

States was underprepared to respond to public health emergencies and national disasters and passed the original Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act, Pub. L. 109–417 to address this weakness.

PAHPAI was reauthorized in 2013, but in recent years, the threats to our country have changed, and PAHPAI must be updated to ensure that we are prepared to respond to increasing natural disasters, emerging infectious diseases, and chemical, biological, and nuclear attacks.

S. 1379 has been adapted to meet the mounting challenges that face us today and those that will face our children tomorrow.

As a biodefense bill, PAHPAI will further protect our country from internal and external terrorists.

As a health care response bill, PAHPAI creates and ensures coordinated healthcare efforts in the face of natural disasters such as hurricanes.

This bill also addresses the nation's need for pandemic preparedness.

Texas has experienced pandemics first hand—with the first diagnosed case of Ebola in the United States in 2014.

Thomas Eric Duncan after traveling from Africa to visit family members in Dallas, Texas became ill.

He went to Texas Health Presbyterian Hospital Dallas for care but was not admitted after presenting with a 103-degree temperature, and Ebola symptoms.

At the time the CDC had alerted all doctors, hospitals, clinics, and pharmacies with alerts to screen all patients for Ebola symptoms.

Mr. Duncan's Ebola symptoms worsened over the days following his visit to Texas Health Presbyterian Hospital Dallas, and he returned by ambulance to the hospital and only then was he finally admitted for treatment.

By that time his condition had worsened, and Mr. Duncan died from Ebola.

His death was a tragedy and the two nurses who were infected while trying to care for him are heroes.

Two years later, in 2016, the Zika Virus pandemic reached Texas carried by mosquitoes.

This disease attacked babies while developing in their mother's womb, which destroyed brain tissue, resulting in severe brain and cranial deformities.

Houston, Texas, has a tropical climate with many climatic similarities with other states along the Gulf Coast, parts of Central and South America as well as the Caribbean. Tropical climates are hospitable to mosquitoes that carry the Zika Virus.

I have shared concerns among Federal, state, and local agency officials regarding a need to have a plan to address future pandemics our nation may face.

This bill will pave the way for much needed work in pandemic preparedness.

PAHPAI will ensure that more health care professionals can be hired and trained to prioritize vulnerable populations such as children, the elderly, and people with disabilities.

To incentivize and protect practitioners, this bill will also provide health care professionals who volunteer after natural disasters with liability coverage.

To support disaster workers and devastated communities, PAHPAI will also ensure the availability of health care supplies by stocking

the Strategic National Stockpiles, located across the United States, with vaccines, gloves, masks, and more.

PAHPAI also renews and increases funding to the BioShield Special Reserve Fund and Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA), which is invaluable to our response capabilities.

S. 1379 is essential to ensuring that the United States is prepared to provide quality care to those in need after devastating events.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 1379 to establish and strengthen the nation's emergency preparedness in the face of health crises and national disasters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1379.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN DREAM AND PROMISE ACT OF 2019

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 415, I call up the bill (H.R. 6) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain aliens, 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 415, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–16, modified by the amendment printed in House Report 116–102, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 6

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “American Dream and Promise Act of 2019”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—DREAM ACT

Sec. 101. Short title.

Subtitle A—Treatment of Certain Long-term Residents Who Entered the United States as Children

Sec. 111. Permanent resident status on a conditional basis for certain long-term residents who entered the United States as children.

Sec. 112. Terms of permanent resident status on a conditional basis.

Sec. 113. Removal of conditional basis of permanent resident status.

Subtitle B—General Provisions

Sec. 121. Definitions.

Sec. 122. Submission of biometric and biographic data; background checks.

Sec. 123. Limitation on removal; application and fee exemption; waiver of grounds for inadmissibility and other conditions on eligible individuals.

Sec. 124. Determination of continuous presence and residence.

Sec. 125. Exemption from numerical limitations.

Sec. 126. Availability of administrative and judicial review.

Sec. 127. Documentation requirements.

Sec. 128. Rule making.

Sec. 129. Confidentiality of information.

Sec. 130. Grant program to assist eligible applicants.

Sec. 131. Provisions affecting eligibility for adjustment of status.

Sec. 132. Supplementary surcharge for appointed counsel.

Sec. 133. Annual report on provisional denial authority.

TITLE II—AMERICAN PROMISE ACT

Sec. 201. Short title.

Subtitle A—Treatment of Certain Nationals of Certain Countries Designated for Temporary Protected Status or Deferred Enforced Departure

Sec. 211. Adjustment of status for certain nationals of certain countries designated for temporary protected status or deferred enforced departure.

Subtitle B—General Provisions

Sec. 221. Definitions.

Sec. 222. Submission of biometric and biographic data; background checks.

Sec. 223. Limitation on removal; application and fee exemption; waiver of grounds for inadmissibility and other conditions on eligible individuals.

Sec. 224. Determination of continuous presence.

Sec. 225. Exemption from numerical limitations.

Sec. 226. Availability of administrative and judicial review.

Sec. 227. Documentation requirements.

Sec. 228. Rule making.

Sec. 229. Confidentiality of information.

Sec. 230. Grant program to assist eligible applicants.

Sec. 231. Provisions affecting eligibility for adjustment of status.

TITLE I—DREAM ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Dream Act of 2019”.

Subtitle A—Treatment of Certain Long-term Residents Who Entered the United States as Children

SEC. 111. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS ON A CONDITIONAL BASIS FOR CERTAIN LONG-TERM RESIDENTS WHO ENTERED THE UNITED STATES AS CHILDREN.

(a) *CONDITIONAL BASIS FOR STATUS.*—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as provided in section 113(c)(2), an alien shall be considered, at the time of obtaining the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence under this section, to have obtained such status on a conditional basis subject to the provisions of this title.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary or the Attorney General shall cancel the removal of, and adjust to the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence on a conditional basis, or without the conditional basis as provided in section 113(c)(2), an alien who is inadmissible or deportable from the United States (or is under a grant of Deferred Enforced Departure or has temporary protected status under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a)) if—

(A) the alien has been continuously physically present in the United States since the date that is 4 years before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(B) the alien was younger than 18 years of age on the date on which the alien entered the

United States and has continuously resided in the United States since such entry;

(C) the alien—

(i) subject to section 123(d), is not inadmissible under paragraph (1), (6)(E), (6)(G), (8), or (10) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a));

(ii) has not ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; and

(iii) is not barred from adjustment of status under this title based on the criminal and national security grounds described under subsection (c), subject to the provisions of such subsection; and

(D) the alien—

(i) has been admitted to an institution of higher education;

(ii) has been admitted to an area career and technical education school at the postsecondary level;

(iii) in the United States, has obtained—

(I) a high school diploma or a commensurate alternative award from a public or private high school;

(II) a General Education Development credential, a high school equivalency diploma recognized under State law, or another similar State-authorized credential;

(III) a credential or certificate from an area career and technical education school at the secondary level; or

(IV) a recognized postsecondary credential; or

(v) is enrolled in secondary school or in an education program assisting students in—

(I) obtaining a high school diploma or its recognized equivalent under State law;

(II) passing the General Education Development test, a high school equivalence diploma examination, or other similar State-authorized exam;

(III) obtaining a certificate or credential from an area career and technical education school providing education at the secondary level; or

(IV) obtaining a recognized postsecondary credential.

(2) APPLICATION FEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, subject to an exemption under section 123(c), require an alien applying under this section to pay a reasonable fee that is commensurate with the cost of processing the application but does not exceed \$495.00.

(B) SPECIAL PROCEDURE FOR APPLICANTS WITH DACA.—The Secretary shall establish a streamlined procedure for aliens who have been granted DACA and who meet the requirements for renewal (under the terms of the program in effect on January 1, 2017) to apply for cancellation of removal and adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence on a conditional basis under this section, or without the conditional basis as provided in section 113(c)(2). Such procedure shall not include a requirement that the applicant pay a fee, except that the Secretary may require an applicant who meets the requirements for lawful permanent residence without the conditional basis under section 113(c)(2) to pay a fee that is commensurate with the cost of processing the application, subject to the exemption under section 123(c).

(3) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The Secretary may not grant an alien permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section until the requirements of section 122 are satisfied.

(4) MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE.—An alien applying for permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section, or without the conditional basis as provided in section 113(c)(2), shall establish that the alien has registered under the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. 3801 et seq.), if the alien is subject to registration under such Act.

(c) CRIMINAL AND NATIONAL SECURITY BARS.—

(1) GROUNDS OF INELIGIBILITY.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an alien is ineligible

for adjustment of status under this title (whether on a conditional basis or without the conditional basis as provided in section 113(c)(2)) if any of the following apply:

(A) The alien is inadmissible under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)).

(B) Excluding any offense under State law for which an essential element is the alien's immigration status, and any minor traffic offense, the alien has been convicted of—

(i) any felony offense;

(ii) 3 or more misdemeanor offenses (excluding simple possession of cannabis or cannabis-related paraphernalia, any offense involving cannabis or cannabis-related paraphernalia which is no longer prosecutable in the State in which the conviction was entered, and any offense involving civil disobedience without violence) not occurring on the same date, and not arising out of the same act, omission, or scheme of misconduct; or

(iii) a misdemeanor offense of domestic violence, unless the alien demonstrates that such crime is related to the alien having been—

(I) a victim of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, child abuse or neglect, abuse or neglect in later life, or human trafficking;

(II) battered or subjected to extreme cruelty; or

(III) a victim of criminal activity described in section 101(a)(15)(U)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(U)(iii)).

(2) WAIVERS FOR CERTAIN MISDEMEANORS.—For humanitarian purposes, family unity, or if otherwise in the public interest, the Secretary may—

(A) waive the grounds of inadmissibility under subparagraphs (A), (C), and (D) of section 212(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)), unless the conviction forming the basis for inadmissibility would otherwise render the alien ineligible under paragraph (1)(B) (subject to subparagraph (B)); and

(B) for purposes of clauses (ii) and (iii) of paragraph (1)(B), waive consideration of—

(i) one misdemeanor offense if the alien has not been convicted of any offense in the 5-year period preceding the date on which the alien applies for adjustment of status under this title; or

(ii) up to two misdemeanor offenses if the alien has not been convicted of any offense in the 10-year period preceding the date on which the alien applies for adjustment of status under this title.

(3) AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT SECONDARY REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding an alien's eligibility for adjustment of status under this title, and subject to the procedures described in this paragraph, the Secretary of Homeland Security may, as a matter of non-delegable discretion, provisionally deny an application for adjustment of status (whether on a conditional basis or without the conditional basis as provided in section 113(c)(2)) if the Secretary, based on clear and convincing evidence, which shall include credible law enforcement information, determines that the alien is described in subparagraph (B) or (D).

(B) PUBLIC SAFETY.—An alien is described in this subparagraph if—

(i) excluding simple possession of cannabis or cannabis-related paraphernalia, any offense involving cannabis or cannabis-related paraphernalia which is no longer prosecutable in the State in which the conviction was entered, any offense under State law for which an essential element is the alien's immigration status, any offense involving civil disobedience without violence, and any minor traffic offense, the alien—

(I) has been convicted of a misdemeanor offense punishable by a term of imprisonment of more than 30 days; or

(II) has been adjudicated delinquent in a State or local juvenile court proceeding that resulted in a disposition ordering placement in a secure facility; and

(ii) the alien poses a significant and continuing threat to public safety related to such conviction or adjudication.

(C) PUBLIC SAFETY DETERMINATION.—For purposes of subparagraph (B)(ii), the Secretary shall consider the recency of the conviction or adjudication; the length of any imposed sentence or placement; the nature and seriousness of the conviction or adjudication, including whether the elements of the offense include the unlawful possession or use of a deadly weapon to commit an offense or other conduct intended to cause serious bodily injury; and any mitigating factors pertaining to the alien's role in the commission of the offense.

(D) GANG PARTICIPATION.—An alien is described in this subparagraph if the alien has, within the 5 years immediately preceding the date of the application, knowingly, willfully, and voluntarily participated in offenses committed by a criminal street gang (as described in subsections (a) and (c) of section 521 of title 18, United States Code) with the intent to promote or further the commission of such offenses.

(E) EVIDENTIARY LIMITATION.—For purposes of subparagraph (D), allegations of gang membership obtained from a State or Federal in-house or local database, or a network of databases used for the purpose of recording and sharing activities of alleged gang members across law enforcement agencies, shall not establish the participation described in such paragraph.

(F) NOTICE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Prior to rendering a discretionary decision under this paragraph, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide written notice of the intent to provisionally deny the application to the alien (or the alien's counsel of record, if any) by certified mail and, if an electronic mail address is provided, by electronic mail (or other form of electronic communication). Such notice shall—

(I) articulate with specificity all grounds for the preliminary determination, including the evidence relied upon to support the determination; and

(II) provide the alien with not less than 90 days to respond.

(ii) SECOND NOTICE.—Not more than 30 days after the issuance of the notice under clause (i), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide a second written notice that meets the requirements of such clause.

(iii) NOTICE NOT RECEIVED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if an applicant provides good cause for not contesting a provisional denial under this paragraph, including a failure to receive notice as required under this subparagraph, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, upon a motion filed by the alien, reopen an application for adjustment of status under this title and allow the applicant an opportunity to respond, consistent with clause (i)(II).

(G) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—An alien is entitled to judicial review of the Secretary's decision to provisionally deny an application under this paragraph in accordance with the procedures described in section 126(c).

(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) the term “felony offense” means an offense under Federal or State law that is punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of more than 1 year;

(B) the term “misdemeanor offense” means an offense under Federal or State law that is punishable by a term of imprisonment of more than 5 days but not more than 1 year;

(C) the term “crime of domestic violence” means any offense that has as an element the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against a person committed by a current or former spouse of the person, by an individual with whom the person shares a child in common, by an individual who is cohabiting with or has cohabited with the person as a spouse, by an individual similarly situated to a

spouse of the person under the domestic or family violence laws of the jurisdiction where the offense occurs, or by any other individual against a person who is protected from that individual's acts under the domestic or family violence laws of the United States or any State, Indian tribal government, or unit of local government; and

(D) the term 'convicted', 'conviction', 'adjudicated', or 'adjudication' does not include a judgment that has been expunged or set aside, that resulted in a rehabilitative disposition, or the equivalent.

(d) **LIMITATION ON REMOVAL OF CERTAIN ALIEN MINORS.**—An alien who is under 18 years of age and meets the requirements under subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of subsection (b)(1) shall be provided a reasonable opportunity to meet the educational requirements under subparagraph (D) of such subsection. The Attorney General or the Secretary may not commence or continue with removal proceedings against such an alien.

(e) **WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, upon receipt of a request to withdraw an application for adjustment of status under this section, cease processing of the application, and close the case. Withdrawal of the application under this subsection shall not prejudice any future application filed by the applicant for any immigration benefit under this title or under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

SEC. 112. TERMS OF PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS ON A CONDITIONAL BASIS.

(a) **PERIOD OF STATUS.**—Permanent resident status on a conditional basis is—

(1) valid for a period of 10 years, unless such period is extended by the Secretary; and

(2) subject to revocation under subsection (c).

(b) **NOTICE OF REQUIREMENTS.**—At the time an alien obtains permanent resident status on a conditional basis, the Secretary shall provide notice to the alien regarding the provisions of this title and the requirements to have the conditional basis of such status removed.

(c) **REVOCATION OF STATUS.**—The Secretary may revoke the permanent resident status on a conditional basis of an alien only if the Secretary—

(1) determines that the alien ceases to meet the requirements under section 111(b)(1)(C); and

(2) prior to the revocation, provides the alien—

(A) notice of the proposed revocation; and

(B) the opportunity for a hearing to provide evidence that the alien meets such requirements or otherwise to contest the proposed revocation.

(d) **RETURN TO PREVIOUS IMMIGRATION STATUS.**—An alien whose permanent resident status on a conditional basis expires under subsection (a)(1) or is revoked under subsection (c), shall return to the immigration status that the alien had immediately before receiving permanent resident status on a conditional basis.

SEC. 113. REMOVAL OF CONDITIONAL BASIS OF PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.

(a) **ELIGIBILITY FOR REMOVAL OF CONDITIONAL BASIS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall remove the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status granted under this title and grant the alien status as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien—

(A) is described in section 111(b)(1)(C);

(B) has not abandoned the alien's residence in the United States during the period in which the alien has permanent resident status on a conditional basis; and

(C)(i) has obtained a degree from an institution of higher education, or has completed at least 2 years, in good standing, of a program in the United States leading to a bachelor's degree or higher degree or a recognized postsecondary credential from an area career and technical

education school providing education at the postsecondary level;

(ii) has served in the Uniformed Services for at least 2 years and, if discharged, received an honorable discharge; or

(iii) demonstrates earned income for periods totaling at least 3 years and at least 75 percent of the time that the alien has had a valid employment authorization, except that, in the case of an alien who was enrolled in an institution of higher education, an area career and technical education school to obtain a recognized postsecondary credential, or an education program described in section 111(b)(1)(D)(iii), the Secretary shall reduce such total 3-year requirement by the total of such periods of enrollment.

(2) **HARDSHIP EXCEPTION.**—The Secretary shall remove the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status and grant the alien status as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien—

(A) satisfies the requirements under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1);

(B) demonstrates compelling circumstances for the inability to satisfy the requirements under subparagraph (C) of such paragraph; and

(C) demonstrates that—

(i) the alien has a disability;

(ii) the alien is a full-time caregiver; or

(iii) the removal of the alien from the United States would result in hardship to the alien or the alien's spouse, parent, or child who is a national of the United States or is lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(3) **CITIZENSHIP REQUIREMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status granted under this title may not be removed unless the alien demonstrates that the alien satisfies the requirements under section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1423(a)).

(B) **EXCEPTION.**—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an alien who is unable to meet the requirements under such section 312(a) due to disability.

(4) **APPLICATION FEE.**—The Secretary may, subject to an exemption under section 123(c), require aliens applying for removal of the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status under this section to pay a reasonable fee that is commensurate with the cost of processing the application.

(5) **BACKGROUND CHECK.**—The Secretary may not remove the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status until the requirements of section 122 are satisfied.

(b) **TREATMENT FOR PURPOSES OF NATURALIZATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.), an alien granted permanent resident status on a conditional basis shall be considered to have been admitted to the United States, and be present in the United States, as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(2) **LIMITATION ON APPLICATION FOR NATURALIZATION.**—An alien may not apply for naturalization while the alien is in permanent resident status on a conditional basis.

(c) **TIMING OF APPROVAL OF LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An alien granted permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this title may apply to have such conditional basis removed at any time after such alien has met the eligibility requirements set forth in subsection (a).

(2) **APPROVAL WITH REGARD TO INITIAL APPLICATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary or the Attorney General shall cancel the removal of, and adjust to the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent resident status without conditional basis, any alien who—

(i) demonstrates eligibility for lawful permanent residence status on a conditional basis under section 111(b); and

(ii) subject to the exceptions described in subsections (a)(2) and (a)(3)(B) of this section, already has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (a) of this section at the time such alien first submits an application for benefits under this title.

(B) **BACKGROUND CHECKS.**—Subsection (a)(5) shall apply to an alien seeking lawful permanent resident status without conditional basis in an initial application in the same manner as it applies to an alien seeking removal of the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status. Section 111(b)(3) shall not be construed to require the Secretary to conduct more than one identical security or law enforcement background check on such an alien.

(C) **APPLICATION FEES.**—In the case of an alien seeking lawful permanent resident status without conditional basis in an initial application, the alien shall pay the fee required under subsection (a)(4), subject to the exemption allowed under section 123(c), but shall not be required to pay the application fee under section 111(b)(2).

Subtitle B—General Provisions

SEC. 121. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise specifically provided, any term used in this title that is used in the immigration laws shall have the meaning given such term in the immigration laws.

(2) **APPROPRIATE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.**—The term "appropriate United States district court" mean the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or the United States district court with jurisdiction over the alien's principal place of residence.

(3) **AREA CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION SCHOOL.**—The term "area career and technical education school" has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2302).

(4) **DACA.**—The term "DACA" means deferred action granted to an alien pursuant to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals policy announced by the Secretary of Homeland Security on June 15, 2012.

(5) **DISABILITY.**—The term "disability" has the meaning given such term in section 3(1) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102(1)).

(6) **FEDERAL POVERTY LINE.**—The term "Federal poverty line" has the meaning given such term in section 213A(h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1183a).

(7) **HIGH SCHOOL; SECONDARY SCHOOL.**—The terms "high school" and "secondary school" have the meanings given such terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(8) **IMMIGRATION LAWS.**—The term "immigration laws" has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17)).

(9) **INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The term "institution of higher education"—

(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002); and

(B) does not include an institution of higher education outside of the United States.

(10) **RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIAL.**—The term "recognized postsecondary credential" has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).

(11) **SECRETARY.**—Except as otherwise specifically provided, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(12) **UNIFORMED SERVICES.**—The term "Uniformed Services" has the meaning given the term "uniformed services" in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 122. SUBMISSION OF BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC DATA; BACKGROUND CHECKS.

(a) **SUBMISSION OF BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC DATA.**—The Secretary may not grant an alien adjustment of status under this title, on either a conditional or permanent basis, unless the alien submits biometric and biographic data, in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary. The Secretary shall provide an alternative procedure for aliens who are unable to provide such biometric or biographic data because of a physical impairment.

(b) **BACKGROUND CHECKS.**—The Secretary shall use biometric, biographic, and other data that the Secretary determines appropriate to conduct security and law enforcement background checks and to determine whether there is any criminal, national security, or other factor that would render the alien ineligible for adjustment of status under this title, on either a conditional or permanent basis, unless security and law enforcement background checks are completed to the satisfaction of the Secretary.

SEC. 123. LIMITATION ON REMOVAL; APPLICATION AND FEE EXEMPTION; WAIVER OF GROUNDS FOR INADMISSIBILITY AND OTHER CONDITIONS ON ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.

(a) **LIMITATION ON REMOVAL.**—An alien who appears to be prima facie eligible for relief under this title shall be given a reasonable opportunity to apply for such relief and may not be removed until, subject to section 126(c), a final decision establishing ineligibility for relief is rendered.

(b) **APPLICATION.**—An alien present in the United States who has been ordered removed or has been permitted to depart voluntarily from the United States may, notwithstanding such order or permission to depart, apply for adjustment of status under this title. Such alien shall not be required to file a separate motion to reopen, reconsider, or vacate the order of removal. If the Secretary approves the application, the Secretary shall cancel the order of removal. If the Secretary renders a final administrative decision to deny the application, the order of removal or permission to depart shall be effective and enforceable to the same extent as if the application had not been made, only after all available administrative and judicial remedies have been exhausted.

(c) **FEE EXEMPTION.**—An applicant may be exempted from paying an application fee required under this title if the applicant—

(1) is younger than 18 years of age;

(2) received total income, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the applicant files an application under this title, that is less than 150 percent of the Federal poverty line;

(3) is in foster care or otherwise lacks any parental or other familial support; or

(4) cannot care for himself or herself because of a serious, chronic disability.

(d) **WAIVER OF GROUNDS OF INADMISSIBILITY.**—With respect to any benefit under this title, and in addition to the waivers under section 111(c)(2), the Secretary may waive the grounds of inadmissibility under paragraph (1), (6)(E), (6)(G), or (10)(D) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)) for humanitarian purposes, for family unity, or because the waiver is otherwise in the public interest.

(e) **ADVANCE PAROLE.**—During the period beginning on the date on which an alien applies for adjustment of status under this title and ending on the date on which the Secretary makes a final decision regarding such application, the alien shall be eligible to apply for advance parole. Section 101(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(g)) shall not apply to an alien granted advance parole under this section.

(f) **EMPLOYMENT.**—An alien whose removal is stayed pursuant to this title, who may not be

placed in removal proceedings pursuant to this title, or who has pending an application under this title, shall, upon application to the Secretary, be granted an employment authorization document.

SEC. 124. DETERMINATION OF CONTINUOUS PRESENCE AND RESIDENCE.

(a) **EFFECT OF NOTICE TO APPEAR.**—Any period of continuous physical presence or continuous residence in the United States of an alien who applies for permanent resident status under this title (whether on a conditional basis or without the conditional basis as provided in section 113(c)(2)) shall not terminate when the alien is served a notice to appear under section 239(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229(a)).

(b) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN BREAKS IN PRESENCE OR RESIDENCE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), an alien shall be considered to have failed to maintain—

(A) continuous physical presence in the United States under this title if the alien has departed from the United States for any period exceeding 90 days or for any periods, in the aggregate, exceeding 180 days; and

(B) continuous residence in the United States under this title if the alien has departed from the United States for any period exceeding 180 days, unless the alien establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Homeland Security that the alien did not in fact abandon residence in the United States during such period.

(2) **EXTENSIONS FOR EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES.**—The Secretary may extend the time periods described in paragraph (1) for an alien who demonstrates that the failure to timely return to the United States was due to extenuating circumstances beyond the alien's control, including the serious illness of the alien, or death or serious illness of a parent, grandparent, sibling, or child of the alien.

(3) **TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE SECRETARY.**—Any period of travel outside of the United States by an alien that was authorized by the Secretary may not be counted toward any period of departure from the United States under paragraph (1).

(c) **WAIVER OF PHYSICAL PRESENCE.**—With respect to aliens who were removed or departed the United States on or after January 20, 2017, and who were continuously physically present in the United States for at least 4 years prior to such removal or departure, the Secretary may, as a matter of discretion, waive the physical presence requirement under section 111(b)(1)(A) for humanitarian purposes, for family unity, or because a waiver is otherwise in the public interest. The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall establish a procedure for such aliens to apply for relief under section 111 from outside the United States if they would have been eligible for relief under such section, but for their removal or departure.

SEC. 125. EXEMPTION FROM NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.

Nothing in this title or in any other law may be construed to apply a numerical limitation on the number of aliens who may be granted permanent resident status under this title (whether on a conditional basis, or without the conditional basis as provided in section 113(c)(2)).

SEC. 126. AVAILABILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) **ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to aliens who have applied for adjustment of status under this title a process by which an applicant may seek administrative appellate review of a denial of an application for adjustment of status, or a revocation of such status.

(b) **JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), and notwithstanding any other provision of law, an alien may seek judicial review of a denial of an application for adjust-

ment of status, or a revocation of such status, under this title in an appropriate United States district court.

(c) **JUDICIAL REVIEW OF A PROVISIONAL DENIAL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if, after notice and the opportunity to respond under section 111(c)(3)(E), the Secretary provisionally denies an application for adjustment of status under this title, the alien shall have 60 days from the date of the Secretary's determination to seek review of such determination in an appropriate United States district court.

(2) **SCOPE OF REVIEW AND DECISION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, review under paragraph (1) shall be de novo and based solely on the administrative record, except that the applicant shall be given the opportunity to supplement the administrative record and the Secretary shall be given the opportunity to rebut the evidence and arguments raised in such submission. Upon issuing its decision, the court shall remand the matter, with appropriate instructions, to the Department of Homeland Security to render a final decision on the application.

(3) **APPOINTED COUNSEL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an applicant seeking judicial review under paragraph (1) shall be represented by counsel. Upon the request of the applicant, counsel shall be appointed for the applicant, in accordance with procedures to be established by the Attorney General within 90 days of the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall be funded in accordance with fees collected and deposited in the Immigration Counsel Account under section 132.

(d) **STAY OF REMOVAL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an alien seeking administrative or judicial review under this title may not be removed from the United States until a final decision is rendered establishing that the alien is ineligible for adjustment of status under this title.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—The Secretary may remove an alien described in paragraph (1) pending judicial review if such removal is based on criminal or national security grounds described in this title. Such removal shall not affect the alien's right to judicial review under this title. The Secretary shall promptly return a removed alien if a decision to deny an application for adjustment of status under this title, or to revoke such status, is reversed.

SEC. 127. DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING IDENTITY.**—An alien's application for permanent resident status under this title (whether on a conditional basis, or without the conditional basis as provided in section 113(c)(2)) may include, as evidence of identity, the following:

(1) A passport or national identity document from the alien's country of origin that includes the alien's name and the alien's photograph or fingerprint.

(2) The alien's birth certificate and an identity card that includes the alien's name and photograph.

(3) A school identification card that includes the alien's name and photograph, and school records showing the alien's name and that the alien is or was enrolled at the school.

(4) A Uniformed Services identification card issued by the Department of Defense.

(5) Any immigration or other document issued by the United States Government bearing the alien's name and photograph.

(6) A State-issued identification card bearing the alien's name and photograph.

(7) Any other evidence determined to be credible by the Secretary.

(b) **DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING ENTRY, CONTINUOUS PHYSICAL PRESENCE, LACK OF ABANDONMENT OF RESIDENCE.**—To establish that an alien was younger than 18 years of age on the date on which the alien entered the United States, and

has continuously resided in the United States since such entry, as required under section 111(b)(1)(B), that an alien has been continuously physically present in the United States, as required under section 111(b)(1)(A), or that an alien has not abandoned residence in the United States, as required under section 113(a)(1)(B), the alien may submit the following forms of evidence:

(1) Passport entries, including admission stamps on the alien's passport.

(2) Any document from the Department of Justice or the Department of Homeland Security noting the alien's date of entry into the United States.

(3) Records from any educational institution the alien has attended in the United States.

(4) Employment records of the alien that include the employer's name and contact information, or other records demonstrating earned income.

(5) Records of service from the Uniformed Services.

(6) Official records from a religious entity confirming the alien's participation in a religious ceremony.

(7) A birth certificate for a child who was born in the United States.

(8) Hospital or medical records showing medical treatment or hospitalization, the name of the medical facility or physician, and the date of the treatment or hospitalization.

(9) Automobile license receipts or registration.

(10) Deeds, mortgages, or rental agreement contracts.

(11) Rent receipts or utility bills bearing the alien's name or the name of an immediate family member of the alien, and the alien's address.

(12) Tax receipts.

(13) Insurance policies.

(14) Remittance records, including copies of money order receipts sent in or out of the country.

(15) Travel records.

(16) Dated bank transactions.

(17) Two or more sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien who have direct knowledge of the alien's continuous physical presence in the United States, that contain—

(A) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(B) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien.

(18) Any other evidence determined to be credible by the Secretary.

(c) **DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING ADMISSION TO AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—To establish that an alien has been admitted to an institution of higher education, the alien may submit to the Secretary a document from the institution of higher education certifying that the alien—

(1) has been admitted to the institution; or

(2) is currently enrolled in the institution as a student.

(d) **DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING RECEIPT OF A DEGREE FROM AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—To establish that an alien has acquired a degree from an institution of higher education in the United States, the alien may submit to the Secretary a diploma or other document from the institution stating that the alien has received such a degree.

(e) **DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING RECEIPT OF A HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA, GENERAL EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CREDENTIAL, OR A RECOGNIZED EQUIVALENT.**—To establish that in the United States an alien has earned a high school diploma or a commensurate alternative award from a public or private high school, has obtained the General Education Development credential, or otherwise has satisfied section 111(b)(1)(D)(iii), the alien may submit to the Secretary the following:

(1) A high school diploma, certificate of completion, or other alternate award.

(2) A high school equivalency diploma or certificate recognized under State law.

(3) Evidence that the alien passed a State-authorized exam, including the General Education Development test, in the United States.

(4) Evidence that the alien successfully completed an area career and technical education program, such as a certification, certificate, or similar alternate award.

(5) Evidence that the alien obtained a recognized postsecondary credential.

(6) Any other evidence determined to be credible by the Secretary.

(f) **DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING ENROLLMENT IN AN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM.**—To establish that an alien is enrolled in any school or education program described in section 111(b)(1)(D)(iv) or 113(a)(1)(C), the alien may submit school records from the United States school that the alien is currently attending that include—

(1) the name of the school; and

(2) the alien's name, periods of attendance, and current grade or educational level.

(g) **DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING EXEMPTION FROM APPLICATION FEES.**—To establish that an alien is exempt from an application fee under section 123(c), the alien may submit to the Secretary the following relevant documents:

(1) **DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH AGE.**—To establish that an alien meets an age requirement, the alien may provide proof of identity, as described in subsection (a), that establishes that the alien is younger than 18 years of age.

(2) **DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH INCOME.**—To establish the alien's income, the alien may provide—

(A) employment records or other records of earned income, including records that have been maintained by the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, or any other Federal, State, or local government agency;

(B) bank records; or

(C) at least 2 sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the alien's work and income that contain—

(i) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(ii) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien.

(3) **DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH FOSTER CARE, LACK OF FAMILIAL SUPPORT, OR SERIOUS, CHRONIC DISABILITY.**—To establish that the alien is in foster care, lacks parental or familial support, or has a serious, chronic disability, the alien may provide at least 2 sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the circumstances that contain—

(A) a statement that the alien is in foster care, otherwise lacks any parental or other familial support, or has a serious, chronic disability, as appropriate;

(B) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(C) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien.

(h) **DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING QUALIFICATION FOR HARDSHIP EXEMPTION.**—To establish that an alien satisfies one of the criteria for the hardship exemption set forth in section 113(a)(2)(C), the alien may submit to the Secretary at least 2 sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the circumstances that warrant the exemption, that contain—

(1) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(2) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien.

(i) **DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING SERVICE IN THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.**—To establish that an alien has served in the Uniformed Services for at least 2 years and, if discharged, received an honorable discharge, the alien may submit to the Secretary—

(1) a Department of Defense form DD-214;

(2) a National Guard Report of Separation and Record of Service form 22;

(3) personnel records for such service from the appropriate Uniformed Service; or

(4) health records from the appropriate Uniformed Service.

(j) **DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING EARNED INCOME.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An alien may satisfy the earned income requirement under section 113(a)(1)(C)(iii) by submitting records that—

(A) establish compliance with such requirement; and

(B) have been maintained by the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, or any other Federal, State, or local government agency.

(2) **OTHER DOCUMENTS.**—An alien who is unable to submit the records described in paragraph (1) may satisfy the earned income requirement by submitting at least 2 types of reliable documents that provide evidence of employment or other forms of earned income, including—

(A) bank records;

(B) business records;

(C) employer or contractor records;

(D) records of a labor union, day labor center, or organization that assists workers in employment;

(E) sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the alien's work, that contain—

(i) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(ii) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien;

(F) remittance records; or

(G) any other evidence determined to be credible by the Secretary.

(k) **AUTHORITY TO PROHIBIT USE OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS.**—If the Secretary determines, after publication in the Federal Register and an opportunity for public comment, that any document or class of documents does not reliably establish identity or that permanent resident status under this title (whether on a conditional basis, or without the conditional basis as provided in section 113(c)(2)) is being obtained fraudulently to an unacceptable degree, the Secretary may prohibit or restrict the use of such document or class of documents.

SEC. 128. RULE MAKING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register interim final rules implementing this title, which shall allow eligible individuals to immediately apply for relief under section 111 or 113(c)(2). Notwithstanding section 553 of title 5, United States Code, the regulation shall be effective, on an interim basis, immediately upon publication, but may be subject to change and revision after public notice and opportunity for a period of public comment. The Secretary shall finalize such rules not later than 180 days after the date of publication.

(b) **PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.**—The requirements under chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, (commonly known as the "Paperwork Reduction Act") shall not apply to any action to implement this title.

SEC. 129. CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may not disclose or use information (including information provided during administrative or judicial review) provided in applications filed under this title or in requests for DACA for the purpose of immigration enforcement.

(b) **REFERRALS PROHIBITED.**—The Secretary, based solely on information provided in an application for adjustment of status under this title (including information provided during administrative or judicial review) or an application for DACA, may not refer an applicant to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or any designee of either such entity.

(c) **LIMITED EXCEPTION.**—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), information provided in an application for adjustment of status under this title may be shared with Federal security and law enforcement agencies—

(1) for assistance in the consideration of an application for adjustment of status under this title;

(2) to identify or prevent fraudulent claims;

(3) for national security purposes; or

(4) for the investigation or prosecution of any felony offense not related to immigration status.

(d) **PENALTY.**—Any person who knowingly uses, publishes, or permits information to be examined in violation of this section shall be fined not more than \$10,000.

SEC. 130. GRANT PROGRAM TO ASSIST ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish, within U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, a program to award grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible nonprofit organizations that will use the funding to assist eligible applicants under this title by providing them with the services described in subsection (b).

(b) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Grant funds awarded under this section shall be used for the design and implementation of programs that provide—

(1) information to the public regarding the eligibility and benefits of permanent resident status under this title (whether on a conditional basis, or without the conditional basis as provided in section 113(c)(2)), particularly to individuals potentially eligible for such status;

(2) assistance, within the scope of authorized practice of immigration law, to individuals submitting applications for adjustment of status under this title (whether on a conditional basis, or without the conditional basis as provided in section 113(c)(2)), including—

(A) screening prospective applicants to assess their eligibility for such status;

(B) completing applications and petitions, including providing assistance in obtaining the requisite documents and supporting evidence; and

(C) providing any other assistance that the Secretary or grantee considers useful or necessary to apply for adjustment of status under this title (whether on a conditional basis, or without the conditional basis as provided in section 113(c)(2)); and

(3) assistance, within the scope of authorized practice of immigration law, and instruction, to individuals—

(A) on the rights and responsibilities of United States citizenship;

(B) in civics and English as a second language;

(C) in preparation for the General Education Development test; and

(D) in applying for adjustment of status and United States citizenship.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2020 through 2030 to carry out this section.

(2) **AVAILABILITY.**—Any amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 131. PROVISIONS AFFECTING ELIGIBILITY FOR ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.

An alien's eligibility to be lawfully admitted for permanent residence under this title (whether on a conditional basis, or without the conditional basis as provided in section 113(c)(2)) shall not preclude the alien from seeking any status under any other provision of law for which the alien may otherwise be eligible.

SEC. 132. SUPPLEMENTARY SURCHARGE FOR APPOINTED COUNSEL.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in section 122 and in cases where the applicant is exempt from paying a fee under section 123(c), in any case in which a fee is charged pursuant to this title, an additional surcharge of \$25 shall be imposed and collected for the purpose of providing appointed counsel to applicants seeking judicial review of the Secretary's decision to provisionally deny an application under section 126(c)(3).

(b) **IMMIGRATION COUNSEL ACCOUNT.**—There is established in the general fund of the Treasury a separate account which shall be known as the "Immigration Counsel Account". Fees collected under subsection (a) shall be deposited into the Immigration Counsel Account and shall to remain available until expended for purposes of providing appointed counsel as required under this title.

(c) **REPORT.**—At the end of each 2-year period, beginning with the establishment of this account, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report to the Congress concerning the status of the account, including any balances therein, and recommend any adjustment in the prescribed fee that may be required to ensure that the receipts collected from the fee charged for the succeeding two years equal, as closely as possible, the cost of providing appointed counsel as required under this title.

SEC. 133. ANNUAL REPORT ON PROVISIONAL DENIAL AUTHORITY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Congress a report detailing the number of applicants that receive—

(1) a provisional denial under this title;

(2) a final denial under this title without seeking judicial review;

(3) a final denial under this title after seeking judicial review; and

(4) an approval under this title after seeking judicial review.

TITLE II—AMERICAN PROMISE ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "American Promise Act of 2019".

Subtitle A—Treatment of Certain Nationals of Certain Countries Designated for Temporary Protected Status or Deferred Enforced Departure

SEC. 211. ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS FOR CERTAIN NATIONALS OF CERTAIN COUNTRIES DESIGNATED FOR TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS OR DEFERRED ENFORCED DEPARTURE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary or the Attorney General shall cancel the removal of, and adjust to the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, an alien described in subsection (b) if the alien—

(1) applies for such adjustment, including submitting any required documents under section 227, not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) has been continuously physically present in the United States for a period of not less than 3 years before the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(3) is not inadmissible under paragraph (1), (2), (3), (6)(D), (6)(E), (6)(F), (6)(G), (8), or (10) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)).

(b) **ALIENS ELIGIBLE FOR ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.**—An alien shall be eligible for adjustment of status under this section if the alien is an individual—

(1) who—

(A) is a national of a foreign state (or part thereof) (or in the case of an alien having no nationality, is a person who last habitually resided in such state) with a designation under subsection (b) of section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a(b)) on January 1, 2017, who had or was otherwise eligible for temporary protected status on such date notwithstanding subsections (c)(1)(A)(iv) and (c)(3)(C) of such section; and

(B) has not engaged in conduct since such date that would render the alien ineligible for temporary protected status under section 244(c)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a(c)(2)); or

(2) who was eligible for Deferred Enforced Departure as of January 1, 2017, and has not en-

gaged in conduct since that date that would render the alien ineligible for Deferred Enforced Departure.

(c) **APPLICATION.**—

(1) **FEE.**—The Secretary shall, subject to an exemption under section 223(c), require an alien applying for adjustment of status under this section to pay a reasonable fee that is commensurate with the cost of processing the application, but does not exceed \$1,140.

(2) **BACKGROUND CHECKS.**—The Secretary may not grant an alien permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section until the requirements of section 222 are satisfied.

(3) **WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall, upon receipt of a request to withdraw an application for adjustment of status under this section, cease processing of the application and close the case. Withdrawal of the application under this subsection shall not prejudice any future application filed by the applicant for any immigration benefit under this title or under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

Subtitle B—General Provisions

SEC. 221. DEFINITIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In this title:

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise specifically provided, any term used in this title that is used in the immigration laws shall have the meaning given such term in the immigration laws.

(2) **DISABILITY.**—The term "disability" has the meaning given such term in section 3(1) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102(1)).

(3) **FEDERAL POVERTY LINE.**—The term "Federal poverty line" has the meaning given such term in section 213A(h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1183a).

(4) **IMMIGRATION LAWS.**—The term "immigration laws" has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17)).

(5) **SECRETARY.**—Except as otherwise specifically provided, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(6) **UNIFORMED SERVICES.**—The term "Uniformed Services" has the meaning given the term "uniformed services" in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

(b) **TREATMENT OF EXPUNGED CONVICTIONS.**—For purposes of adjustment of status under this title, the terms "convicted" and "conviction", as used in sections 212 and 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182, 1254a), do not include a judgment that has been expunged or set aside, that resulted in a rehabilitative disposition, or the equivalent.

SEC. 222. SUBMISSION OF BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC DATA; BACKGROUND CHECKS.

(a) **SUBMISSION OF BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC DATA.**—The Secretary may not grant an alien adjustment of status under this title unless the alien submits biometric and biographic data, in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary. The Secretary shall provide an alternative procedure for aliens who are unable to provide such biometric or biographic data because of a physical impairment.

(b) **BACKGROUND CHECKS.**—The Secretary shall use biometric, biographic, and other data that the Secretary determines appropriate to conduct security and law enforcement background checks and to determine whether there is any criminal, national security, or other factor that would render the alien ineligible for adjustment of status under this title. The status of an alien may not be adjusted unless security and law enforcement background checks are completed to the satisfaction of the Secretary.

SEC. 223. LIMITATION ON REMOVAL; APPLICATION AND FEE EXEMPTION; WAIVER OF GROUNDS FOR INADMISSIBILITY AND OTHER CONDITIONS ON ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.

(a) **LIMITATION ON REMOVAL.**—An alien who appears to be *prima facie* eligible for relief under

this title shall be given a reasonable opportunity to apply for such relief and may not be removed until, subject to section 226(c), a final decision establishing ineligibility for relief is rendered.

(b) **APPLICATION.**—An alien present in the United States who has been ordered removed or has been permitted to depart voluntarily from the United States may, notwithstanding such order or permission to depart, apply for adjustment of status under this title. Such alien shall not be required to file a separate motion to reopen, reconsider, or vacate the order of removal. If the Secretary approves the application, the Secretary shall cancel the order of removal. If the Secretary renders a final administrative decision to deny the application, the order of removal or permission to depart shall be effective and enforceable to the same extent as if the application had not been made, only after all available administrative and judicial remedies have been exhausted.

(c) **FEE EXEMPTION.**—An applicant may be exempted from paying an application fee required under this title if the applicant—

- (1) is younger than 18 years of age;
- (2) received total income, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the applicant files an application under this title, that is less than 150 percent of the Federal poverty line;
- (3) is in foster care or otherwise lacks any parental or other familial support; or
- (4) cannot care for himself or herself because of a serious, chronic disability.

(d) **WAIVER OF GROUNDS OF INADMISSIBILITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), with respect to any benefit under this title, and in addition to any waivers that are otherwise available, the Secretary may waive the grounds of inadmissibility under paragraph (1), subparagraphs (A), (C), and (D) of paragraph (2), subparagraphs (D) through (G) of paragraph (6), or paragraph (10)(D) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)) for humanitarian purposes, for family unity, or because the waiver is otherwise in the public interest.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—The Secretary may not waive a ground described in paragraph (1) if such inadmissibility is based on a conviction or convictions, and such conviction or convictions would otherwise render the alien ineligible under section 244(c)(2)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a(c)(2)(B)).

(e) **ADVANCE PAROLE.**—During the period beginning on the date on which an alien applies for adjustment of status under this title and ending on the date on which the Secretary makes a final decision regarding such application, the alien shall be eligible to apply for advance parole. Section 101(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(g)) shall not apply to an alien granted advance parole under this section.

(f) **EMPLOYMENT.**—An alien whose removal is stayed pursuant to this title, or who has pending an application under this title, shall, upon application to the Secretary, be granted an employment authorization document.

SEC. 224. DETERMINATION OF CONTINUOUS PRESENCE.

(a) **EFFECT OF NOTICE TO APPEAR.**—Any period of continuous physical presence in the United States of an alien who applies for adjustment of status under this title shall not terminate when the alien is served a notice to appear under section 239(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229(a)).

(b) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN BREAKS IN PRESENCE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), an alien shall be considered to have failed to maintain continuous physical presence in the United States under this title if the alien has departed from the United States for any period exceeding 90 days or for any periods, in the aggregate, exceeding 180 days.

(2) **EXTENSIONS FOR EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES.**—The Secretary may extend the time periods described in paragraph (1) for an alien who demonstrates that the failure to timely return to the United States was due to extenuating circumstances beyond the alien's control, including the serious illness of the alien, or death or serious illness of a parent, grandparent, sibling, or child of the alien.

(3) **TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE SECRETARY.**—Any period of travel outside of the United States by an alien that was authorized by the Secretary may not be counted toward any period of departure from the United States under paragraph (1).

(c) **WAIVER OF PHYSICAL PRESENCE.**—With respect to aliens who were removed or departed the United States on or after January 20, 2017, and who were continuously physically present in the United States for at least 3 years prior to such removal or departure, the Secretary may, as a matter of discretion, waive the physical presence requirement under section 211(a)(2) for humanitarian purposes, for family unity, or because a waiver is otherwise in the public interest. The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall establish a procedure for such aliens to apply for relief under section 211 from outside the United States if they would have been eligible for relief under such section, but for their removal or departure.

SEC. 225. EXEMPTION FROM NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.

Nothing in this title or in any other law may be construed to apply a numerical limitation on the number of aliens who may be granted permanent resident status under this title.

SEC. 226. AVAILABILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) **ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide to aliens who have applied for adjustment of status under this title a process by which an applicant may seek administrative appellate review of a denial of an application for adjustment of status, or a revocation of such status.

(b) **JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an alien may seek judicial review of a denial of an application for adjustment of status, or a revocation of such status, under this title in the United States district court with jurisdiction over the alien's residence.

(c) **STAY OF REMOVAL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an alien seeking administrative or judicial review under this title may not be removed from the United States until a final decision is rendered establishing that the alien is ineligible for adjustment of status under this title.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—The Secretary may remove an alien described in paragraph (1) pending judicial review if such removal is based on criminal or national security grounds. Such removal does not affect the alien's right to judicial review under this title. The Secretary shall promptly return a removed alien if a decision to deny an application for adjustment of status under this title, or to revoke such status, is reversed.

SEC. 227. DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING IDENTITY.**—An alien's application for permanent resident status under this title may include, as evidence of identity, the following:

(1) A passport or national identity document from the alien's country of origin that includes the alien's name and the alien's photograph or fingerprint.

(2) The alien's birth certificate and an identity card that includes the alien's name and photograph.

(3) A school identification card that includes the alien's name and photograph, and school records showing the alien's name and that the alien is or was enrolled at the school.

(4) A Uniformed Services identification card issued by the Department of Defense.

(5) Any immigration or other document issued by the United States Government bearing the alien's name and photograph.

(6) A State-issued identification card bearing the alien's name and photograph.

(7) Any other evidence determined to be credible by the Secretary.

(b) **DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING CONTINUOUS PHYSICAL PRESENCE.**—An alien's application for permanent resident status under this title may include, as evidence that the alien has been continuously physically present in the United States, as required under section 211(a)(2), the following:

(1) Passport entries, including admission stamps on the alien's passport.

(2) Any document from the Department of Justice or the Department of Homeland Security noting the alien's date of entry into the United States.

(3) Records from any educational institution the alien has attended in the United States.

(4) Employment records of the alien that include the employer's name and contact information.

(5) Records of service from the Uniformed Services.

(6) Official records from a religious entity confirming the alien's participation in a religious ceremony.

(7) A birth certificate for a child who was born in the United States.

(8) Hospital or medical records showing medical treatment or hospitalization, the name of the medical facility or physician, and the date of the treatment or hospitalization.

(9) Automobile license receipts or registration.

(10) Deeds, mortgages, or rental agreement contracts.

(11) Rent receipts or utility bills bearing the alien's name or the name of an immediate family member of the alien, and the alien's address.

(12) Tax receipts;

(13) Insurance policies.

(14) Remittance records, including copies of money order receipts sent in or out of the country.

(15) Travel records.

(16) Dated bank transactions.

(17) Two or more sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien who have direct knowledge of the alien's continuous physical presence in the United States, that contain—

(A) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(B) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien.

(18) Any other evidence determined to be credible by the Secretary.

(c) **DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING EXEMPTION FROM APPLICATION FEES.**—An alien's application for permanent resident status under this title may include, as evidence that the alien is exempt from an application fee under section 223(c), the following:

(1) **DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH AGE.**—To establish that an alien meets an age requirement, the alien may provide proof of identity, as described in subsection (a), that establishes that the alien is younger than 18 years of age.

(2) **DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH INCOME.**—To establish the alien's income, the alien may provide—

(A) employment records or other records of earned income, including records that have been maintained by the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, or any other Federal, State, or local government agency;

(B) bank records; or

(C) at least 2 sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the alien's work and income that contain—

(i) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(ii) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien.

(3) DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH FOSTER CARE, LACK OF FAMILIAL SUPPORT, OR SERIOUS, CHRONIC DISABILITY.—To establish that the alien is in foster care, lacks parental or familial support, or has a serious, chronic disability, the alien may provide at least 2 sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the circumstances that contain—

(A) a statement that the alien is in foster care, otherwise lacks any parental or other familial support, or has a serious, chronic disability, as appropriate;

(B) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(C) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien.

(d) AUTHORITY TO PROHIBIT USE OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS.—If the Secretary determines, after publication in the Federal Register and an opportunity for public comment, that any document or class of documents does not reliably establish identity or that permanent resident status under this title is being obtained fraudulently to an unacceptable degree, the Secretary may prohibit or restrict the use of such document or class of documents.

SEC. 228. RULE MAKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register interim final rules implementing this title, which shall allow eligible individuals to immediately apply for relief under section 211. Notwithstanding section 553 of title 5, United States Code, the regulation shall be effective, on an interim basis, immediately upon publication, but may be subject to change and revision after public notice and opportunity for a period of public comment. The Secretary shall finalize such rules not later than 180 days after the date of publication.

(b) PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—The requirements under chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, (commonly known as the “Paperwork Reduction Act”) shall not apply to any action to implement this title.

SEC. 229. CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not disclose or use information provided in applications filed under this title (including information provided during administrative or judicial review) for the purpose of immigration enforcement.

(b) REFERRALS PROHIBITED.—The Secretary, based solely on information provided in an application for adjustment of status under this title (including information provided during administrative or judicial review), may not refer an applicant to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or any designee of either such entity.

(c) LIMITED EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), information provided in an application for adjustment of status under this title may be shared with Federal security and law enforcement agencies—

(1) for assistance in the consideration of an application for adjustment of status under this title;

(2) to identify or prevent fraudulent claims;

(3) for national security purposes; or

(4) for the investigation or prosecution of any felony not related to immigration status.

(d) PENALTY.—Any person who knowingly uses, publishes, or permits information to be examined in violation of this section shall be fined not more than \$10,000.

SEC. 230. GRANT PROGRAM TO ASSIST ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish, within U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, a program to award grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible nonprofit organizations that will use the funding to assist eligible applicants under this title by providing them with the services described in subsection (b).

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds awarded under this section shall be used for the design and implementation of programs that provide—

(1) information to the public regarding the eligibility and benefits of permanent resident status under this title, particularly to individuals potentially eligible for such status;

(2) assistance, within the scope of authorized practice of immigration law, to individuals submitting applications for adjustment of status under this title, including—

(A) screening prospective applicants to assess their eligibility for such status;

(B) completing applications and petitions, including providing assistance in obtaining the requisite documents and supporting evidence; and

(C) providing any other assistance that the Secretary or grantee considers useful or necessary to apply for adjustment of status under this title; and

(3) assistance, within the scope of authorized practice of immigration law, and instruction, to individuals—

(A) on the rights and responsibilities of United States citizenship;

(B) in civics and English as a second language;

(C) in preparation for the General Education Development test; and

(D) in applying for adjustment of status and United States citizenship.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2020 through 2030 to carry out this section.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Any amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 231. PROVISIONS AFFECTING ELIGIBILITY FOR ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.

An alien's eligibility to be lawfully admitted for permanent residence under this title shall not preclude the alien from seeking any status under any other provision of law for which the alien may otherwise be eligible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 2 hours, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 6.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act of 2019, is vital legislation that provides a path to lawful permanent resident, or LPR, status for two groups of people who enrich our Nation and who are in dire need of protection, Dreamers, and long-term recipients of humanitarian relief, known as Temporary Protected Status, or TPS, and Deferred Enforcement Departure, or DED.

Dreamers are undocumented immigrants who came to the United States

as children and have embraced this country as their own. They are our neighbors and coworkers; they are the classmates of our children; and they serve in our military with distinction. Many did not even know they were not born here and were not American citizens until they found they could not get drivers licenses or in-state tuition rates for college.

That is why it was so devastating when the Trump administration announced that it was ending the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, also known as DACA, which enabled approximately 800,000 Dreamers to work lawfully, attend school, and plan their lives without the constant threat of deportation.

Although less is known or understood about long-time TPS and DED recipients, there is no doubt that they are equally deserving of our protection and support. Broadly speaking, TPS and DED provide humanitarian relief to individuals from countries facing dangerous conditions or experiencing upheaval, such as ongoing armed conflict, natural disasters, or other extraordinary conditions.

TPS and DED recipients have lived in the United States, on average, for decades, laying down deep roots in our communities. They also contribute to the U.S. economy by making up a significant portion of the workforce in key industries, including construction and food service, as well as through consumer spending and tax revenue.

Unfortunately, like Dreamers, their futures now hang in the balance as a result of the Trump administration's anti-immigrant, enforcement-only approach to immigration policy. Since September 2017, the administration has announced the termination of TPS and DED for seven affected countries.

Fortunately, the courts have issued multiple injunctions preventing efforts to terminate DACA and TPS from moving forward. But even if the courts ultimately rule against the administration, only a fraction of Dreamers and TPS recipients will benefit from a reprieve that is itself only temporary. That is why we must pass H.R. 6 today to provide Dreamers and TPS recipients the permanent protections they need and deserve.

The American Dream and Promise Act is carefully crafted legislation that delivers needed protections, while creating rigorous eligibility standards, including specifically restricting eligibility to those individuals who pose no public safety or national security concerns.

I want to congratulate my colleagues, Representatives LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, and you, Madam Speaker, YVETTE CLARKE, for introducing this important legislation.

I would also like to thank the distinguished chair and vice chair of the Immigration Subcommittee, Representatives ZOE LOFGREEN and PRAMILA JAYAPAL. Their steadfast support for

the Dreamer and TPS/DED populations, and their tireless efforts, have been essential in bringing this bill to the floor today.

Dreamers and TPS and DED recipients contribute to our thriving economy, and they make America a stronger, more united, and more diverse nation. Failing to provide permanent protections for them at this critical juncture would be a travesty, not only for these individuals, but also for us as a country.

I hope that all of my colleagues will stand up for these vital members of our society when it truly counts by supporting H.R. 6 today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act of 2019.

Last week, I went to El Paso to see what was going on on our southern border. I can tell my colleagues today that our border is an utter disaster.

Last month, Customs and Border Protection apprehended an average of 4,500 people every day. During the first 7 months of the fiscal year, CBP has apprehended more individuals than in any full fiscal year since 2009.

While I was in El Paso, a single group of more than 1,000 aliens illegally walked across the border from Juarez. A group of migrants the size of a high school strolled right into downtown El Paso and surrendered to Border Patrol. I personally witnessed hundreds of others in smaller groups do the same thing.

The number of family unit members and unaccompanied alien minors apprehended in April set records, and May numbers eclipsed those records. The number of single-adult apprehensions has now reached a 5-year high.

So far this year, Border Patrol has encountered over 180 large groups, those with over 100 people. With so many people entering illegally, it is no wonder Border Patrol processing centers are far beyond capacity and ICE detention facilities are full.

Even the NGOs providing shelter and other aid to migrants are completely overwhelmed by the unending surge of people who have learned we are rewarding those who break our laws and endangering vulnerable men, women, and children in the process.

Perhaps the worst part of this humanitarian crisis is the toll it takes on children. CBP has identified over 3,000 potentially fraudulent family units arriving at the border. As unbelievable as it may sound, aliens admitted that they have “borrowed,” “rented,” or “bought,” yes, “bought” a child because they know showing up with a child at the border all but guarantees release into America’s interior.

It is a crisis. One of the overworked, overwhelmed agents that I met last week told me, after I thanked him for

doing his work and being there, he looked at me and he said: “I’m doing my job; now y’all go do yours.”

I took that to heart. I believe that the surge of migrants can be all but ended by enacting a legislation to fix the Flores settlement, which the Obama administration agreed with me on; amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act and raise the credible fear standard of asylum.

But what are my Democratic colleagues going to do to address this situation? Nothing.

Democrats have the chance to help the overworked DHS heroes, overwhelmed NGOs, and the American people who believe in our country’s sovereignty.

Sadly, the Democrats are making us consider a bill that will worsen, give a green light to the border crisis, incentivizing more people to cross our borders illegally in hopes of getting a piece of the amnesty pie.

No doubt, at this very minute, the smuggling cartels are getting the word out—just as we heard from migrants walking across our border, they were told it’s open—that there’s availability, to come across. They are telling them Congress is going to legalize millions. Just get there. They will do it for you.

I have repeatedly implored my committee chairman to give us a bill legalizing some of the illegal immigrant population and include enforcement measures to secure our border and enforce our laws inside our country.

□ 1515

Sadly, Democrats refuse. They had a chance to show they are serious about an immigration solution for DACA recipients and perhaps even for the Dreamers they have talked about protecting for years. Instead, today, we are considering a political messaging bill. The message is that America won’t enforce its laws or protect its people.

H.R. 6 provides a special path to citizenship for millions of illegal immigrants as well as hundreds of thousands of TPS and DED, or deferred enforced departure, recipients. It places the interests of those who have violated our laws before those people who have waited patiently for green cards to become available. Because the bill provides that same path to some legal nonimmigrants and even people living outside America, the number of potential beneficiaries is completely unknown.

H.R. 6 allows criminal aliens and those who have committed immigration fraud to receive green cards. It rewards with green cards and eventual citizenship the parents who knowingly brought children to the U.S. illegally. It incentivizes fraud through lax documentation requirements, allowing affidavits to show compliance with some of those requirements and allowing people to withdraw an application at any time without prejudice.

H.R. 6 pretends to prevent alien gang members from getting green cards, but the prohibition is so deliberately narrow, it is virtually unworkable.

H.R. 6 actually provides U.S. taxpayer funds to NGOs, in the form of grant programs, to help illegal aliens apply for green cards.

It has been said by my colleagues across the aisle to not worry, that the Department of Homeland Security Secretary will have the nondelegable ability to review these. I am not sure what my colleagues across the aisle believe the Secretary does all day except review these applications. It is the most amazing thought and statement I have ever heard.

If enacted, H.R. 6 would overwhelm U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to the point where adjudicators will be pulled off of processing legal immigration benefits to process the millions of applications resulting from this bill. There will be several million applications for amnesty because H.R. 6 has no consequence for filing a false or frivolous application.

Hear me clearly: A person could file a false or frivolous application, and there is no consequence to it.

CBO has estimated that over the 2020 to 2029 period, the two bills combined to make H.R. 6 would cost \$26.3 billion and \$8.3 billion respectively, and that is, frankly, I believe, an underestimate.

As evidenced by the two floor votes last year, Republicans want to provide legal status for DACA recipients. We want to do it the right way, to minimize fraud, to ensure criminals cannot get legal status, and to bolster border security. Without these commonsense measures and compassionate measures, we will find ourselves repeating this conversation a few years from now.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 6 does none of these things, so I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the distinguished chairperson of the Immigration and Citizenship Subcommittee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, today, we have the privilege of voting for the American Dream and Promise Act of 2019. This vote will bring Dreamers, young immigrants who came to the country as children, as well as individuals who have lived here lawfully for years under temporary protected status or deferred enforced departure, another step closer to being fully recognized as American.

Many of us, both inside and outside this room, have been working to advance this legislation for almost two decades. It is hard to believe that 18 years have passed since the Dream Act was first introduced, and 9 years have passed since the House last voted on it.

Yet, despite bipartisan support in Congress as well as the support of almost 90 percent of the American people, we have thus far been unable to get this bill enacted into law.

I am proud to stand here with so many colleagues who worked with determination over the years to bring this bill to the floor, as well as all the young people and their allies who persisted through setbacks and never gave up on their call for lawful permanent residence.

Madam Speaker, our work has paid off. Today, I urge my colleagues to support the American Dream and Promise Act.

In September 2017, President Trump announced the end of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, otherwise known as DACA, which provided temporary relief from removal to approximately 800,000 Dreamers. Over the next few months, the administration announced plans to terminate the TPS designation for six countries, as well as DED for Liberia. These actions have upended the lives of hundreds of thousands of Dreamers and TPS and DED holders.

They have come to the United States in different ways, and they have had different opportunities once they arrived. But today, they are united not only by the passage of time but also by the uncertainty of the future. Congress has the power to bring certainty to their lives by passing this act.

The bill provides a fair and reasonable opportunity for Dreamers to apply for lawful permanent residence with tough eligibility standards and discretion to consider unique situations on a case-by-case basis. The TPS and DED holders must continue to meet the strict eligibility requirements that already apply to them.

Based on comments made earlier during the rules debate, comments that I assume may be repeated during this debate, I feel the need to remind everyone just how tough this bill is.

To begin with, the bill applies criminal bars that apply to any other immigrant seeking admission to the United States. It then adds to current law by disqualifying anyone convicted of any felony or more than two misdemeanors.

On top of that, it authorizes the Secretary to deny individuals who pose a threat to public safety based on a single misdemeanor conviction, a juvenile delinquency adjudication, or proof of gang-related activities.

This is a very tough bill. Anyone who poses a threat to public safety is simply ineligible under this bill.

This legislation should not be controversial. The Dream Act has enjoyed bipartisan support in the past, with many of the same provisions. TPS and DED holders are integral parts of our communities and have been contributing to our economy for years, if not decades.

On this point, I also want to stress the important economic benefits that Dreamers and TPS and DED holders provide to our country.

Immigrants eligible for the American Dream and Promise Act own 215,400 homes in the United States and pay an

estimated \$2.5 billion in annual mortgage payments. If these individuals were to lose their homes, be deported, and default, it would certainly shock housing markets around the country and cause serious damage to cities, States, and the economy as a whole.

Eligible immigrants and their households currently contribute around \$17.4 billion per year in Federal taxes and \$9.7 billion per year in State and local taxes.

Annually, these households generate over \$75 billion in spending power. That money helps to fuel local economies, creating new jobs and bringing new economic prosperity to everyone living and working with H.R. 6 beneficiaries across the country.

Without this bill, these individuals would lose their status and be kicked out of the workforce, creating a major hole in the American economy.

That may be why the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has indicated it may make this bill a key vote for its scoring purposes and why hundreds of major business leaders are urging us to pass this bill in order to grow the economy and bolster our global competitiveness.

We must set aside partisanship and move this bill forward so that Dreamers and long-term TPS and DED recipients can finally have the peace of mind they deserve and so that our country can have the contributions that they are ready to make.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote for the bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Speaker, just quickly, if their criminality keeps them simply ineligible, then why does the bill have an entire section devoted to the Secretary's provisional authority of those who conduct a public safety determination?

By the way, again, going to the Secretary of Homeland Security, I am not sure what they believe that person does, but it is definitely not to review these every day.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), the ranking member of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, there is a crisis at our southwest border. In fact, we are on track to break nearly every record from recent history.

Just last week, CBP apprehended a single group, one group, with 1,036 people in it at the border. Madam Speaker, we couldn't fit that many people in this Chamber, and we certainly can't fit them in a single Border Patrol station.

This bill does nothing to address this crisis. Instead, it tells an entire generation of illegal immigrants that breaking our laws is rewarded.

This is not rocket science. We have seen this before. In 2014, a wave of unaccompanied children came to our borders, driven by smuggler propaganda citing DACA and other amnesty policies.

The smugglers have doubled down. They call children permisos, or permits, and use them to get scores of adults, unrelated to the children, across the border.

Securing our border and enforcing our laws is the only way to break this cycle.

Ranking Member COLLINS introduced legislation to close the asylum loopholes that are fueling this crisis. That is the bill that should be on the floor today.

We also desperately need to provide supplemental funding to get us through this crisis. Last month, I asked the House to provide \$4.5 billion that DHS requested to address this humanitarian and security crisis. Despite urgent pleas for additional funds from front-line personnel responsible for caring for unaccompanied children, Democrats refused to add the funds to the supplemental.

Today, the majority again rejected those funds during the previous question vote. Democrats haven't approved a dime to address this crisis.

Because of the political dysfunction in their own Caucus, they stubbornly refuse to put forward real solutions. Instead, they put forward a bill today that is sending a clear message: Democrats would rather reward illegal immigrants than secure our border, enforce our laws, and fix this crisis. It is disgraceful.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), the chief sponsor of this bill.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, let me begin by thanking my cosponsors, NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ and YVETTE CLARKE, Judiciary Chairman NADLER, Chairman LOFGREN, the Judiciary Committee, and especially Congresswoman PRAMILA JAYAPAL for the extraordinary work they did in bringing this bill to the floor.

Today is truly a historic day for our country. It will be the first time the House of Representatives will pass a Dream Act under regular order, sending a strong message that Dreamers and TPS and DED recipients truly belong in America and contribute greatly to its success.

The American Dream and Promise Act is landmark legislation that will provide 2.1 million Dreamers with hope, security, and the opportunity to become American citizens.

We would not be here today without the tireless work of Dreamers and TPS and DED recipients who bravely and publicly shared their stories with Members of Congress and our Nation. Their stories of endurance, resourcefulness, and heartbreak, coupled with their love of America, is what inspired me in 2001

to introduce the first Dream bill, a bipartisan bill known as the Student Adjustment Act, with former Congressmen Howard Berman and Chris Cannon.

One such story is of Josue, a student studying aerospace engineering. He dreams of contributing to the advancement of space exploration and is one of many Dreamers who will produce a new generation of scientific research that will help shape our country's future.

Another Dreamer is Carolina, who hopes to become a teacher, serving as a role model, as her high school teacher did for her.

And there is Julio, who is working toward a psychology degree and whose goal is to serve historically underrepresented and marginalized students as a community college counselor.

This is just a sampling of Dreamers whose stories exemplify American values, talents, and a desire to give back to their community and the only country they know as home.

Although Dreamers live under the veil of fear and uncertainty, they still contribute over \$17.3 billion in Federal taxes and nearly \$9.7 billion in State and local taxes each year. Their households have \$75 billion in buying power.

The reality is TPS and DED recipients and our Nation's Dreamers make our Nation stronger with the contributions they make to our economy and our American society. We cannot afford to lose or hinder their talents, resilience, and contributions to our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Citizenship.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), the ranking member, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this bill we are debating today is fatally flawed. Republicans are for a compassionate solution to help DACA recipients, but that solution must be paired with commonsense border security, interior enforcement, and changes in policy to stem the tide of illegal border crossings, human smuggling, and frivolous claims of asylum. Tragically, this bill does nothing to address the crisis at our southern border.

□ 1530

Ninety-nine days ago, Chief of the Border Patrol Carla Provost testified before the Judiciary Committee that "a humanitarian and immigration crisis" was occurring at the border. By any measure, Chief Provost is correct.

Border Patrol stats show that total apprehensions in the first 7 months of the current fiscal year have already exceeded the total apprehensions from last fiscal year.

What does this bill do to address that reality and stem the tide of illegal border crossings? Nothing.

This year, the Border Patrol has also seen a 266 percent increase in apprehensions of aliens wanted by law enforcement.

What does this bill do to address that? Nothing. In fact, this bill contains weak screening requirements that will almost certainly put criminals on a path to citizenship. Republicans tried to fix this at committee, but our efforts were rejected by the majority.

The Border Patrol also reports a sharp increase in the apprehension of gang members.

What does this bill do to address that? Nothing. The bill contains no additional enforcement resources, not even to apprehend and remove known gang members. This bill will certainly give green cards to gang members.

Republicans tried to fix this in committee. Democrats rejected the amendment, impugning the integrity of police departments across America in the process by suggesting that America's cops indiscriminately add people to gang databases.

Chief Provost also noted in her February testimony that the nature of illegal border crossings has changed significantly. A decade ago, the Border Patrol used to apprehend, primarily, single adult males. Today, there is an unprecedented influx in family units and unaccompanied minors.

Over the past 5 years, family unit apprehensions are up 621 percent. Unaccompanied minor apprehensions are up 105 percent. The Border Patrol has evidence showing that transnational criminal organizations are exploiting the law to traffic children, using a child repeatedly to aid in the smuggling of adults into the U.S.

Why is there a crisis involving family units and children? What changed? The law.

In 2008, a Democratic Congress enacted the Unaccompanied Alien Child Protection Act, a law that offers perverse incentives, leading to the very problems we see today. In 2008, there were 8,041 unaccompanied minors apprehended at the border; last year, 50,036 apprehensions.

While the nature of the immigrants detained has changed, Congress has not kept pace with these changes. The Border Patrol is now in need of diapers, formula, meals, and medical care appropriate for children. Madam Speaker, you would think that Democrats could at least include more resources to care for young children at the border, but you would be wrong. This bill doesn't do that either.

Homeland Security is also hampered by a 2014 court order limiting how long Immigration and Customs Enforcement can detain not only unaccompanied minors, but also children traveling with parents and, in some cases, child traffickers. This means entire family units and criminals are released into the U.S. after 20 days of detention.

DHS desperately needs Congress to address this critical issue. Does this bill fix this issue? No, it does not.

We also know that there is abuse of our generous asylum laws. Aliens encountered at the border are being coached to claim fear, guaranteeing they will be released into the U.S.

Does this bill do anything to reduce frivolous asylum claims? No.

Does it require asylum seekers to apply at a legal port of entry? No.

Does it hold people accountable for filing or assisting in filing fraudulent claims? No.

Does it impose any kind of asylum quota? No. This bill fails to advance even basic asylum fixes.

Make no mistake about it, Madam Speaker: The policies passed by this House, even if they never become law, will send a message.

If the House passes this bill, Democrats will be sending a clear message to DACA recipients, those young adults brought here by their parents illegally, that Democrats are willing to hold these young adults hostage in the push for open borders.

If the House passes this bill, we will incentivize illegal immigration, just as Congress did in 2008, and we will certainly get more of it. That is exactly what this bill will do.

This is not compassionate. It is reckless. It is misguided.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), a sponsor of the bill.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

Let me thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman NADLER, Chairwoman LOFGREN, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, and YVETTE CLARKE for all their work on this legislation.

Today, because of Donald Trump's anti-immigration policies, millions of immigrants across the country live in constant fear that they will face deportation and potentially be separated from their families. Among these immigrant communities are recipients of TPS, or temporary protected status, or DED, deferred enforced departure.

The portions of this bill I authored say, if you have been here in the U.S. for 3 years and have been here since January 2017, then you can apply for legal permanent residence and, from there, pursue citizenship.

When we talk about our TPS and DED populations, we are talking about some of our most vulnerable neighbors. These are people who fled natural disasters or political violence. They came here with the heartfelt belief that the words inscribed at the base of the Statue of Liberty, "Give me . . . your huddled masses yearning to breathe free," are not a hollow tourist attraction.

Those words are a sacred American compact, etched into the character of our Nation. And, today, as we launch Immigrant Heritage Month, House Democrats are going to prove to the Dreamers, TPS recipients, and those in the DED program the words on the base of the statue are a promise we will honor.

Madam Speaker, those in the TPS community are our neighbors. The average TPS recipient has been in the Nation for two decades, and almost a third arrived in the U.S. younger than age 18; they have built entire lives here, many have American-born children.

Deporting them will be cruel; it will be inhumane; it will cause enormous economic disruption; and it would not be the America that we love and that we know. We cannot let that happen.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to do what they know is right. Vote "yes" on this bill. Let's send a strong message to the world that we recognize that immigrants make America America.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCENTIALER), another member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, this week, as the humanitarian crisis at our southern border escalates, House Democrats want to pass a bill that will actually make this situation even worse.

Daily border crossings at our southern border have hit record highs in a decade. Until just a few weeks ago, my colleagues across the aisle were calling this a manufactured crisis, but the numbers don't lie. On average, 4,500 individuals are apprehended each day trying to illegally cross our southern border.

Border Patrol is completely overwhelmed; ICE facilities are full; and HHS is at risk of running out of the resources necessary to take care of unaccompanied children. Yet my colleagues across the aisle want to just ignore this humanitarian crisis and, instead, pass a bill to actually encourage and reward illegal entrants and incentivize further illegal immigration.

H.R. 6 provides amnesty to millions of people, placing the interests of those who broke our laws above the interests of those who followed our laws.

The bill also has no enforcement provisions and includes loopholes that make gang members and other criminals eligible for green cards. It even requires that U.S. taxpayers fund grant programs to help illegal immigrants obtain green cards.

Most notably, it fails to provide any additional resources for law enforcement personnel at our border.

And let's be realistic about this. We all know this is dead on arrival at the Senate, and here we are just wasting our time.

Congress actually has the power and the responsibility to address the humanitarian crisis at our southern border. Unfortunately, my colleagues across the aisle are too busy playing party politics.

I want to thank Ranking Member DOUG COLLINS for introducing legislation that will actually fix the root causes of the problem at our southern

border, and I ask my colleagues across the aisle to end this desperate political showmanship and, instead, just work with us to address this devastating security and humanitarian crisis at our southern border.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), and I ask unanimous consent that she may control the time for the majority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), the sponsor of the bill.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Madam Speaker, to Speaker PELOSI, Chair NADLER, and Chair LOFGREN, my colleagues Representative ROYBAL-ALLARD, Representative VELÁZQUEZ, Representative JAYAPAL, and Representative CHU, their leadership has been tremendous in bringing forth H.R. 6, the Dream and Promise Act.

2.5 million, this is how many of our neighbors, our friends, and our family members will be able to officially call themselves American citizens because of the Dream and Promise Act as they obtain legal permanent residency on the pathway to citizenship.

I am proud to sponsor H.R. 6, the Dream and Promise Act, which provides 2.5 million Dreamers, persons with temporary protected status, and deferred enforcement departure recipients with a pathway to citizenship—2.5 million people who already call America home and are mightily contributing to our society.

As chair of the Congressional Black Caucus Immigration Task Force and as a second-generation American myself, it is my passion and my duty to stand up for immigrants.

From rural America to urban America, like in my district in Brooklyn, New York, immigrants are part of all of our communities. Immigrants own, operate, and shop at our corner shops and bodegas; immigrants cheer on their kids at neighborhood soccer games; and immigrants worship with us at our places of worship. Simply put, immigrants are woven into the fabric of our society.

The Dream and Promise Act is commonsense immigration policy, commonsense immigration policy that recognizes today's immigrant dilemmas—Dreamers and TPS and DED recipients who are contributing to our communities and are part of our blended status families—and provides them with a long, overdue pathway to citizenship.

In New York City alone, where my district is located, more than 109,000 people are eligible for the Dream and Promise Act. That number balloons to more than 180,000 people when you take into account the entire State of New York. These immigrants are not only a

part of our social fabric, but they directly boost our economy.

I look around in this Chamber and I would be hard-pressed to find anyone who hasn't been positively impacted, directly or indirectly, by the multitude of ways that these immigrants have added value to our communities.

For example, in my home State of New York, immigrants eligible for the Dream and Promise Act own 9,500 homes and pay \$228,300,000 each year in mortgage payments. These same immigrants contribute more than \$1.6 billion each year in Federal taxes and more.

Having said that, Madam Speaker, I am proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with my colleagues.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

□ 1545

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, as we dither and posture and virtue signal here today, our southern border is collapsing.

The border patrol warns that before this year is out, they will have apprehended over 1 million illegal aliens making a mockery of our sovereignty and our asylum laws. Unless Congress acts, these illegals will have to be released into our country; that is the population of the cities of Atlanta and Sacramento combined.

Now, instead of taking simple measures necessary to secure our borders and reserve our asylum laws for the truly persecuted, the House meets today to grant blanket amnesty to roughly 2.5 million illegal aliens, encouraging millions more that they, too, can violate our borders with impunity.

Now, the Democrats have long-advocated free services for illegals: free healthcare, legal counsel, education, food, housing—all paid by American taxpayers.

Now, they deny they support illegal immigration; yet, they heap rewards on those who illegally immigrate.

Many have gone so far as to advocate abolishing the agencies that defend our borders.

Democrats long ago ceased to call illegal immigration for what it is—illegal. They have supported allowing illegal aliens to vote in our elections and opposed visa tracking of foreign nationals entering our country.

They have even enacted sanctuary laws that require dangerous criminal illegal aliens to be released back into our communities rather than to be deported, as Federal law requires.

Now, the real tragedy today is that there are hundreds of thousands of

children who were brought here illegally and, in effect, stranded here without a country.

They have no legal status here, yet little familiarity with their birth country. And there is broad bipartisan support to remedy this situation today, but we cannot do that until we first fully secure our border and fully enforce our immigration laws. Otherwise, we simply encourage more children be brought here illegally, producing yet another generation who will come to us in a few years with the same demands that we hear today.

We could address both issues right now, right here and now. If full funding of the border wall and reform of our asylum laws were to be combined with legalizing the status of children who were brought here and raised here, through no fault of their own, this bill could become law in a matter of days.

Within days, we could bring these young people out of legal limbo and restore the integrity of our borders—within days.

But by forcing the completely one-sided partisan approach, the Democrats end up with precisely nothing.

This is not legislating. This is farce.

And history is screaming this warning at us that nations that either cannot or will not secure their borders simply aren't around very long.

Madam Speaker, let that not be the epitaph of the American republic.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), the vice chair of the Immigration Subcommittee, and a fierce proponent of this bill.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I am so very proud to rise in strong support of H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act.

At the heart and the core of this bill are 2.5 million people who are American in every single way but paper. Dreamers, and those with temporary protective status and DED, are integral parts of our communities and families; a community of strivers who have given and will continue to contribute to America in the finest of our traditions as a Nation.

Over 400,000 U.S. citizens live in a household with TPS holders. They own homes in our communities and fill critical workforce gaps central to our economic and community development, including in construction, food service and landscaping.

And Dreamers, too, have long-called the United States their home. One of those Dreamers is Esther, who interned in my office last year.

Esther came to the United States on a visa when she was 3 years old from South Korea. Her parents sought to obtain more permanent legal status. They gave an immigration lawyer most of their money, and he ran away with all of it. Esther's parents' visas expired.

They pushed their kids around in a shopping cart because a stroller was

too expensive. But they started over and they built their lives here, raising a smart, passionate daughter who went to Harvard.

The DACA status that Esther obtained in 2013 helped her to pursue her own American dream. And this bill would give her, and so many millions more, true freedom.

At the core of this bill, Madam Speaker, is the dignity and respect that we accord to human beings, the way in which we see people and exercise our own compassion.

We have a rare opportunity today to provide permanent protections for Dreamers and TPS and DED holders, not just for them, but also for the approximately 1 million U.S.-born children whose parents would get permanent protection.

This is a first step, not a last. We must stop criminalizing immigrants at every turn, even as we willingly accept their labor and contributions.

We cannot allow xenophobia and racism to permeate our country from its top ranks. We must continue the work to pass germane and just, comprehensive immigration reform that provides a roadmap to citizenship for 11 million undocumented immigrants, strengthens family-based immigration, and protects workers' rights on the job.

But today, Madam Speaker, we have a chance to right real wrongs for these young people and TPS and DED holders. And I thank Chairman NADLER, the incredible Immigration and Citizenship Subcommittee Chairwoman, ZOE LOFGREN, and my colleagues, Representatives ROYBAL-ALLARD, VELÁZQUEZ, and CLARKE for their hard work to bring this forward.

I also thank our staffers—including mine—Jennifer Chan in my office, but most of all, Madam Speaker, I thank the Dreamers, TPS and DED holders, families, friends, and advocates, many of whom are here in this Chamber.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CLARKE of New York). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I thank the Dreamers, TPS and DED holders, the families, friends and advocates, many of whom are right here in this Chamber with us.

Thank you for your courage in speaking out.

Thank you for demanding a different and more just future for our country.

Thank you for knowing that we always make the road by walking and for never giving up.

Madam Speaker, we have a chance to affirm the hope and promise of America. I urge a "yes" vote on this bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), another committee member.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

I can't help but to be struck here as I reflect on the markup that we had, as we have listened to the Rules debate earlier, plus this debate.

I can't help but be struck by the very notion of this is kind of what happens whenever you start moving the goalposts on what a law should be.

So under the Obama Administration, deferred action was provided for children who were brought into the country by a certain date and time, through no fault of their own, and that number was about 800,000 people applied for that.

Now, the estimate is somewhere in the neighborhood of an additional 1 million who might have qualified who didn't file the requisite application. And now, this particular bill, as several of my colleagues across the aisle have said, will apply to anywhere from 2.2 to 2.7 million people.

You can see the number starts creeping as we go forward here, as we change laws, and we acknowledge certain ideas about what the law should be.

So this actually is not about DACA. We left DACA a long time ago. And, quite frankly, there is no age limit here. So even an alien who entered the U.S. illegally 30 or 40 years ago, could be granted a green card under this bill. So we see that it has other problems as well.

So then we start talking about gang members, and we say, Oh, yeah, no, no, this is really tough on gang members.

But in fact, the denial provision is written so narrowly that it will almost never exclude gang members. In fact, it actually prohibits the use of gang databases to establish gang participation in order to deny green cards to gang members.

You got that? You can't use gang databases.

And moreover, only the Secretary of Homeland Security—and he or she cannot delegate that authority to other officials—can provisionally deny an applicant.

And what makes this particularly intriguing is if there is a denial, we are charging a fee, so that free attorneys can be hired on to represent these gang members who are provisionally denied. So they can challenge the Secretary's determination, and that is done by a de novo review.

So this is a real problem. It is too narrowly crafted in this area. And there are some other areas—and some of my colleagues have talked about it—but ultimately, we get to the heart of this, and it is just this: There is a border crisis. This bill does nothing to stop that border crisis. It will do nothing to slow the number of people who are entering this country illegally. In fact, it will do just the opposite, because it provides an incentive.

People respond to incentives. I respond to incentives. You respond to incentives.

We also respond to deterrence. We remove deterrence here. Instead, we buttressed incentives.

And so we will have a year where we are going to apprehend about 1.2 million people, at the low end. We know that a year ago we were getting about half; we were apprehending about half the people.

And we know about 4 months ago, we were getting only about a third of the people. Now, we have no idea what the getaways are.

You can talk to border patrol agents, ICE agents—whichever you want to talk to down at the border—and they will tell you, “we have no idea the numbers coming in because we are overwhelmed.”

When I was down in Yuma, the Yuma facility is designed for 250 people. A month and a half ago, it held 750 people in inhumane conditions.

No question. Inhumane conditions.

Today, that number is over 1,000, going through that same facility. That is inhumane.

And so we are just releasing them. We are releasing them, and we are saying, Come back in a couple of years.

And you know what? We have got a million people who have absconded from their court dates. We have got another million people with active removal orders.

You think this is going to serve this problem long-term? I am sad to tell you, it won't.

You are going to see more people come because you have got the incentives in place. And they are not just coming from Mexico or the Northern Triangle. They are coming from Venezuela; they are coming from Cuba; they are coming from Africa; they are coming from China.

They are coming from all over the world today. And they are coming because they know that we have no place for them. They will be released into the interior, and we will continue to be overwhelmed.

This bill will contribute to that problem.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a long-serving member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

□ 1600

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlewoman from California, and I acknowledge all the dynamic leadership that has generated where we are today, including all the sponsors whose names I recognized earlier and, of course, the magnificent persons who have met with us over and over again, who met with me. I remember the roundtable that I had of Dreamers in Houston, and their stories are powerful.

Let me say to my bipartisan friends, friends from Texas, let us work together. One gentleman was up speaking

about the need for Border Patrol and CBP. As someone who has introduced comprehensive immigration reform, as a former ranking member of the Judiciary Committee's Immigration Subcommittee, I can tell you that we are ready to work. That work, of course, is done in the Homeland Security Committee.

Let's fund and write the legislation for our leader there, Chairman THOMPSON, to be able to provide the resources that CBP is asking for, which the administration is not giving to them, and that is more staff, more health facilities, better physical plants, and more judges to help with the asylum cases.

I am ready to work. Today, we have a job to do. We have a job to do for the 386,300 immigrants who are eligible in my State, the same State that my colleagues represent.

These individuals live with 845,300 family members. Interestingly, they provide some \$340 million in mortgage payments, \$2 trillion in Federal taxes, and \$1 trillion in State and local taxes. We are looking at people who are working. Let me also indicate that the economic opportunities for these individuals are enormous.

One thing I want to indicate is that it is not DACA that is driving people. The surge is being driven by the violence in El Salvador and other places, not by DACA. It is also being driven by wrong-headed State legislators or State officials like the Texas attorney general, Ken Paxton, who threatened a lawsuit, which he did, if they didn't stop DACA.

When they stopped DACA, they put millions of young people in jeopardy. They even ignored the tragedy of Alonso, who lost his life coming down to Houston, in Harris County, to save people who were suffering from Hurricane Harvey.

Which of us on this floor went down to try and save anyone? Who sacrificed and lost their lives? What about the millions of young people who are doctors and lawyers and teachers in our districts or the paramedic whom I met in my roundtable discussion who is saving lives every day?

These false premises are killing us because we are the land of laws and the land of immigrants. I am reminded of the Statue of Liberty.

Let's pass this bill. Let's grant TPS. Let's be Americans who love this country and value the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and the equality of all people.

Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Committees on the Judiciary and on Homeland Security, and a representative of a state on the southern border, I rise in strong support of the rule governing debate of H.R. 6, the “American Dream and Promise Act of 2019,” and the underlying legislation.

Today's debate and consideration of this bill is a historic step for this vital piece of legislation.

The American Dream and Promise Act of 2019 establishes a roadmap to U.S. citizenship for (1) immigrant youth and current or po-

tential holders of (a) temporary protected status (TPS) or (b) deferred enforced departure (DED).

Today's vote is not the end of the work we have to do. It is the beginning.

We are here on behalf of all of the Dreamers all across the country and in each of our Congressional districts.

For example, in the Eighteenth Congressional District, there are 13,600 Dreamers eligible for DACA protections.

I have met with these individuals and heard the fear in their voices as they speak about the jeopardy they feel as a result of their unprotected status.

Just a few weeks ago, I met with recipients of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals—our nation's dreamers. This was one of many events I have had that engages residents of Houston.

It is through these events that I meet advocates on this vital issue.

I think of my good friend Cesar Espinoza, whom I know through a group called FIEL.

Cesar has a younger brother and a younger sister. His brother was able to get citizenship because as a minor, his citizenship was automatic when his mother became a citizen.

But Cesar himself is a recipient of DACA and so is his sister.

With the President's rescission of this program, he has placed in peril families like Cesar's family.

The Dream and Promise Act would add certainty to the lives of these individuals so that they can pursue their lives without having to account for a circumstances placed on them by their parents.

Today's vote represents the first time that the Dream Act is being considered.

It is the product of years of determination, grit, and perseverance.

The bill is supported by the business community as well as human rights groups.

The DREAM Act is supported by traditionally conservative groups like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the CATO institute.

The bill is one of the most significant pieces of pro-immigrant legislation to be voted on—and passed—in years, and many advocates across the country spent the day watching the progress of the bill through committee.

When we considered this bill in the Judiciary Committee, it was a markup that lasted over 8 hours.

During that time, we did not consider any legislation that would strengthen the bill consistent with its charge to bring peace of mind and security to our nation's Dreamers.

Instead, we sat there as members of the Committee from the other side of the aisle, tried to deny the country and the nation's hundreds of thousands of Dreamers the peace of mind that they are owed.

Under the Dream Act, undocumented immigrants who were under the age of 18 upon arrival in the United States and have lived in the country for at least four years, would be eligible for a conditional permanent resident (CPR) status if they are enrolled in secondary school or have a high school diploma, equivalent, or industry recognized credential, and pass a background check.

Under this bill, 1.8 million immigrants will be immediately eligible for this CPR status.

Ensuring a path to earned citizenship is a non-negotiable principle for me and the sine qua non of meaningful immigration reform legislation.

Indeed, providing a path to earned access to citizenship has been a central feature of every comprehensive immigration reform bill I have co-sponsored or sponsored in the Congress since 2007 when I became Ranking Member of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and introduced the "Save America Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act, (H.R. 1525)," which I have reintroduced in each succeeding Congress.

Like H.R. 6, Section 501 of my legislation provides a path to earned legalization status to those undocumented immigrants who have resided in the United States for 5 years and meet other eligibility requirements.

Madam Speaker, as we stand today on the precipice of passing the American Dream and Promise Act of 2019, I am thinking of the hundreds of thousands of young immigrants whose lives will be changed for the better by keeping our promise to them, so they can realize their dreams and making America better, stronger, and more prosperous.

And at this moment, I am thinking of Alonso Guillen, an heroic DREAMER who lived in my congressional district, and who came to the United States from Mexico as a child and died when his boat capsized while he was rescuing survivors of the flooding caused by Hurricane Harvey in the Houston area.

That is the type of courage, honor, and commitment to service we are talking when we speak of DREAMERS.

Madam Speaker, Title I of H.R. 6, the Dream Act of 2019, contains provisions regarding relief for immigrant youth.

Title II of the bill, American Promise Act of 2019, contains provisions related to persons eligible Temporary Protected Status (TPS) or Deferred Enforcement Departure; the third and final title contains general provisions that apply to both Titles I & II).

Madam Speaker, I support H.R. 6 because it keeps America's word to the more than 800,000 young people we asked to come out of the shadows and walk proudly and unashamedly as legitimate members of the American community.

The legislation does this by providing conditional permanent resident (CPR) status and a roadmap to lawful permanent resident (LPR) status and, eventually, earned U.S. citizenship for immigrant youth who entered the U.S. before age 18, have four or more years of residency, and graduated from high school (or the equivalent).

H.R. 6 also provides an opportunity to apply for LPR status for people who currently have or who may be eligible for TPS or DED and who have three or more years of residency.

Madam Speaker, individuals who are eligible for protection under the bill have lived in the United States for much of their lives; the average Dreamer came to the United States at the age of 8, while the average TPS- or DED-eligible person arrived in 1997.

Without permanent protections such as those in H.R. 6, these immigrants' and their families' futures in the United States—as well as the fiscal and economic contributions they make—are at risk.

Passing this legislation is the right thing to do and now is the time to do it; in fact, it is long overdue.

I am mindful also Madam Speaker that in addition to helping restore America's reputation as the most welcoming nation on earth, the legislation the House will pass also posi-

tions America to better compete and win in the global economy of the 21st century.

According to expert studies, including one by the Center for American Progress, ending deferred action for childhood arrivals would result in a loss of \$460.3 billion from the national GDP over the ensuing decade and would remove an estimated 685,000 workers from the nation's economy and workforce at a time when more, not fewer, workers are desperately needed.

And 10 states, including my home state of Texas, would stand to lose more than \$8 billion annually in state GDP.

Madam Speaker, immigrants eligible for protection under H.R. 6 are part of Texas's social fabric.

Texas is home to 386,300 immigrants who are eligible for protection under the Dream and Promise Act, 112,000 of whom reside in Harris County.

These individuals live with 845,300 family members and among those family members, 178,700 are U.S.-born citizen children.

Dreamers in Texas who are eligible for protection under the bill arrived in the United States at the average age of 8.

TPS- and DED-eligible immigrants in Texas who would be eligible for protection under H.R. 6 have on average lived in the United States since 1996.

Immigrants eligible for the Dream and Promise Act own 43,500 homes in Texas and pay \$340,500,000 in annual mortgage payments.

Eligible immigrants in Texas and their households contribute \$2,234,800,000 in federal taxes and \$1,265,200,000 in state and local taxes each year.

Annually, these households generate \$10,519,000,000 in spending power in Texas and help power the national economy.

Madam Speaker, during general debate on H.R. 6, I will have more to discuss about the salient features of this long overdue legislation that fulfills the American promise that all of its residents who share our values and respect for the Constitution and laws have an opportunity to realize their dreams.

But in the limited time I have now, let me highlight some of the more important provisions of the American Dream and Promise Act.

H.R. 6 helps young persons in the following ways:

1. Extends the length of conditional permanent resident (CPR) status from eight to ten years to give applicants more time to fulfill requirements;
2. Stays the removal of minors who are not yet eligible for relief but may become eligible in the future and who temporarily unenroll from school;
3. Permits people with CPR to obtain legal permanent resident (LPR) status without satisfying the employment, military, or educational tracks if their deportation would cause "hardship" to themselves or immediate family members (instead of "extreme hardship");
4. Includes apprenticeship programs as a qualifying education to obtain CPR status;
5. Eliminates the costly medical examination for applicants;
6. Establishes a fee ceiling of \$495 for immigrant youth applying for CPR status;
7. Clarifies that people with CPR can access professional, commercial, and business licenses;
8. Permits people with CPR who obtain a certificate or credential from an area career

and technical education school to obtain LPR status; and

9. Updates the criminal background bars and inadmissibility requirements.

Additionally, H.R. 6 provides LPR status to CPR holders who (1) serve in the uniformed services for two years; (2) complete two years at or obtain a degree from an institution of higher education; or (3) work 75 percent of the time in CPR.

Another important feature of this legislation is that makes it easier for states to provide in-state tuition to immigrant students and establishes that CPR-holders are eligible for federal loans, work study, services, and grants.

I mentioned earlier that we sat through a marathon session of the Judiciary Committee.

That's because some on the committee could not bring themselves to see our nation's Dreamers as anything other than criminals.

They see the act that brought them here with their parents as nothing more than a crime.

Indeed if you did not know better, and you listened to the parade of horrors put forth by the other side.

You would think that if we merely deported all of our nation's Dreamers—hardworking young people seeking to make their lives in America—all crime in the nation would stop.

In Committee we heard all sorts of dramatic stories. We heard of gang members who would feel liberated to take advantage of this program.

We heard this was amnesty. We heard that this bill perpetrates a crisis. We heard this would enable a humanitarian crisis. We have heard that this legislation was a disgrace.

We heard horror stories of criminals who would take the Dream Act to serve their own ends.

This is wrong.

They cannot see that these children are American in every way except for that piece of paper.

For persons with TPS or DED status, the American Dream and Promise Act provides much needed relief.

First, H.R. 6 provides LPR status for people with TPS or DED (and those who were eligible but did not apply) who apply within three years from the date of enactment if they (1) had at least three years of continuous residence (as well as residence since the date required the last time that the person's nation of origin was designated) and (2) were eligible for or had (a) TPS on September 25, 2016, or (b) DED on September 28, 2016.

This protection covers nationals of 13 countries: El Salvador, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Liberia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen.

I believe similar protections should be extended to Guatemalan nationals in our country, which is why I will soon reintroduce the "Continue American Safety Act," which extends TPS status to Guatemala and I look forward to working with my colleagues to achieve this outcome.

Second, H.R. 6 classifies people with TPS or DED as inspected and admitted for the purposes of Immigration & Nationality Act (INA) section 245(a), making it easier to obtain LPR status through existing channels (e.g., a family-based petition).

Third, H.R. 6 stays the removal or deportation of an individual while an application is pending.

Fourth, the American Dream and Promise Act establishes a fee ceiling of \$1,140 for people with TPS or DED applying for LPR status.

Fifth, the legislation provides greater transparency by requiring the Secretary of the Homeland Security (DHS) to provide an explanation for and report within three days of publishing notice to terminate TPS designation for certain nationals.

I have one the gentleman from North Carolina remarked on the bill—he indicated that legislation with great names does not make it great legislation and we should not pass a bill that does not have a chance of passage in the Senate.

We cannot let the fact that this House of Representatives has passed countless pieces of legislation and that they have gone to the graveyard in the Senate.

Acting for the people, in order to deliver a better deal, House Democrats have passed legislation to strengthen our democracy, with H.R. 1, the For the People Act.

We have passed legislation to end anti-LGBT discrimination with H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

We have passed a nonbinding resolution to pass the full Mueller Report.

We have passed legislation to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, landmark legislation which—through policy reforms, interstate cooperation and grant allocation—has been pivotal in providing a national response to protecting half of the population.

And, as this week dawned, it did so with flags at half-staff, a recognition of the 12 people who were shot and killed in just the latest incident of mass shootings.

That is why the House of Representatives passed H.R. 8, the first piece of gun safety legislation, the first piece of gun safety legislation to pass the House in a quarter-century.

Put simply we cannot accept Senate inaction as a reason not to do anything.

The Senate must act for the American People, in not just passing the bills I just mentioned above, but also passing the Dream and Promise Act. Indeed, in a recent public opinion poll, protections for Dreamers received 83% support from Americans.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 6 is exceptional legislation and a welcome development but is not a substitute for undertaking the comprehensive reform and modernization of the nation's immigration laws supported by the American people.

Only Congress can do that and passage of H.R. 6 shows that this House has the will and is up to the challenge.

Comprehensive immigration reform is desperately needed to ensure that Lady Liberty's lamp remains the symbol of a land that welcomes immigrants to a community of immigrants and does so in a manner that secures our borders and protects our homeland.

Madam Speaker, let us build on the historic legislation that is the American Dream and Promise Act and seize the opportunity to pass legislation that secures our borders, preserves America's character as the most open and welcoming country in the history of the world, and will yield hundreds of billions of dollars in economic growth.

I urge all Members to support the rule governing debate of H.R. 6 and the underlying bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I would remind the gentle-

woman from Texas that, as Americans, we also have rule of law. We stand for that and have wanted to fix the DACA situation, not just give a green light to continue a problem on the border that we are continually seeing.

There are problems with this bill. It is not a perfect bill and doesn't fit, in many ways. We are pointing that out. The pride that we take in that is not that we are seeing something broken. It is the pride that we need to fix something in this. We want to see these recipients be here and be able to participate in a legal fashion.

The legal immigration system is being overwhelmed by the illegal population coming across, which we are not fixing, and don't say that we are because we are not. Nothing has come to this floor, and it happens every day.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), another member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her remarks. She alluded to a number of reforms to our legal immigration process, and yes, I stand ready to work with the gentlewoman on those issues, but none of the legal reforms that are necessary to balance this legislation are in this bill.

In fact, this bill is called the American Dream and Promise Act, but if we are looking for reforms that will secure our border, we are dreaming. The only promise being kept is the promise to put people who are here illegally ahead of legal immigrants in line for citizenship. It is a grave disappointment and a violation of this document, the Constitution of the United States.

The American people might think, when tuning in, hey, great, we are finally addressing immigration, so maybe we will find a way to secure our borders. But this bill has no language to secure our borders, no language to build the wall, no language to help children and families in terrible conditions at the border, no language to reform our asylum programs or our visa programs to make them more efficient, and no language to stop the thousands of caravans of illegals crossing over the border, over 5,000 each and every day.

Instead, it does the exact opposite. It incentivizes illegal immigration. It incentivizes the dangerous journey that these families are taking.

We have heard a lot from the other side about individuals here illegally who are achieving, but we can cite every individual who is currently facing enormous danger, children facing enormous danger on this journey to the border, one in three women who are facing sexual assault on this journey to the border, families right now who are deciding whether or not to put their children at risk of death by marching up to the United States because they are hoping that there is an incentivized program like this in place when they get here.

We need to take action to control our border. We will never stop the flow of

illegal immigration coming into this country until we get serious about securing the border and until we follow through on the enforcement mechanisms that Congress has and continues to put in place. Until we do that, human trafficking, drug smuggling, and cartels will continue to thrive.

This bill is unfair to immigrants who have obeyed the law to enter our country legally. America welcomes all who are coming to our Nation who respect the rule of law and want to contribute to our society. Unfortunately, they will be left to wait while USCIS attempts to process the millions of applications that today's legislation would authorize.

It creates a system that is ripe for fraud and abuse. It includes a laundry list of unverifiable documents that can be used to obtain green cards.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this legislation that fixes what is wrong with our immigration laws. This is the wrong way to go. I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will quit playing politics with people's lives and work with this side of the aisle to fix our broken immigration system and replace it with a system based on merit.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I thank the bold and courageous women of the House of Representatives with the Democratic Party for their strong hearts, minds, and leadership in pressing the action for passage of H.R. 6, which will help millions of people—men, women, and children—who by all accounts are already Americans.

They pay taxes, serve in our military, and attend our schools. They should not be dehumanized by calling them illegals or illegal aliens. Don't stereotype them as drug dealers, rapists, and murderers. They are real people contributing to America's greatness.

My district alone has over 7,000 constituents who would benefit from these Dream, TPS, and DED reforms. These are Americans whom the system is failing, people who grew up on the foundational American principle that if you work hard, you can improve the future for your children. And they do work hard.

But Republican inaction and hostility have put their American Dream at risk, and they face deportation to a country they have never known.

My Republican colleagues should recognize that this is a good bill. It is a necessary bill. It is a bill that will improve the country we all love. Have a heart. Pass H.R. 6.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the ranking member, for yielding.

Listening to the debate here, the first thing that I think was missed in

this discussion was the subject of amnesty. This bill is clearly amnesty, and it is amnesty for a large chunk of people, whether they do the math at 2 million, 2.2 million, 2.7 million, or whatever that number may be north of that. Whenever we have had amnesty in this country, it has always been a lot more than was calculated.

I recall those days back in 1986 when Ronald Reagan let me down. He only did it twice in 8 years, but this was one time.

I watched the debate in the House and the Senate on whether to grant amnesty to roughly a million people. All along, I believed that the wisdom of the House and Senate would prevail, and they would understand that amnesty destroys the rule of law.

I listened carefully, and the debate went the other way. The bill was sent to the President's desk.

But I was confident that Ronald Reagan would see the principle and protect the rule of law and veto the amnesty act. Well, we all know he signed it that day in 1986. He regretted it after that, as did many of his Cabinet members, but that was a big mistake.

This is an amnesty bill, and it goes a long way toward the destruction of immigration law. When you send out an advertisement that if you can get into America, you get to stay in America, people are going to keep coming here. It doesn't stop until they have to go back home again to tell those folks whom they had recently left that they didn't get to stay in America, to discourage the rest of them.

Here is an example: In a briefing from Francis Cissna, the recently retired Director of USCIS, he gave us these numbers. He said of 100 percent of those who apply for asylum, there will be 60 percent who show up for their asylum hearings. That surprised me. I thought the number would be maybe 95 percent that wouldn't show up. Sixty percent show up; 40 percent do not.

Of the 60 percent, 10 percent get asylum. That amounts to 6 percent of the whole. Forty percent don't show up. Fifty-four percent then get assigned a deportation hearing, and they don't show up at all.

When you add 40 percent, 54 percent, and 6 percent, that is 100 percent of them who get to stay in America.

I recall a night when I was in Serbia in the middle of that huge, epic migration. I asked the chief of police, who was directing traffic, loading trains to go off to Germany out of Serbia, when and why this ever stops. The first thing he said was the international answer of, "That is beyond my pay grade." But then, as I pressed him, he said it only stops when the people receiving them stop receiving them.

That is the principle here. We have to decide what we are going to do here. Whom are we going to say no to? I haven't heard anybody define, especially on the other side, whom we might say no to. This is just the people

that we want to say yes to, or at least as far as the left wants to say yes to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AGUILAR). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. There is a report that, before the last census, with an average 710,000 in a Member's congressional district, at least six districts in California were comprised, figuratively, of illegal aliens. That means that illegal aliens in California had more representation in the United States Congress than any one of 23 States that have less representation. That is something to keep in mind as this debate moves on.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think this bill goes anywhere, but if it does, it could be the destruction of the rule of law and the fracture of the United States of America.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of our Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act.

This legislation will protect 2.5 million people as American as everyone in this Chamber but for a piece of paper, young people who came here as children, brought by their families to pursue the American Dream. That is why we call them Dreamers.

They did what we would expect of any other good American. They worked hard. They served in our communities. They served in our military. They studied at our schools. They strengthened our communities.

□ 1615

We had a hearing of examples of Dreamers, these young people who did extraordinary things, who enriched the lives of their own communities, who are scholars, community activists, teachers, doctors, and lawyers, people making incredible contributions.

I have met with Dreamers in my home State, where 6,000 people will be protected by this legislation. They are valued and productive members of our community.

There is also protection in here for TPS designees. In the State of Rhode Island, we have the largest Liberian community, who make unbelievable contributions and live with such uncertainty.

We, of course, need comprehensive immigration reform, but protecting Dreamers is first.

We have heard a lot of arguments about other problems with our immigration system. We agree, but I haven't heard anyone say that these young people don't deserve protection in this debate today.

This bill doesn't solve all the problems, but it solves three specific problems: TPS, DED, and Dreamers. It is

voting to give protections to these young people.

This is a very powerful symbol of our patriotism and our love of our country because we are a stronger and better America because of these young people and because of the magnificent contributions of these Dreamers. There is nothing more American than passing the Dream Act and ending the uncertainty in the lives of these young people and acknowledging they represent the best of America.

I wish everyone in this country could have watched that hearing of just some examples of the differences these young people have made in the lives of their communities.

Let's do the right thing. Let's pass this in a bipartisan way and give certainty to the lives of these young people who know no other country but this great country.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman, the speaker, Mr. CICILLINE. I agree with him that we need to fix this, but this is not the way to fix this. There is a bipartisan way to fix this, and this simply just gives a green light.

It is a powerful symbol. This bill is a very powerful symbol to those who want to come here and know that there will be no consequence for coming and will continue to overload our border. That is the symbolism that comes from this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, our immigrants have always been our future. Wave after wave of moral, patriotic, hardworking, and law-abiding immigrants have kept America vibrant. Today, the majority party intends to put another 2 to 3 million people on the path to citizenship.

I think it is accurate to say that America does want some form of relief for some DACA folks and some way to make them made legal, but this bill would do a lot. This bill, in my mind, would ruin America.

First of all, I think America would want to restrict this bill to the law-abiding, including law-abiding DACA folks. This bill does not do that. You can commit two crimes and still be here. You can be on a list of gang members and still be here.

As far as self-supporting, this bill doesn't begin to deal with the problem of people who are already taking advantage of our generous welfare safety net. They are going to be staying here under this bill.

Like I said, you can already be on a variety of public assistance programs; it is not dealt with. You can be a bad role model for your kids; it is not dealt with. You don't have to learn English.

People always say: Oh, all the DACA members all know English. That is not true. You do not have to learn English and you are set on a path to citizenship.

We can continue the divisive policy of having people who come here illegally and once made legal get preferences over people who are here native born.

I was in Texas last week, Mr. Speaker. As you know, we have over 100,000 people streaming across our border every month. The majority party does nothing about this.

Yesterday, we passed another welfare bill continuing another, to a large extent, failed welfare program, but we do nothing in that bill to make sure the current welfare programs aren't being abused by illegal or legal immigrants. That is what we should be focusing on at this time.

A lot of people have been trying to destroy America over many years. Go back 100 years, and people realized America is the light of the world. America is the hope for civilization. If I wanted to destroy America, I would craft a bill like this. I would craft a bill saying that we have got people here on the welfare system, path to citizenship; criminal background, path to citizenship; and we put these folks ahead of so many wonderful, hardworking people who are trying to do the system the right way and trying to come here legally.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA), who is a member of our Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, if I may call your attention to this poster here to my right. This is a photo of brave Americans out of Orange County who have made the ultimate sacrifice since 9/11. Among them are Navy SEAL Michael Monsoor, Army Ranger Sergeant Tyler Holtz, and right here in the middle is a picture of Corporal Jose Angel Garibay, a Dreamer and a marine without status who joined the Marine Corps and made the ultimate sacrifice in 2003. Later on, he was given American citizenship posthumously. This is a Dreamer, Jose Angel Garibay.

I want to also take a moment to talk about another Dreamer, Police Officer Germain Martinez Garcia, who grew up in southern Illinois. In the words of his police chief:

Germain is a part of our community. He's a good citizen. He's a good person, and we need him.

He is a Dreamer.

Two other Dreamers are two brothers, John and James, who both grew up in L.A. They are both Dreamers. They joined the U.S. Army last year, and they are out in basic training right now. These two want nothing more than to defend our country, and today's legislation will ensure that these brothers, John and James, can come home to the United States after serving our country.

Another Dreamer, Gloria, grew up in the center of my district, Santa Ana. She is a Dreamer who attended Harvard and is now getting her Ph.D. at Claremont University.

All these are Dreamers, and for the life of me, I don't understand how these

individuals do not add to the greatness of America.

Dreamers have been vetted. Dreamers are hardworking. They pay taxes; they follow the law; and many, many of them are defending our country all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, let's give Dreamers the opportunity to earn the American Dream. I ask for a vote of "aye" on H.R. 6.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is a member of our committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I claim the time in opposition to this very flawed piece of legislation here this afternoon. It is flawed in many ways.

First of all, it doesn't do anything to get more control at our southern border. We have thousands of people streaming across that border in various places on the border. It does nothing about that.

It does nothing to improve on our asylum system, which is very flawed right now.

The drug cartels make huge amounts of money by the people who are coming in illegally. They are told the magic words, which are basically to say that they fear if they return to their country, so they are let into our country.

They are put on a bus or they are put on a plane and shipped somewhere around the country, to some city. They are given a court date 2 years out, 3 years out, 5 years out. Very seldom do they show up for that court date, so they basically disappear into the population.

This legislation does nothing to reform our asylum laws or to protect the American people. It does nothing to basically protect folks around the world who are trying to come here the right way.

The DACA amnesty program which is being created here will allow people to cut in front of the line for people who are trying to do it the right way.

Not only does it not do things to improve the existing law—and it certainly doesn't do it in a bipartisan manner—but it is dangerous, and I will tell you why.

In the Judiciary Committee—I have been on that committee for many years now—I offered an amendment. I think we all know that far too many people are killed or injured in this country by drunk drivers, by people who have, in some States they call it a DUI, in some States they call it a DWI, driving, basically, impaired, either drugs or alcohol.

I offered a commonsense amendment which said, basically, that you would not be eligible for this if you were convicted—not just that you have driven, but you were convicted—of drunk driving and you either killed a person or the person was seriously injured. Serious bodily harm could be loss of an eye or a limb. Or, if you had multiple DUIs,

two or more DUIs, you wouldn't be eligible for these.

All the Republicans on the committee voted for it; all the Democrats voted against it.

Mothers Against Drunk Driving, MADD, indicates that there are over 10,000 people killed every year in America by drunk drivers. Over 300,000 every year are injured by drunk drivers.

In my amendment, we are talking about people convicted of it. Mothers Against Drunk Drivers indicates, for every time a person is convicted, on average, they think they have probably driven drunk 80 times.

So we are allowing folks to be eligible for this program. All the Democrats on the committee voted against this amendment that would have basically made us safer in this country against drunk drivers. But they refused to go along with that, so I think it is really dangerous to pass it. It could have been much safer.

The people who are injured are our sons. They are our daughters, wives, spouses, brothers, sisters, mothers, and fathers. But this bill doesn't make them safer. It had an opportunity to do so, but all my colleagues on the other side of the aisle voted against it.

That is just one reason why I think this is a very flawed bill, and I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

We could, in a bipartisan manner, actually do something for these Dreamers, these DACA folks, but Democrats said: No, we are not going to do this bipartisan. We are going to ram this thing through.

It is really unfortunate because we could have done something good for the country, but that is not what this bill does.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 30¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 20¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). The majority leader has been such a supporter of Dreamers for these many years.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. More than that, I thank her for the thousands of hours that she has put in over the years in trying to address in a positive, constructive way our broken immigration system and for her leadership in forging a bill that is a step—just a step.

I want to thank Mr. NADLER, the chairman of the committee, for ensuring that this bill came forward.

Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here for a few minutes, and I have heard a number of my Republican colleagues bemoaning the fact that we could have done this in a bipartisan fashion and come with up with a much better bill. Many of those folks who said that have

been serving here over the last 8 years in the majority, and we have been pleading with them over those 8 years: Bring us a bill, a bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, as you so well know, you and Mr. HURD, a Republican from Texas, worked tirelessly in fashioning a bipartisan bill, and the Republicans refused to bring it to the floor; although, in my view it had a majority of votes on this floor.

Indeed, it was about to be petitioned out of the committee and brought to the floor in a process that you can do that without the committee's voting for it. Just short of the 218 votes necessary to do that, the Republican leadership put all sorts of pressure to assure that that bill was not discharged from the committee.

So spare me the crocodile tears about a bipartisan bill. We tried to do a bipartisan bill. The Senate did a bipartisan bill in 2013, and we pleaded for the Republicans to bring it to the floor, a bipartisan Senate bill, and they refused, all the time saying the immigration system was broken. But they refused to fix it.

□ 1630

So, now they come to the floor, bemoaning the fact that a bipartisan bill did not come forward. If they had intended to work on a bipartisan bill, as the majority leader, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, a bipartisan bill would have come forward.

So sad, so unfortunate that that didn't happen.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read something:

"We're going to work something out that's going to make people happy and proud.

"They"—referring to the Dreamers—"got brought here at a very young age"—1, 2, 3 years of age.

"They've worked here. They've gone to school here. Some were good students. Some have wonderful jobs. And they're in never-never land because they don't know what's going to happen."

Who said that? Donald Trump said it.

When did he say it? After he was elected, but before he was sworn in as President of the United States.

I met with the President, along with a few others, at the White House, and he said to us: "Send us a bill," then he created the problem we are confronting today. And he said: "Congress, fix it, and I will sign it."

Well, today, Mr. Speaker, we are fixing it. And I hope that my Republican colleagues would join us and that the President of the United States would sign a bill which will take these folks out of never-never land.

The bill we have on the floor today is called the American Dream and Promise Act—the American dream and American promise.

We lift our lamp beside the golden door. That is what we have said to the world. That dream is to see hard work rewarded with opportunity.

My father came here at the age of 32 in 1934, an immigrant from Denmark. That promise is the commitment of our Founders and every generation since to ensure that this Nation makes that dream a reality for all.

Today, more than a million people who grew up in America don't know any other home, yet they live in fear of being sent to a home they never knew. They live in fear of being deported to countries they never or barely knew.

These Dreamers, these yearners for justice and opportunity, deserve to live without fear. They deserve to access the opportunities of America that they have been helping to build already—a Nation of immigrants, made great by immigrants.

This bill will remove that fear. It will give them the opportunity to stay in the country they know and love and to know their hard work and contributions will give them a chance to make it in America and that they can give back by serving in our military or creating jobs or working in their communities; that they can have a pathway to citizenship, which is in their interest and in the interest of our country.

This bill will keep the promise of our Founders and our forebears, and it will keep the promise of policymakers from both sides of the aisle who agree they should stay, along, I might add, with 86 percent of the American people.

They are American in every sense. They are patriots and dreamers.

President Trump campaigned on a promise to help Dreamers—a promise he broke. It was President Trump who created the crisis we now face by rescinding the DACA program 2 years ago and allowing the Republican-controlled House to stand in the way of a legislative solution.

Now, the Democrat-led House is taking action. With this bill, we proclaim to the Senate and President: Take the advice of the American people. Pass this bill.

For these Dreamers are, in all but a certificate of citizenship, brothers and sisters.

One of them from my district, Gabby Hernandez, is here today, Mr. Speaker, to watch us take this important vote. She arrived in this country from El Salvador at the age of 4. She attended school in Prince George's County, Maryland, which I represent, and she has been studying these last few years to be a social worker and help people in our community.

I hope we can give Dreamers like Gabby reassurance that their country, America, will not abandon them.

In addition, this bill would also allow those who have been on temporary protected status and deferred enforced departure to remain as permanent residents.

One of them has a business in my district. He employs 40 people. Forty families would be affected by his leaving. He has been here for 25 years. He is, in every sense, a member of our community.

These are people who fled a natural disaster and violence and were welcomed into our country as refugees. Here, they have helped build a stronger community and have participated in building our economy.

I am proud to represent a strong community of Liberians in my district, many of whom fled war and disease outbreak and built new lives here. We should not allow them to be uprooted from their homes a second time.

Some of them are here today in the gallery as well.

Let's show them. Let's show them that we stand together with them and cherish their contributions to America.

Whether we are Irish or Danish or Italian or Jews or Poles or Germans, all who came here in great numbers immigrated to this country and have made us great.

This bill is not perfect. No bill is perfect. But it is a step, a very important step, a down payment on fulfilling that promise.

But change happens most often in steps, and today the Democrat-led House is taking that step forward by keeping our promise to Dreamers.

I want to thank LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, YVETTE CLARKE, JERRY NADLER, and—yes, once again—ZOE LOFGREN for all the work that they have done to get us to a place where we have a fair bill—not amnesty, a fair bill for America.

I hope my Republican colleagues will join us in voting for this bill. Together, let's send a message of inclusion and acceptance of these Dreamers, whose dreams are the same as ours, whose patriotism is the same as ours, and whose Nation is the same as ours.

Vote "aye." Vote for America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from references to occupants of the gallery.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate the majority leader coming down. It is amazing to me, though, that as we come down and talk about this bill, if there really was a desire to have a bipartisan bill, then maybe we would have brought the bill that actually did get close, as the gentleman did bring up last Congress, and actually ask some of those cosponsors on the Republican side who were sponsoring it last time to be a part, who have said they have been froze out.

Let's face reality. So spare me the discussion on getting a bipartisan bill and the disdain for it and saying that this bill actually helps.

This is a bill written for a promise, as was just said. Let's, at least, be honest about why it was written and the fact that it will not help the situation on the border and, frankly, is not going to help us get a bill passed, because this will not pass because, as the President has said, he wants to see some security attached to this, so that we have a safe and secure legal immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, I would agree with him. Spare me those discussions because that didn't happen here, as is painfully obvious.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I have the utmost respect for the majority leader.

What I see as a problem here, that we see over and over again, is finger pointing.

Yes, we did have the majority and the Republican Party didn't do anything. But the Democrats had the majority back in President Obama's first 2 years; they did nothing. But fingers get pointed. Nothing gets done.

I rise today in opposition to this bill, but that is not to say I am against legal immigration. In fact, I don't believe anyone in this Chamber or up in the gallery, even though we can't reference them, is against legal immigration.

I have repeatedly stated that I want to find a solution for the Dreamers, those kids who, through no fault of their own, were brought to the United States as children, illegally.

I support providing a method for those who have registered under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, or DACA, to obtain legal status. However, this must only be done in coordination with measures completely fixing our Nation's broken border.

We have to have border security and the enforcement of current immigration law or we can't go forward, because a vacuum is turned on and more people will come.

Without enhancing border security and addressing the loopholes in our immigration system, this bill simply encourages more illegal immigration.

There is a cause-and-effect process that does occur. If borders are open, they are overrun, and immigration laws aren't enforced. Guess what? There is more illegal immigration.

There is a crisis at our southwest border, and this year we have seen apprehensions of people illegally entering at the border increasing every month.

For instance, in January of 2019, there were approximately 49,000; in April of 2019, 99,000. The numbers are going to continue to go up because the word is out, as Mr. COLLINS said, if you get to the U.S. southwest border, you will get amnesty.

That is unfortunate. The 99,000 in April are only the crossings that we know about.

Let's look at why this is a crisis. It is because the previous administration created an illegal program called DACA.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Florida an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. YOHO. It has created a problem in Congress.

What we have to do, if my colleagues on the other side are serious about finding a fix for this problem, for our

broken immigration system: Let's work together and agree that, without border security, this will not work.

Let's fix this broken system once and for all. Let's do what is best for America because, if we do what is best for America, is that not best for the immigrants, too?

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA), a valued member of our Judiciary Committee.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank our chair, our leadership, and, particularly, NANCY PELOSI for making sure that this bill was a priority bill.

For me, I have dedicated a great part of my life in public service to helping immigrants who come to the United States in search of a prosperous and dignified life.

Today, I am honored to participate in this historic day in the House of Representatives.

Since 2001, when the DREAM Act was first conceived, Dreamers have waited.

In 2012, DACA enabled eligible young adults to work lawfully, attend school, and contribute to society without the constant fear of deportation.

DACA, however, does not provide a path to citizenship, and it leaves out a huge number of deserving Dreamers.

Now, in 2019, they are still waiting. They are Americans in waiting. Right now, Dreamers live in fear of being deported to countries they may never have known, don't remember, or don't know at all, countries with which they have little or no personal connection.

And, because of their status, most Dreamers have never left the United States, never having had the opportunity to know their places of origin and never knowing any other place to call home other than the American communities in which they grew up. Some don't even know another language other than English.

Opponents of this bill fail to realize that it is not just about the Dreamers. It is also their families that would be harmed by mass deportations. It is their employers who would lose key members of their workforce. It is their communities who would lose vital members of their community.

It bears repeating: Dreamers are American in every way except on paper. In their hearts, in their minds, and in their souls, they are Americans. They are Americans in waiting.

Many have been in this country for decades, becoming business owners, employers, and homeowners.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the majority leader gave his remarks a few moments ago, I was reminded that, in December of 2010, I was in this House of Representatives and, during a lameduck session, the House of Representatives had, at that time, a sizable Democratic majority. They had lost the majority in the 2010 election,

so it was the waning hours of the Democratic majority, and they passed what was then known as Senator DURBIN's DREAMer bill here in the House of Representatives.

□ 1645

It went over to the Senate, and Democrats had a 59-41 majority in the United States Senate, and the Dreamer bill failed to achieve cloture, not because it was blocked by Republicans. Three Republicans voted with the then-majority Democrats to move the bill along. Senator Lugar, no longer with us, Senator MURKOWSKI, who is still with us, and Senator Bennett from Utah, voted in favor of moving that bill along.

Five Democrats voted against cloture, and that was the reason why, in the waning days of President Obama's first 2 years, as the Democratic majority was winding down its term, that that bill did not pass.

But this bill before us today—and I felt so compelled to come and talk about this because we have a serious problem in the lower Rio Grande Valley sector on our Texas-Mexico border. There are parts of that border where there is not a single stick of barrier and, as a consequence, the number of people coming over—you have read the headlines, you have heard the statistics that have been talked about here today, 100,000 a month.

I serve on the Committee on Energy and Commerce. We have the Office of Refugee Resettlement under our jurisdiction in the Health Subcommittee. The men and women there do a tremendous job. They do everything we ask.

I visited one of their facilities last week, Casa Padre, down in Brownsville, Texas; 1,380 children under their care. That number has stayed fairly constant since my previous visit last July. They get some kids in, they move some kids out, and it is a steady state.

But at the border station in McAllen, it is a different story. They have no control over how many come in.

Yes, the law says that within 72 hours—it is purely a processing center—they are to move, particularly children, out of their center and off to the OOR facilities. But if there is no place to receive them then they cannot. And OOR, by law, cannot receive more children than they are allowed to receive.

They closed the surge facility up in Tornillo by El Paso during the summer, so there is no place else to go.

I have got to tell you, the men and women who work for the Customs and Border Patrol in the State of Texas in the lower Rio Grande Valley sector, overwhelmed is not a strong enough word. They are burnt out. They have been taking care of so many people for so long, and they are asking, Where is the United States Congress? Why will we not reform the asylum laws that would allow us to get on top of this situation?

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act of 2019.

For so many, this day is a long time coming. It would not be possible without so many amazing people and organizations, including in my home State of Arizona, who never stopped fighting, who never gave up hope on this dream.

We are here today to pass a bill that will provide permanent protections and a pathway to citizenship for our Dreamers, a solution that is long overdue, one that will lift up 2 million people across our Nation. For many, giving them a permanent place in the only home, the only country that they have ever known.

But this bill does more than the right thing. It does a smart thing. Make no mistake, this is an economic stimulus bill. The economic gains in communities across the country will be significant, and fewer stand to benefit more than my community.

The Phoenix metro area ranks among the top areas that will experience real economic benefit from the passage of this bill. When we bring stability to eligible immigrants, we bring stability to our local economies as well.

The American Dream and Promise Act of 2019 is a case of doing both the right thing for people and doing the right thing for our economy.

Dreamers are an integral part of our community, our neighbors, our coworkers, our friends. They are woven into the social and economic fabric of our entire region, and we have a responsibility to make sure that they can continue to contribute and participate fully without fear.

When our Dreamers succeed, our communities will be stronger.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL), a member of our committee.

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act of 2019.

Almost half of the people in my district were born in a country other than the United States, including myself. I did not have the great privilege of being born into this incredible Nation. But my story is not unique. My story, and every immigrant's story, is the American story. It is who we are as a country.

Dreamers, DED holders, TPS, and DACA recipients, are Americans in every single way but on paper; and it is time that we change that.

Protecting these Americans is not only the right thing to do, but it also makes economic sense.

In my district alone, Dream and Promise households contribute over \$53

million in Federal taxes and have a spending power of over \$271 million. These Americans are our friends, our neighbors, and our coworkers. They are teachers, doctors, farmers. They represent our Nation's commitment to hard work.

To every Dreamer, DED holder, TPS and DACA recipient with us here and across the country, I want you to know, we see you. We hear you. Your fight is our fight.

Today, we will pass the American Dream and Promise Act of 2019 and give all these Americans the protections that they deserve.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we heard earlier some comments from the other side about, gee, what could have been done, and the desire for a bipartisan agreement on things. And yet, I know since President Trump came into office, he offered a deal to work out legalization for folks that had been granted DACA, and that offer was slapped down.

So it is interesting to hear now, after the opportunity did present itself in the last Congress, with Republicans in control in the House and Senate, and the President, wanting to work something out in a bipartisan manner, now, we hear, oh, we wanted it bipartisan all along.

Well, a problem with a self-governing nation is that when people abandon the rule of law in that self-governing nation, it is not going to remain self-governing that much longer.

What has made America strong was that—one of the things—that nobody was above the law. That included Presidents, it included most everybody. There were exceptions.

But as I have continued to say for a number of years, we should seal—not seal, but we should control the border, get it secured, continue to give over a million visas a year. Fine. Most generous country in the world when it comes to allowing access, ingress and egress. Continue that, but control the border.

And once the border is controlled, we can work out about what to do about the people that came in illegally. We can work that out.

Some try to slam Republicans and say, oh, you must hate Hispanics. They don't know our hearts. They don't know my heart.

The huge majority of Hispanics I know, they love God, they are devoted to their family, and they have an incredibly hard work ethic. I think those are three things, three components that help, really, make America a great country, the greatest I believe in the world. We need more of that. That is a great thing. But the immigration has to be legal.

Now, this bill, though, we had a rule shoved through, no amendments were

going to be allowed. Not only is this not going to be a bipartisan effort to work out an agreement from both sides, we are slamming this through. We are not letting any amendments.

And there were clearly problems with the bill. For example, my amendment would have helped stop gang members from being given legalization. No. No. That got voted down.

And not only was the amendment voted down, under the bill, the Secretary cannot consider the fact that we have information in our database that clearly shows that someone is a gang member. Oh, no.

Not only that, the Secretary, under this bill, is prohibited from getting help to go through and review evidence of who is a gang member and who isn't. That would mean hundreds of thousands of people would have to be considered by the Secretary individually.

That is no mistake. They knew the Secretary could not do that. So they were going to get as many gang members in as can possibly come in. And there will be disputes over who came in when. That is an ongoing issue.

But if a gang member is denied under this program, then all the other applicants, will have to pay a fee that will pay for the gang member's lawyer to sue in Federal court.

Look, it is clear what is going on. One party thinks their future as the only party, as the majority party, will be to get as many felons voting as possible and get as many people in here beholden to the Democratic Party, legally, illegally, whatever.

But the tragedy continues to go on at the border. Every time we mention legalization, amnesty, DACA, Dreamers, all of those things, the Border Patrol made clear, people flood in illegally.

Let's do the right thing. Let's vote "no" on this and work something out when the border is secure.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR), a member of our Judiciary Committee.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act of 2019.

This bill would provide Dreamers, TPS holders, and DED recipients with the relief and certainty that they and our country need in order to thrive.

I would like to congratulate the architects of this bill, Representatives ROYBAL-ALLARD, VELÁZQUEZ, and CLARKE, who worked so tirelessly, as well as our Judiciary Committee Chairman NADLER, and our Immigration and Citizenship Subcommittee Chairwoman LOFGREN for the tireless work that they put into this.

This bill has the potential to help hundreds of thousands of hardworking individuals who are American in every way except on paper.

I am so proud that Texas has the second highest Dreamer population in the Nation, including the more than 9,000 Dreamers in the safe border community of El Paso, Texas.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle vacillate between arguments intended to stall this legislation that range from get in line, to build a wall, to painting all undocumented immigrants as dangerous criminals that Americans should fear. One of my colleagues even said that this bill would destroy America.

I would like to remind them that America is a nation of immigrants. Dreamers, TPS holders, and DED recipients are our friends, neighbors, and colleagues. Some have even bravely served in the military, and others are pillars within communities across the Nation.

They have built good lives here, started families, created small businesses, employed thousands of people, paid their taxes, made our country better.

□ 1700

I stand with Dreamers and TPS holders and will do all I can to ensure that they are shielded from deportation and have a pathway to citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to be on the right side of history and support this bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, it is sad that I rise today in opposition to H.R. 6. It brings me no pleasure, for I support an equitable solution for our Nation's Dreamer population, but this bill goes well beyond that kind of a balanced, equitable solution and, in fact, puts illegal immigration ahead of legal immigration.

While we are a nation of immigrants, it is true, we are a nation of laws as well. Once again, the majority has failed to find common ground on this topic in this House.

Last year at this time we worked mightily, when in the majority, to try to find common ground, with Bob Goodlatte's effort of last summer, our former chairman of the Judiciary Committee. He, too, could not find full bipartisan common ground, and barely common ground among Republicans, but common ground we must find, and this bill, Mr. Speaker, is not that.

One example of why: legal Dreamers. These are kids of work permit holders in America from countries like India and China who can't get green cards due to arbitrary country caps in our immigration laws. Their kids have to self-deport when they turn 18 years old.

Why aren't these kids being dealt with and protected? Their parents followed the rules, came to the United States the right way with a legal work permit, and yet with this bill, we are going to reward those who came illegally, through no fault of their own for the kids, and not protect those who are here legally.

Mr. Speaker, that is not right.

Last year, House Republicans and the President offered equitable solutions for Dreamers in exchange for much-needed asylum reforms, family unification at the border, and border security funds, but, sadly, as noted, the floundering majority in this House can't find that compromise, can't find that common ground.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6 is an insincere bill with no chance of being signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, I call on you to stop the messaging bills and negotiate with Republicans in the minority to fix our broken immigration system.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the American Dream and Promise Act, to stand with the thousands of Dreamers across the country and in Oregon, Dreamers like Gustavo and Brenda, who are living in and serving in our community.

Gustavo graduated from Forest Grove High School. He knew he was ineligible for Federal student aid, yet he found a way to go to college because he knows that education cannot be taken away from him.

Gustavo wrote: "I have found my calling in the nonprofit work I do. I am here to give back to the Latino community that believed in me and helped me achieve my dream."

Brenda is an educator in Hillsboro, Oregon. Last summer, her students asked her: "Are you coming back next year?" Despite uncertainty about her status, Brenda will watch her students graduate this Saturday, and she hopes to continue supporting kids and families in the very same school district from which she graduated.

It is long past time for Dreamers like Brenda and Gustavo, Americans in every way except on paper, to live out of the shadows. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I inquire how much time is remaining for both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 7¼ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 21¼ minutes remaining.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), my colleague.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, but I also want to thank her for her tireless and longstanding steadiness and leadership in support of our Dreamers.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6, which ensures the Dreamers, temporary protected status recipients, and individuals with deferred enforcement departure status are protected from deportation. This bill will also establish a path for 2.5 million people to become lawful permanent residents.

These young people have lived in the United States for decades and have

made a life for themselves and for their families.

Now, let me be clear. Dreamers, TPS, and DED recipients make our Nation better. They are active members of our community and contribute to our economy and make America a stronger nation.

I am so proud to represent so many Dreamers in my district. They are American in every way except on paper, and it is beyond cruel to deport them to countries many of them barely know.

By passing this bill today, House Democrats are maintaining the promise of the American Dream to immigrants around the country.

It is time to protect our young people, recognize their love for America, and finally help their dreams come true.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 6.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), a leader in this movement.

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding and my colleagues who have brought this before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the American Dream and Promise Act.

As a teen, Daniella had a dream, a dream to be a lawyer. Her grandmother had brought her here from Venezuela when she was a small child, from a place she barely knew and never returned to.

Daniella learned English, made friends, studied hard, and became an honors student. When she applied for a college scholarship, she learned for the first time a family secret: she was undocumented.

Disqualified from this scholarship and with no money for college, Daniella was devastated. Then, in 2012, like for hundreds of thousands of young people, the doorway to opportunity opened. President Obama issued the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals order. Daniella enrolled in college and is now preparing for law school.

Mr. Speaker, today is a day that walls come down and we show the world that dreams like Daniella's can come true.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), my colleague and neighbor in California.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman LOFGREN for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the American Dream and Promise Act of 2019, but more importantly, for Dreamers and TPS recipients in my community and all across our country.

As the Representative for the central coast of California, this bill will affect not just the lives of Dreamers and TPS recipients, but the lives of people throughout our communities.

In my district, there are nearly 20,000 Dreamers and thousands and thousands of Salvadorian TPS recipients. These are men and women who don't just live in my district; they work there; they go to school there; they own homes there; they have families there. They are our loved ones; they are our friends; they are our neighbors; they are our employees. They are our community. They are our country.

As the grandson of immigrants who grew up in this Nation of immigrants, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the Dreamers and TPS recipients in my community are filled with the spirit of this country. They don't just want to stay here; they want to contribute here. They want to give back to this community and country that has given them so much. They understand, they value, they yearn to fulfill their obligations as Americans in this democracy.

Mr. Speaker, let's fulfill our obligation in Congress. Let's do our job for our communities by giving our Dreamers, our TPS recipients that opportunity for our country.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, "Does anybody really want to throw out good, educated, and accomplished young people who have jobs, some serving in our military? Really?"

"They have been in our country for many years through no fault of their own, brought in by parents at young age."

Those were the words of a President Trump tweet on September 14, 2017, but, unfortunately, Donald Trump is a man of his last tweet. Later, when a bipartisan group of Senators went to meet with the President and present a viable bipartisan plan, he flew into a racist rant and refused to act.

Only because of Federal court orders, consistently rejecting the Trump administration arguments, do our Dreamers have any protection today.

I have visited personally with these young people: a nurse, a teacher, a county prosecutor, a key person in a small business, many students. They are contributing to our communities, and America is stronger for their presence. They are Americans in every sense except for the documents that allow them to fully participate.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, if protection for our Dreamers is terminated, all of us will lose.

A coalition of Texas businesses has estimated that Texas, alone, will lose \$6 billion in economic activity every year.

Mr. Speaker, let's provide our Dreamers the certainty of a clear path to citizenship. Let's recognize them as

the full-fledged Americans they certainly are.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, derogatory statements toward the President; also, that was impugning the integrity of the President. I think that is much more beyond what was actually warned about, and I would ask the Parliamentarian for a ruling on that.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary inquiry would say that that statement, as quoted, "a racist rant" is an attack on the President, implying he is a racist. Is that not true? Which is contrary—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair continues to remind Members that they should refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President. The Chair will not issue an advisory opinion.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that this House is run on parliamentary language that is not consistent with what was just used?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will continue to enforce the rules of decorum.

The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia continues that parliamentary inquiry, then, because it is an issue that needs to be addressed. It should not have been said on this floor.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), a leader on this issue.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6, the Dream and Promise Act.

This is a historic day. H.R. 6 provides a long-awaited pathway to citizenship for Dreamers, to temporary protected status recipients, and deferred enforced departure status individuals.

A floor vote on this bill could not have come soon enough. More than 2.5 million immigrants currently living in

fear that they would be torn from their families could find relief in this bill.

Losing them would be disastrous to our communities, and it would harm our economy. It would be devastating to so many. This includes 130,000 Asian American Dreamers and 9,000 TPS recipients who urgently need relief from the President's xenophobic threats to tear apart immigrant families.

The Dream and Promise Act unites us around the shared ideal that anybody can live the American Dream if they are willing to work for it. That is the lesson that has inspired generations of immigrants to build this country, and that is the lesson we cannot afford to forget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Now, it may not matter to anyone else here, but the Members who wear pins understand that parliamentary language is important and what rules this floor. "Xenophobic" is another word being used on this floor about the President's character. Please advise how that is parliamentary language.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would again remind all Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 1715

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS).

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is long overdue in the U.S. and in my State of Minnesota.

In Minnesota we are home to a thriving community of Liberian refugees who fled two civil wars and an Ebola outbreak, refugees like my good friend, Louise Stevens. She escaped civil war, left her life behind, and slept on a friend's floor for over a year just for the chance at the American Dream.

Now she is over 60. She has worked hard in Minnesota's healthcare industry for 18 years. She is the mother of American children. She pays taxes, and she is here legally under DED. But because of that DED status, she still has no path to citizenship. The same is true for thousands of Liberians in America.

I am so proud to help lead the Dream and Promise Act and finally, at long last, change that. That is the American Dream and, at long last, it should be our reality.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day in our Nation as we live up to our most noble and altruistic ideals.

Today, by passing the American Dream and Promise Act, we will again reaffirm that we are still a Nation of immigrants.

Today, we follow a great tradition that goes back even before Ellis Island, when hundreds of thousands of, mainly European, immigrants from humble, poor beginnings reached our shores in an attempt to better their lives. They made us a more perfect union, strengthening the notion that we are still a nation of immigrants.

With H.R. 6, young people and others who are students, teachers, nurses, caregivers, and members of our Armed Forces will be able to fully embrace the potential and live the American Dream, reaffirming that the United States of America is still a nation of immigrants.

No one but two of our colleagues can say otherwise. Whether from red States or blue States, we all share an immigrant heritage in one way or another. Some came by force, shackled to their destiny, while others came fleeing violence, poverty, hunger, or in search of liberty and religious freedom. So many came to our Nation, and we are still, Mr. Speaker, a Nation of immigrants.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my colleague from California (Mrs. TORRES).

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise also in strong support of H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act.

I recently met with a young Dreamer from my district who asked me a simple question: Have you ever thought about doing something to change someone else's life?

Passing the American Dream and Promise Act is that moment in history. This is a historic day for the millions of hardworking young people who, like me, were brought to the U.S. as children. And not just me, but many other members of the new American caucus who are serving in Congress today. They built lives here. They own businesses, homes, and cars. Many have U.S. citizen children. They are not a national security concern. These are our neighbors and our friends who have done everything that they could possibly do to be on the right side of the law and on the right side of our communities.

Immigrants make America great. I urge passage.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the

gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), the chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative LOFGREN for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the most powerful movements in American history, those that have made the most change in our country, have often been started by young people.

More than a dozen years ago, many young Dreamers took to the streets of cities like Los Angeles, Dallas, Chicago, New York, and so many other places throughout our country asking that they be recognized fully as Americans. Many of these are folks who were brought here when they were 6 months old, 5 years old, or 3 years old and have only known the United States as their home country.

Today, the House of Representatives recognizes their Americanness and takes a step forward to move them out of the legal limbo in which they have found themselves and, unfortunately, in which they have lived their lives. These are folks who are servicemembers, they are teenagers, they are engineers, and they are workers in the fields. They are people who are producing for our country, who are making this Nation strong. They are people who we can be proud of. They are, like us, Americans. And today, most of all, we give them something to celebrate as we acknowledge their Americanness.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Speaker PELOSI for her hard work. This is the second time, under her tenure as Speaker, that a Dream Act has passed. I thank LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, PRAMILA JAYAPAL, and everybody on the Judiciary Committee who has also done the hard work of shepherding this bill through.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 6.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA).

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER and Chairwoman LOFGREN for their leadership on this important bill. This moment has been years in the making, thanks in no small part to the advocates, the allies, and the young people who fought hard for their right to stay in a country that they call and consider home.

Let me be clear, the American Dream and Promise Act is not perfect, but there is a lot of good in it. This is a big step forward.

That is why I offered amendments to, first, prohibit juvenile adjudications from being used to determine a public safety risk, and, two, to eliminate all references to gang databases or presumed gang affiliation from H.R. 6. It didn't make it, but it is still a great compromise.

We cannot afford to turn our backs now. We must pass H.R. 6 today, a sig-

nificant precedent by the House of Representatives to create a pathway to citizenship for millions.

Mr. Speaker, I thank everyone responsible for their contributions to this piece of immigration reform.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), my colleague, the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN for yielding and for her extraordinary leadership.

Congresswoman LOFGREN has been an immigration lawyer. She has taught immigration law, and she has served now as chair of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Citizenship. She was masterful in bringing elements together to make today possible. I commend our distinguished chairman, Mr. NADLER, for his leadership, and Congresswoman JAYAPAL for making this success possible.

But also, I commend Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD. When we passed this bill on the floor a long time ago, it was her legislation. She is the godmother—they are young godmothers—she is the godmother of this legislation. And I commend Congresswoman NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ, who was the chair of the Hispanic Caucus when we passed the bill the first time; Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE, who has been a champion on this issue; Congresswoman JUDY CHU, the chair of her caucus; Congresswoman KAREN BASS of her caucus; and Congressman JOAQUÍN CASTRO of the Hispanic Caucus—inside maneuvering, but the outside mobilization is what made today possible.

The stories of the Dreamers elevated this issue, their stories told with such dignity and patriotism for our country, the mobilization that they evoked from their stories for other people to take up their cause and their case, because it is so important to America. And today, we are not only honoring and rewarding our Dreamers, but we are also addressing the temporary protected status and DED recipients so that they feel much safer.

A year ago, I stood on the floor of this House—yes, in 4-inch heels, for 8 hours, if you want any more statistics—and told many stories of our Dreamers. I couldn't yield because then I would give up my time, so I told the stories of Dreamers. These Dreamers are the constant reinvigoration of America.

Dreamers such as Fernando, who lives in my district, came to the U.S. when he was just 9 years old. He had an excellent education, which I will submit for the RECORD. He now works at UCSF—that would be the University of California, San Francisco—Helen Diller Family Comprehensive Cancer Center, where he is working hard to provide new insights into deadly diseases and disorders.

There are other stories to tell.

To our businesses and economy, Javier came from Mexico City when he was 5 and now employs hundreds of Americans as CEO of an investment firm.

To technology and innovation, Saba came from Pakistan and is now a Ph.D. candidate studying cancer and other deadly genetic diseases.

And to our security, Andrea came from Peru and is hoping to follow in her father's footsteps as a member of the Air Force.

The list goes on and on. My colleague from California, MIKE THOMPSON, is always bragging that, in California, 5,000 of our teachers are DACA, are Dreamers. We want to give back to them.

The courage, patriotism, and determination to succeed of those young people strengthens our Nation and they must be allowed to stay.

There is nothing partisan or political about protecting Dreamers and TPS and DED recipients.

If the Dream Act had been brought to the floor in the last Congress under the Republican majority and leadership, I do believe that it would have passed under a Republican majority by strong, bipartisan support.

Every President in recent memory—Democrat and Republican—has understood the value of immigration to our Nation.

In his last speech as President of the United States, President Ronald Reagan said he had an important message to communicate to the country he loves, and he went on to say: "Thanks to each wave of new arrivals to this land of opportunity, we're a nation forever young, forever bursting with energy and new ideas, and always on the cutting edge, always leading the world to the next frontier. This quality is vital to our future as a nation."

President Reagan went on to say: "If we ever closed the door to new Americans, our leadership in the world would soon be lost."

Today, our new Democratic House majority is advancing that leadership in the world, in a bipartisan way, hopefully, with the American Dream and Promise Act.

We are pleased that this legislation opens a door of opportunity to TPS and DED recipients, who are American in every way: raising families, starting businesses, contributing to our communities, and fighting in our wars over decades.

Once we pass this bill—we want it to pass the Senate and be signed by the President. We want it to be a bridge to understand why we need comprehensive immigration reform for an immigration system that embraces the contributions of our newcomers.

Protecting Dreamers and TPS and DED Americans is about honoring the respect for family that is at the heart of our faith and at the heart of who we are as Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong, bipartisan vote to pass this legislation, and

to safeguard every person's right to pursue his or her American Dream. And to my colleagues, today, on the floor of this House, we have the opportunity to be part of history, to be on the right side of history, but, more importantly, to be on the right side of the future by voting and recognizing the value of Dreamers to that future.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

□ 1730

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 7¼ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 9½ remaining.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of time, and I appreciate the gentlewoman (Ms. LOFGREN) and the ability to close.

Mr. Speaker, there is a saying sometimes, and it is "everything has been said, just not everybody has said it." I think we sort of went through that today.

But some of the things that have been said today need to be brought out and, I think, continue to be brought out, and it may be that we don't talk about them.

What we have found here is that, today, my colleagues clearly do not care—as we have seen—about rule of law. They don't even seem to care about the rules of the House today, and they had to actually waive the paygo rules in order to bring this bill to the floor.

The estimate on this was \$35 billion. They have waived that. They said: We don't care. We have got a bill that is going nowhere, a bill that is not going to be signed. So I guess, just to make our point, we are just going to waive that.

But let's talk a little bit about some of the other stuff that is not in this bill, that is not with DACA recipients, or DACA, or the Dreamers—however, it is described today—that many of us would like to have seen.

I think it was very telling when the majority leader came down here and brought up a bill which I acknowledged was very close to coming bipartisanly and passing last year, but didn't. If you wanted a bipartisan bill, that is where you would have started, and you would have had an opportunity to actually then put something with it with security and actually get something passed.

But that was not what my friends across the aisle wanted. They wanted,

it seems to me, a political bill, a statement bill, something that will not get passed but simply continue to use this population, seemingly, in a way that furthers political goals and not a real solution.

An interesting part of this bill which has not been talked about as much—it has been mentioned, but it also needs to be recognized. We have a serious issue with this temporary protected status, TPS. There is no T anymore. T is not available in this. Temporary does exist.

When we talk about this—and it is supposed to be for those who are in dire need. I agree with the concept of TPS, that it should be there for those areas and times when we need to allow people to come in, and that should be a part, and it should not be natural disasters and other things. But I want you to think for just a second—and this was actually brought out in Rules last night by my colleague from California, whom I respect highly about this.

But understand, the TPS was granted to El Salvador in March 2001; Haiti, 2010; Honduras, 1999—these were earthquakes, hurricanes—Nepal, 2015, an earthquake; Hurricane Mitch in 1999, with Nicaragua. Others were armed conflicts, which we can understand.

But temporary after a hurricane, we are looking at 15, almost 20 years and we are still dealing with this, because all we did in this body and all the administration did was simply kick the can down the road.

I feel for those who came here on a temporary status but did not go home, and then they got left. Yes, this has become their home because we did not obey the law.

Now, there has been a lot said also about—and there is no need to continue on it because there is the ability for criminal elements to get green cards—the discussion about having the Secretary of Homeland Security being able to take these up; and an individual, a nondelegable authority, to actually take these individual items up is a farce. They don't have that time or ability.

They will never get that far because, actually, amazingly, the Department of Homeland Security Secretary is a busy person, both female or male. Whoever serves in it, under Republican or Democrat, does not have time to do this. So the very narrow exemption will never get used. So, yes, it does open that possibility up.

But I think the interesting thing here is, it was shown by some of the discussion in this debate, it was beyond the political rhetoric of a bill that is going nowhere and a bill that should and could find solutions.

It goes back to the problem that we see right now that this is, frankly, another green light to those who want to come here seeking freedom from the place that they currently are, which I sympathize with. I understand. But either we have a way to get into our country legally or we don't. Either we

have a way that you should come properly to our country or we don't.

It is not an in-between item here. It is not saying that we want you to come but, yet, at the same point, don't worry about our rules and laws if you can come.

As I said earlier in my statement today, they are borrowing, renting, and begging for children to walk across the border because they know that, once they do, they are free. Within 48 to 72 hours, they can get to an NGO and be on a plane somewhere, even when we have found over 3,000 cases of fraudulent, unaccompanied minors and family units. But we don't address that here.

In other words, we don't talk about what is happening in combination with this, which many of us could have actually gotten on board with. We simply put another green light, Mr. Speaker, on the fact that we are not helping.

If either side, both Republicans or Democrats, could look at a Border Patrol agent or an ICE agent or one who works in our immigration and port authority and actually look at them and tell them while they are doing their job upholding the law, which is all they can do—it is not their job to make laws. That is this body's job: to make laws or to help them or to send them aid.

Then how can we look them in the eye when they are staying 15 and 20 hours away from their families each day, when their own families are falling apart, because we are overcrowding our Border Patrol offices because they can't hide them?

How do we explain to those who come here properly on asylum from Cuba and other places where they have been told, as one told me, looked at me and said: "If I was to go back to Cuba, they would disappear me," how can we sit there and look at them while they are held for 60 or 90 days or longer, while unaccompanied family members and unaccompanied minors and family units are being passed over within 24 to 48 hours as they are sitting there legitimately trying to get into this country through an honest asylum claim?

But we sit them there to the side. We don't want to discuss them. We want to make a political statement today.

So this will be a partisan vote. There will be some bipartisan vote. There may be some who will vote for it, and that is okay. But at the end of the day, we are not getting what we asked for. We are not getting what we wanted. If we did, we probably would have taken the bill from last Congress. They did have bipartisan votes, what the majority leader spoke of. But that is not what we did.

Until we get serious about this issue, until we get serious about wanting to fix this and not simply use debate time to bash the administration or the President and to find solutions here, then we will continue down this path.

And you can celebrate if you pass this—which you will because the ma-

jority has the numbers—but how hollow a celebration is something when you look and say: This will not do anything because this will not become law.

The powerful symbol spoken of by one of my colleagues earlier is this. The powerful symbol is not that you can pass a bill on the floor that has nothing of support from either side or actually has the hope of becoming law, or giving false hope to anyone who is watching today, what actually has the ability to do is that why would we do this if we are not dealing with the issues that we have as we go forward? Why would we take the flaws in this bill, bringing it to the floor in a closed rule?

Why? Because I believe the majority didn't want to have to deal with the honest problems in this bill with amendments, so they closed the rule. They didn't want it to happen.

Mr. Speaker, but as this is our time, this our place, I would urge a "no" vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct a couple of things that have been said in the course of this debate.

Unfortunately, there are those in our country who try and claim that immigrants are criminals, and that is really incorrect. But for those who have said that this bill was loose for people who have committed serious crimes, it is simply not the case. We have tough restrictions in this bill.

Under the bill, an applicant is disqualified if any one of the following apply:

There is reason to believe the applicant is a national security risk;

The applicant has a felony conviction of any kind other than immigration status related;

The applicant has a single misdemeanor conviction involving moral turpitude with a sentence of more than 6 months, whether or not that has been served;

An applicant has two misdemeanors involving moral turpitude, regardless of sentence;

An applicant has more than two misdemeanors of any kind, excluding offenses that should not bar anyone, like minor traffic offenses; and

The applicant has a single misdemeanor conviction for domestic violence.

A lot has been said, I think, incorrectly, about the provision in the bill that says the Secretary's authority to deny applicants who pose a threat to public safety—and that is our failsafe in this—the Secretary can deny an applicant if he determines, or she, that the applicant poses a current threat to public safety, that somehow that is unworkable. But that is not true.

Let's be clear. Members of Congress are the only ones who can introduce bills and sign letters. But do we do every single aspect of that? Of course not. We have staff who assist us.

That is how that would work in the Department of Homeland Security. The staff would help, and they would prepare something for the Secretary, who would not be able to delegate it. And this is how it has worked in the Immigration and Nationality Act before.

I draw your attention to INA's 236(a), which is the mandatory detention of suspected terrorists at habeas corpus and judicial review. This section provides that this decision cannot be delegated, and yet it is workable because a lot of the staff work is done to present to the Secretary who, himself, must make that decision; similarly, with public law 110-301, the Libyan Claims Resolution Act, and 8 U.S.C. 1522 that provides nondelegable activities.

Now, there has been discussion that somehow the language that we have in the bill about databases means you can't use that evidence. That is simply incorrect.

Mr. Speaker, if we had wanted to prevent the Department of Homeland Security from using or referring to gang databases, we would have said so. The bill would clearly state that DHS could not use, rely on, or refer to gang databases. That is not what the bill says.

The bill says "it shall not establish disqualifying gang participation." It can be evidence, but it can't be the establishment of that fact.

Now, why would that be the case? We value our law enforcement community. They keep us safe. They are hardworking. But these databases are populated by people way beyond law enforcement, people in school police, school security. They can result in people being mistakenly tagged as gang members when they are not.

I will give an example.

There was an audit done of California's gang database, CalGang. When the auditors went through, they found out there were 42 individuals who were under the age of 1 year old who had allegedly self-reported that they were part of a gang. Obviously, that was incorrect. So we would not want to make that the determining factor.

I want to mention a little bit about the comments that were made about DUI. DUI is a very serious matter, and no one wants to see individuals who are threats to public safety obtain relief under this bill.

First, anyone who is convicted by an offense punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of more than 1 year is barred from relief. So anyone who would commit a serious offense is barred.

If you have one conviction for DUI with a suspended license and you knew your license was suspended, you have committed a crime of moral turpitude, because section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act still applies.

Some have said that a single DUI conviction should be enough to disqualify you. Well, we have provided for that as well. If the Secretary finds that you pose a serious public safety threat, he can deny your application.

I will just say this. There are Members of the House of Representatives who have a single DUI. We didn't exile them from a single DUI, and I don't think if someone has turned their life around, we should exile them as well.

Now, I want to talk about the value of this bill.

It is interesting to hear the bill has been jammed, because we have waited for 18 years for this moment to pass this bill.

□ 1745

Mr. Speaker, over 400 diverse organizations, associations, and industry leaders support this bill, including United We Dream, NAACP, National Organization for Women, Interfaith Immigration Coalition, United States Chamber of Commerce, and National Education Association.

Yesterday, more than 100 business leaders, including Walmart, Koch Industries, Coca-Cola, Starbucks, and General Motors all came out in support of this bill. They had full-page ads in The New York Times, asking us to please pass this bill.

H.R. 6 is the solution we have been waiting for. Passage of this measure is long overdue. Dreamers and TPS and DED recipients do not have the luxury of time. President Trump terminated DACA. He terminated TPS for six countries. He extended DED only through March 2020.

While the courts have stopped the President on DACA and TPS, these individuals are living on borrowed time.

We can vote on their futures now. To a great extent, we are deciding their fates, and we are also deciding our fates. Are we the America that made us great, who opened our doors to those who wanted to become Americans with us, who understood that those who have done no wrong should not receive punishment? I say that we are.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the American Dream and Promise Act of 2019, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the treatment of the Dreamers, brought to this country by their parents and others with unsettled status, is un-American and must be set right by the rational process outlined by H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act of 2019. The Dreamers have come to symbolize the entire group of individuals who have been left in the shadows, where they experience the fear of the hunted. The Dreamers have lived among us for almost their entire lives. I have invited Dreamers who live in the District of Columbia to a public meeting to talk about their lives. They are fulfilling their own dreams going to college and working in good jobs.

The shame of our failure to permanently settle the Dreamers question will not go away as long as we leave them and others living without settled legal status twisting in the wind. H.R. 6 does not pretend to settle this issue. Rather, it establishes a path to citizenship not only for Dreamers but also for Temporary Protected Status and Deferred Enforced Departure holders.

Never before in American history have we left any group of people in our country in legal

limbo. H.R. 6 presents the ordered and predictable process this issue has long needed. These issues and these people will not go away. The House has an obligation to use our new majority to set this issue on the path to resolution.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the American Dream and Promise Act. For too long, Congress has failed to take action in providing certainty to members in our community whose immigration status has been thrown into question because of the actions of this erratic administration. With the passage of this important and substantial piece of legislation, we will be sending a clear message to these individuals that they are valued members of our communities.

This bill provides certainty to the roughly 14,600 DREAMers in my district, including people like Juan Carlos Cerda. Juan Carlos came to the United States at the age of 7 with his mother from Mexico. Juan Carlos didn't understand completely what was going on at the time—all he knew was that he and his mother were leaving Mexico to join his father in the United States. Juan Carlos worked hard through school and eventually earned a B.A. at Yale University. He returned to North Texas as a kindergarten teacher in the Pleasant Grove neighborhood in my district to contribute back to the community that gave him so much. Because of the uncertainty surrounding the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program and the Trump Administration, Mr. Cerda's work authorization had a cloud of uncertainty. This bill would lift that cloud and allow people like Mr. Cerda to continue to be contributing members in our diverse communities.

Furthermore, roughly 2,400 individuals under Temporary Protected Status and Deferred Enforced Departure within my district will also be protected under this legislation. These individuals were granted refuge in the United States while their home countries dealt with issues such as natural disasters or civil unrest. These individuals have been in the United States for an average of 22 years and have already set down roots within my district. We know them as small business owners, educators, community leaders, and friends. These individuals along with DREAMers are Americans, just like myself, the only difference is what is written on a piece of paper.

Overall, up to 2.5 million people who have spent most of their lives in the United States will have a door of opportunity opened so that they too can fulfill their vision of the American dream. These individuals make our country stronger and make valuable contributions to it every day. As a cosponsor of this bill, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and for the Senate to take it up immediately upon passage in this chamber.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ESPAILLAT). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 415, 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. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 6 is postponed.

REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS OF THE VIOLENT SUPPRESSION OF DEMOCRACY PROTESTS IN TIANANMEN SQUARE AND ELSEWHERE IN CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 393) remembering the victims of the violent suppression of democracy protests in Tiananmen Square and elsewhere in China on June 3 and 4, 1989, and calling on the Government of the People's Republic of China to respect the universally recognized human rights of all people living in China and around the World, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 238]

YEAS—423

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Abraham | Casten (IL) | Duffy |
| Adams | Castor (FL) | Duncan |
| Aderholt | Castro (TX) | Dunn |
| Aguilar | Chabot | Emmer |
| Allen | Cheney | Engel |
| Allred | Chu, Judy | Escobar |
| Amash | Cicilline | Eshoo |
| Amodei | Cisneros | Espaillet |
| Armstrong | Clark (MA) | Estes |
| Arrington | Clarke (NY) | Evans |
| Axne | Clay | Ferguson |
| Babin | Cleaver | Finkenauer |
| Bacon | Cline | Fitzpatrick |
| Baird | Cloud | Fleischmann |
| Balderson | Cohen | Fletcher |
| Banks | Cole | Flores |
| Barr | Collins (GA) | Portenberry |
| Barragán | Collins (NY) | Foster |
| Bass | Comer | Fox (NC) |
| Beatty | Conaway | Frankel |
| Bera | Connolly | Fudge |
| Bergman | Cook | Fulcher |
| Beyer | Cooper | Gaetz |
| Biggs | Correa | Gallagher |
| Bilirakis | Costa | Galleo |
| Bishop (GA) | Courtney | Garamendi |
| Bishop (UT) | Cox (CA) | García (IL) |
| Blumenauer | Craig | García (TX) |
| Blunt Rochester | Crawford | Gianforte |
| Bonamici | Crenshaw | Gibbs |
| Bost | Crist | Gohmert |
| Boyle, Brendan | Crow | Golden |
| F. | Cuellar | Gomez |
| Brady | Cummings | Gonzalez (OH) |
| Brindisi | Cunningham | Gonzalez (TX) |
| Brooks (AL) | Curtis | Gooden |
| Brooks (IN) | Davids (KS) | Gosar |
| Brown (MD) | Davidson (OH) | Gottheimer |
| Brownley (CA) | Davis (CA) | Granger |
| Buchanan | Davis, Danny K. | Graves (GA) |
| Buck | Davis, Rodney | Graves (LA) |
| Bucshon | Dean | Graves (MO) |
| Budd | DeFazio | Green (TX) |
| Burchett | DeGette | Griffith |
| Burgess | DeLauro | Grijalva |
| Bustos | DelBene | Grothman |
| Butterfield | Delgado | Guest |
| Byrne | Demings | Guthrie |
| Calvert | DeSaulnier | Haaland |
| Carbajal | DesJarlais | Hagedorn |
| Cárdenas | Deutch | Harder (CA) |
| Carson (IN) | Diaz-Balart | Harris |
| Carter (GA) | Dingell | Hartzler |
| Carter (TX) | Doggett | Hayes |
| Cartwright | Doyle, Michael | Heck |
| Case | F. | Hice (GA) |