will speak up and will vote down this DREAM Act when the majority leader in the Senate brings it up, which may be tomorrow. I suspect what will happen is that he won't have the votes, but he will try it anyway, because this has all been political from the beginning. He has realized it is not going to become law, but he made a promise to his constituents: If you will reelect me, we will give you a vote on this DREAM Act.

The gentleman from Chicago, who had pushed on this so hard, got his vote today. We saw the results of it here in the House in this lame duck Congress, in this repudiated 111th Congress that has been led by NANCY PELOSI.

I think about Thomas Jefferson, who once said large initiatives should not be advanced on slender majorities. Well, this was a slender majority, and this is a large initiative. This initiative

of amnesty under the DREAM Act is so large that it's twice the size of the Amnesty Act of 1986, and we have seen the fraud triple the estimates. So, if that's the case, this could become—pick your number—3 million to 6 million people who would get amnesty. Then they will start bringing in their extended families over and over and over again, generation after generation.

It gets out of control, and this poor America, which has between 7 and 11 percent of our legal immigration based on merit, based on people who are going to encourage and enhance and develop the economic, social and cultural well-being of the United States of America, starts to fall apart a little more. It gets undermined a little more, and the principles that make us great are undermined a little bit more.

We need to be in the business of refurbishing those pillars of American exceptionalism, of not getting out the jackhammer and chiseling away at them as was done here today by this PELOSI-led Congress.

So, if Thomas Jefferson said large initiatives should not be advanced on slender majorities—and he did—he didn't contemplate about large initiatives being advanced by repudiated Congresses that have been voted out of office and by Congresses that should go meekly out the door in respect for the will of the American people. They should do nothing that violates a sense of decency and the will of the American people—nothing. Only provide the functions that are necessary to get this government bridged over to the other side so that the new Congress can be seated and so that those new 87 freshman Republicans and however many Democrats there are—nine or so—can take this oath of office here on the 4th day of January and go to work, go to work fixing and saving America from the debacle that has been visited upon her by a dysfunctional Congress that writes bills in the Speaker's office, that brings them zigged through the hole in the wall of the Rules Committee and zagged down to the floor, bills with no amendments and with 30 minutes of debate on each side to try to resolve an issue. There is no time to penetrate with a concept in 30 minutes. You can't fix a bill with talk and with being denied a motion to recommit, which is standard practice in this place.

So there is no possible way to put up a motion that is going to fix a bill here. It is a bad bill. It damages the rule of law. It grants amnesty. It costs tens of billions of dollars. It rewards people for breaking the law. It gives them a tuition discount, an in-State tuition discount. If it's Iowa, it's \$3,000 a semester versus \$9,000 a semester in round terms. If it's California, it's free tuition versus \$22,021.

That's the America they are building. Americans saw what was going on—debt and deficit, irresponsible spending, damaging the rule of law, breaking down the American culture

and civilization—a Constitution demolition crew at work every day. They said, You're digging us a hole, and we aren't going to take it anymore. The American people rose up and took the shovel out of the hands of Barack Obama and NANCY PELOSI, and they made it a lot harder for HARRY REID.

So what do we have going on?

NANCY PELOSI is still digging because, technically, the shovel is not out of her hands yet. She lined up all of those Blue Dogs, and said, I'm going to make you walk the plank one last time before you go home for the last time. They said no. They stepped off the side of the plank, and voted against the rule and voted against the DREAM Act, and they sent a statement as they walked out the door.

Well, I think there are a lot of them who deserve credit for serving America in the fashion they have. Those who stood up to the courage of their convictions deserve our thanks. Those who came to this place to work in good faith deserve the gratitude of the American people. As for those who disagreed with me and who made a good argument, I hope, if you're right, it prevailed. It is my privilege to have served with people on both sides of this aisle as I think that the debate is essential and important.

From my standpoint, I will stand up for the things I believe in and will debate them with those folks who have beliefs that disagree with mine, believing as our Founding Fathers did that, in that debate, we will sort out the right policy for this country.

But when you shut the debate off, when the iron fist of the Speaker shuts out the committees and writes the bill in her office and sends it to the floor with no amendments and no motion to recommit, you end up with a terrible piece of legislation. You break faith with the American people, and you break faith with the franchise of every other Member of this Congress on both sides of the aisle. That is what has happened here over and over again over the last 4 years, and it has gotten worse each year.

□ 2340

This is one of the starkest examples. Who would have thought that in a lame duck session, when we had big things to do and big things to worry about, the Speaker would push an amnesty act out here in a lame duck session in a repudiated Congress and not give all of those freshmen an opportunity to weigh in on this? They are the new voices. They are the new voices for America. They are the new vigor. They are the convictions of this United States of America.

I look for good things from them, big things from them. I want to see them empowered to the maximum. Their fresh ideas and their energy and the cohesiveness that I hope is that class. I believe they will put a marker down in history that will meet that standard perhaps of the 1994 class—of which

some are here, still here—and take us on up to another level. In that class, I expect we will see committee chairs and we will see new majority leaders. Maybe there is a Speaker in that class. Maybe there is a majority whip in that class or a conference chair, maybe all of them. There might be a President of the United States that's coming into this Congress that will be sworn in here on January 4. All of those things are possible, and most of them are likely, Mr. Speaker.

I look forward to the new breath of fresh air that is arriving in this Congress. I look forward to Speaker BOEHNER, who will be offering transparency here in this Congress. I look forward to the voice of every Member being heard with respect. And those ideas that can prevail in the arena of ideas, which is here in this debate on the floor of the House and in our committees, are the ones that are the best ideas for the American people.

We will get there. We've got a lot of things to reconstruct. We've got a lot of undoing to do. And it's not going to be an easy job and it won't be a short job. We will be undoing perhaps for the next 2 years while we elect a President that will help us do in the following 4 years.

America will never be chiselled to perfection, but it's our charge, it's our struggle to work on it every day, to get it as close to right as we mortals can so that when it's handed off to the next generation, they can be proud of the toil that we did here and understand there was a vision and a commitment, and that we kept, in this new majority, our oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence and attention here tonight and the opportunity to address you here on the floor and close out the business for the day, and I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MITCHELL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MITCHELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, December 15.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, December 15.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.