

forced to sleep on cold concrete floors and benches.

What I saw shocked me as a mother and disappointed me as an American.

I left that day determined to do everything I could to ensure that these children, many of whom fled horrific violence, are treated with care and compassion.

That's why I'll be voting "no" on the bill before us.

Joining me and others who oppose this destructive legislation are faith leaders, anti-trafficking groups, and women's organizations.

This diverse coalition is united in the belief that children escaping violence and persecution deserve to be protected and treated with basic human dignity.

The influx of refugees from Central America has put a strain on our border and immigration agencies. These agencies need greater resources to handle the heart-wrenching situation at our border in a way that is consistent with our American values. When things get tough, and when our resolve is tested, we must not abandon the ideals that make America so special.

Instead, we must live up to our ideals, and back our lofty rhetoric with meaningful action. Passing a clean supplemental spending bill that addresses the causes and consequences of the humanitarian crisis at our border would be meaningful and effective action, because the Senate would pass that bill and the President would sign it.

The tired, scared, helpless kids I saw in that overcrowded Border Patrol station are counting on us. Instead of playing political games and falsely claiming our borders are at risk, we need to act like Americans and stand up for these vulnerable children.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this irresponsible and shameful Republican supplemental.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 710, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 189, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 478]

YEAS—223

Aderholt	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Amash	Buchanan	Cotton
Amodei	Bucshon	Cramer
Bachmann	Burgess	Crawford
Bachus	Byrne	Crenshaw
Barletta	Calvert	Cuellar
Barr	Capito	Culberson
Barton	Carter	Daines
Benishek	Cassidy	Davis, Rodney
Bentivolio	Chabot	Denham
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Dent
Bishop (UT)	Clawson (FL)	DeSantis
Black	Coble	Diaz-Balart
Blackburn	Coffman	Duffy
Boustany	Cole	Duncan (SC)
Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)	Duncan (TN)
Bridenstine	Collins (NY)	Ellmers
Brooks (AL)	Conaway	Farenthold

Fitzpatrick	Lamborn
Fleischmann	Lance
Fleming	Lankford
Flores	Latham
Forbes	Latta
Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Fox	Long
Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Gardner	Lummis
Garrett	Marchant
Gerlach	Marino
Gibbs	McAllister
Gibson	McCarthy (CA)
Gingrey (GA)	McCaul
Gohmert	McClintock
Goodlatte	McHenry
Gosar	McKeon
Gowdy	McKinley
Granger	McMorris
Graves (GA)	Rodgers
Graves (MO)	Meadows
Griffin (AR)	Meehan
Griffith (VA)	Messer
Grimm	Mica
Guthrie	Miller (FL)
Hall	Miller (MI)
Hanna	Mullin
Harper	Mulvaney
Harris	Murphy (PA)
Hartzler	Neugebauer
Hastings (WA)	Noem
Heck (NV)	Nugent
Hensarling	Nunes
Herrera Beutler	Olson
Holding	Palazzo
Hudson	Paulsen
Huelskamp	Pearce
Huizenga (MI)	Perry
Hultgren	Petri
Hunter	Pittenger
Hurt	Pitts
Issa	Poe (TX)
Jenkins	Pompeo
Johnson (OH)	Posey
Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)
Jolly	Reed
Jordan	Reichert
Joyce	Renacci
Kelly (PA)	Ribble
King (IA)	Rice (SC)
King (NY)	Rigell
Kingston	Roby
Kinzinger (IL)	Roe (TN)
Kline	Rogers (AL)
Labrador	Rogers (KY)
LaMalfa	Rogers (MI)

NAYS—189

Barber	DeFazio	Johnson (GA)
Barrow (GA)	DeGette	Johnson, E. B.
Bass	Delaney	Jones
Beatty	DeLauro	Kaptur
Becerra	DelBene	Keating
Bera (CA)	Deutch	Kelly (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Kennedy
Bishop (NY)	Doggett	Kildee
Bonamici	Doyle	Kilmer
Brady (PA)	Duckworth	Kind
Braley (IA)	Edwards	Kirkpatrick
Broun (GA)	Engel	Kuster
Brown (FL)	Enyart	Langevin
Brownley (CA)	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Bustos	Esty	Larson (CT)
Butterfield	Farr	Lee (CA)
Capps	Fincher	Levin
Capuano	Poster	Lewis
Cárdenas	Frankel (FL)	Lipinski
Carney	Fudge	Loeb sack
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	Lofgren
Cartwright	Gallego	Lowenthal
Castor (FL)	Garcia	Lowe y
Castro (TX)	Green, Al	Lujan Grisham
Chu	Grijalva	(NM)
Cicilline	Gutiérrez	Luján, Ben Ray
Clark (MA)	Hahn	(NM)
Clark (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Lynch
Clay	Heck (WA)	Maffei
Cleaver	Higgins	Maloney
Clyburn	Himes	Carolyn
Cohen	Hinojosa	Maloney, Sean
Connolly	Holt	Massie
Conyers	Honda	Matheson
Cooper	Horsford	Matsui
Costa	Hoyer	McCarthy (NY)
Courtney	Huffman	McCollum
Crowley	Israel	McGovern
Cummings	Jackson Lee	McIntyre
Davis, Danny	Jeffries	McNerney

Meeks	Polis	Smith (WA)
Meng	Price (NC)	Swalwell (CA)
Michaud	Quigley	Takano
Miller, George	Rahall	Thompson (CA)
Moore	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
Moran	Richmond	Tierney
Murphy (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Titus
Nadler	Ruppersberger	Tonko
Napolitano	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas
Neal	Sanchez, Loretta	Van Hollen
Negrete McLeod	Sarbanes	Vargas
Nolan	Schakowsky	Veasey
O'Rourke	Schiff	Vela
Owens	Schneider	Velázquez
Pallone	Schrader	Visclosky
Pascarell	Schwartz	Walz
Pastor (AZ)	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Payne	Scott, David	Wasserman
Pelosi	Serrano	Schultz
Perlmutter	Sewell (AL)	Waters
Peters (CA)	Shea-Porter	Waxman
Peters (MI)	Sherman	Welch
Peterson	Sinema	Wilson (FL)
Pingree (ME)	Sires	Yarmuth
Pocan	Slaughter	

NOT VOTING—20

Blumenauer	Fattah	Nunnelee
Camp	Garamendi	Ruiz
Campbell	Grayson	Rush
Cantor	Green, Gene	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Hanabusa	T.
DesJarlais	McDermott	Schock
Ellison	Miller, Gary	Speier

□ 2037

Mr. GOSAR changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 478 I was caught in traffic and couldn't reach the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 478 (On Passage of H.R. 5230), had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DEFERRED ACTION FOR ALIENS

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 710, I call up the bill (H.R. 5272) to prohibit certain actions with respect to deferred action for aliens not lawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 710, the amendment printed in part B of House Report 113-571 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5272

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LIMITATION ON DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS; RESTRICTIONS ON EMPLOYMENT AUTHORIZATION FOR ALIENS NOT IN LAWFUL STATUS.

No agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government may use Federal funding or resources after July 30, 2014—

(1) to consider or adjudicate any new or previously denied application of any alien requesting consideration of deferred action for childhood arrivals, as authorized by Executive memorandum dated June 15, 2012 and effective on August 15, 2012 (or by any other

succeeding Executive memorandum or policy authorizing a similar program);

(2) to newly authorize deferred action for any class of aliens not lawfully present in the United States; or

(3) to authorize any alien to work in the United States if such alien—

(A) was not lawfully admitted into the United States in compliance with the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); and

(B) is not in lawful status in the United States on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5272.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5272 prohibits Federal funding or resources from being used to adjudicate any application for the President's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, program; and it prohibits the President from issuing employment authorization documents to unlawful immigrants in the United States.

This bill differs from the bill the House was set to consider yesterday in that it prohibits funds from being used for adjudication. The prior version of this bill was a simple prohibition on the President's actions.

□ 2045

According to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Director Leon Rodriguez, the President's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program has already allowed over 714,000 unlawful immigrants, who claimed to have arrived as minors, to remain in the United States and seek employment. DACA is a major reason for the unprecedented influx of minors and family units along our southern borders.

This deferred action program was announced by the President and the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security on June 15, 2012.

It is a usurpation of the plenary authority over immigration law that article I, section 8, clause 4 of the United States Constitution confers on the legislative branch.

And the President knows that it is a usurpation of congressional authority. In fact, in March of 2011, he stated: "With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that's just not the case, because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed. The execu-

tive branch's job is to enforce and implement those laws. There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply, through executive order, ignore these congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President."

Despite this admission, just over a year later, the President implemented the DACA program. And today it stands as a beacon for any unlawful immigrant to simply cross into the United States illegally because word has gotten out that they will be given permission to stay. I heard this again and again from unlawful immigrants in Border Patrol custody when I visited the Rio Grande Valley earlier this month.

So let's be clear: the President's administrative policies abandoning immigration enforcement and his promises about future administrative legalizations continue to encourage unlawful immigrant parents to smuggle their children into the United States. These policies and promises put money directly into the pockets of human smuggling and drug cartels and put children at risk of perilous, illicit journeys to the United States. And they undermine the fundamental constitutional principles that Congress creates the laws and the President is bound to enforce them.

H.R. 5272 sends the vitally important message that minors tempted to come here in the future will no longer be rewarded by a President who chooses to use his pen and cell phone to legislate. They will have absolutely no opportunity to receive DACA benefits.

I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for introducing the bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I strongly oppose H.R. 5272. This, in all honesty and candor, is one of the most mean-spirited and anti-immigrant pieces of legislation I have seen in all of my years in the Congress.

Now, the main reason, of course, is that it would unfairly harm current and future DREAM Act kids. The majority have been clear about their intent with this bill: No DREAMers.

This legislation is designed to prevent young people who have lived here most of their lives and are members of our communities from benefiting from deferred action. It would foreclose the administration from focusing resources on identifying and removing individuals such as criminals and gang members from our communities. And even worse, the legislation would mean that the hundreds of thousands of young people who have already benefited from deferred action, who are contributing to our economy, participating in our communities, and obtaining an education could be deported in less than 2

years. And that is why the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, the AFL-CIO, and the American Civil Liberties Union, ACLU, have already registered their strong opposition to the bill.

I am confident that there are many more who would oppose this legislation because it seeks to roll back protections supported by civil rights organizations, religious organizations, college and university presidents, labor unions, and national educational organizations.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to both the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader, for purposes of a colloquy. And I will begin by yielding to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

There is a section within the bill, which we just passed, that provides that the Attorney General—who is currently under contempt of Congress—will appoint the 40 new immigration judges established in the bill. A number of us have a problem with that. And I know that concerns you, Chairman GOODLATTE.

I believe that you, as Judiciary chairman, have agreed to work on a solution to deal with that issue going forward and to attempt to craft a solution that would be acceptable to a majority of the committee. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GOODLATTE. That is correct.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. And I can assure you that I will work with Chairman GOODLATTE in an effort to remedy that problem.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank you both so much for your commitment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. How did we get here? In the dark of night, Republicans are voting to deport DREAMers, take away the DACA program, and make every undocumented immigrant deportable.

In November of 2012, the Republicans were shellshocked, and they spoke of turning over a new leaf with young voters, with Asian voters, with women, and Latinos.

A year ago, I was working with Congressman SAM JOHNSON and Judge CARTER of Texas. I did town hall meetings and public appearances with Judge CARTER and with Congressman VALADAO. I worked with MIKE COFFMAN of Denver and stood up with AARON SCHOCK and ADAM KINZINGER in my own State of Illinois.

But now STEVE KING, MICHELE BACHMANN, and TED CRUZ are literally writing the immigration script for the Republican Party, a script filled with ugly and mean policies that demonize

children and marginalize immigrants and destroy families.

In January, you were saying that all of the DREAMers should get green cards and citizenship. We always understood you wanted to deport their parents.

But now, late on a Friday night, you are going after the DREAMers, who have known no other country but this one, who risked their identities and their families to come forward and sign up with the Department of Homeland Security and pass FBI background checks so they could get right with the law.

The United States said, come forward and get right with the law. And now Republicans are saying they should go back in the shadows, back to a life of fear, where opportunities are few, and their futures are uncertain.

The voters had a referendum on the program back in 2012, and the winner was President Obama, the DREAMers, and the American people. But now you want to take all of that away. Thank God the Senate is gone. The President has called this “veto bait,” and this will never become law.

Is there no one in your conference who can stand up and talk sensibly when others in your party want to demonize children at the border and deport the DREAMers who live in our neighborhoods across America? You are so frozen in fear of your own voters, so frozen in fear of your own colleagues, and the Nation needs you to be courageous.

Only cowards scapegoat children. And only those who are ashamed of themselves do it in the night, on a Friday. You are apparently not strong enough to stand up and craft real solution to America’s problems.

But here is the truth revealed about the Republican Party in the last few weeks, and why all of the talk this year about immigration reform was just talk.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. In the end, the Republican position on immigration can be summed up as “deport ‘em all.” When push comes to shove, your party is standing by the simplistic desire to deport ‘em all.

Most of you know that the approach of deport ‘em all is nonsense, and you know it is suicide as a political strategy. But you continue to say, deport ‘em all. Shame on those who will not stand up for the children at the border, and shame on all those who will not stand in the neighborhoods of our communities for the children who live with us.

Say “no” to this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say that this bill does not deport anyone. This bill simply freezes a program that violates the United States Constitution.

So now, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I thank the chairman for his excellent work on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, tonight, the U.S. House of Representatives has passed, with my support, a strong border security bill. And I rise in support of this second reform bill that would, if enacted, immediately and effectively address the humanitarian and national security crisis that has developed along the southern border of the United States.

This crisis, which will result in an estimated 90,000 unaccompanied children entering the United States illegally through the end of this fiscal year, representing a 1,381 percent increase since 2009, was entirely caused by the Obama administration’s failure to secure the border, its unwillingness to enforce existing laws, and its disastrous 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, which invited this surge in illegal immigration.

The action taken by the House tonight is a serious, bold, and thoughtful legislative response to President Obama’s failure to secure the border and ensure that the laws are faithfully executed.

But there is a second and very important reason besides a policy reason why every Member of this House should support this legislation, and that is to vindicate the separation of powers.

There was a U.S. Supreme Court case in 1983 that dealt with an immigration issue, *INS v. Chadha*. And in that case, the Supreme Court talked about the procedure that the Constitution outlines to change the law, how legislation is enacted in accordance with constitutional command. And the court held that there was a single, finely wrought, and exhaustively considered procedure for enacting legislation. And unilateral executive memoranda from the White House is not the way to change the law.

So if you are interested in vindicating the separation of powers, if you believe that the way to change the law—even if you believe in the DREAM Act, even if you believe in the President’s policy of deferred action—the way that we do that is through constitutional procedure.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BARR. So there is not just a policy issue at stake here, not just a humanitarian and national security issue at stake—the Constitution is at stake.

So I appreciate the House leadership for heeding the call that I and many of my colleagues made to stay in session and finish the work of the American people before the start of the August district work period.

I strongly urge the Senate and President Obama to do their jobs, stop trying to score political points, listen to

the American people, pass this bill, and join the House in solving this very important problem.

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

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

Mr. CONYERS. How much time remains on either side, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 25½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 22½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. At this time, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the brand-new majority whip of the United States Congress.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, for bringing this bill to the floor and for his leadership on Mrs. BLACKBURN’s legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if you go back and look at DACA in 2012, when it was issued as an executive order, it was an example of President Obama’s executive overreach.

Some want to make this a partisan issue, yet, Mr. Speaker, more than a dozen times, the United States Supreme Court has issued 9–0 rulings that President Obama has overreached his executive authority. That is not a 5–4 decision. That is 9–0. Ruth Bader Ginsburg recognized more than a dozen times this President has overreached his executive authority.

□ 2100

Mr. Speaker, why is this DACA ruling so dangerous? This has been the magnet that has led to the flood of people coming across our border. This crisis at the border is partially responsible to the DACA ruling. We have got to stop having this kind of message go out that has led not only to a flood of people coming across our border, but has led to and can be responsible for the human trafficking that is going on. There are so many devastating things that this has done. We have got to stop this overreach.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, a distinguished member of the judiciary committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I hope the Speaker says that word from Texas very loud because I listened earlier today of all of the relief in the appropriations bill given to Texans down at the border, \$594 million.

Let me tell you that there are people in Texas who are ready to serve and help the unaccompanied children. There are people in Texas who recognize that we are the good Samaritans. Don’t label us with wanting \$594 million, and don’t label us with standing against the DACA children, the DREAMers, who have come to this country and been here for 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, these children ran into the arms of the Border Patrol. There is no criminal or legal crisis at the border, but the DACA bill that is here on

the floor of the House is a disgrace to the words of the Star-Spangled Banner. We are the home of the free and the brave. We are free enough to be able to welcome those in need.

This body knows that DACA has nothing to do with the unaccompanied children, and it is a disgrace that we would undermine the hardworking students like Juan Jesus in my office this summer, that we would undermine it with a disgraceful bill—a disgraceful bill. It is disgraceful. Pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5272, a bill brought to the floor at the eleventh hour by the House Republican leadership to placate its extreme right-wing Tea Party faction and one of the most hypocritical, irresponsible, and mean-spirited legislative proposals brought to the House floor this year.

H.R. 5272 seeks to prohibit the Administration from exercising its administrative discretion to focus resources on identifying and apprehending those aliens who are present in country illegally who pose the most serious danger to our national security and the safety of our citizens.

This cynical bill is hypocritical because the vast majority of its proponents have been claiming for years now that the reason they refuse to compromise on budget issues, support for sequestration, and voted to shut down the government is because of their belief in the importance of setting spending priorities.

Yet, H.R. 5272 would deny ICE the ability to use its limited resources in the most efficient manner to achieve its highest priorities which is to apprehend, detain, and remove aliens who pose a danger to national security or a risk to public safety.

This bill is irresponsible because it seeks to prevent trained, experienced, and professional agents and prosecutors from exercising their discretion and acting on the basis of what everyone knows to be true: that there is a vast difference between a terrorist bent on harming America and a DREAM Act kid studying hard in school so he or she can graduate, join the Armed Services and willingly risk his or her life to defend the country, or go to work to support his or her family.

This inefficient use of resources wastes taxpayer dollars and does nothing to keep America safe.

This bill is mean-spirited because it would have ICE target its limited resources on innocent, law abiding, young people who were brought to this country as children and would have them deported to a foreign land even though America is the country they may know as home and the only one to which they may have ever pledged allegiance.

Mr. Speaker, I traveled many times to Iraq and Afghanistan and always the highlight of my visit was meeting the young men and women who were willingly risking their lives to defend the country they love more than life.

More than 5,000 of the soldiers who fought for us in Afghanistan and Iraq were not yet American citizens but DREAMers who dreamed that one day they might become citizens of the nation they gladly risked their lives to defend.

Instead of honoring their service, this heartless bill before us crushes their dream by forcing ICE agents and prosecutors to pretend that there is no difference between one of

these veterans who came to this country as an undocumented immigrant and an alien engaged in or suspected of espionage or terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5272 also wastes the money of hard-working taxpayers and does nothing to make America safer, and eliminates a fair and just policy legal under the President's executive authority which allows for relief for young children who have been in America for a certain number of years, follow certain requirements and may be deferred from deportation to serve in the U.S. military, go to school and contribute to America.

And, just as bad, it is inconsistent with American values of justice and fair play.

We must address our broken immigration system through comprehensive reform rather than extinguish Ms. Liberty's lamp of freedom or close her Golden Door.

We are better than that and I urge all Members to join me in rejecting this terrible legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman GOODLATTE, for yielding. There are a lot of people in this Congress that I appreciate a great deal tonight, but I have listened to the anger and the fury over on the other side, and I have never seen the Sergeant at Arms have to come and clear the floor like we have seen here tonight.

I am wondering what is this about? I would take this back to the State of the Union Address when I watched the President of the United States here on the rostrum speak, and he said, essentially, the summary of what he has delivered to America a number of times: Congress, I am going to tell you what to do, and if you don't do it, I am going to use either my cell phone or my ink pen, and I am going to do it. Here it goes again, Mr. Speaker.

What I saw was this, our Founding Fathers set up this balance in our Constitution between the three branches of government, articles I, II, and III, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branch of government.

They drew as fine a line as they could between the three, but they always knew that there would be a gray area, and they anticipated that each branch of government would jealously protect the constitutional authority that is vested within it within the Constitution, the supreme law of the land.

When the President said, I am going to usurp your legislative authority, I am going to take over article I, and I am going to legislate if you don't do what I tell you, what happened? The people that are applauding now applauded then, and they said, Mr. President, take the power that is in the Constitution, take it from me, take article I, too, take your pen, take your cell phone. You run this country as if you were a king, rather than only the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this debate is about here. This is about the DACA

language that the President has introduced 2-plus years ago, and I said then when we had Hill hearings before the Judiciary Committee and Janet Napolitano—I said that we will take you to court on this, this will be litigated.

It will be litigated because the President does not have legislative authority. He is only the President of the United States. If the President wants to somehow grant amnesty to one person, he has some prosecutorial discretion to do that, but they argued in the Morton Memos, and they argued in the DACA memos—seven times in the Morton Memos—on an individual basis only, on an individual basis only, prosecutorial discretion on an individual basis only.

They put it in there seven times because they knew they were wrong, and they knew it was going to be litigated. You don't do 700,000 people on an individual basis only. You don't suspend the law. If the President wants the law changed, he knows to come to Congress, ask us—and ask us, and when you take an oath to uphold the Constitution, you had better believe that it means what it says.

Why would you just throw your authority over the side and say, Mr. President, take this from us? That is not what you pledged to your constituents. That is not the oath that you take.

So what this says is that the DACA language says this: Mr. President, stop violating the Constitution from this point forward. As the chairman said, it does not deport anybody. It just restores constitutional article I authority.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, this just restores the constitutional authority of the United States Congress, and it says: President Obama, don't continue to violate this Constitution. President Obama, when you waved your ink pen at us a week and a half ago and you said you were going to legalize 5 to 6 million people, it is unconstitutional.

He knows it. He has many times given the lecture that he knows it. He gave his word, and he needs to keep it. I want to remind him, it won't go cheap if you try this, Mr. President. I urge the adoption of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members of the House are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Thank you, Congressman CONYERS.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I rise today to strongly oppose H.R. 5272, an extreme and highly partisan bill that

would prevent the continuation or expansion of President Obama's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, known as DACA.

Simply put, this misguided bill limits President Obama's prosecutorial discretion and seeks to dismantle the DACA program. I am very concerned that the majority has brought this anti-Hispanic amended bill to the floor in order to prevent President Obama from building upon the successes of the DACA program and to appease the most extreme wing of the Republican Conference.

The underlying bill punishes hard-working DREAMers and immigrants who are eager to contribute to America's prosperity and have waited long enough for comprehensive immigration reform.

Since its inception in 2012, the DACA program has protected DREAMers who meet certain requirements from deportation, allowing hundreds of thousands of young undocumented immigrants who were brought to the United States as children to remain and work in the United States.

In my view, closing the door on undocumented youth is un-American. We in the Congress of the United States have a moral responsibility to protect the welfare and rights of vulnerable children and youth, including children and youth who are undocumented or are fleeing from violence and despair in their countries of origin.

Mr. Speaker, I close by urging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in strong opposition to H.R. 5272, extreme and highly partisan legislation that does nothing to fix our Nation's broken immigration system.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, as I sit here and I listen to the other side talk about this issue, I wonder if they even understand what is happening at the border.

In 2011, there were only 6,500 children coming to the border. In 2012, the President acted through DACA, and we started seeing an increase of these children coming to the border. Today, in 2014, we will have 90,000 children rushing to the border, and next year, it is estimated that we will have 142,000 children coming to the border.

Almost 2 months ago, Gilberto Ramos, a 15-year-old boy from Guatemala, was found lying in brush, dead from the heat. Many of these children that are coming to the border don't make it across the river. There are reports of discoveries of small, lifeless bodies washed up along the riverbanks. Many of these children are abused, they are victimized, and they are raped.

We must understand that the President is responsible because of his failure to fully comply with the law. We have heard a lot from the other side

that the President acted because we did not act. Well, that is not true.

The reality is that the President and his party had majorities in both Houses of Congress for 2 years, and you failed to act, so don't point your finger at us. In November of 2012—in November of 2012—we passed in this House a STEM Jobs Act, which was the beginning of a step-by-step approach to actually deal with the immigration process. What did you do? You didn't vote for it, and the Senate refused to take it up.

In September of 2011, we passed here in the House the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act, and the Senate again refused to act, which would have been the beginning of a step-by-step approach for us to deal with the immigration process. You have refused to do small things.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman is reminded to direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. LABRADOR. Stop the hypocrisy. If you truly care about these kids, stop encouraging them to come to the United States illegally. They are crossing the border. Most of them are being harmed, many of them are being abused, and a few of them are dying.

It is time for us to stop this nonsense and to have the President of the United States actually follow the law and work with the Congress, so we can actually do immigration reform.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GOODLATTE and Mrs. BLACKBURN who is responsible for this wonderful bill this evening, which I wholeheartedly support. This is why: last weekend, I think the Nation was stunned when our President said that he would unilaterally use his power—raw power—to effectively grant amnesty to 5 to 6 million foreign nationals here in the United States illegally.

He said that he would do that with his power, and what happened this week is that this body came together and we decided to answer the President's unconstitutional call.

So with this DACA bill, effectively, we will put forward the strongest possible legislative response that this body could put forward. We say in this bill that the President has no power, no authority administratively to grant permits which would effectively grant amnesty to 5 to 6 million foreign nationals illegally in the United States.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we will put a handcuff on one of the President's hands.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Now, in the United States Senate, the majority leader,

HARRY REID, has left town. He has left town. Not only did he fail to complete an immigration bill, but he knows full well that President Obama may illegally grant amnesty to 5 to 6 million foreign nationals illegally in the United States without doing anything.

What HARRY REID has the opportunity to do is to come back and join us. We will be here any time, any day, anywhere, anyhow. We will join him here in August, September, whenever, and he needs to put the other handcuff on this lawless President's hands, so we constrain this President from granting amnesty.

Mr. Speaker, that is what the American people want us to do. We do that tonight with this bill. We invite HARRY REID to bring the Senate back and put the handcuff on the President's other hand, so that we can have sovereignty again on our southern border.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 2115

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, my inquiry is: Is it not a fact that we are here because the Republicans opposed this legislation in the Senate and there were not sufficient votes to move the bill and that is why we are here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who comes from the State of Texas, and like many in this House, I have been down on the Texas-Mexico border. I was there last weekend. You have to be there to know what is going on. I went up and down the Rio Grande River with law enforcement officers from the State of Texas. We see the people on the Mexican side—and I think the Mexican Government is complicit—just waiting for us to pass, and then they start coming across.

And the other side talks about it just being one group of people—children. Well, that is just not true, because the people who are being apprehended are not just children. A lot of them are teenagers. A lot of them are older. The chief of Border Patrol of the McAllen sector said there are 144 nations that came across the border this year represented. Just a week ago before I got there, there were three Ukrainians.

Why, Mr. Speaker? Why is everybody coming to America through south Texas? Because they believe wherever they start out, whether it is kids in

Honduras looking for a better life, or terrorists, or Ukrainians, or someone else, they believe that this President, this administration, said: You get to America, we are going to let you stay.

We have all kinds of different legal reasons. Some of it is called DACA, and there are other reasons. But the bottom line is you are going to get to stay in America, and Americans will take care of your needs. That is what they believe. And the reason they believe that is because the rule of law is not being enforced in America.

Third World countries protect their borders better than the United States.

And who is benefiting from all of this? Well, it is not the kids. As pointed out, many of them are dying or getting hurt. It is not America. It is not legal immigrants. Who is benefiting? It is the drug cartels, the criminal gangs, the MS-13 gang. They are making money off the fact that the rule of law in this country is not being enforced.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. POE of Texas. The rule of law is not enforced when it comes to the sovereignty and security of the Nation. And that is all we are asking. Let's have some rules and follow them so people all over the world who want to come to America, let them know there is a right way to come. And the wrong way is they shouldn't believe that you get here, you are going to get to stay because the administration is not going to enforce the law. That is why we have the chaos. That is why we have the 50,000 to 60,000 people crossing in south Texas.

So all we are trying to do with this little piece of legislation is get back to let's enforce the rule of law. Let's not grant amnesty and let's not treat people from different countries differently. Let's treat them all the same way. That is why I support this legislation, because it will send the message that even in America the rule of law will be enforced.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I know you said that is just the way it is, and I agree, but I just want to make an added point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman if he will yield to me.

Mr. POE of Texas. I continue to yield to the chairman.

Mr. GOODLATTE. So 50,000 coming across the border, that is 50,000 unaccompanied minors coming to the border, and they are a small percentage of the total number of people. Eighty-five percent of the people coming to the

border right now—and all categories are up. Children are up most, but all categories are up, and 85 percent are not unaccompanied minors.

So the gentleman makes a very valid point about the crisis at our border and the cause of that crisis. The President caused it. The President can solve it. The President should act now, and we need to send a strong message that America is not open to people who violate our laws.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry as to the bill that is on the floor, is this not the bill dealing with deferred action for juveniles or young people who have been in this country for 5 years, graduated from high school, going to college or working, and in actuality is not dealing with the unaccompanied children? But more importantly, is it not true that this bill is destined for a veto, will not be passed in the Senate, and in essence, we are here passing a bill that has no future?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has not stated a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, we are ready to close on this side.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I also only have one speaker remaining and am prepared to close.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, to close.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, some Members have asked whether this bill terminates deferred action for DREAMers with DACA. This question was put to Chairman GOODLATTE at the Rules Committee today, and he answered, as I saw on TV, that the text speaks for itself. He is right. The text does speak for itself. And on lines 5 through 7 on page 1, the text clearly terminates DACA by prohibiting DREAMers from applying to renew their deferred action, which they must do after a 2-year time period.

It also prevents future deferred action to ensure that we continue to deport the parents of the DREAMers and parents of U.S. citizen children, sending those children, by the way, into foster care, or prevent DREAMers who have not yet filed for deferred action from doing so.

So basically, this bill will have the effect of removing DACA from the DREAMers and making them deportable.

Now, there has been a lot of discussion about the role that DACA has had, and I will put into the RECORD a report from the Cato Institute, titled, "DACA Did Not Cause the Surge in Unaccompanied Children." If you do statistic analysis, you can see that it is impos-

sible that DACA has been the cause of these children coming from the three war-torn countries, as the report reports.

[From the Cato Institute, July 29, 2014]

DACA DID NOT CAUSE THE SURGE IN UNACCOMPANIED CHILDREN

(By Alex Nowrasteh)

In June, 2012 the Obama Administration announced that it had authored a memo deferring the deportation of unauthorized immigrant childhood arrivals in the United States, a program known as deferred action for childhood arrivals (DACA). The memo directed then Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to practice prosecutorial discretion toward a small number of unauthorized immigrants who fulfilled a specific set of characteristics. In essence, some unauthorized immigrants who had come to the United States as children were able to legally stay and work—at least temporarily.

DID DACA CAUSE THE UAC SURGE?

Some politicians contend that DACA is primarily responsible for the surge in unaccompanied child (UAC) migrants across the border in recent years. A recent House Appropriations Committee one-pager stated that, "The dire situation on our Southern border has been exacerbated by the President's current immigration policies." Proponents of this theory argue that DACA sent a message to Central Americans that if they came as children then the U.S. government would legalize them, thus giving a large incentive for them to come in the first place. Few facts of the unaccompanied children (UAC) surge are consistent with the theory that DACA caused the surge.

First, the surge in UAC began long before the June 15, 2012 announcement of DACA. It is true that DACA had been discussed in late May 2012 but the surge was underway by that time. From October 2011 through March 2012, there was a 93 percent increase in UAC apprehensions over the same period in Fiscal Year 2011. Texas Governor Rick Perry warned President Obama about the rapid increase in UAC at the border in early May 2012—more than a full month before DACA was announced. In early June 2012, Mexico was detaining twice as many Central American children as in 2011. The surge in unaccompanied children (UAC) began before DACA was announced.

Second, the children coming now are not legally able to apply for DACA. A recipient of DACA has to have resided in the United States continuously from June 15, 2007 to June 15, 2012, a requirement that excludes the unaccompanied children coming now.

Third, if DACA was such an incentive for UAC to come from Central America, why are so few Nicaraguan children coming? They would benefit in the same way as unaccompanied children from El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. The lack of Nicaraguans points to other causes of the surge.

The timing, legal exclusion of the UAC from DACA, and lack of Nicaraguans indicate that DACA was not a primary cause of the surge. Of the 404 UAC interviewed by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees since 2011, only 9 mentioned that U.S. laws influenced their decision to come to the United States. Other American laws could have influenced the unaccompanied children to come but DACA is not the main culprit.

DETAILS ON DACA

The DACA beneficiaries, at the time of the memo, would have to fulfill all of these requirements to have their deportations deferred: under the age of 31; arrived to the United States before reaching their 16th birthday; entered the United States without

inspection or overstayed a visa prior to June 15, 2012; continuously resided in the United States from June 15, 2007 to the time of the memo; physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012, as well as at the time of requesting deferred action from United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS); been in school at the time of application, or have already graduated or obtained a certificate of completion from high school, or have obtained a general education development (GED) certificate, or are an honorably discharged veteran of the U.S. Coast Guard or the U.S. Armed Forces; not been convicted of a felony, significant misdemeanor, or three or more other misdemeanors, and do not otherwise pose a threat to national security or public safety.

Beneficiaries of DACA were also allowed to apply for employment authorization according to the Code of Federal Regulations. There is a debate amongst legal scholars over whether the administration's grant of deferred action was legal. Those who argue that DACA was illegal contend that the President overstepped his constitutional authority to defer the deportation of some unauthorized immigrants. Those who argue that DACA was legal point to the general power of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to defer enforcement action. They argue that the Supreme Court has ruled that decisions to initiate or terminate enforcement proceedings fall within the authority of the Executive—an enforcement power used since the early 1970s. Here is more of their argument. This disagreement has not been settled.

By the end of September, 2013, 580,000 requests for DACA were accepted by the U.S. government and 514,800, or 89 percent, were approved. Seventy-six percent of the requests came from Mexicans. Twenty-nine percent of the requests were filed from California, 16 percent from Texas, and 6 percent from Illinois.

Read the Full Article: DACA Did Not Cause the Surge in Unaccompanied Children

Ms. LOFGREN. Now, we know that this bill would eliminate DACA for DREAMers and make them deportable, but few in this body may know that the bill also returns to our bitter 2-year fight about reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. It took this House 2 years to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act at the beginning of this Congress, and when we did it, we did it over the strong opposition of the majority of House Republicans.

Today's bill undermines the basic premise of that act, that victims of domestic violence should be empowered to leave their abusers. It does that by denying the ability of battered immigrant spouses who have left their abusers and successfully self-petitioned for a VAWA visa the ability to work for the months it may take for a visa number to become available. This one change will prevent countless battered immigrant spouses from ever leaving their abusers and will drive others right back into the hands of their abusers.

Now, we have heard a lot of discussion about the law, but I think it is important to recall that the ability to make prosecutorial decisions is well-grounded in the law. In fact, in 1999, I recall well the letter sent by then-Chairman Henry Hyde, signed by 28 bipartisan Members of Congress, to the

Clinton administration asking for the use of prosecutorial discretion. And most recently, the Supreme Court in the Arizona case recognized the broad authority of the administration to make decisions about whom to prosecute. The Arizona case reaffirmed the legality of the deferred action program.

So all this discussion to the contrary is really nothing more than legal nonsense.

What does this bill do?

It deports the DREAMers. It reinvigorates the Republican war on women by forcing women with VAWA visas back to their abusers. This is bad policy. It is an outrageous bill. It is being done in the worst possible process, and I wish so much that the Republicans had reached out, taken the offer of our leaders to sit down and work together to come up with a solution that really works for our country instead of deporting the DREAMers who are so much the hope and future of our great American Nation.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say that DACA is more than just abuse of prosecutorial discretion. It also creates benefits that are not provided for under the law.

At this time, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

I rise in support of my amendment to prevent the extension of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program that was indeed unlawfully put in place by an executive memo on August 15, 2012. What this amendment does is to return us to the original language of H.R. 5160. Plus, it strengthens that original language by looking beyond July 30. What it will do is to tie the President's hands as to future executive actions that he might take to expand amnesty for illegal entrants into this country. It would freeze DACA.

Now, I want to read the bill because it is not a lengthy bill. Beginning on line 1, section 1, Limitation on deferred action for childhood arrivals; restrictions on employment authorization for aliens not in lawful status.

No agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government may use Federal funding or resources after July 30, 2014:

One, to consider or adjudicate any new or previously denied application of any alien requesting consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, as authorized by the executive memo dated June 15, 2012, and effective on August 15, 2012, or by any other succeeding executive memorandum or policy authorizing a similar program.

Number two, to newly authorize deferred action for any class of aliens not lawfully present in the United States.

Number three, to authorize any alien to work in the U.S. if such alien, A,

was not lawfully admitted into the U.S. in compliance with the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.); and, B, is not in lawful status in the U.S. on the date of the enactment of this act.

That is it. That is it. That is what is in this piece of legislation.

What it does, in effect, is to give Central American children a false hope. It says that they are going to be able to obtain amnesty, as those before them have done in this program. And the reason we are so concerned about this and the reason my colleagues have come and have talked about their concern, what is happening is you have the traffickers, you have the smugglers, you have the coyotes who are preying on these innocent people. And they believe if these children can make it here, they will get amnesty. It is a false hope. Certainly we know and we care about these families. We know these countries want to get their children back and reunite them with their families in their home countries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we are hearing is that the administration would like to expand DACA. Indeed, we have heard that the President has instructed Secretary Johnson and General Holder to come up with a list of executive actions to address immigration.

□ 2130

The increase and the statistics that Mr. LABRADOR gave us on the percentages of increase cannot be denied.

We see what is happening on this border. Mr. POE talked about what he has seen happening with those families. And true to form, just as Governor Perry warned us in 2012 that this was going to happen, indeed, it is. We are seeing this unprecedented increase going back to 2009, looking at where we are with today, with the children, with the teens, with the adults that are streaming across this border and are disrupting life along the southern border for American families.

I want to make one other point. Chairman GOODLATTE mentioned this earlier. We have talked a little bit about the Constitution tonight, and, indeed, we all know that when you look at the Constitution, article I, section 8, clause 4, that is where those enumerated powers are given to Congress. They are given to Congress "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization."

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5272. In this legislation, Republicans are turning their backs on children, toddlers, and infants who are trying to escape violence and abuse. The reality is that there is a humanitarian crisis on our doorstep.

Militarizing these borders and expelling children are not long-term solutions. If you read in the news about a country taking these actions, you would assume it was a third-world dictatorship—not the U.S. Instead, we should be rising to the occasion—not cowering from it.

Republicans say that they are just closing a loophole. But, they are really slamming the door shut. Subjecting 5 year-olds to sham legal hearings without counsel is un-American. What's next for the Republicans, sending these kids to Guantanamo Bay?

The reality is that this is a cowardly approach. Time and time again Republicans say "Deport them!" But we know that this does not work—and we do know this is not right.

We like to call ourselves "the land of brave." But the real "brave ones" are those children who travel thousands of miles to reach a better place. We must reject this unjust and dehumanizing Republican bill.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this mean-spirited bill that will slam the door in the faces of young DREAM Act students who know America as their only home, their only country.

Rarely have I seen fear and hatred turned into an actual piece of legislation and debated on the floor of the People's House.

This GOP bill proposes to deport DREAM Act students like Jose Godinez-Samperio from Tampa, Florida, who was only 9 when his parents brought him to the United States.

He has done everything right. Jose graduated as Valedictorian from Armwood High School in Hillsborough County.

Jose graduated from the State of Florida's Honors College, New College, and then graduated from law school with honors from Florida State University College of Law.

He passed the bar exam, and this year the Republican-dominated Florida Legislature said Jose should receive his license to practice law. They passed a law to do so. In fact, Republicans and Democrats gave him a standing ovation.

There are hundreds of thousands of students like Jose across America tonight who have been living in limbo, waiting for Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform. They were given a lifeline by the President through the DREAM Act and America has invested in them.

Now, the Republican Congress is moving us farther away from immigration reform, farther away from justice, farther away from smart policy to utilize the talents of young men and women who love America, and farther away from the values America holds dear.

Vote "no" on this malicious piece of legislation.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, this bill isn't just an assault on Dreamers who grew up in our communities and except on paper, are Americans in every way.

It's not just an attack on their parents who raised them and taught them their values and love of this great country.

What it is, is an affront to everyone who believes in the American Dream and our American values. It is an affront to those who uphold and subscribe to the basic notion that America is a fair, compassionate, and welcoming nation.

It is unconscionable that this bill will condemn Dreamers and their parents to second-class status.

It is unconscionable that this bill will cruelly foreclose any possibility that Dreamers and their parents could adjust their status, regardless of how hard they work or how much they contribute to their communities and our country.

If deported, their loss will be America's loss as we will lose the benefits of their talents and

their ability to strengthen our economy and enrich our nation.

If we end DACA, our country could lose young people like Paola, a medical student from Los Angeles, to cure the sick. We would lose Andree, a brilliant young woman who is also from LA, who is studying at Harvard and dreams of one day curing cancer.

President Clinton once observed that "we cannot build our own future without helping others to build theirs."

That sentiment—the basic awareness that we're all in this together—is at the center of the American Dream, a Dream which is threatened by the bill before us.

Let's stand up for Dreamers, for their families and for our nation's future by defeating this mean-spirited and destructive legislation.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 710, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, this 15-minute vote on the passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to House Joint Resolution 76.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 192, answered "present" 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 479]

AYES—216

Aderholt	Collins (NY)	Gowdy
Amash	Conaway	Granger
Bachmann	Cook	Graves (GA)
Bachus	Cotton	Graves (MO)
Barietta	Cramer	Griffin (AR)
Barr	Crawford	Griffith (VA)
Barrow (GA)	Crenshaw	Grimm
Barton	Culberson	Guthrie
Benishek	Daines	Hall
Bentivolio	Davis, Rodney	Hanna
Bilirakis	Dent	Harper
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Harris
Black	Duffy	Hartzler
Blackburn	Duncan (SC)	Hastings (WA)
Boustany	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Ellmers	Herrera Beutler
Bridenstine	Farenthold	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Fincher	Hudson
Brooks (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Huelskamp
Broun (GA)	Fleischmann	Huizenga (MI)
Buchanan	Fleming	Hultgren
Bucshon	Flores	Hunter
Burgess	Forbes	Hurt
Byrne	Portenberry	Issa
Calvert	Fox	Jenkins
Capito	Franks (AZ)	Johnson (OH)
Carter	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Sam
Cassidy	Garrett	Jolly
Chabot	Gerlach	Jones
Chaffetz	Gibson	Jordan
Clawson (FL)	Gingrey (GA)	Joyce
Coble	Gohmert	Kelly (PA)
Cole	Goodlatte	King (IA)
Collins (GA)	Gosar	King (NY)

Kingston	Olson	Sessions
Kline	Palazzo	Shimkus
Labrador	Paulsen	Shuster
LaMalfa	Pearce	Simpson
Lamborn	Perry	Smith (MO)
Lance	Peterson	Smith (NE)
Lankford	Petri	Smith (NJ)
Latham	Pittenger	Smith (TX)
Latta	Pitts	Southerland
LoBiondo	Poe (TX)	Stewart
Long	Pompeo	Stivers
Lucas	Posey	Stockman
Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)	Stutzman
Lummis	Rahall	Terry
Marchant	Reed	Thompson (PA)
Marino	Renacci	Thornberry
Massie	Ribble	Tiberi
McAllister	Rice (SC)	Tipton
McCarthy (CA)	Rigell	Turner
McCaul	Roby	Wagner
McClintock	Roe (TN)	Walberg
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Walden
McIntyre	Rogers (KY)	Walorski
McKeon	Rogers (MI)	Weber (TX)
McKinley	Rohrabacher	Webster (FL)
McMorris	Rokita	Westrup
Rodgers	Rooney	Westmoreland
Meadows	Roskam	Williams
Meehan	Ross	Wilson (SC)
Messer	Rothfus	Wittman
Mica	Royce	Wolf
Miller (FL)	Runyan	Womack
Miller (MI)	Ryan (WI)	Woodall
Mullin	Salmon	Yoder
Mulvaney	Sanford	Yoho
Murphy (PA)	Scalise	Young (AK)
Neugebauer	Schweikert	Young (IN)
Noem	Scott, Austin	
Nugent	Sensenbrenner	

NOES—192

Amodei	Engel	Lynch
Barber	Enyart	Maffei
Bass	Eshoo	Maloney,
Beatty	Esty	Carolyn
Becerra	Farr	Maloney, Sean
Bera (CA)	Foster	Matheson
Bishop (GA)	Frankel (FL)	Matsui
Bishop (NY)	Fudge	McCarthy (NY)
Bonamici	Gabbard	McCollum
Brady (PA)	Gallego	McGovern
Braley (IA)	Garcia	McNerney
Brown (FL)	Gardner	Meeks
Brownley (CA)	Green, Al	Meng
Bustos	Grijalva	Michaud
Butterfield	Gutiérrez	Miller, George
Capps	Hahn	Moore
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	Moran
Cárdenas	Heck (NV)	Murphy (FL)
Carney	Heck (WA)	Nadler
Carson (IN)	Higgins	Napolitano
Cartwright	Himes	Neal
Castor (FL)	Hinojosa	Negrete McLeod
Castro (TX)	Holt	Nolan
Chu	Honda	O'Rourke
Ciциlline	Horsford	Owens
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	Pallone
Clarke (NY)	Huffman	Pascarell
Clay	Israel	Pastor (AZ)
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Payne
Clyburn	Jeffries	Pelosi
Coffman	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Peters (CA)
Connolly	Kaptur	Peters (MI)
Conyers	Keating	Pingree (ME)
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Costa	Kildee	Polis
Courtney	Kilmer	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kind	Quigley
Cuellar	Kinzinger (IL)	Rangel
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Reichert
Davis, Danny	Kuster	Richmond
DeFazio	Langevin	Ros-Lehtinen
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Delaney	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Ryan (OH)
DelBene	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Denham	Lewis	Sarbanes
Deutch	Loeb sack	Schakowsky
Diaz-Balart	Lofgren	Schiff
Dingell	Lowenthal	Schneider
Doggett	Lowey	Schrader
Doyle	Lujan Grisham	Schwartz
Duckworth	(NM)	Scott (VA)
Edwards	Luján, Ben Ray	Scott, David
Ellison	(NM)	Serrano

Sewell (AL)	Tierney	Visclosky	Davis, Danny	Kaptur	Petri	Walz	Wenstrup	Woodall
Shea-Porter	Titus	Walz	Davis, Rodney	Keating	Pingree (ME)	Wasserman	Westmoreland	Yarmuth
Sherman	Tonko	Wasserman	DeFazio	Kelly (IL)	Pittenger	Schultz	Williams	Yoder
Sinema	Tsongas	Schultz	DeGette	Kelly (PA)	Pitts	Waters	Wilson (FL)	Yoho
Sires	Upton	Waters	DeLaney	Kildee	Pocan	Waxman	Wilson (SC)	Young (AK)
Slaughter	Valadao	Waxman	DeLauro	Kilmer	Poe (TX)	Weber (TX)	Wittman	Young (IN)
Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	Welch	DelBene	Kind	Polis	Webster (FL)	Wolf	
Swalwell (CA)	Vargas	Wilson (FL)	Denham	King (IA)	Pompeo	Welch	Womack	
Takano	Veasey	Yarmuth	Dent	King (NY)	Posey			
Thompson (CA)	Vela		DeSantis	Kingston	Price (GA)			
Thompson (MS)	Velázquez		Deutch	Kinzinger (IL)	Price (NC)			

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Lipinski

NOT VOTING—23

Blumenauer	Gibbs	Nunnelee
Camp	Grayson	Ruiz
Campbell	Green, Gene	Rush
Cantor	Hanabusa	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	T.
DesJarlais	McDermott	Schock
Fattah	Miller, Gary	Speier
Garamendi	Nunes	Whitfield

□ 2155

Mr. PETERS of California changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 479 (On Passage of H.R. 5272), had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.J. Res. 76) making continuing appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 8, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 480]

YEAS—395

Aderholt	Brooks (IN)	Clarke (NY)
Amodei	Broun (GA)	Clawson (FL)
Bachmann	Brown (FL)	Clay
Bachus	Brownley (CA)	Cleaver
Barber	Buchanan	Clyburn
Barletta	Bucshon	Coble
Barr	Burgess	Coffman
Barrow (GA)	Bustos	Cohen
Barton	Butterfield	Cole
Bass	Byrne	Collins (GA)
Beatty	Calvert	Collins (NY)
Becerra	Capito	Conaway
Benishek	Capps	Connelly
Bentivolio	Capuano	Conyers
Bera (CA)	Cárdenas	Cook
Billirakis	Carney	Cooper
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Costa
Bishop (NY)	Carter	Cotton
Bishop (UT)	Cartwright	Courtney
Black	Cassidy	Cramer
Bonamici	Castor (FL)	Crawford
Boustany	Castro (TX)	Crenshaw
Brady (PA)	Chabot	Crowley
Brady (TX)	Chaffetz	Cuellar
Braley (IA)	Chu	Culberson
Bridenstine	Cicilline	Cummings
Brooks (AL)	Clark (MA)	Daines

Davis, Danny	Kaptur	Petri
Davis, Rodney	Keating	Pingree (ME)
DeFazio	Kelly (IL)	Pittenger
DeGette	Kelly (PA)	Pitts
DeLaney	Kildee	Pocan
DeLauro	Kilmer	Poe (TX)
DelBene	Kind	Polis
Denham	King (IA)	Pompeo
Dent	King (NY)	Posey
DeSantis	Kingston	Price (GA)
Deutch	Kinzinger (IL)	Price (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Kirkpatrick	Quigley
Dingell	Kline	Rahall
Doyle	Kuster	Rangel
Duckworth	Labrador	Reed
Duffy	LaMalfa	Reichert
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Renacci
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Ribble
Edwards	Langevin	Rice (SC)
Elmiers	Lankford	Richmond
Engel	Larsen (WA)	Rigell
Enyart	Larson (CT)	Roby
Eshoo	Latham	Roe (TN)
Esty	Latta	Rogers (AL)
Farenthold	Lee (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Farr	Levin	Rogers (MI)
Fincher	Lewis	Rohrabacher
Fitzpatrick	Lipinski	Rokita
Fleischmann	LoBiondo	Rooney
Fleming	Loeback	Ros-Lehtinen
Flores	Long	Roskam
Forbes	Lowenthal	Ross
Fortenberry	Lowe	Rothfus
Foster	Lucas	Roybal-Allard
Fox	Luetkemeyer	Royce
Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham	Runyan
Franks (AZ)	(NM)	Ruppersberger
Frelinghuysen	Luján, Ben Ray	Ryan (OH)
Fudge	(NM)	Ryan (WI)
Gabbard	Lummis	Salmon
Gallego	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Garcia	Maffei	Sarbanes
Gardner	Maloney,	Scalise
Garrett	Carolyn	Schakowsky
Gerlach	Maloney, Sean	Schiff
Gibson	Marino	Schneider
Gohmert	Matheson	Schrader
Goodlatte	Matsui	Schwartz
Gosar	McAllister	Schweikert
Gowdy	McCarthy (CA)	Scott (VA)
Granger	McCarthy (NY)	Scott, Austin
Graves (GA)	McCaul	Scott, David
Graves (MO)	McClintock	Sensenbrenner
Green, Al	McCollum	Serrano
Griffin (AR)	McGovern	Sessions
Griffith (VA)	McHenry	Sewell (AL)
Grijalva	McIntyre	Shea-Porter
Grimm	McKeon	Sherman
Guthrie	McKinley	Shimkus
Gutiérrez	McMorris	Shuster
Hahn	Rodgers	Simpson
Hall	McNerney	Sinema
Hanna	Meadows	Sires
Harper	Meehan	Slaughter
Harris	Meeks	Smith (MO)
Hartzler	Meng	Smith (NE)
Hastings (FL)	Messer	Smith (NJ)
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Smith (TX)
Heck (NV)	Michaud	Smith (WA)
Heck (WA)	Miller (FL)	Southerland
Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Stewart
Herrera Beutler	Miller, George	Stivers
Higgins	Moore	Stockman
Himes	Mullin	Stutzman
Hinojosa	Mulvaney	Swalwell (CA)
Holding	Murphy (FL)	Takano
Holt	Nadler	Terry
Honda	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Horsford	Neal	Thompson (MS)
Hoyer	Negrete McLeod	Thompson (PA)
Hudson	Neugebauer	Thornberry
Huelskamp	Noem	Tierney
Huffman	Nolan	Tipton
Huizenga (MI)	Nugent	Titus
Hultgren	Olson	Tonko
Hunter	Owens	Tsongas
Hurt	Palazzo	Turner
Israel	Pallone	Upton
Issa	Pascrell	Valadao
Jackson Lee	Pastor (AZ)	Van Hollen
Jeffries	Paulsen	Vargas
Jenkins	Payne	Veasey
Johnson (GA)	Pearce	Vela
Johnson (OH)	Pelosi	Velázquez
Johnson, E. B.	Perlmutter	Visclosky
Johnson, Sam	Perry	Wagner
Jolly	Peters (CA)	Walberg
Jordan	Peters (MI)	Walden
Joyce	Peterson	Walorski

NAYS—8

Amash	Lofgren	O'Rourke
Ellison	Massie	Sanford
Jones	Moran	

NOT VOTING—29

Blackburn	Gibbs	Nunes
Blumenauer	Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee
Camp	Grayson	Ruiz
Campbell	Green, Gene	Rush
Cantor	Hanabusa	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	T.
DesJarlais	Marchant	Schock
Doggett	McDermott	Speier
Fattah	Miller, Gary	Tiberi
Garamendi	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2203

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 480, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE ON THE CURRENT SITUATION IN IRAQ

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 683) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State in Iraq and Levant (ISIL) as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 683

Whereas Iraq is currently embroiled in a political and religious insurrection stemming from an Islamic State in Iraq and Levant (ISIL)-led offensive that began in the Anbar province and has spread to key locations such as Mosul, Tikrit, and Samarra and continues to engulf the region in violence and instability;

Whereas ISIL is a transnational Sunni insurgency whose ideological and organizational roots lie in both al Qaeda in Iraq and the Syria-based Jabhat al Nursa and has a stated mission of establishing an Islamic state and a caliphate across the Levant through violence against Shiites, non-Muslims, and unsupportive Sunnis;

Whereas Iraq's population is approximately 31,300,000 with 97 percent identifying