

Over the last few years, NIAAA has made great strides in incorporating women into their research, and I applaud them for their progress. In fiscal year 1995, NIAAA spent 23 percent of their budget on research on alcohol abuse and alcoholism among women. This represents a 69-percent increase over their fiscal year 1992 spending. However, the differences in the effects of alcohol and alcoholism on men and women necessitate further research on women and alcoholism.

The impact of alcoholism on women and men differs greatly. Women are more likely to use nontraditional health care systems for alcohol-related problems. Studies have shown that the development of consequences associated with heavy drinking may be accelerated in women. The death rate of female alcoholics is 50 to 100 percent higher than for male alcoholics. Heavy drinking contributes to menstrual disorders, fertility problems, and premature menopause, and alcohol use by pregnant women is the leading known cause of mental retardation in newborns. FAS strikes between 3,600 to 10,000 babies a year, and a Centers for Disease Control study indicates that the percentage of babies born with alcohol-related health problems increased sixfold between 1979 and 1993. It is critical that we bolster NIAAA's research on women and alcohol, and this legislation will help accomplish this.

This legislation recognizes the progress NIAAA has made. It instructs the NIAAA to maintain their current spending on women and alcoholism within their existing budget. It would also instruct House authorizers to add an additional \$25 million in spending for NIAAA on research on alcohol abuse and alcoholism among women. Thus, this additional money would not subtract money from NIAAA's overall budget for women and alcohol, but instead add new funds for this critical research.

Clearly, alcohol abuse among women is a very serious problem with grave consequences. This legislation will include women in NIAAA's research so that we may better understand the effects of alcoholism particular to women and develop solutions that will work for women.

IMMIGRATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1996

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2202) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve deterrence of illegal immigration to the United States by increasing border patrol and investigative personnel, by increasing penalties for alien smuggling and for document fraud, by reforming exclusion and deportation law and procedures, by improving the verification system for eligibility for employment, and through other measures, to reform the legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States, and for other purposes:

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2202, the Immigration in the National Interest Act of 1995. This is an ex-

traordinary important bill that improves our Nation's immigration policy.

Clearly, Congress has a responsibility to formulate sound and comprehensive policies governing immigration—legal and illegal. The need to re-examine our immigration policy has been long overdue. Over the past few days this bill has been considered on the floor, a vigorous national debate has ensued on this complex and controversial issue. Frankly, there are still provisions in this bill that concern me—some remaining, some added by floor amendments—but in balance, H.R. 2202 makes needed reforms which I will speak about in a moment.

Like nearly every American, I am concerned about the problems of illegal immigration. Over 1.8 million undocumented aliens enter the United States each year. We must stem this flow, both for economic and security reasons. Terrorism is a growing and legitimate law enforcement concern, and illegal entry is frequently the way they get into our country. Similarly, the economic cost of illegal immigrants is undeniable.

Limiting the flow of illegal aliens through improved enforcement is part of the solution. As a member of the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Appropriations Subcommittee, I have consistently supported giving the responsible Federal agencies sufficient resources to deal with the problem of illegal immigration. We still have work to do in this area, and I will continue to work with the Immigration and Naturalization Service, as well as with the members of the Appropriations Committee, to make sure that we have sufficient manpower along the border to deal with flow of undocumented aliens.

H.R. 2202 includes provisions to improve border crossing identification cards by making them less susceptible to counterfeiting. In addition, it includes provisions to deter document fraud and alien smuggling, and streamlines procedures for the inspection, apprehension, detention, adjudication, and removal of inadmissible and deportable aliens.

But there must also be a long-term solution that encourages democracy and economic growth in countries that send illegal immigrants to our borders—especially Central and South America. Job opportunities in those countries is the strongest incentive to keep potential immigrants there. Thus, in addition to strong enforcement of our immigration laws and imposing sanctions on those who hire illegal aliens, we must seek mutually beneficial trade relationships that can stimulate economies in Central and South America. This is one of the many reasons I support the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA]. It is in our own self-interest to help Mexico build an economy that can create the nearly one million new jobs required each year to keep ahead of population growth. Only in that way can we provide an incentive for Mexicans to stay at home—and a disincentive to come to the United States.

With respect to legal immigration reform, this bill addresses the abuse of claims for political asylum. These are currently 300,000 pending claims, and that number is growing by 12,000 each month. Of course, there can be legitimate claims of political asylum, but our current system allows for six opportunities of appeal when a claim is denied. This is excessive and unacceptable. H.R. 2202 makes much needed changes to this asylum process.

The asylum reform provision in the bill would require aliens to file an application for asylum within 180 days of entering the United States. Those filing after the deadline would not be eligible for asylum. This is a reasonable and important reform because it encourages aliens to apply for asylum without delay and makes their presence known to immigration authorities.

The bill provides that an alien who qualifies as a political refugee will be granted asylum unless the person is discovered to have a prior history of persecuting other persons, has been convicted of a felony or other serious crime prior to his arrival, is regarded as a danger to national security, or is inadmissible on terrorist grounds. It provides that asylum protection for an alien may be terminated if the person is no longer a refugee, can be moved to another country where he will be granted asylum or other temporary protection, voluntarily returns to his native country with the intent to stay, or has changed his or her nationality to a country which will grant asylum.

Although I favor maintaining numbers of legal immigrants admitted to the United States annually at current levels, I did not support the Chrysler/Brownback amendment to strip legal immigration reforms from the bill. There is a tie between legal and illegal immigration reform that cannot be disputed and should not be separated. Changes in illegal immigration policy will have an effect on legal immigration and vice versa. Although these provisions should have been kept together, I support final passage of H.R. 2202. It is imperative that we move forward, send this bill to conference with the Senate, and send President Clinton a comprehensive and responsible immigration reform bill.

IMMIGRATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1996

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2202) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve deterrence of illegal immigration to the United States by increasing border patrol and investigative personnel, by increasing penalties for alien smuggling and for document fraud, by reforming exclusion and deportation law and procedures, by improving the verification system for eligibility for employment, and through other measures, to reform the legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States, and for other purposes:

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the following correspondence from the NCLR:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA,

Washington, DC, March 15, 1996.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing on behalf of the National Council of La Raza (NCLR), the nation's largest constituency-based national Hispanic organization, to express profound concern about H.R. 2202, which will be considered by the House next week. NCLR supports effective measures to control our borders. We believe that effective immigration reform must include professionally conducted border enforcement, visa

control, and enforcement of labor laws against employers who knowingly hire and exploit undocumented workers. However, we believe that many of the provisions in this bill undermine the ultimate purpose of immigration control, often at the expense of major groups of Americans including Latinos and others who look or sound "foreign."

Several such provisions in this sweeping legislation have generated severe opposition from many sectors of society and leaders on both sides of the aisle because they undermine the basic principles of good immigration reform legislation. NCLR joins in that opposition on the grounds that such measures do not constitute effective immigration reform, and are likely to harm hardworking Americans, particularly Latinos. We urge, therefore, that you consider the following recommendations when this legislation reaches the floor:

Support the Chabot/Conyers amendment to strike the verification system—NCLR joins a broad range of organizations including small businesses, labor unions, and civil rights organizations, which oppose the establishment of a government computer system to verify workers. Because of the intense opposition to this provision, the bill's sponsor, Rep. Lamar Smith (R-TX) has modified this provision by making the system "voluntary" for employers and by deleting some civil rights protections which were added to the system by the Judiciary Committee. Such changes do not appease opponents of the verification system; even a voluntary system ensures the creation of the government database, and it is highly unlikely that it will be "voluntary" in practice in the short term. We believe that once Congress invests in the creation of a system, it will inevitably act to make the system mandatory. The establishment of a verification system will be costly, and will inappropriately inconvenience both employers and legally authorized workers who are playing by the rules, and simply want to do business and work without government interference.

Oppose the Gallegly/Bilbray/Seastrand/Stenholm amendment establishing a mandatory verification pilot program in 5 of the 7 states with the largest number of undocumented immigrants. This amendment would restore the original mandatory verification system, which was modified because of concern that it would prove costly to taxpayers, to businesses and to workers, and that its error rates would result in a one-in-five chance that a legitimate worker would be denied job opportunities because of mistakes in the government's computers. Employers who play by the rules would be forced to abide by new procedures, while those who intentionally hire undocumented workers with full knowledge that they are violating the law would simply continue to do business as usual.

Support the Brownback/Berman/Chrysler amendment to strike the legal immigration changes: H.R. 2202 represents the most extreme changes to the legal system in 70 years, and unfairly exploits public concern over illegal immigration to impose unwarranted restrictions on legal immigration. The provisions in this section of the bill would prevent U.S. citizens from reuniting with their spouses, minor children, adult children, and siblings. Such changes unnecessarily undermine the nation's family values, and punish U.S. citizens who play by the rules and wait in long lines to reunite with their loved ones.

Support the Velazquez/Roybal-Allard amendment to allow U.S.-born children to have access to services and protections regardless of the legal status of their parents. It is unreasonable and outrageous to use U.S. citizen children as a means of punishing

their parents for their immigration status. This provision does nothing to control undocumented immigration, and severely punishes innocent Americans.

Oppose the Pombo/Chambliss, Goodlatte, and Condit amendments to create a massive new guestworker program. NCLR strongly opposes amendments to introduce or alter guestworker programs in order to bring hundreds of thousands of new, exploitable workers for the agricultural industry. These amendments are inimical to the purpose of the legislation; they are unnecessary, and would harm both the guestworkers themselves and Americans who work in agriculture.

Oppose the Gallegly amendment to deny public education to undocumented children—This amendment defies a Supreme Court decision by allowing states to deny public education to undocumented children. It is both ineffective and unreasonable to punish children for the immigration status of their parents; such a measure undermines the well being of the entire community.

Oppose the McCollum amendment to create a national I.D. card—This amendment would turn the Social Security card into a national identification card. The Social Security Administration has estimated that the cost of generating such a card for all Americans would be \$6 billion. Such a card would lead to massive civil rights abuses as Americans who look and sound "foreign" would be asked to demonstrate that they really belong in this country over and over again.

Oppose the Tate amendment to bar admission to former undocumented immigrants—This amendment is excessively harsh, and would undermine several key tenets of immigration law. A U.S. citizen who marries someone who came illegally to the United States would be precluded from petitioning for his/her spouse to become a permanent resident. It is unnecessary to punish U.S. citizens in this manner; such a policy will do little to control immigration.

Oppose the Bryant (TN) amendment to require medical facilities to report their patients to the INS—If such an amendment is adopted, immigrants and their American family members will be frightened to seek medical care, to the detriment of the entire community. America can control undocumented immigration without bringing ugly enforcement efforts to the emergency room.

Oppose the Rohrabacher amendment to repeal the immigrant adjustment provision—This amendment would eliminate a procedure in existing law requiring persons adjusting their status to pay a higher fee rather than return to their home countries to process their papers. This procedure was advocated for by the State Department, to avoid having to process large numbers of immigrant petitions at foreign consulates. Overturning this procedure accomplishes nothing toward immigration enforcement, and would seriously inconvenience Americans reuniting with immigrant family members.

NCLR acknowledges the right and duty of any sovereign nation to control its borders, and we have consistently supported sound measures pursuant to that goal. We do not support the kind of unnecessary, extremist, and ineffective proposals embodied in—and being proposed as amendments to—the pending legislation. Such amendments do a great deal to undermine the nation's most sacred values and nothing substantive toward immigration control. We urge you to vote in keeping with American values and ideals and prevent unnecessarily divisive provisions from being enacted.

Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Sincerely,

RAUL YZAGUIRRE,
President.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIBERTY TRIBUNE

HON. PAT DANNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1996

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Speaker, since the Liberty Tribune's initial publication on April 4, 1846, and through the Civil War, both World Wars, America's voyages into space and countless other events, great and small, the newspaper has faithfully reported the news of the day. In fact, it is my understanding that the Liberty Tribune is the oldest continually published paper west of the Mississippi. This is truly an impressive accomplishment.

But longevity matters little if it is not accompanied by substance and style. The paper has more than passed muster on all three accounts, and the city of Liberty is a better place today because of it.

Community newspapers such as the Liberty Tribune serve as an important meeting place for generations of people from all walks of life. They provide information, chronicle the rough times, tout the good ones, and serve as a community's conscience when needed.

This is particularly true for our young people, who see that their successes in the classroom and on the ballfields make the local paper. They read about the important contributions of local civic leaders and witness how the power of well-reasoned opinions—on matters from local school district bond issues to international affairs—can affect government.

I know that the Liberty Tribune reports the positive happenings in the community as well as the bad news—true balanced reporting. This should not be surprising as the paper has had plenty of experience.

For instance, it is interesting to note that the Liberty Tribune started publication while James Polk was President. Some of the paper's first articles were about the Mexican-American War, in particular the story of Col. Alexander Doniphan and his troops from Clay County who fought in the Battle of Bracito. Year later, the Liberty Tribune covered the Civil War and Jesse James. But to put matters into perspective, all of this is really little more than a quick glance back into history full of so much more news and reporting by the Liberty Tribune.

William Allen White, a towering figure in midwestern journalism for decades, believed that a hometown newspaper should serve a dual role—reporting the news and serving as a booster for the community. He understood that the true community newspaper works diligently not only to deliver the news but also to improve the community.

When the editor of a metropolitan paper scoffed at Mr. White and his Emporia, KS, Gazette, the respected small town editor fired back a timeless response.

"Know this and know it well," White said. "If you would take the clay from your eyes and read the little paper as it is written you would find all of God's beautiful sorrowing, struggling, aspiring world in it—and what you saw