

care? Why don't we have the best education? And let's get down to business and start doing it.

Any questions for Members who are listening. www.speaker.gov/30something is our Web site. E-mail is 30SomethingDems@mail.house.gov.

And I have got to confess, I did not know your mom is Polish. I just figured you were 100 percent Irish.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. It is not a secret, Mr. RYAN. I am very proud of my Polish heritage. I'm glad that it has come out into the open this afternoon.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is now public.

And we yield back the balance of our time.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CLARKE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Welcome to the Speaker's chair and the gavel of the United States Congress. It is a big and important thing to serve in this place, and it is always an honor to walk down here on the floor. It is absolutely an honor to be seated there in the Speaker's chair that has seated so many esteemed colleagues on both sides of the aisle. And the kind of leadership that has come from there back through history, the halls and the floor here echo with their influence, and the destiny of America has absolutely been redirected by that seat and by that gavel, and will continue to do so. And I very much look forward to continuing to work in this capacity.

I come to the floor this afternoon, Madam Speaker, to raise an issue here and carry on a discussion that is the most intense discussion item across America. And I would challenge anyone to walk into a coffee shop or a place of work or anyplace where Americans gather to talk about the issues of the day, and you don't have to change the subject, just stop and listen, ask a question and see what comes up first. Maybe the weather, maybe a sports team.

But when it shakes down to it, Madam Speaker, and we have talked about all of the amenities and the niceties and the general discussion topics that don't have a lot of substance but carry on the day, in the end, in America we get down to one of two subjects, and that is either the global war on terror on which Iraq is a principle battleground, or it is immigration. And sometimes it is both.

And having just come back from another trip to the border last week about now a week ago, and having been

flush full of the things that I learned down there, I am compelled to come here to the floor, Madam Speaker, and raise the issue and begin to examine this subject and topic a little bit more.

We have now, for about 3 years, had an intense debate and discussion on immigration, and there are those of us here in this Chamber, in fact, this House of Representatives last fall voted to build a double fence/wall on the southern border, and laid out the distances, the locations and the distances from those locations. And, when calculated and totaled up, it becomes clear that Congress has mandated, the House and the Senate has mandated that there be 854 miles of at least double-walled fencing, a double fencing or a double fencing and wall constructed upon our southern border in priority areas, Madam Speaker. And last week, I went down to review some of the beginnings of that construction.

It also establishes a mandate that the Secretary of Homeland Security, Mr. Chertoff, will establish interlocking cameras and other technology along the border, and he has until May 31 of this year to complete the construction of the interlocking technology according to authorization of the Secure Fence Act, and another year to complete the construction of the double fencing and that 854 miles of that priority area. And then, with the exception of an area at Laredo that is 15 miles, that are 15 miles of either side of Laredo, and that those 15 miles can be constructed in the 2008 construction season on up until December 30 of 2008, that is the congressional mandate, Madam Speaker.

That is the mandate that was passed by a significant majority here in the House of Representatives, and a mandate that was passed by a vote that I do remember in the Senate that was 80-19. It was bipartisan, obviously. It had very solid support. And the reason that it had such solid support is this physical barrier that is mandated by Congress and signed by the President, bipartisan mandate, House and Senate, Madam Speaker; these physical barriers or these pairs of physical barriers, double fencing and walls, are something that is not an administrative decision; it is not something that is necessarily prone to human failure or human error or human lack of will to enforce. If you put those barriers in there, they are going to do some good regardless of whether there is anyone there that is maintaining and manning and guarding them or not, which, of course, we need to do.

And any kind of a structure that we put in place must be maintained, it must be guarded, it must be manned. It needs to have sensors on it. But these barriers will allow our Border Patrol officers and other backup enforcement officers that we have to be able to respond in a more effective fashion. And if they are going to defeat the barriers, it will take time to do that. And if they trip the sensors, and they should,

that will give our Border Patrol officers an opportunity to descend upon that site and make the kind of arrests that are necessary so that the word gets out that there are areas of this border at least that you had better not try to cross.

Now, this area in San Luis, Arizona is just south of Yuma. It is a community on the U.S. side that is as far southwest as you can get on the border in Arizona. This is a location that has had some rather permanent steel wall right on the border that has been there for some time, and we have added to that. Now, this permanent steel wall, this is a steel landing mat, interlocking landing mat that is welded together along that border, is being extended in both directions from San Luis. And I reflect also in hearing the remark from the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) that we need some 200,000 welders by the year 2010 or 2012, I forget which exact year that was.

I have heard those kinds of cries for help before, and I have lived through those deadlines, and we always seem to come up with the number of people we need to do the job that is necessary. One of the things we do is we just simply pay people what it is worth and they show up to do the job. But if they are short about 6 or 7 welders in 2010, they can get ahold of Secretary Chertoff who picked up a welder down there and welded some of that steel wall together right on the border of San Luis, Arizona. And that also was the case with Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON, Senator BEN NELSON, Congressman MIKE PENCE. And I am not sure, that is the ones that I saw, there were probably others that also lended a hand, as I did, to weld some of that fencing and wall together. It was more symbolic than production, but symbolism does matter in this business, and it helps encourage the people that are down there building those barriers.

And particularly, our National Guard that are down on the border, approaching 6,000 strong, they freed up at least 500 on-line slots for Border Patrol agents that can be up-front patrolling. And they are constructing fence and wall with the time that they have down there on the border. Their morale seems to be good. They act like they believe in their mission. I believe in their mission. I am encouraged by the fact that they are there, hands on, building, constructing, putting barriers in place, because this Congress mandated and the President signed, however unenthusiastically, he did sign the authorization of the Secure Fence Act that mandates 854 miles of double fence wall on our border.

And then, after the mandate and the authorization, the authorization which is the mandate, then we heard continually from the critics across the country, well, you will never fund it. And if you never fund it, then it will never be built. So it was only, the allegation that it was only the part of Congress to just simply make a promise that we

didn't intend to fulfill. And I heard that criticism all the way through the campaign season to November 7 and all the way beyond that well into December, and I have heard smatterings of it since then and questions that come from the media. And at some point last month, Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER, who is the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee and former chairman, and a real leader on this fence on the border, and I and several others, did a press conference. Actually, it was DUNCAN HUNTER and myself on that particular press conference. And we talked about how this fence will be built and needs to be built and must be built, and it is a congressional mandate.

And I pointed to the line item in the appropriations bill that funds the Department of Homeland Security, and their overall appropriation is 34 point something billion dollars. And in that 34 point something billion dollars is a line item for double fence and wall and the technology that goes with it, the interlocking cameras and the other devices, and some of them now are ground based radar, funding for all of that to the tune of \$1,187,000,000 and change.

Now, that is the line item that has been appropriated. That money goes to only one thing, and that is securing our border with either technology or fence, and then the necessary support that it takes to get that done.

We followed through, we mandated 854 miles of fence and wall, double, and we have appropriated \$1,187,000,000. Now that is probably not enough to complete the whole 854 miles, but, Madam Speaker, it is a great start. And we have given a great start here in Congress and created this inertia and provided the mandate, and now the Department of Homeland Security working with the National Guard has got a beginning.

I won't say they have a great start or that they have even a good start, but they have a beginning. And it is great to have a beginning. We are able to do hands-on on the beginning. It is a triple fence there south of Yuma in San Luis.

So as I ask the question, Madam Speaker, of how effective are these barriers that we are putting here in place, the answer that I get back down there is: In that area they had interdicted 2 years ago 138,000 illegal border crossers in that area. And, since October, they had interdicted 15,000. Now, that is not quite apples to apples. You have to calculate it out so much per month, but you get the idea that it has been about two-thirds effective at this point. And as I ask the question, has anyone come through the area where we have this triple fence, this 12-foot high steel wall made out of landing mat steel, the 16-foot high steel mesh wall. And that is about 100 feet apart, and then as you come into the United States going north, then there is a 10-foot high chain-link fence like a school play-

ground fence with about three or four bars on top, barbwire. Shorthand in Iowa as barbs.

And there, they said that maybe about three people had gotten through that area. And upon further questioning, one or two through the waterway, one or so around the end. Had anybody defeated the area where it is triple fencing? And the answer was, they will defeat anything we build. They will find a way to get over, under, or through it. And, of course, then the follow-up question is: Has anyone defeated it yet, this fence we are looking at? And the answer is no. To date, no one has gone over, under, or through the triple fencing that is constructed there south of Yuma at San Luis.

Now, I would like to hold that record intact. I don't know that we will be able to hold it intact, but I think it is important to note that that fencing has not been defeated yet. And, that as long as illegal border crossers have an option to go someplace else to go around, they are not going to try to go over, under, or through. And that will be the case as long as we have a fence that doesn't extend the full length of the border. Now, it is possible for us to supplement those areas where there isn't a lot of concentration of pressure on the border with technology, with ground-based radar, with interlocking cameras, with a quick response force, with teams that can go out and pick people up in the deserts that have 25 miles to walk to get anywhere where they can pick up any transportation mode once they get across the border. So we can use some of those kinds of methods, too, until it becomes inefficient in that approach and we have to go back to extending the fence, extend the wall, give the people on the ground some tools to work with.

But continually, Madam Speaker, I get this answer when I ask our Border Patrol about the effectiveness of structures like fences and walls, and that they need more boots on the ground. And the answer is always: Whatever you will do to fencing, there are places where we need to do it in urban areas. We don't need to do it in rural areas. This is their answer. And, we always need more boots on the ground. That is the answer. The answer really isn't to build structure or to build wall.

□ 1700

Well, I take issue with that philosophy, and I do so because of looking at it from a bit of a different perspective. That bit of a different perspective comes along like this. If we were to award contracts to companies and pay them according to the level of efficiency of being able to stop all human traffic coming across their sector of the border, stop all contraband from coming across their sector of the border, force all products, all contraband, all people, legal or illegal, through the ports of entry, that is our objective. That is what the laws that are established here in this Congress are about

is forcing all that traffic through the ports of entry.

In fact, that is what the law presumes that they go through a port of entry. So anything we do to direct traffic through the port of entry is the right thing to do. It has been a piece of wisdom for this country for a long, long time, well over 100 years. Yet we have people that argue well, no, we should just leave the border open, leave it unmarked. I plead sometimes, can't we at least string up a number 9 wire and mark the border, so if you are out in the desert you don't wander across into another country.

There are miles and miles and miles of our southern border that are not marked in any way whatsoever, not a wire, not a post, not a fence are not a road, not a wall, certainly, and not a double fence, and not a virtual fence, virtually nothing is there. In fact, literally nothing is there.

If you go into some areas of New Mexico, when they laid out the border, the border is marked by a concrete pylon that is about 5 feet high, poured on a base, about this big square, 5 feet high, tapers up, and has a little insignia on it that says this is a border. That concrete pylon will be standing on a ridge line, and then if you look way down the border, you probably cannot see it from the naked eye, miles away. Over on the next ridge line will be another concrete pylon, and that is another mark for the border.

I will say that I think many people have crossed through that area and never known that there was a mark for the border because they didn't know where to look. These pylons, these markers were set up back in those old days with an old brass transit, with whatever power they had to set the cross hairs up, dial it in and look down range and then give the motion to the fellow on the other end, who did not have a walkie-talkie, did not have much optical equipment, but simply hand signals.

Go ahead, drive your stake in here. We will put the pylon there. That is good enough for this border. But that is all we marked it with, is just concrete pylons from ridge line to ridge line, and there is not a barrier, obviously.

So, if I were a contractor, and I were given the job to, say, guard 10 miles of border, and if the benchmark are for the amount of money that I would be paid for that job would be the amount that we are spending on the border today, that being \$8 billion to protect our southern border, and that amounts to \$4 million a mile, let's just say I were in the business of guaranteeing border security for 10 miles across the desert, and I went in and bid that at the going rate of \$4 million a mile.

Well, that would mean the Federal Government would pay me \$40 million a year to guard that 10 miles of border. Now, what would a rational person do if that were their job to get 100 percent efficiency? If they had a contract, the

amount of that contract would be deducted by the number of failures that you have?

Let's just say the average crossing of interdictions last year across our southern border, 1,188,000. I mean, that was the number reported by the Border Patrol of border interdictions, that many fingerprinted and returned back to their home countries. Perhaps 155,000 of them were other than Mexicans. Most of the rest were returned back to Mexico.

That many fingerprinted, you could divide that out, and I have not done the math. But you could figure out how many came through each mile on average, and then determine that if your mile was successful, we are going to pay you at your \$4 million. Or if your 10 miles were successful, we will pay you at your \$4 million a mile. If you didn't let anybody through, you are going to get to keep the whole \$40 million, this year, next year, every year that you have the contract.

We would be getting far more for our money than we are getting today for the \$4 million a mile that we are paying and the \$8 billion that it costs us to guard that southern border. I can tell you that I would go down, and I would bid my 10 miles or whatever link it was that I thought I could manage and handle.

Then I would look at my contract for \$40 million, and I would think, you know, for about \$1.2 million a mile, I could build a concrete wall on here. I could put double fencing in. Maybe by the time I added interlocking cameras and some sensors and some interlocking ground radar, I may be even up to even \$2 million a mile to build my double-wall fence with interlocking cameras and sensors. Now what do I have to do to make sure that no one gets through my 10 miles of border?

I would simply have to sit back and watch my monitors, have somebody that is out there ready to respond if anybody does get through, but monitor the situation, and we can monitor into Mexico. We can monitor when they get over, if they should get over the wall, in the United States, and do a quick response and interdiction.

I don't think you are going to spend a lot of money out of the remaining \$30-some million. I may have to back up here, for 10 miles, if you built 10 miles, and you invest it all together up to \$2 million a mile, then you have \$20 million invested in that 10 miles. But you have a \$40 million contract every year.

Then you have got \$20 million to work with in order to hire personnel to drive around in Humvees and react, respond, interdict. I would submit that you could hire a helicopter for that 10 miles and do that if you needed to guard it that way. There is plenty of money left over to apply the labor and the patrolling and the maintenance for the fencing that would be necessary.

In fact, it would be minimal. It would be minimal. It would take far less

labor, far less manpower, far less equipment, to monitor a border that has sealed barriers, barriers. Some of those barriers, to date, have not been breached by anyone.

That is far more effective than simply an open desert that will allow people to run through, drive through, ride through on a motorcycle or a horse or a donkey or a Humvee or an ATV or walk or run, daylight or dark, winter, well, not much winter down there, but in rain, when it rains, or in a sandstorm when the wind blows. I will be far more effective to put the barrier in place.

Yet when I ask the question of the Border Patrol, be it the union or be it the representatives of the Border Patrol and the administration themselves, their answer always is, we can take some structures like some fences in urban areas, because that gives us more time to react when they jump the fence, but it is going to take more boots on the ground.

I have tried and tried in hearings to ask the question in a way that I can get an objective answer, what do we have to do so it takes fewer boots on the ground? I will pose this question this way, and that is, if we created an impermeable curtain that could not be cut, it could not be torn, it could not be penetrated, but a magic kryptonite impermeable curtain that would go from all the way up to the heavens all the way down to hell, and all the way, 2,000 miles from San Diego to Brownsville, if we could hang that there on the border, couldn't be penetrated, couldn't be cut, couldn't be gone over, and it couldn't be dug under, how many Border Patrol would it take then to patrol the border? I would submit that answer then becomes none except for any place where we would have ports of entry.

I hope I have illustrated the logic of why we need to build a fence and a wall. This Congress understands it. They voted overwhelmingly to support it here in the House of Representatives just a few months ago, and the Senate, as slow as they are, to be proactive. As much as they like to let the hot coffee cool in the saucer of the Senate, they also moved, and three times they had votes on the floor last year to put a fence on the southern border. My very liberal Iowa Senate counterpart three times voted to put a fence on the border, and that vote in the Senate was 80-19.

Yet I am watching the undermining that is taking place on the part of, to some degree, the administration. Also the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee is using his chairmanship to undermine current law. I am watching the undermining that goes on the part of some of the Democrat candidates for the presidency and people who essentially don't appear to believe in American sovereignty.

Well, something that we need to simply know in America is that you have to make a decision if you are going to

be a nation. If you are going to be a nation, and I will submit that over the last 200 years, the most successful institution of government has been the nation state. Can you imagine going to something other than the nation state?

Can you imagine going to the city states that we had at the beginning of the industrial revolution when Machiavelli wrote his books, and when the cities became the center point of government and control, and everything revolved around the cities? What happened was that common languages sprung up, and they began to be formed and shaped by the people that had trade in commerce and travel in a common region. As the languages defined themselves, the borders of the nations also defined themselves along the lines of language.

There came from that, the nation states, a common belief, a common history, a common form of communications currency, language, tied people together. They voluntarily moved together and established the nation states. Of course, the nation states have changed and shifted over time.

We have tried to create unnatural nation states. Yet here in America, we came together in these 50 States of the Nation State of the United States of America, and we are unique in all of history. We are unique because what we have done is we have welcomed people from all over the world.

Let me point out that we continually hear the statement America is a nation of immigrants, and it is stated to us over and over again, as if because we are a nation of immigrants, then therefore we cannot have a rational immigration policy that is designed to enhance the economic, the social and the cultural well-being of the United States of America.

No, we simply have to open our borders, because immigrants came here and helped build America. If some is good, more is better. If some from anywhere is good, more from anywhere is better. That seems to be the logic and the rationale.

I would submit there is a lot more to building an American exceptionalism than simply saying we are a nation of immigrants and that is all we need to know about this subject matter. No, this is a very deep, very complicated subject matter that ties together everything we know about history, everything we know about human nature, everything we know about sociology and biology, and the common sense of geographical origins that come along, and the commonalities of language, common interests, those things all tie us together.

But what we have done here in America, founded a nation upon the rule of law, perhaps I will get to that a little bit later.

But we are tied together by a common language. That is something that is not unique to the United States, a common language has defined nation states from the beginning. When we get

away from the common language that fractures the nation state, and you become squabbling minorities that are bickering against each other, forming and shaping ourselves in ethnic enclaves and pitted against each other because one side of this aisle believes in rights of group rights and victimhood.

The other side of the aisle over here believes in individual rights and personal responsibility and the commonalities of equal justice under the law.

But the things that tie us together are a common history, common experiences, common goals, a common cause. But we couldn't understand those things if we didn't have a common language. This great experiment of America has been founded upon a common language. This common language ties us together.

Then as we look across the vitality that we have within this country, this American exceptionalism that I mentioned a little bit earlier, you would be thinking in terms of where did this American exceptionalism come from? Why do we have it here, and why is that vitality nonexistent in many of the other countries that were donor countries to the United States in the form of the immigrants that they sent to us over the years, over the 200 to 300 years that we have received, accepted and welcomed immigrants into America?

I would look back at that and think about my oldest ancestor that we can trace back, at least on my mother's side of the family. One of them would have been a gentleman by the name of Samuel Powell who came here, and he was a Welshman who came over here in 1757 to become an indentured servant.

He landed in Baltimore. He had nothing. He pledged to work for 7 years to work off his passage to the United States. So he worked in the stables to work off his passage. This gentleman was kicked by a horse, crippled for life. We know that as there is a little hardbound book about it.

Still, through the course of his lifetime, he was the father of 17 children, and those descendants fanned out across the country, and they added to the vitality of America, as many of the children of immigrants and the children of immigrants have.

But there was something in the vitality of Samuel Powell, that vitality that is a component that exists within many, many of, and I will say most of, and perhaps almost all of those who come to America. That vitality gives them the courage and the confidence, the fortitude and the adventuresome spirit to get on a ship with everything that they have, mortgage their future for their passage, and come here to reach for their dreams in the United States of America.

That vitality that gave them that courage and that confidence, that boldness of spirit was like a filter that skimmed the vitality off of the other civilizations and cultures around the

world. As they got out of Ireland and Sweden and out of Germany and out of Italy, and as they came from other places around the globe and came here, and certainly out of Scotland and England as well, and this goes back to our history 100 years ago, as they came over here, they brought that vitality with them. Often we saw that vitality within them, and we identified that as a national characteristic that came from the country that they came from.

□ 1715

One of the questions that I ask in my district, I have a wonderful Dutch region in the northwestern part of my district there in Iowa, and it is idyllic communities that are the best combination that anyone could ask for, the absolutely ideal combination of churches to banks to bars in a community. Plenty of churches and a lot of capital in the banks and just a few bars, not hardly any. And their quality of life, and it is strong, and the young children grow up and they expect to build their future in those communities. They are not taking that diploma and going somewhere else in the world to cash it in for the biggest paycheck they can get. Some do. Many come home. Many stay home, rebuild and build their lives there and have their children there, raise their parents' grandchildren right there within the same neighborhood. That is an ideal circumstance that they have.

And I ask them, how is it that you have got such ideal communities here in the Dutch areas of Iowa, and I go over to Holland, and there they have abortion on demand, euthanasia, they have prostitution, they have legalized drugs. They have one of the most liberal countries in the world, one of the most permissive, but yet one of the most closed societies in the world where you could never go over there and become a Dutchman. And yet so many things that they do permit in that very liberal society are things that we would reject in our communities, and I have listed some of them. Why is it then that we have such a wholesome, rich community in an area that I have described in western Iowa, and we have the different environment in Holland entirely, and especially in the communities like Amsterdam? And their answer to me, with only a little bit of sense of irony is, well, the good Dutch came here.

And, Mr. Speaker, I tell this story because it identifies the source of American exceptionalism. The good Dutch came here. So did the good English, so did the good Spanish, so did the good French, so did the good Norwegians and Swedes and Germans and Irish and all the way down the line. Western Europe were the first big donors to this American society that we have here. And we have also picked up a significant amount of exceptionalism and vitality from our neighbors to the south.

And so I want to point this out and emphasize in a very serious way how

important it is that we be smart and we be careful with our immigration policy and understand that we are defining an immigration policy that should enhance our economic, our social and our cultural well-being here in the United States of America in a selfish way. Any nation state should have that kind of an immigration policy. It should be promoting them. They should be building their future, whatever country they might be.

We need to do it here. We need to set this American destiny on a glide path that soars way beyond the aspirations that I hear here in this place and that I even hear out in the streets of America where there is more optimism than there is here in this Congress, Mr. Speaker. We need to set our destiny and control it from here, and we have got to have a vision, we have got to have a dream, and we need to understand the foundations of what has made us great as a Nation. And we need to be looking for new things, new principles, new ideas, new tools that might, just might, supplement the time-honored tradition and principles and tools that were gifted to us from God through our Founding Fathers that are the foundation of this great Nation.

But American exceptionalism is one of them. The foundation of the rule of law is another one, Mr. Speaker. And in spite of all of the things that we read about in our history and so much of the glorious past and some of the marginal, shameful events that took place in our history, this Nation has been a Nation that has been grounded on, built upon, rooted in and a pillar of which is the rule of law. The rule of law is sacrosanct in America. And when we set aside the rule of law, it diminishes us all. It erodes everyone's constitutional rights when someone else is given a pass by the law. And so if we are allowed to drive down the highway at 70 miles an hour in a 55-mile-an-hour zone, and if we pass the Highway Patrol, and even if they happen to pull us over and they say, well, you know, everybody breaks the law, so I am not going to write you up on this 70 in a 55 zone, then pretty soon everybody drives 70, and they will push it up to 75. If they don't get a ticket at 75, then they may go 80. They will drive as fast as they can until they get scared. Then they will slow down a little. That is human nature, and we have known that from the studies on our highways. But too low a speed limit breeds contempt for the rule of law, but enforcement of any speed limit breeds respect for the rule of law.

The same is so with our immigration laws, Mr. Speaker, if we have immigration laws that are not enforced, or the foundation of this rule of law is it applies to everyone equally. So if our immigration laws are not enforced equally to all people in this country, then also it breeds contempt for the law. And if we allow the contempt for the law to be bred, then it undermines the

rule of law, it undermines this Constitution, and it weakens the rights of individuals.

This Constitution I carry in my pocket all days. I have sworn to uphold this Constitution, and I will do so. It is an oath that I take seriously, and, in fact, in spite of some of the news that has come down here, that we don't swear in to the new Congress on the Bible, some of us do bring our Bible down here and do swear in on the Bible, and we take that seriously, as did George Washington. And some of us, in fact, all of us, should add "so help me God" when we take that oath.

But this Constitution is the foundation for our law. And, in fact, it is the descendant of the Declaration of Independence, the foundation for our law. It is the framework of justice in America writ large. It is the framework of government in America writ large. And we need to adhere to the language that is here and the intent that is here and the original text that is here in this Constitution, Mr. Speaker.

And I continue to intend to do that, and I am sworn to uphold this rule of law. And so when I go back to my district, and we have had a finally, at long last, a Department of Homeland Security raid on some of the meat packing around my neighborhood, within the adjoining States and within the State of Iowa, and about 1,282 individuals were picked up and loaded up, and charges were brought against many of them for immigration violations and also for fraudulent documents and document theft. When that happens, and there were truckloads of hogs that were stacked up waiting to go into the packing plant, and there wasn't enough labor there, and actually the plants were temporarily shut down. The hogs had to stay on the trucks. There were a few that were lost. Most were not so badly treated. That is one of the elements we don't talk about so much. But also families were affected, children were affected, and we have debated across that.

But when I go before the pork producers and they say, we need to have people in these packing plants to process our livestock, we have got to have a market for the livestock that we raise, we have got to make sure that they can harvest on the days they are supposed to be, and that meat can be processed, packaged and delivered to the meat case so we have got a continuous supply and a continuous flow of our product, however urgent they sense that to be, however focused they are on the problem that is in front of them, and remember, people have a tendency to look at the world through their straw. It is rare for us to step back and look at the big picture and try to add up all the components, or look at the world through somebody else's eyes, let alone look at the world through everybody else's eyes if we would could possibly do that. And that is partly my job is to ask people to look at the world through somebody else's eyes.

And so as they say, we need that labor, we can't be shutting down plants because of illegal labor, we have got to find another solution, that is no solution. I ask them, point blank, I understand how important this is to your industry, but are you willing to sacrifice the rule of law in America to be sure that it is convenient, and that you don't have to go out and recruit for labor someplace other than outside the United States for people that will come into the plant?

Wouldn't you rather maybe pay a couple bucks more an hour and hire people that are already here, hire some of the 30 percent of America that are high school dropouts; hire some of the 69 million people in America that are simply not in the workforce, but are of working age?

We only have about 6.9 million working illegals in America, Mr. Speaker, and we have 69 million nonworking, not in the workforce, Americans. So wouldn't a logical Nation just look around and say, well, let's try and hire? First we would go hire some of those folks that are on unemployment. And we are not at a historically low unemployment level. That was 1.3 during World War II. And I recognize that was all hands on deck. But still we have quite a ways to go, and we can drop more than 3 points before we get down to the levels of unemployment that we had during World War II. But that is not enough to fill the gap. And if we take the people that are on welfare now and that are hireable, and maybe if that is half, and that might be a lot, you put those together with those that are unemployed. If you take the 4.4 percent unemployment and take that down to 1.3 percent, World War II levels, and then reach in and hire half of those that are on welfare and put them to work, you still don't have enough people there to replace the 6.9 million working illegal immigrants in the American workforce. But where you can find them is to go into the 69 million nonworking Americans that are not in the workforce, many of whom are presumably healthy and can be hired.

And the answer that I get when I propose that is, well, they aren't in the right place. They don't live where we need them. They are not sitting there next to the job. And so therefore, we should what? Let's go 2,000 or 3,000 miles away and go get some people out of a different country and bring them here, against the law, to replace the need for a workforce that you could replace if you just simply went someplace else in America and put some people in a car, on a bus, on a plane or on Amtrak and send them down there.

I mean, I can give you an example, Mr. Speaker. When the raid came in on the Swift and Company at Marshalltown, Iowa, and they picked up about 90 workers there, so presumably there were 90 jobs that were open at that moment, there was a couple, an African American couple, from down in

the Dallas area that loaded up and drove from Texas all the way up to Marshalltown, Iowa, went to the H.R. office at Swift and Company and said, we would like to have a job working here processing this meat. We drove a long ways to get here, and now we would like to resettle to Texas, to Marshalltown, middle of the winter, Texas to Marshalltown for those jobs.

That kind of answers the questions that there are jobs that Americans won't do. At least there is a personalized example of it, Mr. Speaker. And statistically there are many. But the argument that the people aren't in the right place doesn't hold up. In fact, the Okies weren't in the right place in the '30s, and they loaded up the things that they had, like the Clampetts in a way, and went on off to California and built the economy out there, and they must have been pretty good because the economy blossomed in California after the arrival of the Okies. And so people can be transferred for labor.

There was a mass migration from the American South to the industrial areas in the Northern States that took place also about that era. And I recall that as that migration took place, we saw concentrations of African Americans moving into the industrial cities. Detroit would be a good example of that. Cleveland would be another good example of that. They came and they took the jobs and went to work. They were good-paying jobs. They did their jobs, and they raised their families there. And some of those young people went off to college, became professionals and moved off. Others went back and went to work in the same plants that their parents did.

But I recall, Mr. Speaker, reading an article in the Des Moines Register some years ago. They had gone into Milwaukee and picked a 36-square-block neighborhood in Milwaukee, and it was a neighborhood that was totally inhabited by people or descendants of that migration from the gulf coast Mississippi area that came up into Milwaukee to take the brewery jobs that were good-paying jobs then. Now, that was back in the '30s, and now, by this time, oh, about the turn of the last millennia, I will say, maybe 1998 or '99, they surveyed those, every house in that 36-square-block area. There wasn't a single working head of household in all homes in that 36-block area. And the article was full of lament as to why government couldn't figure out a way to move some jobs up there to Milwaukee and establish those jobs close enough to the people that lived there that didn't have work that they could then have jobs again.

Well, how did government fail the people that are sitting in that 36-square-block area, 6 blocks by 6 blocks in Milwaukee? How did government fail was the focus of the article. And, Mr. Speaker, I will point out that government didn't fail. It never was government's job. It wasn't government that moved them from the gulf coast

up to Milwaukee in the '30s, and it wasn't government that moved the Okies from Oklahoma to California in the '30s. It was the promise of jobs that relocated people. They did it on their own.

I mean, after all, that is how the illegal immigrants got here, wasn't it? Billboards in Mexico. People migrated up and took the jobs. People move for jobs. I have done it. Many of us have done it. In fact, most of us have done it. And to imagine that Americans can't relocate to take a job is a pretty weak position to take if you are going to set the direction for the destiny of America.

But the rule of law, the rule of law is a pillar, it is a foundation, it is essential. And we are embroiled in a central debate here in America on this rule of law.

Now, the Senate will be introducing legislation next week that will be comprehensive immigration reform. That is White House language for we are going to take some people that are here, and we are going to give them the path to citizenship. And you are going to hear an argument and a debate about what is the right, the just, the true, the appropriate path for us as a Nation, a compassionate Nation, yes, a Nation that cares about all people, not just within the borders of the sovereign State of the United States of America. We care about the well-being of people all over the globe.

□ 1730

No Nation has been generous as the United States of America has been. We have provided more resources for more people. We have sacrificed more lives for liberty and freedom. We have poured more treasure out to the rest of the world than any nation in history by any model or comparison that anyone can create or come up with or convolute, for that matter. And yet we are being accused of being a cold hearted, unkind Nation because we have an obligation to control our borders so we can define ourselves as a Nation.

And I will argue that if we give amnesty to the people that have broken our laws and who are in violation of our laws and unlawfully present here on the soil of the United States, if we grant them amnesty, we have kicked aside the rule of law. We have knocked the pillar out, the foundational pillar, from underneath this great citadel of the United States of America. And if the rule of law is gone, what then holds up our values here?

What then supports this Constitution that I have put back in my pocket, Mr. Speaker? How do we argue ever again that there is a foundation that exists that we should adhere to the rule of law, that we should respect and protect and defend it, how could we, if this Congress granted amnesty to law breakers in America, gave them a free pass at the encouragement and behest of the White House and the administration, who are focused on this, at the

encouragement of the left wing liberals in the United States Senate that are advocating for open borders because they know they can count the masses of illegals whether they are here legally or not, whether they are ever allowed to vote or not, they know that it provides representation here on the floor of the United States Congress.

There are Members of this Congress that won't need more than 30,000 votes to be re-elected or elected to this Congress. They are the ones that represent districts that are full of illegal immigrants that are counted in the census for reapportionment purposes. So my 600,000 people, where it takes over 100,000 votes to get re-elected in my district even in a nonpresidential year, has less representation per capita, the citizens in my district have less representation per capita than the citizens in the districts that have high concentrations of illegal immigrant population, because we draw the lines around about 600,000 people.

And if there are 400,000 illegals in a single district, that means there are only 200,000 citizens. And if they go to the polls and register and vote, that means there might only be 50,000 of them that will actually vote that are of the age to vote and that will take the trouble to do so. That is a gross distortion of the intent of our Framers, and it is clearly a distortion of the concept of our Constitution and it is a distortion of the understanding of equal representation that the taxpayers and the citizens of America expect from us. We need to address that. But before we do that, we are going to need to address this amnesty issue, this amnesty question, that will be before the Senate shortly and expecting to come over here to the House some weeks or months after that.

What is amnesty, Mr. Speaker? Well, it is a simple question for a person from my perspective. If you have a law and the law exists and someone breaks that law, if you reduce or eliminate the penalty for the law that they have broken after the fact, you have provided them amnesty, whether you do it en masse in a group or whether you do it as an individual. I guess as an individual you could call it a pardon. I will say amnesty is a mass pardon for people who have violated an existing law for which there is an existing penalty, and if that penalty is eliminated or reduced, then that is amnesty.

Now, that is not a hard concept to understand. Something that I think the vast majority of the American people will understand. I am very confident that Ronald Reagan would have understood. He signed an amnesty bill in 1986. It was one of only about two or three times that that great man let me down. But at least he had the clarity and the conscience to say this is an amnesty bill. He called it an amnesty bill. He signed it, and he also said, and we expected, that there would be enforcement of existing laws. And what happened from 1986 was the enforce-

ment of existing laws diminished gradually over time to the point where in 2005 only three employers were sanctioned for hiring illegal employees. Only three.

Now, in this virtual world, I call that virtually no enforcement in the workplace. Virtually none. In fact, when I went down and welded on the fence, I really wanted a virtual welder and a virtual welding rod and a virtual hood so that I could weld some of that virtual fence that I think will only virtually stop people in the end if we don't have the manpower in there to do the job. And I think we have to put up literal barriers to get this done and we can't rely on virtual anything because we will virtually go through a lot of semantics, linguistic semantics, to be able to reach our political goals, but the subject matter and the efficiency is what we need to be after here, the rule of law.

Amnesty. There can be no amnesty, and that is where this fight will turn. That is where this debate will turn. That is where it is going to turn in the Senate, and I said last year that those that supported an amnesty bill will be marked with the scarlet letter "A" for "amnesty," and they will be held accountable by the voters in the ballot box. And the House and the Senate heard that call and the threat and the danger of those that came close to losing their jobs over there and the ones that are worried about it in 2008. And yet I heard we lost people here because they were for border control, and it is interesting to me that those couple of Members, only two that I can think of, were very strong on border security lost elections last fall. Their opponents, the ones who defeated them, also were advocating for strong border enforcement and employment enforcement in the workplace.

So I don't think there is a case that anyone lost an election because they were for border security. I think there were those that were jeopardized because they came late to the subject or they didn't understand the conviction of it. But most, if not all, made some commitment at some level that they are going to support it. Stop the bleeding at the border. Get it under control. Push all traffic through the ports of entry; all human traffic, legal and illegal; all product, both contraband and legal product, through the ports of entry we should support that in this Congress unequivocally.

There should be no effort to undermine that and there should be no effort to create a scenario by which we can turn a blind eye to illegal crossings on the border. That is something that is sacrosanct that all of us should agreed to. And I would challenge anyone to stand up now or later, and I would be happy to yield: Do you oppose the idea that we secure our borders and seal them so that all traffic will go through the ports of entry? If anybody wants to oppose that, I will be happy to yield. I don't think that is going to happen. That is number one.

Number two means we have got to enforce our employer sanctions, and employers have to understand that if they are going to knowingly and willfully hire illegals, then we are going to have to knowingly and willfully, with our enforcement mechanisms, go in there and punish the employers that have a business plan that is premised upon the hiring of illegal labor. And that happens all over this country.

I am watching it happen and it is permeating us more and more, and our resistance is breaking it down more and more. Do we have an amnesty plan for employers that are paying corporate income tax off the profits that they made off the backs of cheap labor at the expense of America's middle class? This middle class is forever shrinking because we are growing an upper class. The elitists believe they have a right to cheap labor, the servant class, as they see it, whether they admit it or not, and the growth of this lower class, this servant class that is coming.

No nation ever failed because of a lack of cheap labor. Can anybody look back at history and name a single nation that didn't have enough cheap labor; so their economy collapsed? I would say none. It has never happened in all of history. But many nations have descended into a squabbling cacophony of minorities that couldn't get along, that didn't have a sense of nationhood, didn't have a sense of common history, didn't have a common language, didn't have literacy skills or job skills but simply pulled the whole system down and put pressure on the social services.

The wait that is there, we are growing our lower class, that class that the elitists see as a servant class, and we are growing our upper class because of the prosperity that comes really from the Bush tax cuts that we have had for 2001 and 2003. And as this growth continues, the upper class grows, they think it is all to their credit. Now, they earned a lot of it. They got their education. They invested their money wisely. They worked hard and smart and they made money, and I am glad they are building their million dollar mansions. Maybe one day an older used one will be a good place for me to spend my retirement. I am happy for them.

And they will move out of a modest home so someone with a more modest income can move in there. It is a natural progression. But they have no right and essentially have no birth right to cheap labor to enrich them.

America has been about expanding the middle class, making it broader and making it more prosperous. And this immigration policy, or, I should say, a lack of enforcement on this immigration policy, is shrinking the middle class, compressing them so they can't make the upward mobility, and it is narrowing the middle class because these 30 percent of the high school dropouts that don't have a high school education and a greater percentage that don't have a college education as

a cumulative total at least, those people are dropping off into the lower class too.

And where are their opportunities, Mr. Speaker? Where do they go to get a job? How does someone with, say, my background, only the age of 17 or 18 or 19 or 20, get started in where my life has been, in the construction business? If I had walked out on the pipeline at age 19 and asked for a job to swamp on the bending crew so I could run 10 miles a day in the dust with a hard hat on my head and get thrown around on the end of a piece of pipe in August going through the cornfields, they wouldn't give a job to a kid today, some blue-eyed white kid that walked up there and wanted a job, because there would already be some people there who had arrived in the United States that were cheap illegal labor that would work cheaper and give them less trouble and those that wouldn't have a workers' comp claim because they would be afraid they would be deported. There wouldn't be an unemployment claim. They wouldn't be any unemployment, any workers' comp. There wouldn't be any lawsuits. They would either show up on time or somebody else would show up to take the job.

It is a lot less trouble to work with people that are living in the shadows because they are afraid that the spotlight will come on them. And so you have a meek, docile labor force, and an employer that is making a rational decision with his capital is going to go that route. And we have enabled it here in the United States of America, and now we have become dependent upon a pretty good size supply of illegal labor. And every day that goes by, another person, another company figures out a way to make some profit off of the illegal population that is here in the United States.

And I feel a little guilty that I sold my construction business to my oldest son because he has to compete against competitors who will be knowingly and willfully finding that avenue to hire that cheap illegal labor, and he has to find a way to be more efficient so he can compete against them because he is going to follow the law. I know he will follow the law. That is the way he is raised, that is the way he believes, and that is his conviction. Those that follow the law are at a disadvantage today because they are being undermined by people who premise their business on hiring illegal labor.

And here we come to the financial institutions that are issuing credit cards to people that don't have a Social Security number. What an outrageous thing, to see large banking companies decide they can find a way to turn a profit and undermine our immigration laws in the United States and essentially provide another avenue that is going to encourage people to continue to break the law, come here, stay here.

But amnesty, Mr. Speaker, is a central question that is before us. Will we

uphold the rule of law or will we kick the pillar out from underneath the United States of America? Will we stand on the principle of no amnesty no time for people who have come in here illegally that we will uphold the rule of law, we will enforce it? And the people who are going to advocate for amnesty, and it will be coming out of the Senate and it is coming to this floor in here in the House of Representatives sometime within the next few months, that path to amnesty needs to be a trail of tears.

And that is a trail of tears that needs to be created by people on the streets of America, in the homes, in the backyards, in the schools, in the churches, in the workplaces. They need to get on their phones. They need to get on their e-mail. They need to call their Members of Congress. They need to write letters to the editor. They need to call the talk radio shows, write articles and get them printed. They need to gin up their neighbors. They need to come to the streets and stand up for the rule of law and oppose amnesty and put that scarlet letter "A" for "amnesty" and brand those that stand up for amnesty here because if you stand for amnesty, you are opposed to the rule of law, and there is no other way to measure this.

And you can't say to someone you are going to go to the back of the line. They are not going to send them to the back of the line. That is not in the heart or the head of the White House. It is not going to happen. Those that are here illegally, the only way they could go to the back of the line would be to have to go back to their home country and get into the line behind the people that are legally in the line from their home country. No one has advocated that, Mr. Speaker. That is not going to happen. They don't want to disturb the lives of the people who came here to live in the shadows. They want to offer that they come out into the sunlight and grant them a path to citizenship. And if that isn't a blatant definition of amnesty, I have no idea what is.

But there is actual a serious discussion about we could make them pay a fine. We could penalize them by making them learn English.

Penalize them by making them learn English? I think that should be a privilege and a goal because that will give access to the American Dream. But if you are here as a criminal, and there is an objection to that term, but if people have come into the United States illegally, then they have violated a criminal misdemeanor for illegal border crossing, unlawful presence in the United States, and that is punishable by deportation. That is the punishment that needs to be there. There can't be anything less. And to have them pay a fine of \$1,500 when a coyote is going to charge \$2,000 to \$3,000 for a trip into the United States just says, well, the path to citizenship is for sale for \$1,500. If you can scratch up the scratch to do that, we can give you a path to citizenship.

And the United States Senate and a lot of the liberals here in the United States House would say, Fine. Here is your green card. Here is your path to citizenship. Forget about that part about breaking the law and getting your reward for breaking the law, but be a good citizen otherwise. How can anyone who is given a reward for breaking the law and gets to go to the front of the line, how can they respect the rule of law?

□ 1745

How can anyone who is given a reward for breaking the law and gets to go to the front of the line, how can they respect the rule of law? How can it be when you get stopped for speeding, if they give you a ticket to speed, or if you get arrested for robbing a bank and they say, well, okay, but we are going to give you amnesty, take the loot and go, be happy; but just forget that one time we didn't enforce the law on you, and so for now on respect the rule of law? Madam Speaker, it does not work that way. That is not the nature of humanity. Humanity is going to follow this path of least resistance; if they see an opening, they are going to go. And if they have an opportunity that we give them, that we grant them, they are going to take it.

And not only they will have contempt for the rule of law, a million back in 1986, that turned into 3 million because of the phony identification and the corruption in the Reagan amnesty, they and their descendants and their friends and their neighbors, almost all of them believe that amnesty is a good idea because they were the beneficiaries of amnesty; just like a bank robber that gets to keep the loot thinks robbing banks is a good idea and will go back and do it again if he runs out of money.

Now, think about doing that with 12 million or 20 million or, by the numbers that came out of the Senate the last time, 66.1 million would be legalized by the Senate version. That would be the cumulative total of all who were naturalized in the United States in all of our history.

I thank you for your focus, Mr. Speaker.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO ZIMBABWE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-16)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Alabama) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the

anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2007.

The crisis constituted by the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions has not been resolved. These actions and policies pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue this national emergency and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 28, 2007.

IMMIGRATION CONCERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was certainly listening to my friend express himself on important issues. I believe it is important for this floor and this Congress to really turn on the light and have a transparent government. And so I will attempt this evening to share some of my concerns as they relate to a number of issues that I believe we have both the interest of the American people in making it transparent in its debate, but also an obligation, in some instances, to even save lives.

First let me say that with all of the missteps on immigration issues, there is no route left for this Congress to take other than to begin a debate on comprehensive immigration reform, because until we get an orderliness with the individuals that are in this country and the securing of the border, all of the frustration will continue. And so I think it is the right step to make to save lives of those who would come into this country undocumented, fleeing for an economic opportunity; for the needs of the Border Patrol agents in the northern and southern border, what I consider to be a plus-up. Inasmuch as the support system provided by the National Guard has a time certain to end, we need to be constructive and look toward comprehensive immigration reform.

I want to add to that discussion what I think is an injustice that has occurred to two particular Border Patrol agents who now languish in jail because they have been prosecuted by the Department of Justice and the U.S. At-

torney's Office. After the U.S. attorney prosecuted, he was heard to have said, I am sorry I had to do it, I wish there was another way. Well, Mr. Speaker, there was another way, and that is, of course, there could have been administrative action. And that is the issue surrounding the Border Patrol agents who fired at a fleeing alien, undocumented, across the border, wounded that individual, none of which I applaud, none of which I believe that any comments I make tonight sanction, but the harshness of 12- and 13-year sentences for what could have been an administrative proceeding to fire those individuals inasmuch as they were in the line of duty, this act of a prosecution and jailing does not speak to the sensibleness of addressing this question of inappropriate behavior, or, if you will, out-of-procedure behavior that might have occurred in this instance.

The real question is why did the U.S. attorney proceed for a criminal prosecution? That needs to be corrected. And I have asked the Attorney General for an explanation and a reason why his U.S. attorney proceeded in that manner. Prosecutorial discretion was used wrongly.

Let me conclude by suggesting that we are also wrongly in the Iraq war. There will be an opportunity forthcoming to make a very serious and deliberative decision about whether we continue the funding of this Iraq war. This is not in any way a diminishing of the heroics and the work of our United States military. I frankly believe, through my legislation, the U.S. Military Success Act, and the plussing up of diplomacy affirms that these individuals have done their job.

It is now time for methodical, deliberative debate on how we do not interfere with the leadership of the United States military and brass and leaders on the ground in Iraq, but begin to give them the assignment of a strategic redeployment of our troops. It is the right decision to make when you look at the debacle of housing conditions for returning injured troops, when you see the mounting numbers of 22,000, 23,000, 25,000 severely injured troops, many of them with brain injury, as we saw very eloquently put forward by Bob Woodruff, who did a wonderful exposé after himself being a real miracle of recovery, to show the imploded brain injuries of these soldiers.

We are not there to babysit the insurgent violence and civil war violence and possibly al Qaeda violence. We should be engaged in the war on terror, but not as, in essence, a sitting symbol for them to abuse and misuse. And frankly, that is what the Iraq war has become.

I applaud some of the diplomatic successes, determining how to organize the oil revenues, and some of the other steps that the Iraqi Government has made. They can continue to make that so that their reconciliation and the downing of the violence can be based upon a reconciliation diplomatic act. If