SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER) announced the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. McCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENSARLING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take this time for my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

IN SUPPORT OF LIEUTENANT PANTANO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today is the second day of the Article 32 hearing for Second Lieutenant Ilario Pantano, a marine who I have talked about at great length who has served our Nation bravely in both Gulf Wars.

In an action of self-defense a year ago, Lieutenant Pantano made a split-second battlefield decision to shoot two Iraqi insurgents who refused to follow his orders to stop their movement towards him. Two and one-half months later, a sergeant under his command, who never even saw the shooting and who was earlier demoted for his lack of leadership abilities, accused him of murder. Because of that, Lieutenant Pantano today continues to face an Article 32 hearing where a hearing officer will determine whether he will face a court-martial for two counts of premeditated murder.

Mr. Speaker, today's hearing came to a halt when it became apparent that Lieutenant Pantano's accuser, Sergeant Coburn, had recently violated his superior's orders not to give interviews on this case. The defense showed that he has interviewed with many media outlets. Just last week, New York Magazine ran a cover story on this case with multiple quotes from Sergeant Coburn. It is clear that his testimony cannot be considered credible.

What is happening to this young man is an injustice. I see absolutely no way these charges can move forward any further when the accuser and key witness in this case is an individual who did not see the incident, has continually disobeyed orders, and who has clearly made it his mission to defame the character and integrity of a superior who demoted him for poor performance.

Lieutenant Pantano has served this Nation in great honor. My personal experience with him and his family convinced me that he is a dedicated family man who loves his Corps and his country. By all accounts, he was an exceptional marine.

I hope that in the next day or two as these hearings end, the hearing officer comes to the same conclusion that I and many like me have come to, that Lieutenant Pantano should never have been charged in the first place, and that all charges against him are dropped. I hope and pray that the truth will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I have put in a resolution, House Resolution 167, to support Lieutenant Pantano as he faces trial. I hope that my colleagues in the House will take some time to read my resolution and look into this situation for themselves. But, most of all, I hope it is not necessary for us to discuss this further after this week.

I close with a quote from a witness in today's trial, Navy Corpsman George "Doc" Gobles, who was present during the shooting, but did not actually see anything. He did, however, testify to the character and leadership of Lieutenant Pantano. When he was asked about Lieutenant Pantano on the stand earlier today, he said, "I just felt a sense of security when a situation arose, I knew he would be able to take care of it. I felt the safest with this platoon, more than any other platoon in our company, more than anything because of Lieutenant Pantano and his leadership."

Mr. Speaker, as I close I want to mention that his mother, who is a wonderful lady from New York whom I have had the pleasure of talking to on several occasions, has set up an Internet Web site. It is www.defendthedefenders.org. and I would ask my colleagues to please look into this and join me on House Resolution 167. I ask the good Lord in heaven to please bless Lieutenant Pantano and his family, and I ask the good Lord to please bless all of our men and women in uniform and their families, and I ask God to please bless America.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. PUTNAM, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-60) on the resolution (H. Res. 200) waiving the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REAL SOLUTIONS FOR IMMIGRATION POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to continue my ongoing effort to offer real solutions to our immigration system and to highlight the real contributions of our Nation's immigrant community.

Last week, we talked about CNN's Lou Dobbs and his "Broken Borders" segment. We talked about how Mr. Dobbs uses his show to offer a venue to anti-immigrant extremists. We talked about how, between all of his regular guests, one would be hard-pressed to find a solution to the challenges we face, because they would rather demagogue and divide than offer tangible ideas or pragmatic proposals. I guess they think it is better for ratings, better for raising money for their organizations, or better for riling up their membership.

Well, let me say this: It is not better for America. It is not better for America to do nothing about an immigration system that hurts families, hampers businesses, and harms communities.

So, this evening, I thought we could continue our discussion on mending borders, and I thought we could do it by answering a few questions Mr. Dobbs left unanswered at the end of his show last week.

Let me start with Ray from Michigan's comment. Ray wrote the following to Mr. Dobbs: "Isn't hiring illegal aliens just another way to outsource labor? The money doesn't stay in the United States."

Well, Ray from Michigan, since Mr. Dobbs did not refute the inaccuracy of your statement, let me point you to a recent study by the Inter-American Development Bank.

According to the study, approximately 16.7 million U.S. workers born in Latin America had a combined gross income of $450 billion last year, of which 93 percent was spent locally. That means billions of dollars spent at local stores for local services, that means hundreds of thousands of jobs created. Just look at Chicago. According to a study by the Center for Urban Economic Development at the University of Illinois, the estimated 220 undocumented immigrants in the Chicago
area alone added $5.5 billion to the local economy, creating more than 31,000 jobs.

So I would simply and respectfully say to Ray from Michigan that immigrants make enormous contributions to our country and to our communities, and we should work together to create a system that allows them to come out of the shadows and work here legally, safely, and humanely.

Now, let’s go to Judy in Belvedere, Illinois. The following is attributed to Dobbs: “I feel like this country is finally waking up to the fact that the illegal population is draining our country of millions of taxpayers’ money.”

Let me respond with a few points, the first being that all immigrants pay taxes, income taxes, property taxes, sales taxes, gasoline taxes, cigarette taxes, every tax when they make a purchase. As far as income tax payments go, sources vary in their accounts, but a range of studies find that immigrants pay billions and $39 billion in Federal, State, and local taxes.

And let us not forget the Social Security system. Recent studies show that undocumented workers sustain the Social Security system with a subsidy as much as $7 billion a year. Let me repeat that: $7 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, I know I have provided a lot of facts and figures this evening, so let me close with a newspaper quote describing immigrants: “These people are by their nature unruly and not fit for civil society and government. We have little hope of containing them, other than by force of law.”

Somebody writing to Lou Dobbs? No. The source of the quote, an editorial in the esteemed New York Times. In their defense, it was in 1895.

And what unruly, ungovernable misfits was the New York Times writing about? Italian immigrants.

Now, my point in reading this quote is not to fault the New York Times or, let me be clear, to say anything disparaging about Italian immigrants.

My point, I hope, is obvious. Uncertainty and fear and ignorance about immigrants, about people who are different, has a history as old as our Nation. Boston and Philadelphia papers in the early 19th century editorialized against the Irish who they said were ruining our Nation, for the only real difference, of course, being of English ancestry. It is not new or unusual for the real Americans, meaning those immigrants who came to America a little bit longer ago, to fear the outsiders, the pretenders, the newcomers. But I think we have an obligation to set the record straight.

Because the truth is, today’s immigrants, as they have for generation after generation, work the longest hours at the hardest jobs for the lowest pay, jobs that are just about impossible to fill. They pick our fruit, they care for our children and elderly, they change bedpans, they clear our tables and wash our dishes. And they do those jobs not because they want to take away anything from America, but because they want to give their skills, their sweat, their labor, for a better life and to help build a better America, just as those who came before them.

I hope we in this House can work in a bipartisan manner to ensure that our immigration system can better reflect their contributions.

ETHICS DISCUSSIONS IN WASHINGTON, DC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHenry) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a lot about ethics these days, ethical problems, ethical controversies. Why is ethics coming up as a topic of discussion here in Washington, DC? It is because the Democrat leadership has led their own campaign against our Republican majority through what I believe is a conspiracy of character assassination and misleading attacks.

Let me quote this week’s U.S. News and World Report. Democrat strategists, confiscators are increasingly fed up with the Republican establishment, are planning an all-out attack on what they call the “abuse of power” by Republicans. Democrat strategists, Mr. Speaker. Those folks who lived and breathed the base- ment of the Democrat National Committee and the DCCC, they see ethics as a way that might be able to gain them a few congressional seats.

I can tell my colleagues why they are doing this. It is because in the last 2 election cycles, Democrats, their agenda, their leaders, their ideas, or lack thereof, are going nowhere. They lost six U.S. Senate seats. They have posted double digit losses in the U.S. House of Representatives races. They are sitting back and they call the Republican congressmen pass tax relief. In fact, in just this Congress, we eliminated the death tax, the double taxation of inheritance. They watched as the Republicans passed an energy policy to keep and lower gas prices. They tried to obstruct class action lawsuit reform which Republicans passed to protect small businesses and individuals from the frivolous lawsuits of ambulance-chasing trial lawyers. They sat back as we passed bankruptcy reform. And they are losing their own Members on these votes.

Mr. Speaker, over 70 Democrats have abandoned their leadership, their Democrat leadership to support a Republican bill on bankruptcy reform. Forty-two Democrats bolted their leadership, their left-wing leadership to support the permanent repeal of the death tax. Forty-one Democrats abandoned their leadership on energy policy, because they see that our ideas are better than theirs. Thirty-five members of the Democratic Caucus abandoned their leader, the gentleman from California (Ms. Pelosi), on class action lawsuit reform. The Democrat Party is hemorrhaging. They are hemorrhaging.

So how does the leadership fight back, when they cannot even win their own rank-and-file members? How do they fight back? It is by baseless, senseless attacks and character assassinations, that is how. Let me quote an article that ran in a January issue of the New Republic, a liberal left wing magazine. The article is called “How the Democrats Can Overthrow the House.” And I quote: “Democrats should consider fighting back by extraparliamentary means, going beyond the standard perimeters of legislative debate and attacking Repub- licans not on issues but on ethics. Character. In other words, it may be time for Democrats to burn down the House in order to save it.”

Not my words, Mr. Speaker. This is the liberal strategy for taking control of this House of Representatives. Burn down the House. Burn down this institution. That is the Democrats’ plan. They are willing to tear down this very institution so they can gain raw political power. We have seen this before, and that is why you are hearing all of this about House rules and ethics.

But here is the deal. Democrats want to apply the rules, Mr. Speaker. They do. They just do not want to apply the rules to themselves. Consider the Democratic leader, the gentleman from California (Ms. Pelosi). She called for an investigation of the House majority leader, the standard Republican majority leader, for alleged irregularities for his travel records.

But ABC News reported last night that members of her very own Democratic leadership staff have not properly disclosed their own travel forms. Not just once. Not just twice. But a dozen times. The gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. Jones) who is a member of the ethics committee, Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is a member of the ethics committee, she went on a trip to Puerto Rico. I do not blame her for wanting to go on a nice trip. The gentlewoman from Ohio went on this with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi) herself, as well as a number of other Democrats.

According to ABC News last night, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. Jones) said the incident was paid for by a registered lobbyist, while the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi) said it was paid for by a different organization.

Then, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. Jones) went back and amended her forms to say that the lobbyist did not pay for it. But you know what? Two other Democrats that went on that trip did not even disclose their travel. Did not even disclose it. When asked, one Member told the Washington Times, this happened 4 years ago. Are we not sure why this is even relevant? Wow.

Do you hear hypocrisy? This is the pot calling the kettle black.