

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KINGSTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

□ 2200

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to rescind the 1-hour special order granted earlier this evening to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] for March 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WALDHOLTZ). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, my friends from California tell me the swallows return to Capistrano. My friends from Ohio tell me the buzzards return to Hinkly. And, Madam Speaker, as you and I have come to discover during our brief time here in the Congress of the United States, and indeed as the people of this Nation are discovering, Madam Speaker, liberal Democrats again and again come to the well of this House and distort and exaggerate and basically tell falsehoods about the aims of this new Republican majority with reference to our Contract With America, and especially when it comes to nutrition programs in the public schools.

It is amazing as we take a look at the publications from around the country, and I would simply point out to those assembled here, Madam Speaker, a very interesting article penned by Nancy Roman in today's Washington Times. I hesitate to read the headline because it contains a three-letter word that I really do not want to use in the course of this discourse, and yet it is part of the RECORD. The headline reads "Democrats Lie About Lunch." And the thrust of this article, to read the subhead line really sums it up. Madam Speaker, it is worth repeating and articulating so that the people of this Nation will really know the facts behind this debate. Quoting from the subhead line in today's Washington Times: "The GOP's school lunch program will grow by \$203 million. The government spends \$4.5 billion. The GOP would spend \$4.7 billion."

In other words, Madam Speaker, according to simple mathematics, we see an actual increase in this school lunch program of \$200 million. Simply stated, Madam Speaker, there is no cut, there is no cut. There is an increase in spending.

Now, in fairness to the way this town works, to the way the guardians of the old order have done their accounting for the past four decades, we should point out that there is some form of reduction, but it is only a reduction in the overall increase. Only in Washington would you call an increase reduced in some way, shape, fashion or form, acute.

Indeed, as we have looked at the challenge we face in putting our fiscal house in order, I believe that fair minded people, Madam Speaker, from both sides of the aisle realize that one of the problems we have had continually is in this creative form of accounting, which would call that increase acute.

I listened with great interest to my good friend from Connecticut, who stood before this House moments ago and talked about a cooperative effort to change the spending habits in this Nation. And I respect my good friend from Connecticut because he authored what again inside this beltway was a revolutionary concept, but to the rest of us throughout the country, Madam Speaker, was a very simple, rational, logical concept. And that is that the people who serve in this House, which we call the people's House, should live under the same laws as everyone else in this country.

I salute my friend from Connecticut for spearheading that fundamental tenet of self-government so vital to this House and so dominant, indeed being the cornerstone of reform as adopted in our rules package when we were sworn in here earlier this year. I applaud his cooperative spirit. In fact, I would say that that cooperative spirit is what we hope to build upon in the days ahead, and we call on our good friends across the aisle to end the discourse and move forward in the constructive debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] is recognized for 58 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BECERRA. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I would like to talk tonight about a subject which has gotten some attention in this country, and these days we see it perhaps grabbing more and more of the attention not just of this Congress and of legislators, but of the American people, and it is a subject which is dear to my heart and which I believe needs more clarity and

more discussion, because it affects human beings and it affects Americans.

The subject is that of immigrants. Not immigrants who come into this country without permission, without documents to be here, not so-called illegal immigrants, but legal immigrants, those who have come in through application, waited, in some cases 10 or 15 years, to come to this country, and have now received the permission of this country to come and reside and make this their home and ultimately become U.S. citizens.

These are the lawful permanent residents in this country, and we have approximately 9 million residing in this country, some who just got here and are waiting the 5 years before they can become U.S. citizens, others who have been here for decades and working and doing what most people in this country do, and that is paying their taxes and abiding by the laws and raising their families.

I would like to discuss legal immigrants because it happens that in this process here in Congress of discussing reforms and in discussing the Republican contract on America, one of the proposals, a welfare reform proposal, proposes to use legal immigrants to fund the cost of this reform proposal within welfare. I think it is important not only that my colleagues have a chance to hear and understand more about legal immigrants, but quite honestly, the greater public should have a chance as well.

So I would like to do a little bit here by discussing legal immigrants and perhaps do some personal discussions as well as some factual discussions and providing some data as well.

Let me begin by giving a couple of examples of people who I happen to know in some cases, others that I know of and have been told about, and I think are worth sharing with you today.

Mr. King Tam and Mrs. Tsui Kung Tam are two legal permanent residents in this country. Both came into the United States back in the 1960's. Mr. Tam and Mrs. Tam came from China, Mrs. Tam actually from Hong Kong, and as they arrived in this country they found right away they had to retrain themselves for jobs here in the United States. Mr. Tam went from a cabinetmaker to a cook, Mrs. Tam from a salesperson to a seamstress. They have lived their entire life and they still do in Chinatown in Los Angeles, CA. They have raised three children. All three have graduated from college; David from UCLA as an engineer, Linda from Cal State University of Los Angeles with a business degree, and Mai Li from Cal State, Los Angeles, with a degree in finance.

Each one of them had a chance to undertake the opportunity to go to college, they had a chance to receive some student loans and some grants, and they worked every year while they

were in school to try to pay their way through as well. Never has the Tam family been on welfare.

This is a family that in some cases, like son David, is providing volunteer services outside of his job with Habitat For Humanity, helping to build homes for people who cannot afford them on their own, and tutoring students. They have done in many ways what we all would love to be able to say at the end of our lives, that we have contributed to society.

I should give a story about Mrs. Tam, who is very active in the community. Mrs. Tam quite some time ago found that there was quite a bit of traffic in one busy intersection in the Chinatown area, so busy in fact that at one point a child was killed. She became very active and pushed and pushed until finally she was able to get a four-way stop sign installed in that intersection.

Now, let me tell you a little bit more about the Tams. The Tams were never rich, as you can tell from their jobs. They had to work very hard to do what they did for their children and also to raise children that were able to go on to college. The Tams mentioned, actually I should say that in discussions with a gentleman, a dear friend by the name of Don Toi, who is an activist and been a community organizer and a businessman in the Chinatown area for years and is sort of the person people turn to in Chinatown in Los Angeles for so much.

He mentioned that these are kids who he knows who made use of school lunch programs because, again, their parents worked very hard, but were never rich. They were able to take advantage of the Chinatown teen post center the Chinatown area which provided recreational and diversion activities for the kids. They were each, all three kids were participants in the summer youth employment program, so they had a job. That was their first time learning how to fill out an employment application. And they were able, of course, to earn a little bit of money to help pay for their education.

Now, the Tams never had enough money to buy health insurance to provide themselves with adequate health care, but they were able to make use of county hospitals and clinics and pay a small fee for the services. David at one point when he was about 13 broke his arm, but his family did not have enough money to go to a private doctor, so they had to use the county clinic. He was fortunate to have his arm reset.

I mention this because Mr. Toi mentioned a very interesting story to me. Right around the time that David broke his arm, there was another young man in the Chinatown area who also had a broken limb, a broken leg. His family, however, perhaps did not make use or know how to make use of those facilities that were available, and they did not do a very good job, the family did not, of making sure

their son was treated. It turned out that he ended up with a limp.

This is significant because Don tells me that this young man, young boy at the time, he was about 14, he was a straight A student, he was doing very well, and after that, he developed a nickname, and in Chinese the nickname is Bai. That means cripple. That is a short version of "cripple." And quickly things started deteriorating for this young man, to the point where he became involved in a gang. Not just any gang, but the Wa Ching Gang, which is notorious, not just in the Los Angeles Chinatown area, but throughout the western region of the United States, because it is a very sophisticated gang.

He has been in trouble in the past, and much of this Don says occurred after he had this problem with the limp. Unfortunate, because he was apparently a very bright student.

I mention that because here you have an example of a young man who was able to take care of his broken limb, and another who didn't, and the path that their two lives took.

Mai Li, the Tam's daughter, had a hearing problem a while back. Now, at one point the schools and teachers were classifying her as a slow learner, perhaps mentally retarded, and certainly mentally regressed. So what the Tams did, because they knew about the clinic, they were able to take her to get some preventive health services, and they found out she had a hearing problem.

As I mentioned to you before, Mai Li now is a graduate from Cal State Los Angeles University, she has a degree in finance and is now an auditor, by the way, for the State Board of Equalization in California, which is the equivalent of the IRS here in the Federal Government. She clearly has no, we are hoping, we are certain now she has no particular mental impairment, because obviously she has a very important job. But clearly she had a chance to take advantage of services made available to her, and for which the Tams were paying, if not directly for the full price of the medical care, clearly through their taxes they were paying as workers through payroll taxes, the many property taxes, business taxes if they had a business. They were paying their taxes.

Now, let me move on and tell you a little bit about another family. This family is the Rodriguez family. Juan and Delores Rodriguez came to the United States in 1956 from Mexico. Mr. Rodriguez served in the U.S. Army from 1956 until 1960. In fact, he was drafted into the Army 6 months after entering this country. After an honorable discharge, he worked as a stockbroker clerk. Later he went on to earn his MBA and he opened his own stockbroker firm. He now works as an internal auditor. Mr. Rodriguez became a U.S. citizen in 1984. Mrs. Rodriguez is still a legal resident and she has been a homemaker raising five children and

doing a very good job at it and working very hard at that.

□ 2215

She has been a PTA volunteer. She has been a schoolroom mother, a Cub Scout den mother and a church volunteer. This family, the Rodriguez family, has never been on welfare either.

As I mentioned, they have five kids. Four are U.S. citizens. One is a legal resident. Ed, the child Edward, is a transportation planner who I know very well. Juan is a college professor at California State University. Victor is an investment banker as well, and Carol is an environmental specialist with the California Coastal Conservancy. And Miriam is a homemaker, five children, five law-abiding individuals, four of them U.S. citizens.

Finally, let me tell you about one other individual. This individual is named Claudia. Claudia actually happens to live in Washington, DC. She came to this country when she was 14 with her parents.

She enrolled in a community youth center shortly after coming. And before long, she was developing tutoring programs for other young people in this area. She work very hard in school, and she was encouraged to go on to apply to college.

At the age of 17, she did so, and she applied for student loans. Now, until Claudia turns 18, she is ineligible, like any other person under the age of 18, to become a U.S. citizen. But she is now someone who not only wishes to become a U.S. citizen but also intends to go on and further her career.

I mention these folks because they are important to us. These people in every respect to what they all consider to be the right thing by anyone in this country, citizen or not, law-abiding, pay taxes, they serve in the military defending this country in time of war. They do everything we would want any upstanding person to do, but there is a difference here, because the fact that they may not be U.S. citizens means that under the welfare reform proposal under the contract for America, these individuals would not qualify for benefits for which they have paid taxes. That, to me, seems to be a contradiction of the American dream and the American work ethic.

Let me do this. Let me talk about immigrants a bit more and give some summary and some background on what we mean by the population of immigrants.

People often ask, how many immigrants, legal immigrants are there in this country? If you take a look, in our country of about 260 million people, about 3.8 percent are lawful permanent residents, legal immigrants. That amounts to about 9 million people in this country who at some point after about 5 years are eligible to become U.S. citizens.

Now, I will mention later, if I have a chance, that when we talk about folks

who are receiving welfare, it is interesting to note that this population of legal immigrants actually has a lower usage rate of welfare than the U.S. citizen population. U.S. citizens, there are about 3.7 percent of the entire U.S. citizen population which is on welfare. That is about twice as much, almost twice as much as for legal immigrants being on welfare. So clearly, even though they are eligible to receive welfare benefits, they are less likely than U.S. citizens to use them.

Now, let me move on and talk a little bit about what others have said about immigrants, because I do not want to just tell you what I think about immigrants.

We have had a lot of folks tell us that we should take these services away from legal immigrants because they happen to not be U.S. citizens. They are not eligible to vote.

These are people, let me show you a chart, these are people who have been recognized as contributors by not just one individual or a group of individuals but by a lot of very important individuals. Even the Council of Economic Advisors for President Bush in 1990 recognized that when they said that immigrants are more likely than the native population citizen to be self-employed and start new businesses. I am sorry. That was said by Commissioner Doris Meissner, who at the time in 1990 was with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

What the President's advisors in 1990 said was that the long-term benefits of immigrants, as you can see here, greatly exceed any short run costs.

What we are saying really, in these two quotes, is very consistent with what we have found. That is, that for the most part you have able-bodied people coming in as legal immigrants, ready to work. They do so. And they start contributing right away. And because you are talking about folks who are, for the most part, had to go through quite a bit to get in this country, whether it was waiting 15 years or trying to make the trek by themselves or with family, they are ready to be industrious. And that is reflected in both the quotes that you see from the Council of Economic Advisors, that President Bush had, and also from Miss Doris Meissner and Mr. Robert Bach.

As I said, Miss Meissner happens to be the INS Commissioner, the Immigration and Naturalization Service Commissioner.

Other things that have been said, the Urban Institute, which is known for doing extensive studies and did an extensive study for the administration recently to determine the effects of immigration and the numbers of immigrants, found in its study that for every increase of 100 people in the native population, in the citizen population, employment grew by 26 jobs. For every increase of 100 in the immigrant population, employment grew by 46 jobs. The Urban Institute further reports that immigrants actually com-

plement native workers rather than substitute or displace native workers.

That is important, because people say they are taking all our jobs. Most studies find that that is not the case.

Immigrants make it possible for industry to survive here in the United States. Without their manpower, many businesses would have no choice but to shut down or perhaps move overseas.

Do immigrants, as I said before, really pay taxes? Of course, they do.

A lot of analysis has been done on this particular subject as well. Let me show you a chart that quotes a report by the periodical Business Week back in 1992.

As you can see, Business Week, in this report, cited the fact that immigrants, while they earn in this country about \$240 billion and they pay taxes to the tune of about \$90 billion, their use of welfare is about \$5 billion. Again, that is consistent with what President Bush's Council of Economic Advisors found to be the case, and it is consistent with what we have found in the past history with immigrants, that they work very hard to produce.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to be here tonight and talk about some of the issues involving legal immigration. I am glad you differentiated between illegal and legal immigration. Because the two stories you told of the families, I think anyone in this chamber, not just tonight but when we are actually here, could relate to that because we all have family or friends who we know who have come here as legal residents and worked their way into becoming full-fledged citizens.

During that time that they are legal residents, they also experience the same thing as someone who is here as a citizen. They experience job growth, as you have shown. They pay taxes. They raise their children. But they also may have problems. They may be laid off, whether they be in Texas or California or anywhere else. And because of that, they are here legally, they should also benefit from the services of the system that we have.

You and I sit on the Economic and Educational Opportunity Committee that considered and marked up a portion of the welfare reform bill last week and the Republican version of the welfare reform bill. I had an amendment during that time that we did not get to that would have said, the bill obviously exempted anyone from any public service who is a legal resident, who is not a full citizen. I had an amendment that would have exempted legal immigrants, would have allowed them to be eligible for these programs if they at least paid taxes for five years over and above being a legal resident. We did not get to consider that amendment because, one, we had a two-day markup on probably the most important bill that we may see this session,

and so our amendment was cut off, and I hope when we do get to that legislation in the next two weeks, we will see it. We also had an amendment that was available that maybe the Ways and Means Committee, in their section, will deal with it. But even a legal immigrant who is in the United States, who laid their life down maybe for our country would be ineligible for benefits under the bill that came out of our committee.

I know the other committees may be addressing it. I hope they do so we do not have to tell a veteran in my district in Houston that may have fought in World War II, may be a legal citizen and yet they cannot go and have a senior citizen nutrition meal because they are not 79 years old.

I think there are some travesties in that bill. I am glad you asked for this time tonight to talk about it.

I wanted to add to a little bit of what you have said. In that bill, a legal immigrant would be ineligible for Pell grants, for example, even though they pay taxes and their families may have paid taxes to the Federal Government. As you said, 240 billion in earnings and 90 billion in taxes and only 5 billion in social services or welfare. So they have paid taxes. A good example of that bill, 111 legal residents in Houston participating in Pell grants right now would be ineligible for those programs. These are legal residents who very well may have paid their taxes, and we were trying to provide that ability for.

Like I said earlier, it seems ironic that we would, in our bill that came out of committee, that a legal immigrant would be ineligible for a hot meal at a senior citizen center or a meals on wheels. Under the bill, they would be eligible if they are 79 years old, I believe. Hopefully, we will be able to address that again when that bill comes up next week or the week after. Or maybe it could be addressed in the other committees that have jurisdiction. But these centers, I have a number of them in my district, they do not check people's citizenship much less whether they are legal or illegal, because that is not their job. They are mainly concerned about providing a hot meal and the social contact that we need for these seniors that is provided under the Older Americans Act.

Let me remind my colleagues that we are not talking about someone who broke the law. We are not talking about somebody who came here illegally. We are not talking about somebody who is just taking jobs as we are worried about. We are talking about somebody who has admitted, who may have waited, as you said, for many years to gain legal residence, who obeyed the rules and still is not allowed to partake of some of the good things that maybe our country may provide them, whether it be low income housing, income energy assistance, or even job training for adults and disadvantaged youth. Someone who comes here legally and because of the

downsizing that we see all over our country, they may be out of a job and they would not be eligible for some of the job training that we have and that we are trying to expand more and even consolidate so it is more effective.

I guess the difference is we are trying to ask Congress to differentiate between someone who is here legally, who obeyed the rules, and someone who is not here legally.

And that is all we are saying. Do not tell a senior citizen that you cannot have a hot meal even though you may have lived here 30 years and raised your family and have, like you said, some great examples of young people who have grown up in the country and obviously productive citizens. And their family would not be eligible to have a hot meal at their local community senior citizen center. Several times during the discussion, members of the committee, particularly from the majority side, said that we have limited resources and we should provide for citizens first. And, of course, that assumes we are pitting our citizens against legal residents. As if any of us would say, we are going to support withholding assistance to citizens to help a legal immigrant.

I think that is not what we are all about. We are about providing the services to people who are here legally, whether you are born here or whether you are here as a legal immigrant. We should not argue with the citizen, argue citizen over legal immigrant. We should try to discuss the needs of the people on our committee, particularly when we are talking about a welfare reform bill or a reform bill that deals with social services.

□ 2230

If a person cannot afford their electricity bill during the summer or their heating during the winter, we should not mandate that the local agency play the INS agent. For one thing, if that person is here legally, whether it be in L.A. or Houston or anywhere else, are we really going to ask that HLNP in Houston or some agency to verify their papers? That is just not the case. It could work, and work efficiently.

I think we are building even more cost into our cost, and particularly after November 8 we surely do not want to build more government bureaucracy.

Restricting legal immigrants from assistance also does not affect that they pay into the system, again, as you said, they pay taxes just like everyone else. They pay sales taxes in Texas, they pay school taxes. If they rent, I have people all the time who say they do not pay any taxes. The last time I looked, even rental property has to pay property taxes, and if they pay whatever they pay per month, their property taxes are built into it, because as someone who owns property, hopefully I do not lose money on renting that property.

Mr. BECERRA. If we can engage in a colloquy, Mr. Speaker, I think that is

an important point. One, we have to stress again that what we are talking about here is people who have a legal right now to be in this country, and eventually will become U.S. citizens.

We are not talking about folks who have come across this country clandestinely or without permission of this government. They are people who have been told by the people of the United States, "You are here, you are allowed to stay here permanently and become U.S. citizens."

We are not talking about visitors on a visa, or about students who come on a visa to stay and then have to go back. We are talking about people who have been told by this country, "Yes, you can come now and make this your permanent home and become U.S. citizens."

They are people who are saying, "We are coming with the intention of coming permanently. That is why we have waited," in some cases, "10 or 15 years, because we are asking for a visa to stay here permanently, not for a visa to visit as a student or tourist."

Then the point about taxes. In every respect, a legal immigrant is like any U.S. citizen except in perhaps two or three situations. Obviously, they cannot yet vote because they are not citizens. They cannot hold certain classified Government jobs, for example, with the CIA. They cannot, obviously, be Members of Congress.

But except for a few things like that, they do everything that citizens do. They have every obligation that citizens have. They have to conduct themselves and comport themselves under the laws the way every citizen must, so that if they own a home they pay the same property taxes.

If they have a business, they must pay the same business taxes. If they work, they must pay the same payroll, social security, all the different taxes, FICA, everything we see in a pay stub deduction they must have deducted, as well; unemployment insurance, they pay that as well.

In every respect they do that. They pay the local taxes, States taxes for schools, et cetera, so in every respect, they are the same. In fact, there is no way to distinguish between a citizen and a legal immigrant unless somehow you can ask them for some verification of their status to try to prove citizenship.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, these are people who had permission to come here, like the gentleman said. If we want to say, today, March 1st, we are not going to let any more people come in legally, if that is the decision this Congress wants to make, or the American people want to make, but not tell someone who has invested not only their life in some cases, and particularly with our veterans, they could have invested their life in defense of our country and not make them eligible even though

they have paid the bill just like everyone else.

I always use the example that our forefathers were not citizens of our country. All of us came from somewhere. I am glad my great-great-grandmother happened to be born in Baltimore Harbor, because that made my great grandmother a citizen. I guess we have to recognize that, that we are a nation of immigrants, because every one of us came from somewhere. Even Native Americans walked across the Alaska bridge to come here.

We need to remember that when we are talking about it and not say that someone is here legally, because for many years we had no immigration controls at all. When a lot of our forefathers came, if you could make it here, that was fine, because we were building a country.

We are still building a country, but we have immigration controls, and we are asking people to abide by the law, and yet these people who have abided by the law, we are now saying, No matter how many years you have invested in this country that you wanted to come here, nobody forced you to come here, that you have invested, now we are going to take these benefits away, or take something away from you.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give some examples about what the Contract With America's welfare reform proposal would do to certain individuals and families. Let me give some examples.

A pregnant woman who is a legal immigrant would not be eligible for the Women, Infants, and Children's Program, called WIC, which gives, in some cases, infant formula—it helps a woman who just had a child, a U.S. citizen child, even though she is preparing to give birth or if she already gave birth, as I said, to what would be a U.S. citizen.

A 7-year-old child would be denied foster care and adoption assistance if, by some accident, her parents happened to die. Because, solely because, she would be a legal immigrant and her parents had expired, she would not be eligible for any foster care or adoption services under the Contract With America.

A 23-year-old woman, again, legally present in the United States, who may have been forced to flee her home from an abusive husband would be denied services coordinated by a battered woman's shelter under the Contract With America's welfare proposal.

A 35-year-old man granted political asylum because the country he was fleeing might have tortured him or was intending to torture him, in some capacity this gentleman's life was in danger and that is why he was granted political asylum, it could have been because of religious beliefs, political beliefs, but he has now been granted by this country refuge because he has proven that he was in danger of losing his life, that person legally in this

country would be ineligible to receive canned goods from the food bank run by his local church under this welfare reform proposal by the Republican Contract With America.

Two more examples: A legal immigrant, again, who served in the armed services and fought in the Persian Gulf War could be ineligible to receive Social Security, excuse me, Supplemental Social Security income benefits, even if he was disabled during the line of duty.

Finally, let us take a 60-year-old woman who may have emigrated to this country legally when she was 15 years of age. She worked in this country, say, all her life, and somehow was rendered incapable of continuing to work because of, say, a heart condition. She would not qualify for any Medicaid under the welfare proposal that the Republicans have in their Contract on America.

Those are the types of things that we face in this particular proposal which make no sense, because we are not talking about people who are somehow sloughing off, taking advantage of this country, not paying taxes, breaking the laws. They are in every respect abiding by the laws of this country and contributing, yet we are now telling them that they will be excluded simply because of the distinction between citizenship and not yet getting there.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me give an example, like the gentleman did. I have a family that I grew up with. Their children are my same age now. They have lived here all their life.

Their mother is still alive. She is not a citizen, she is here legally. The children were all born here. The children are now in their forties, and they are law enforcement officers, they are managers of business, they are superintendents at companies, and those children are providing—and that mother raised those children here. They pay taxes with their father, and they have lived here, and yet to tell that elderly senior citizen that now, I'm sorry, you are 77 years old, and even though your children are hard-working and paying lots of taxes, because I know their income, that she is not going to be able to have the socialization and the hot lunch with the senior citizen center that is 7 blocks from her house.

I do not think that is the Americanism that we all understand, and the compassion for people, and also the feeling that we have for everyone who, again, tries to obey the law and is a productive citizen. That is why I think hopefully the committees will change, the other committees, because we were not able to in ours, because of the abbreviated session, and I don't know if we would have had the votes anyway, even if we had the time to have the amendment.

But I hope when it comes to the House floor we will at least make that correction so we can address it for legal immigrants, and particularly for

legal immigrants who are also veterans, who again have put down their lives and sacrificed their time in defense of the freedoms that they now enjoy, but we may be taking some of them away if we pass this bill.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas for coming down tonight at this late hour to participate in this special order. I appreciate his words. He has always been there to talk about families and people, and it is clear that he has a concern for people who are contributors to this society. I thank him for adding some very eloquent words to this particular discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss a little bit more about welfare, more of the specifics about welfare. What most of us know as welfare includes a number of different programs, from AFDC, which is Aid to Families with Dependent Children, to Supplemental Security Income to Medicaid and food stamps.

AFDC costs the Federal Government about \$16.5 million. SSI is about \$26 billion. Medicaid is \$82 billion. That is, of course, medical services to the aged, the blind, and the disabled. Food stamps is about \$25.5 billion. If we add up those programs, they amount to about 1 percent of the Nation's budget, annual budget.

Mr. Speaker, folks think of that as welfare, when we talk about welfare, but most people do not recognize other things as welfare. Welfare is really government assistance of some form or another, whether it is AFDC to a woman with a child who is poor, or in many cases, most of us do not think of it this way, but I know I own property.

I own a home. I am able before April 15 of every year to deduct the interest I pay on my mortgage from my taxes. I am also able to deduct the property taxes I pay on that home from my taxes, and I get to reduce the tax load that I have by that particular deduction.

In essence, I have reduced the amount of taxes the government collects, which makes it necessary, of course, to collect from some other source, or have that budget deficit. That in a sense is assistance that is offered to me, because I am subsidized by the Federal Government for the purchase of my home.

Mr. Speaker, most folks do not think of the mortgage interest deduction or the property tax deduction as welfare. We think of them as incentives that we have to purchase property, to own property, and ways to make it possible for families to, obviously, buy a home.

Most people would find it very difficult to purchase a home and actually maintain that residence if they found that they had to pay the full amount and actually pay it off in less than 30 years, so we have ways to try to encourage home ownership, which I hope most families growing these days and becoming participants in society have a chance to do, even though it is be-

coming tougher and tougher these days to do it.

However, that is an example of something that could be considered public assistance or government assistance that most folks do not consider obviously welfare. We never classify that as welfare.

However, let me say that the mortgage interest deduction by itself, without the property tax deduction, amounts to about \$51 billion. That is what we will probably see deducted from tax forms from people's taxes just in 1995.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, 44 percent of that deduction, 44 percent, about \$23 or so billion of that \$51 billion, goes to taxpayers with incomes in excess of \$100,000 or more.

Compare that, Mr. Speaker, \$51 billion just in the mortgage interest rate deduction that I get to participate in, and anyone who owns a home gets to participate in, with some of the proposals in the majority party's Contract on America welfare reform proposal.

They are talking about cutting school lunch programs, they are talking about cutting back student loan programs, and there you are talking about sums that are even less than what we are talking about for the mortgage interest rate deduction.

We have subsidies for agricultural products and crops. In my mind, what concerns me greatest is this idea that we see floating around these days of cutting taxes at a time when we have a large deficit, where we are trying to balance the budget, and at the same time, we have discussions about a capital gains tax cut.

The capital gains tax is something that is used by people who own capital, certain types of capital. If you happen to own a big tractor or a bulldozer and a construction company, that is capital. If you happen to sell it, you would be able to reduce your taxes on the capital gains, on the gain from that particular product or that equipment, by a certain amount if a capital gains tax cut were actually implemented.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are talking about a capital gains tax cut of about \$200 billion over the next five years. That means that somewhere we are going to have to find the money to make up for the \$200 billion.

When we put that on top of the \$1.2 or so trillion deficit that we have to make up over the next seven years or so, you see that the task is monumental, to try to balance the books.

When you see proposals to cut capital gains taxes which will benefit mostly those who make over \$100,000, about 70 percent of the benefits will go to those who make over \$100,000, you will see that it is going to be difficult to swallow having to cut a program that would make a legal immigrant who has paid taxes ineligible for services that he has already paid for.

That, I think, shows a contradiction that we are going through right now, the reason I wanted to have a chance in

this special order to discuss the whole issue of legal immigrants.

What we have to do is come up with some reasonable approaches to fund welfare. We have to come up with things that will help us change the way we provide welfare assistance. We have to streamline, obviously, the process. We have to make it workable, so that ultimately, people will work and be off of welfare, but we have to attack the problem where the problem lies.

Why go after legal immigrants who, as we can see from the studies, the empirical data, all of which show that immigrants by far contribute much more than they ever consume. Not only that, but if you are going to attack a population for purposes of welfare reform, why attack the group that is making least use of welfare? It does not make any sense. But that is the direction some of the Members of Congress would seem to want to head in, and I think that is unfortunate because what we find is that rather than have reform we are ending up with expediency, and to me that does not make the best sense; this is not the way to legislate.

□ 2314

I believe when we have a chance to closely look at the issue, especially the issue with regard to legal immigrants, we are going to see that rather than try to dissuade or punish people who are showing industry and entrepreneurship, the American dream, that are trying to do the things that make us America, what we will see is there will be I hope a change of heart and a recognition that what we must do is tackle the problem, and with welfare that means of course making sure we put people on a program where we tell them here is the plan, you have to follow this plan. You may need some assistance now, so we are going to give you some assistance. You may need some education, you may need some training and we are going to give you that. And once that is done, we want you to work. And you are going to work, because that is why you are on welfare, to transition off of welfare back to being a productive, paying member of society.

And when we do that, when we provide that training and the education, if the person happens to lack some skills and education is necessary, and if the person maybe has a child, maybe provide the child care to let the person get to school or get to work, and make some health care available so a person does not have to worry about the child getting sick or the individual getting sick, when we can transition them off and see them become productive, then we have true welfare reform. And in the process of coming up with that program we have to come up with the financing for it, and in coming up with the financing for it we should be addressing the issues that relate to welfare, not going after a population that is demonstrating in every respect the American dream.

I think that is where we have to head and I hope that is where we will head, and perhaps by having full, open discussions on this we will head in that direction.

That is my hope, and I hope to have a chance over the course of the next days and weeks as we discuss welfare reform to bring this issue closer to the fore so people can have an opportunity to understand it, recognize it, and then act based on full, complete and accurate information.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] for calling this special order tonight on the subject of immigrants and welfare benefits. As we debate the complex and sometimes heated issues surrounding immigration generally, I am hopeful that the tone of this discussion will be both reasonable and balanced.

Furthermore, I hope that this special order, and others to follow, will deflate some of the politically-charged myths surrounding the immigration debate.

One of the myths often cited to support the contention that immigrants cost more than they contribute is that they are heavy users of welfare. The facts, however, are very different. When refugees are excluded, statistics show that immigrants of working age are considerably less likely than native-born residents of working age to receive welfare.

Only 3.9 percent of immigrants, who come to the United States to join family members or to work, rely on public assistance, compared to 4.2 percent of native-born residents.

The failure to differentiate between the legal status of refugees—who are explicitly entitled to public benefits upon arrival—and other immigrants contributes greatly to continuing misperceptions and to proposals of potentially ineffective policies.

It should also be noted that those legal immigrants who seek public assistance must meet much tougher standards for the major programs than native-born residents, while undocumented immigrants are ineligible for any public assistance except emergency medical care under Medicaid and some nutrition programs.

Another one of the myths surrounding immigrants and welfare benefits is that these benefits act as a magnet which attract immigrants to the United States. According to an INS report on the legalized alien population, this is simply untrue.

Fully 64 percent of legal immigrants come to the United States to join family members, 14 percent come because U.S. employers need their skills, and 16 percent are fleeing political persecution. Very few immigrants come to the United States seeking public assistance.

Undocumented immigrants legalized under the amnesty program come to the United States for the same reasons: to join close family members—62 percent, to work—94 percent, and to flee repression—28 percent, not to use public services like welfare.

Mr. Speaker, most of the Republican welfare reform proposals would hurt U.S. citizens and their sponsored relatives. Some of these proposals involve outright bans on more than 60 Federal programs for legal immigrants who have not yet become citizens.

One of these proposals would require Federal programs to report to the INS all legal immigrants who receive benefits for more than 1

year. These immigrants would be considered public charges by the INS and therefore subject to deportation.

I urge my colleagues to examine the facts and not the myths surrounding the debate on immigrants and welfare benefits.

The facts are these, Mr. Speaker, and they speak for themselves.

Immigrants pay more in taxes than they receive in benefits. According to the Urban Institute, legal and undocumented immigrants combined, pay approximately \$70.3 billion per year in taxes and receive \$42.9 billion in services such as education and public assistance.

Legal immigrants' Social Security deductions help keep the Social Security system solvent. Because immigrants tend to be young and have years of work ahead of them, they are significant contributors to the Social Security system.

The combined total of all immigrants' income came to \$285 billion according to the 1990 census. This was 8 percent of all income earned in the United States, and equal to immigrants' share of the population—7.9 percent. Immigrants spend much of their income on U.S. goods and services, helping to spur the U.S. economy forward.

Undocumented immigrant workers provide tax dollars to the United States because undocumented workers are subject to payroll deductions and income taxes, they help to support programs like unemployment insurance and Social Security, even though they themselves are not eligible for benefits from these programs. In 1990, undocumented immigrants paid \$2.7 billion in Social Security and \$168 million in unemployment insurance.

Once again, I thank Mr. BECERRA for his leadership on this important issue.

RETURNING DECISIONMAKING TO THE STATES AND LOCALITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WALDHOLTZ). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. EHRLICH. Madam Speaker, I rise to enter into a colloquy with my colleague from California. Madam Speaker, cliches are very popular in politics as we all know, particularly in election years. Everyone is pro-small business, everyone loves the family, everyone is tough on crime, everyone likes the middle class, cares about the middle class, wants to support the middle class.

The problem, Madam Speaker, is that right here in the House of Representatives is where the rubber meets the road, and cliches are know longer good enough. This is where the votes occur, this is where the lines are drawn in the sand and this is where positions are taken that we must defend come every other November.

Right now the tough votes with respect to regulatory reform are being taken every day in this House. It is part of the Contract With America, it is a very important part of the Contract With America, but it is also what the people want.