

Republic of China to eliminate corruption, accelerate economic and political reform, and protect human rights, particularly the freedoms of expression and assembly, issues that remain relevant in United States-China relations 30 years later.

Although these activists' reform efforts continue to inspire the Chinese people, the Government of the People's Republic of China takes active measures to deny its citizens the truth about the Tiananmen Square massacre, including the blocking of uncensored internet sites and social media commentary on microblog and other messaging services, and the placement of misleading information on the events of June 3 and 4, 1989, on internet sites available in China.

The Chinese government also continues to silence the voices and memory of these activists through gruesome attacks on demonstrators who recognize the false information being spread by the Chinese Government.

On May 20, 1989, martial law was declared in Beijing, China, after authorities had failed to persuade demonstrators to leave Tiananmen Square, sending thousands of armed troops, supported by tanks and other armor, moved into Beijing and the surrounding streets where the forces fired into crowds of unarmed civilians.

The "Remembering the victims of Tiananmen Square" Act promises to do this by expressing sympathy and solidarity to the families of those killed, tortured, and imprisoned for their participation in the pro-democracy demonstrations during the spring of 1989 in Beijing and in other cities across the People's Republic of China and verbally supporting the leaders of the Tiananmen demonstrations and all those who peacefully sought political reform, democratic transparency, the rule of law, and protections for universally recognized human rights in China.

The resolution also renounces the practices of the Chinese government's actions during and after the Tiananmen Square Protest and calls on the government to take responsibility for the number of deaths that occurred during the violent suppression of the spring 1989 Tiananmen demonstrations, rehabilitate the reputations of those who participated in the demonstrations and those detained for seeking to commemorate the anniversary of the demonstrations, and cease the censoring of information and discussion about the Tiananmen Square massacre, including at Confucius Institutes worldwide.

Through these actions, H.R. 393 promises to adequately relay the United States' disappointment with the violence towards Tiananmen demonstrators and aid the advocates and protesters in their quest for protected human rights.

The Government of the People's Republic of China continues to actively suppress universally recognized rights by imprisoning or restricting the activities of pro-democracy activists, human rights lawyers, citizen journalists, labor union leaders, religious believers, members of ethnic minorities, and individuals in the Xinjiang and Tibetan regions, among many others who seek to express their political or religious views or their ethnic identity in a peaceful manner.

Despite persistent, ongoing, and sometimes brutal repression, the desire of Chinese citizens to risk life, limb, and liberty to exercise universally recognized human rights, ensure

the rule of law, and promote political reform cannot be extinguished, thus the legacy of Tiananmen Square lives on.

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, H. Res. 393, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6, AMERICAN DREAM AND PROMISE ACT OF 2019

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 415 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 415

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain aliens, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-16, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 415, providing for consideration of H.R. 6,

the American Dream and Promise Act, under a closed rule self-executing a manager's amendment. The rule provides 2 hours of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the bill in this rule, H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act. I rise as the granddaughter of immigrants.

This is a historic day in which we begin to shape immigration policy that reflects American values. H.R. 6 offers a path to lawful permanent residence status for Dreamers, TPS holders, and DED beneficiaries. These are our neighbors, our friends, our schoolmates, our workers, and our family. They make our communities stronger and fuller. They are Americans in every way except under the law. We intend to correct that omission today.

These immigrants are longtime residents of our country with deep roots in the communities where they reside. For many of them, the United States is the only country they have ever called home. It is cruel and un-American that we have left members of our communities to suffer uncertainty in this way.

With this bill, we keep families together and ensure that these women, men, and children can continue contributing to the communities we share. In my district, Florida's 27th, there are 11,400 residents who are eligible for protection under H.R. 6. Approximately 8,200 are Dreamers, and 3,400 are TPS or DED holders.

As I have long said, in my south Florida community, it doesn't matter the color of your skin, the language you speak, whom you hold hands with, your religion, or your country of origin. You are a Miamian if you call our city home. Today, the House of Representatives will make clear that you have every right to call yourselves Americans, too.

Madam Speaker, I proudly support this historic step forward towards a more just America. Let's pass this rule and H.R. 6.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank Representative SHALALA for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, circumstances demand that we make substantial improvements to our Nation's broken immigration system. My home State of Arizona is at the forefront of a crisis on our Nation's southern border, but the bill before us today offers no solutions and will instead, I believe, exacerbate the problem.

I have represented the people of Arizona for over a decade. Last Congress, I was honored when the people of Arizona's Eighth Congressional District sent me to represent them here in Washington, D.C.

For my constituents, as residents of a border State, fixing our broken immigration system is a top priority. With Customs and Border Patrol apprehending 4,500 people per day and, in April, over 100,000 people just in that month alone, it is critical to develop and implement a solution immediately. As a member on the Homeland Security Committee, the Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Immigration and Citizenship, and the House Rules Committee, I stand ready to work with my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to develop real solutions to our immigration crisis.

Unfortunately, with the bill and the rule before us today, it is evident that the majority has no intention of advancing consensus legislation to fix our broken immigration system. The bill advances a series of what I believe are flawed policies.

As the bill worked its way through the committee process, the majority denied reasonable amendments to improve the bill; and the rule passed in a party-line vote—very partisan bill—by the Rules Committee does not allow for amendments to be considered by this body as a whole at all. It is a closed rule.

□ 1300

Democrats have framed this bill as a solution for recipients of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival program, or DACA, a laudable goal.

In fact, last night in the Rules Committee, the chairman said it is only designed for a small group of people, the DACA recipients. Well, that is just not true.

In fact, the American people should know what this bill really does. It provides green cards and, thus, a special path to citizenship to millions of illegal aliens, whether they are current recipients of DACA or not.

Unlike President Obama's executive order on DACA, this bill allows people who have been living in the United States illegally for 40 years—decades—to get a special path to citizenship. That is not what President Obama's DACA program did.

It places the interests of those who violated U.S. immigration laws above the interests of those who have been waiting and waiting to enter this country legally. It provides amnesty. It will only incentivize further illegal immigration.

The American people should also know what this bill fails to do.

It does nothing to provide the men and women protecting our border with the resources they need to keep our country safe. It does nothing to fix the de facto system of catch and release. It does nothing to remedy the crisis at our southern border. In fact, I believe it will make it worse.

Finally, the American people should know the changes that my Republican colleagues and I proposed to improve upon this bill, all of which my Democratic colleagues rejected.

Democrats rejected an amendment to exclude aliens convicted of misdemeanor firearms convictions from getting this special pathway. Democrats rejected an amendment to exclude illegals convicted of a misdemeanor DUI offense if the alien's conduct killed or injured another person or if they had multiple DUIs.

What this means is, if there was an illegal immigrant who had a misdemeanor DUI that severely injured someone, they are still welcomed in under this plan.

Approximately half of the 158,000 people arrested by ICE in fiscal year 2018, the illegal immigrants who were arrested, or about 81,000, had been charged or convicted of driving under the influence. This bill could reward people like this with a special pathway to citizenship.

Democrats also rejected an amendment to make gang members ineligible for benefits under this bill.

Democrats also rejected an amendment to make fraud a ground for ineligibility. In fact, I proposed an amendment that said, if they fraudulently fill out the application form, or misrepresented themselves as U.S. citizens in the past to get benefits, they would be rejected. Unfortunately, my Democratic colleagues said no, welcome them in.

Democrats rejected an amendment to remedy a confidentiality provision that prevents information contained in an application from being used for law enforcement purposes, thereby impeding law enforcement efforts.

To summarize, under this bill: Gun criminals are welcome. Drunk drivers are welcome. Gang members are welcome. Fraudsters are welcome. But law enforcement hands are tied.

From the bill's text and failure to adopt reasonable amendments, it is clear that my Democratic colleagues do not value the integrity of our immigration system or ensuring that criminals do not exploit loopholes in their bill. At best, they are choosing to ignore the chaos at the border and to ignore the perverse incentives of their policy of wide-reaching amnesty. At worst, they are encouraging it.

Last Congress, Republicans voted for a DACA solution that enforces the law and remedies our immigration system. Republicans recognized that America is a nation of immigrants but also that the world has changed since we put in place the immigration laws governing our enforcement efforts along the southern border and that we need immigration laws reformed.

That bill that Republicans proposed and I supported last year would have addressed DACA by allowing DACA recipients to obtain legal status. It would not have allowed for a special pathway to citizenship. It would not have allowed them to jump in front of the line.

That Republican bill recognized that many DACA recipients entered this country without legal documentation

through no fault of their own but that they were in the country and we needed a solution.

That Republican bill would have also secured our border, improved enforcement, and addressed our need for skilled workers. It authorized a border wall, mandated E-Verify, and increased visas for the skilled workers we need most. It also eliminated the diversity visa lottery and increased the credible fear standard to combat asylum fraud.

The bill offered reasonable immigration reform, but not one single Democratic Member of Congress voted in favor of it. Instead, today, my Democratic colleagues are advancing a bill that offers no reforms to the legal immigration system, no border security, no solutions for the humanitarian crisis that is happening each and every day at our border. And it comes with a \$35 billion price tag.

The crisis at our southern border is real and substantial, with Customs and Border Protection apprehending an average of 4,500 people per day on the southern border. Border Patrol facilities are beyond capacity. Immigration and Customs Enforcement facilities are full.

The number of people apprehended in the past 7 months has already surpassed any year since 2009. At this rate, CBP will apprehend over 1.64 million people in just 1 year. That is more than the last recorded official population of the city of Phoenix.

We must develop and implement a solution to the crisis at our southern border immediately. Instead, we have before us a partisan bill to provide amnesty to millions of people and incentivize countless more to cross our border illegally.

This bill has no chance of being taken up by the U.S. Senate or signed by the President.

The majority's inaction to the crisis at our southern border is absolutely unacceptable. Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership refused to even fund the extra funding for the humanitarian crisis that would help the children and the migrants themselves.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the distinguished chair of the Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Immigration and Citizenship.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I stand here today in strong support of H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act of 2019, a product of decades-long advocacy, grit, and compromise.

I am extremely proud to stand with Dreamers and recipients of temporary protected status and deferred enforced departure. We are here because of their hard work, as well as the steadfast determination of immigrant rights groups, faith-based organizations, labor unions, civil rights groups, business associations, and so many of my colleagues who have worked tirelessly to bring this bill to the floor today.

Our work has paid off. There is widespread, bipartisan support across the country for protecting Dreamers and passing the American Dream and Promise Act.

Just yesterday, over 100 business leaders urged us to vote in favor of the bill, including household companies such as eBay, Hewlett-Packard, IKEA, Chobani, and Levi Strauss. They support the bill because the United States will benefit economically from its passage.

The Chamber of Commerce says that it supports the bill, and it may make the vote on the American Dream and Promise Act a key vote.

Even now, more than 70 percent of the top 25 Fortune 500 companies, which generate \$3 trillion in annual revenue, employ Dreamers. Even the conservative Cato Institute found that allowing Dreamers to remain here would add an extra \$350 billion to our economy and an additional \$90 billion in tax revenue.

On the other hand, failure to support lawful status for Dreamers will directly undermine our competitiveness and subject them to permanent exile. That makes no sense.

We have waited long enough. It is time for us to pass the American Dream and Promise Act in the House of Representatives.

It was 2001 when the first iteration of the Dream Act was introduced. Eighteen years later, we are finally poised to pass it.

We have seen the benefit of President Obama's DACA announcement, a temporary initiative that allowed these young people to temporarily work and to stay without looking over their shoulders. The courts have kept us from seeing the destruction of DACA that President Trump had ordered, even though polls show that almost 90 percent of Americans support legal recognition for Dreamers.

Dreamers are Americans. All they lack is the paper to prove it. They live in every one of our 50 States. Their families hail from every region of the world. Their contributions are felt all across the landscape of this country.

Among them are future industry leaders; nurses; doctors; chefs; construction workers; teachers, including 5,000 teachers in California; and care providers for our children and parents.

Dreamers are joined in their efforts by TPS and DED brethren. In the same month that the administration announced the end of DACA, they also announced the termination of TPS for six countries and, a few weeks later, the termination of DED for Liberians, even though many of them have been here for 30 years.

More than 400,000 nationals of seven countries now face exile from the United States. The majority have lived here for at least 20 years, building their lives, raising families that include more than a quarter of a million U.S. citizen children.

The future for Dreamers and long-time TPS and DED recipients does not

have to be uncertain. We have the opportunity to pass the American Dream and Promise Act in the House of Representatives today and, by doing so, put those Dreamers and strivers on the path to legal recognition.

Let's put partisan fights aside for the good of our Nation, for the good of our economy and our communities. Approve this rule and, later today, vote for the American Dream and Promise Act.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I want to give context to this before I talk specifically about the idea of a closed rule here, which I oppose so much.

First of all, there are about 690,000 in the DACA population, but there is an estimate that there is another 1 to 1.2 million, though no one really knows what that number is, who might have applied but chose not to apply under the Obama-era DACA regulations.

We also have a significant population, post-2012, who have been brought here. We had a surge in 2013 and a surge in 2014 of unaccompanied minors. We have again seen a surge in the last few months even. We don't know what the population looks like for this.

Another way to put this into context is this way: We have a million people who have absconded from their court dates. That means they haven't shown up. They got an order to appear, and they are not showing up. We have another million with active removal orders.

That is 2 million people who are roaming the country. We don't know who they are, where they are.

We brought in 1.2 million legal immigrants last year. That is a good thing.

We are going to catch more than 1.2 million illegal aliens coming across our border this year. These are numbers that are almost unfathomable.

That population I just mentioned would be the second largest city in the United States after New York City, more than Los Angeles itself.

□ 1315

When we say that we are going to apprehend 1.2 million this year, when one talks to Border Patrol agents, people who conduct censuses on these things, they will say that we have no idea any longer what the getaway number is. A year ago, they thought they were catching 1 in 2. Four months ago, they thought they were catching 1 in 3. Today, they will say that they have absolutely no idea.

Last week, in El Paso alone, one group of over 1,000 people were apprehended.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Arizona an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. BIGGS. A group of 1,000 was apprehended, and 2,200 came in through

El Paso, in 1 day alone, who were apprehended. We are averaging about 4,500 apprehensions a day in this country.

What happened when this bill came to markup? Why is it, in my opinion, a real problem that we have a closed rule here? The Republicans offered a number of amendments. We pointed out issues that we thought were of concern. We offered amendments to address those issues, such as allowing repeat criminals and gang members to obtain green cards. We offered amendments that would allow application information regarding illegal status to be used for deportation. We attempted to prevent fraudulent applications from being filed.

But none of these and a whole host of other amendments offered by Republicans were accepted, even some that were just absolutely rational, such as those with DUIs that resulted in an accident where someone was seriously injured or even killed. They were not prevented from obtaining this path of legalization.

Here we are today, and now they are saying no amendments can be offered from either side of the aisle. I have essentially opposed every closed rule since I came to Congress. I think it actually undermines this process where we represent districts and come to try to offer amendments. I have offered many amendments and had them all shut down, quite frankly, whether by vote or in the Rules Committee.

But the reality is, I represent a district, and when the majority closes a rule like this, it is preventing me from representing a border State that has a great deal of difficulties because of the rampant border crossings of illegal aliens.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the underlying bill and the rule that is presently before us.

As I do so, let me thank my colleague on the Judiciary Committee. We have served for any number of years, and Congresswoman LOFGREN has been on the front lines of reason and trying to address the question of comprehensive immigration reform.

Together, respectively, and parallel to each other, we have introduced, over and over again, comprehensive immigration reform. We have watched it be refuted and rebutted by those who really could have helped us solve even the problem of the surge that we are seeing crossing the border today.

Let me, as well, thank Madam Speaker, who has been engaged in a very important way, and my friend and colleague LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, who has clearly been leading on this issue and many others. Let me thank the Judiciary Committee as well, where we came together as a team.

Let me reinforce what has been said over and over again, and that is that Dreamers are Americans. Those who

are beneficiaries of TPS, they have been here 20 to 30 years because of the difficulty of their home countries. They have, likewise, shown themselves to love this country.

There was a period of time when Dreamers had joined in and went to the Iraq war. They were not citizens, but they went there because they loved this country so much. They came as a child, and they realized the wonderment of this country.

It is important to convince those who believe that we are opening the doors and that we are reckless. Let me be very clear. Besides the Immigration and Nationality Act that is already in existence, there are very clear parameters on dealing with people who are felons or a threat to national security, individuals who have committed DUIs, those who have misdemeanors. There are clear parameters of ensuring that the Nation is protected. But, as well, there is dignity and human rights.

There is also the question of what investment in dollars you will lose, what you will throw away, \$460 billion from the national GDP over the decade from 685,000 workers—in my own State, \$3 billion annually in the State GDP.

Immigrants are in the fabric of our society. We are immigrant and non-immigrant. All of us have come from that history. Mine is different, having been brought here by, meaning those who are of African American heritage, as slaves.

386,300 immigrants are eligible under the American Dream and Promise Act, and 120,000 live in Harris County.

But this is the story that I want to tell and dwell on. A Dreamer died trying to rescue Hurricane Harvey victims. That is Alonso Guillen, who came to help those in the darkest moments of our region, during Hurricane Harvey, the greatest and most significant disaster.

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

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her courtesy.

He came from Lufkin, Texas. He loved Texas football and country music. He had fundraisers for any manner of needs in his area.

When he saw the devastation and the people in water in Harris County, and we were in 51 trillion gallons of water, he came, with a little boat and a friend. He didn't ask whether they were immigrant or nonimmigrant, Dreamer or non-Dreamer, what their background was. As they were in the water, as they were on their rooftops, as they were desperate without food, he came.

Tragically, his family had come to, ultimately, find him floating in the water, when his boat had toppled and, we believe, had been impacted by the wires in the water.

This is the face of Dreamers. This is the face of those who would benefit

from temporary protective status coming from Nepal, from El Salvador, and from countries that are under major devastation.

Many times, there is crime in America, and I understand that. But people don't imagine what it is to flee from the natural disasters that these individuals have fled from, to have no relief from the government, and to compound that with the violence that is going on, knowing so much violence.

I stand here today to ask for rational thought. With a multitude of organizations, I want to raise up one, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It doesn't come lightly to this question. I would argue that, had we passed comprehensive immigration reform 10 years ago, 15 years ago, the question of surging across the border would not be an issue.

Let me also be clear that we have built barriers across the border for more than a decade. I remember giving huge sums of money to ensure it, in certain spaces.

What we are saying now is that that is not a sole solution. The solution is regularizing individuals with the safeguards of this legislation.

I would hope my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, as Americans, understand that this Nation was built with the sweat and tears and love of immigrants. Every American, except Native Americans, can point to coming from somewhere else, no matter what condition they were in when they came.

I ask our colleagues to support this legislation, H.R. 6, because it is the American thing to do.

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.

The American Dream and Promise Act of 2019 establishes a roadmap to U.S. citizenship for (1) immigrant youth and (2) current or potential holders of (a) temporary protected status (TPS) or (b) deferred enforced departure (DED).

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 positions 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.

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 national 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.

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.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a grandchild of legal immigrants to this country.

We are debating whether or not to grant the greatest gift our Nation has to offer, permanent residency and citizenship. We must get our priorities straight.

While we are here in the middle of a humanitarian crisis on the southern

border, Democratic leadership is choosing to bring amnesty for millions of illegal immigrants to a vote.

By choosing to ignore our current immigration laws, Democrats are effectively inviting the mass migration of illegal immigrants across our border States, including Arizona. If enacted, this would be the largest amnesty in U.S. history. It would do nothing to enforce our laws but, instead, reward lawbreakers.

This legislation grants smugglers and gang members with green cards and a path to citizenship. It will simply serve to incentivize more migrants to come to the United States illegally.

Congress should work with the administration in stopping the surge of illegal immigration, not incentivizing more caravans.

My constituents have recently and repeatedly made it clear that Arizona's Fourth Congressional District does not support amnesty.

This bill does not promise the American Dream but, rather, the perpetration of a crisis. This crisis is doing real harm to Arizona and all of America.

I encourage my colleagues not to vote for H.R. 6, which would only serve to enable the humanitarian crisis on our southern border and does nothing to close loopholes or even enforce existing law.

I find this legislation to be a disgrace. The American people deserve better. It is time this Congress started putting American citizens first.

It came as a closed rule. That shows you that it is bad process and bad policy.

As former Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis is quoted: "In a government of laws, existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. . . . If the government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy."

Do I need to say anything else?

I ask my colleagues to reject this legislation and vote "no."

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, this is a bright day in the history of the House. We are going to provide relief to people who are innocent.

We have the debate about immigration, no question about it. But we are talking about children, infants, in some cases, who were brought here through no decision of their own. They then went to school here, began a career here, built a family here. In many cases, they served in the military here and served as first responders.

This is finally an opportunity for those Dreamers to have legal status, 2.5 million of them.

We are also going to provide temporary protected status to other law-abiding people living and contributing here.

This is a big deal in Vermont. First, for the people, for those affected, it is

relief. It is about time. Second, they are contributing to the economy with the jobs that they perform and the taxes that they pay, about \$3.5 million in Federal taxes and \$2 million in State and local taxes.

One, in particular, is a student at the University of Vermont Medical School, Juan Conde. He was brought here from Mexico when he was 9 years old. His mom later died of cancer.

His goal in life is to help cancer victims. First, he got a master's degree in chemistry and a Ph.D. in molecular biology, doing research to advance a cure for cancer. Now he is a student at the University of Vermont Medical School, and he is dedicating his life to cancer research and cancer treatment.

What a win it is for this country to have the services of this bright, idealistic young man. This legislation is going to allow him to have the security that we all need in order to be the best that we can possibly be as a contributing member of society.

A confident nation welcomes people who are law-abiding citizens. Pass this legislation overwhelmingly.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I have noticed a trend lately with the bills that we are voting on. They all have attractive names: the Save the Internet Act, the Equality Act, and now the thing that we are voting on this week, the American Dream and Promise Act.

I rise in opposition to this bill because great titles don't equal great policies. H.R. 6 doesn't really provide a legal pathway for the DACA population. Instead, it gives green cards to, potentially, millions of illegal aliens. There is no age limit, and the bill is so broad that it prohibits DHS from using evidence found in Federal or State gang databases as the reason to deny an application.

□ 1330

The bill also does nothing to address the humanitarian crisis at our southern border, absolutely nothing.

Madam Speaker, I visited the southern border earlier this year and I saw the crisis firsthand. I talked with our Border Patrol agents, who need Congress' help.

Many things are needed to fix our immigration system, but what isn't needed is a political messaging bill that has no chance of passing the Senate or being signed into law.

Madam Speaker, clever bill titles don't equal good policy, and good intentions don't always lead to good outcomes. I swore an oath to defend the rule of law, and that is what I will continue to do.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), my good friend.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs.

LESKO) for her time and energy on this important issue. I thank my colleagues who have been speaking on the floor.

Madam Speaker, I have got to say, this bill, like my colleague from North Carolina just spoke of, is more of the same. It is more of the same political theater that we see day in and day out in this body, where we refuse to actually address the issues of the day.

We have 100,000 people pouring across the border of the United States per month who are apprehended—100,000. And then I watch with complete disbelief while my colleagues on the other side of the aisle dare to complain about how children are being housed, about how people are being housed when we don't have the facilities to do it, and they literally refuse to bring forward legislation to fund dealing with the problem.

I have never seen greater hypocrisy in this body, and that is saying something pretty profound. I don't know how Members can look, with a straight face, at the American people and say that this House is actually addressing this concern legitimately.

The Democrats are bringing forward a bill, now, under the idea of taking care of people who are here illegally—who, by the way, were given status by the President of the United States previously, illegally and unconstitutionally, as we proved in DAPA, which I was proud to litigate on behalf of Texas along with Attorney General Paxton, Solicitor General Scott Keller, where we won in the Fifth Circuit. We were upheld in the Supreme Court for DAPA, the DACA class was illegally and unconstitutionally granted status.

It matters what we do here; it matters what the government does; it matters that we follow the rule of law; and it matters that we not look at the American people and claim to be, in the false name of compassion, concerned about the migrants coming here when we have open borders that are exploiting these kids.

A little girl today is going to be raped on the journey coming up through Mexico while we pretend to care. When are we going to do something about it?

If we actually care about the people at the border right now, if we actually care, why wouldn't we fund beds right now?

Why wouldn't we fund immigration judges right now?

Why wouldn't we fix asylum laws right now, not to prevent asylum, but to match it up with the 88 percent who are found to be fraudulently claiming asylum once they go through the process and immigration judges look at it? Why wouldn't we fix that problem today?

Why are we empowering cartels to profit to the tune of \$2 billion in 2018 by moving human beings across our border?

Why are we empowering 54 migrants being stashed in a stash house in Houston, Texas, by the Reynosa faction of

the Gulf Cartel while we do nothing about it, when we can?

We are the most powerful nation in the history of the world. Why don't we go to our southern border and address the problem rather than engaging in the political theater of this ridiculous bill?

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona has 9 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Florida has 16 minutes remaining.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good friend.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my colleague on the Rules Committee, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, you heard my colleague's passion from this microphone just seconds ago.

Lest anyone thinks this is about money, this rule today combines two bills: one, CBO estimates to cost \$8 billion, not a penny for border security; another, the CBO estimates to cost \$26 billion, not a penny for border security.

Lest anyone thinks this conversation today is about helping those young people here under DACA protections, remember, the Republican majority brought two bills to the floor last year that would do exactly that, got not one Democratic vote on either one of them.

If anyone thinks this bill is about protecting folks who are trying to strive for the American Dream, Madam Speaker, I would encourage you to read from page 3 of the bill. It says:

This bill applies to an alien who is inadmissible or deportable from the United States, and those aliens only.

I tell you that, Madam Speaker, because I represent a constituency that is 25 percent first-generation Americans. I represent a constituency that has played by the rules, done everything right, come to this country legally. Their children are unprotected today, and this bill does not one thing to protect those children. In order to qualify for the protections in this bill, Madam Speaker, people had to have come to America the wrong way.

If people came to America the right way and have been waiting in line for 5 years or 10 years or, in the case of my constituents—and you know this well, Madam Speaker—15 years, 20 years for a green card while their children are aging out of the system, this bill does not one thing to protect them. Only if people came the wrong way are there protections in this system.

To be in the DACA program, people had to get here before 2007. President Obama's crisis on the border came in 2014. This bill today not only grandfathers all the DACA kids, it grandfathers all of those kids. In the meantime, we have spent not one penny on border security.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I am grateful to my colleague for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, we could be doing something together today. My friend, the chairwoman of the Immigration and Citizenship Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, has a bill that has been cosponsored by more than half of the Democrats and by more than half of the Republicans that would go directly to this issue of folks who have been standing in line for decades and cannot get a green card. We could be bringing that bill today. It has not even gotten a hearing in the committee or the subcommittee so far.

This is not beyond our control. The rabbi who prayed for us this morning, Madam Speaker, said we can achieve the unachievable. We absolutely can come together and do that. This is not a serious effort to do that today, Madam Speaker, but it doesn't have to be the last word.

If we defeat this rule, we can come back together with bills that have been cosponsored by a majority of the Republicans, a majority of the Democrats, and move forward on this issue together. I know that is what the Speaker wants to do. I know that is what the chairwoman of the Immigration and Citizenship Subcommittee wants to do. I know that is what most of us in this Chamber want to do, and we can.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, you know I am from the State of Arizona. Border security and immigration has been the top issue for years now, not only in my district, but the entire State of Arizona, because we see it firsthand. We also see the DACA recipients. I mean, they are good kids, going to school, and I applaud the good and great DACA recipients that we have.

But what Representative WOODALL says is true: Republicans offered two bills to give legal status and one a pathway to citizenship to DACA recipients, but this bill goes beyond DACA. It is like DACA on steroids, because it will allow millions more people to get a special pathway to citizenship in front of the line of other legal immigrants who are trying to do it the legal way.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know this is going nowhere in the Senate and the President is not going to do this. I hope at one point we are actually going to work together, because as Representative WOODALL said, on those two bills that we put forward last year that would have solved the DACA problem, not one Democrat voted for them.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, let me begin by thanking Speaker PELOSI for making the Dream and Promise Act one of the top 10 Democratic priorities for the people and the Judiciary Committee for all their hard work on this bill.

As coauthor of H.R. 6, I rise in strong support of the rule and the Dream and Promise Act. I will focus primarily on the Dream portion of the bill.

Eighteen years ago, I was coauthor of the original DREAM Act, known as the Student Adjustment Act. Today's vote on H.R. 6 is a major milestone in a long fight to protect Dreamers who are part of the fabric of our American society.

This bill eliminates the fear of deportation, which each day haunts 2.1 million Dreamers at school, at work, and as they care for their families.

I represent 24,000 Dreamers, the largest number of Dreamers of any congressional district. I think of these talented and patriotic Dreamers and the barriers that they have overcome to build lives and families in America, the only country they call home. I think of the courage that they have shown by standing up and sharing their stories of endurance, resourcefulness, sacrifice, and heartbreak.

Dreamers exemplify American values and what it means to pursue the American Dream.

I think of Dreamers like Yasmin, who was raised in a mixed status family and watched her father fight against a serious illness. This experience inspired her to help others. She is now studying to be a physician's assistant, serving patients like her father.

H.R. 6 will enable Dreamers like Yasmin to reach their full potential, contribute to their community, and help ensure America is a stronger and greater nation.

Dreamers like Yasmin are why Democrats, Republicans, and Independents all support our Dreamers, as well as businesses, organized labor, faith groups, educators, health professionals, and former Cabinet officials, among others.

This broad and unprecedented coalition of support highlights the fact that this is not a partisan issue. This is about who we are as Americans and what is in the best interests of our country.

Just like generations of immigrants before them, these incredible young people are vital to the well-being of our Nation. According to the Center for American Progress, each year, Dreamers contribute \$17.3 billion in Federal taxes and nearly \$9.7 billion in State and local taxes, and their households have \$75 billion in buying power.

Madam Speaker, we cannot afford to lose the Dreamers' talents and valuable contributions to our country. Let's make the dream a reality once and for all. I call on my colleagues to pass the Dream and Promise Act today.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I would inquire if my colleague has any more speakers.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, again, Republicans, too, want to have a DACA solution for the DACA recipients, but this bill isn't it, because it goes way above the DACA recipients and basically lets millions more people in, people who could be gang members, who have DUIs, and so on and so forth.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide for additional consideration of H.R. 3056 authored by Representative ROGERS.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

□ 1345

Mrs. LESKO. H.R. 3056, the bill, provides \$4.5 billion in funding to address the immediate humanitarian crisis we have on the southern border. It includes \$3.3 billion for humanitarian assistance, including shelter capacity for unaccompanied children, care for children in custody, and transportation for safe and efficient border processing centers.

It also includes \$1.1 billion for operational support, including personnel, transportation, and resources to combat human trafficking and drug trafficking—very serious issues.

It also includes \$178 million for technology upgrades and law enforcement pay adjustments to respond to this great influx of families coming from Central America to our border.

The Democrats today are waiving all the rules to spend \$35 billion on their, I call, amnesty bill, but they have chosen to ignore the humanitarian crisis that is happening right now on our southern border. H.R. 3056 takes steps to resolve that problem.

Madam Speaker, in closing, it is critical that we develop and implement a solution to the crisis at our southern border immediately. I am from Arizona. There is a crisis at our border. Instead, H.R. 6 is just another political messaging bill because my colleagues know it is not going anywhere.

Madam Speaker, I urge "no" on the previous question, "no" on the underlying message, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I wish to remind them what the President said after terminating DACA and ending TPS for hundreds of thousands of immigrants: "It is now time for Congress to act." And today, we are acting.

We are in the midst of the longest probationary period for citizenship and

permanent status in American history. But today, we are finally providing real solutions for Dreamers, TPS recipients, and DED beneficiaries.

We are providing solutions for people like Maria Moreno, who came to the United States as a child and is a constituent of mine. She is now a 22-year-old anthropology student at Florida International University and currently working at HistoryMiami Museum.

She has spent her life focused on her education. Now, as she pursues her career as an anthropologist, she continues to find ways to make changes within her community. She is a tutor for local kids, empowering them to find joy in learning.

To say that Maria is not worthy of permanent legal status is cruel and unjust. She is just as American as you and I.

And Maria is just one of millions of Dreamers who cherishes the American Dream. They work hard and believe in a country that has been shamefully slow in recognizing their worth.

Despite all the hardship we have put them through, like the newcomers before them, they still believe in our country's commitment to opportunity and fairness.

Today, the Dreamers, Madam Speaker, are one step closer to getting their dream. Today, the Dreamers, Madam Speaker, are one House closer to getting their dream.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

Mr. WOMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 415, a rule providing for House consideration of H.R. 6, the American Dream and Promise Act of 2019.

According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), H.R. 6 increases the deficit by at least \$30 billion over ten years. CBO indicates that this is additional mandatory spending. Under current projections, mandatory spending is set to increase from 69 percent to 78 percent of the federal budget over the next decade. Adding to this already unsustainable projected growth, mandatory spending threatens to crowd out necessary spending on defense, homeland security, veterans, infrastructure, public health, education, and other discretionary priorities. Absent the waiver made by this rule, H.R. 6 would be vulnerable to a PAYGO point of order.

The rule providing for consideration of H.R. 6 waives all points of order against the bill, including clause 10 of rule XXI, the House PAYGO, or "Pay-As-You-Go," rule, which requires any legislation increasing the deficit to be offset with spending cuts or tax increases.

Unsurprisingly, this rule was met with strong objections at the start of the 116th Congress by many progressive lawmakers who viewed PAYGO as an impediment to costly proposals such as the "Green New Deal" and "Medicare-for-All," which is projected to cost at least \$32 trillion on top of what the federal government is already spending. After much debate, the PAYGO rule was adopted by the new House majority on January 3, the first day of the 116th Congress. Immediately after this new House rule was adopted, a number of stories circulated in the press indicating that my colleagues in the Democratic Leadership

intended to waive the PAYGO rule any time they needed to. In a sign of more division on that side of the aisle, Democrats introduced bills to repeal the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act, even though they had just voted for PAYGO in the House rules package.

From a budget enforcement perspective, it's clear Democrats continue to circumvent their own rules. I hope this waiver does not continue the practice that the House PAYGO rule will be waived by the House Rules Committee whenever a bill is non-compliant, feels inconvenient, or stands in the way of advancing their costly agenda.

I oppose the rule for H.R. 6, since it enables a fiscally irresponsible bill to move forward without following House rules. Budget enforcement should be an important priority of the House Budget Committee. I hope the House will limit the extent to which future legislation increases already unsustainable budget deficits.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 415

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3056) to provide supplemental appropriations relating to border security, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Clause 2(e) of rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3056.

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Agreeing to House Resolution 415, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 192, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

YEAS—228

Adams	Garcia (TX)	Norcross
Aguilar	Golden	O'Halleran
Allred	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Axne	Gonzalez (TX)	Pallone
Barragán	Gottheimer	Panetta
Bass	Green (TX)	Pappas
Beatty	Grijalva	Pascrell
Bera	Haaland	Payne
Beyer	Harder (CA)	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Peters
Blumenauer	Heck	Peterson
Blunt Rochester	Higgins (NY)	Phillips
Bonamici	Hill (CA)	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan	Himes	Pocan
F.	Horn, Kendra S.	Porter
Brindisi	Horsford	Pressley
Brown (MD)	Houlahan	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Quigley
Bustos	Huffman	Raskin
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Carbajal	Jayapal	Richmond
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Cartwright	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Case	Kaptur	Ruiz
Casten (IL)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ryan
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Sánchez
Cicilline	Kildee	Sarbantes
Cisneros	Kilmer	Scanlon
Clark (MA)	Kim	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schiff
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schrader
Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Schrier
Connolly	Lamb	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Langevin	Scott, David
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Costa	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lawrence	Shalala
Cox (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Sherrill
Craig	Lee (CA)	Sires
Crist	Lee (NV)	Slotkin
Crow	Levin (CA)	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Levin (MI)	Soto
Cummings	Lewis	Spanberger
Cunningham	Lieu, Ted	Speier
Davids (KS)	Lipinski	Stanton
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Stevens
Davis, Danny K.	Lofgren	Suozyi
Dean	Lowenthal	Takano
DeFazio	Lowe y	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Luján	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Luria	Titus
DelBene	Lynch	Tlaib
Delgado	Malinowski	Tonko
Demings	Maloney,	Torres (CA)
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Torres Small
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	(NM)
Dingell	Matsui	Trahan
Doggett	McAdams	Trone
Doyle, Michael	McBath	Underwood
F.	McCollum	Van Drew
Engel	McEachin	Vargas
Escobar	McGovern	Veasey
Eshoo	McNerney	Vela
Espallat	Meeks	Velázquez
Evans	Meng	Visclosky
Finkenauer	Moore	Wasserman
Fletcher	Morelle	Schultz
Foster	Moulton	Waters
Frankel	Mucarsel-Powell	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Murphy	Welch
Gabbard	Nadler	Wexton
Gallego	Napolitano	Wild
Garamendi	Neal	Yarmuth
Garcia (IL)	Neguse	

NAYS—192

Abraham	Baird	Brady
Aderholt	Balderson	Brooks (AL)
Allen	Banks	Brooks (IN)
Amash	Barr	Buchanan
Amodel	Bergman	Buck
Armstrong	Biggs	Bucshon
Arrington	Bilirakis	Budd
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Burchett
Bacon	Bost	Burgess

Byrne	Holding	Riggleman	[Roll No. 236]	Fitzpatrick	Kustoff (TN)	Rouzer
Calvert	Hollingsworth	Roby	YEAS—219	Fleischmann	LaHood	Roy
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Rodgers (WA)		Flores	LaMalfa	Rutherford
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Roe, David P.	Adams	Fortenberry	Lamborn	Scalise
Chabot	Hunter	Rogers (AL)	Aguilar	Foxx (NC)	Latta	Schweikert
Cheney	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)	Allred	Fulcher	Lesko	Scott, Austin
Cline	Johnson (LA)	Rooney (FL)	Axne	Gaetz	Long	Sensenbrenner
Cloud	Johnson (OH)	Rose, John W.	Barragán	Gallagher	Loudermilk	Shimkus
Cole	Johnson (SD)	Rouzer	Bass	Gianforte	Lucas	Simpson
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Roy	Beatty	Gibbs	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Collins (NY)	Joyce (OH)	Rutherford	Bera	Gohmert	Malinowski	Smith (NE)
Comer	Joyce (PA)	Scalise	Beyer	Golden	Marchant	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	Katko	Schweikert	Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez (OH)	Marshall	Smucker
Cook	Keller	Scott, Austin	Blumenauer	Gooden	Massie	Spano
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Sensenbrenner	Blunt Rochester	Gosar	Mast	Stauber
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Shimkus	Bonamici	Granger	McAdams	Stefanik
Curtis	King (IA)	Simpson	Boyle, Brendan F.	Graves (GA)	McCarthy	Steil
Davidson (OH)	King (NY)	Smith (MO)	Brown (MD)	Graves (LA)	McCaul	Steube
Davis, Rodney	Kinzing	Smith (NE)	Brownley (CA)	Graves (MO)	McClintock	Stewart
DesJarlais	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NJ)	Bustos	Griffith	McHenry	Stivers
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Smucker	Butterfield	Grothman	McKinley	Taylor
Duffy	Lamborn	Spano	Carbajal	Guest	Meadows	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	Latta	Stauber	Cardenas	Guthrie	Meuser	Thornberry
Dunn	Lesko	Stefanik	Johnson (GA)	Hagedorn	Miller	Timmons
Emmer	Long	Steil	Johnson (TX)	Harris	Mitchell	Tipton
Estes	Loudermilk	Steube	Carson (IN)	Hartzler	Moolenaar	Turner
Ferguson	Lucas	Stewart	Cartwright	Hice (GA)	Mooney (WV)	Underwood
Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer	Stivers	Case	Higgins (LA)	Newhouse	Upton
Fleischmann	Marchant	Taylor	Casten (IL)	Hill (AR)	Norman	Wagner
Flores	Marshall	Thompson (PA)	Castor (FL)	Holding	Nunes	Walberg
Fortenberry	Massie	Thornberry	Castro (TX)	Hollingsworth	Olson	Walden
Foxx (NC)	Mast	Timmons	Chu, Judy	Horn, Kendra S.	Palazzo	Walker
Fulcher	McCarthy	Tipton	Cicilline	Hudson	Palmer	Walorski
Gaetz	McCaul	Turner	Cisneros	Huizenga	Pence	Waltz
Gallagher	McClintock	Upton	Clark (MA)	Hunter	Perry	Watkins
Gianforte	McHenry	Wagner	Clarke (NY)	Hurd (TX)	Peters	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	McKinley	Walberg	Clay	Johnson (LA)	Posey	Webster (FL)
Gohmert	Meadows	Walden	Cleaver	Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe	Wenstrup
Gonzalez (OH)	Meuser	Walker	Cohen	Johnson (SD)	Reed	Westerman
Gooden	Miller	Walorski	Connolly	Jordan	Reschenthaler	Williams
Gosar	Mitchell	Waltz	Cooper	Joyce (OH)	Rice (SC)	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Moolenaar	Watkins	Correa	Joyce (PA)	Riggleman	Wittman
Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)	Weber (TX)	Costa	Katko	Roby	Womack
Graves (LA)	Newhouse	Webster (FL)	Courtney	Keller	Rodgers (WA)	Woodall
Graves (MO)	Norman	Wenstrup	Cox (CA)	Kelly (MS)	Roe, David P.	Wright
Griffith	Nunes	Westerman	Craig	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)	Yoho
Grothman	Olson	Williams	Crist	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)	Young
Guest	Palazzo	Wilson (SC)	Crow	King (NY)	Rooney (FL)	Zeldin
Guthrie	Palmer	Wittman	Cuellar	Kinzing	Rose, John W.	
Hagedorn	Pence	Womack	Cummings			
Harris	Perry	Woodall	Lieu, Ted			
Hartzler	Posey	Wright	Lipinski			
Hice (GA)	Ratcliffe	Yoho	Loeb			
Higgins (LA)	Reschenthaler	Young	Loeb			
Hill (AR)	Rice (SC)	Zeldin	Davis, Danny K.			

NOT VOTING—12

Clyburn
Green (TN)
Hastings
Hern, Kevin

□ 1416

Messrs. JOYCE of Ohio and RUTHERFORD changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. NORCROSS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LAMALFA, Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 235.

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

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

Mrs. LESKO, Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 203, not voting 10, as follows:

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cardenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)

NAYS—203

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson

Garcia (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (VA)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McBath
McColum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeke
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross

NOT VOTING—10

Clyburn
Green (TN)
Hastings
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Mullin
Omar
Sherman
Swalwell (CA)
Wilson (FL)

□ 1426

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 203, answered “present” 2, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 237]

YEAS—212

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Banks
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bergman
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline