

they will leave behind a facility rich with history and echoing with the voices of welders, painter, and engineers who built and serviced everything from copper-bottomed wooden ships to nuclear submarines. Hundreds of thousands of people have worked at or passed through the shipyard, from the first dozen shipwrights who arrived in 1892 to Mare Island's high point in World War II, when the shipyard population reached 46,000. These are the workers that made Mare Island the best naval shipyard in the country.

During its tenure as the Navy's oldest base on the west coast, Mare Island built 512 ships and repaired hundreds more. Those ships, both great and obscure, fought in every conflict since. Mare Island's first ship, the paddle-wheeled gunboat *Saginaw*, was launched before the Civil War, in 1859, and its last ship, the nuclear submarine U.S.S. *Drum*, was launched in 1970 when our country was divided over the Vietnam war. These vessels also included the small ferryboat *Pinafore*, which chugged between Mare Island and Vallejo for 30 years starting in the 1890's, and the battleship U.S.S. *California*, the only battleship built on the west coast.

It was during World War II that the shipyard quickly set a record that was never broken, building the destroyer U.S.S. *Ward*, in 17½ days. In addition to the *Ward*, Mare Island built 17 submarines, 4 sub tenders, 31 destroyer escorts, 33 small craft, and more than 300 landing craft. In the 1960's the decision was made to build nuclear submarines at Mare Island. The U.S.S. *Sargo* was the first, with 16 more following, ending with the launch of the U.S.S. *Drum* in 1970.

To all of the workers over the generation that are a part of this proud history who have made so many significant contributions to the defense of the United States, I offer my thanks and that of this country.

#### A TRIBUTE TO DESIREE JONES

HON. WAYNE ALLARD

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1996

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, all too often we hear speeches on this floor about our troubled youth and problems that teens face.

Today I want to share with my colleagues a positive example of a teenager in my district.

I want to commend Desiree Jones, a teenager from my district who acted selflessly and who helped save the life of another teenager, in fact, a complete stranger.

Last Friday, March 22, 14-year-old Janet Westover, an eighth-grader at Bill Reed Middle School in Loveland, was riding through town when she slumped over and her heart stopped. Her friend flagged down another car in which Desiree Jones was riding.

Desiree, a 15-year-old sophomore at Rocky Mountain High school in Fort Collins, stopped to help. She stayed with Janet and helped her until police and paramedics arrived.

This kind of action by Desiree Jones merits recognition from this body and gives us all hope.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2202, IMMIGRATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1996

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2202. Let me begin by applauding my colleagues for separating the issue of legal immigration from the rest of the bill. However, I remain very troubled with measures in the bill that hurt children and families.

By stripping the bill of cuts made to legal immigration, the House has reaffirmed the invaluable contributions legal immigrants have made and continue to make to our Nation, "stated chairman Pastor." This move has assured that our legal immigration system continues to support and prioritize family reunification.

I must remind my colleagues—immigrants are hard-working taxpayers, they go to war on our behalf, and they do not abuse the system. The truth of the matter is that the overwhelming majority of immigrants support themselves without assistance. Studies by The CATO and Urban Institutes indicate that immigrants are more likely than the native-born population to work and contribute \$25 billion more in annual taxes than they receive in benefits.

First, I am extremely concerned with items in this bill that harm children and families. The Gallegly proposal added to the bill proposes to deny public education to undocumented children. This provision has a chilling effect by jeopardizing the education of children labeled as foreign. This requirement is seriously misguided since the role of our teachers is to teach, not serve as immigration enforcement agents. In addition, this requirement would deflect scarce educational funds to do the job of the INS.

Second, restrictions in benefits to legal immigrants in H.R. 2202 will hurt real people who work hard and contribute to this Nation. In addition, this bill adds great stress to State and local governments. The provisions that extend deeming requirements to all needs-based programs are too extreme. We are not looking at solving a problem here, but one created to divide our country and promote short-term political gain.

We are talking about stealing the American dream away from most immigrants. President Roosevelt once said, "We are a nation of many nationalities, many races, many religions—bound together by a single unity, the unity of freedom and equality." H.R. 2202 proposes to greatly alter these American values. On equality and freedom will be no longer.

Third, the immigrant restrictions would add great stress to State and local governments. We are talking about adding more Federal regulations and verification burdens to comply with the immigrant restrictions. Private and public entities will be required to redirect scarce resources from running programs to meeting Federal mandates.

Listen to the concerns of the National Governors' Association, the National Conference of Mayors, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Association of

Counties, and the National League of Cities. In a letter to Speaker GINGRICH, they say that the immigrant provisions create mandates and cost shifts for States and localities. They describe the immigrant verification requirements as a very burdensome, top-heavy approach to welfare reform.

Fourth, this bill makes the Federal Government irresponsible by placing the burden of serving some people solely on State and local governments. If the Federal Government excludes noncitizens from social safety net programs, the need for this safety net will not go away. State and local governments will have to serve them under State programs, translating into a massive cost shift. That, my colleagues, is promoting irresponsibility.

Last, this bill will advance a climate of intolerance, suspicion, and division. It will result in increased discrimination against anyone suspected of being a noncitizen. The courts are now reviewing constitutional concerns over California's proposition 187. In the aftermath of proposition 187, reports document the increase in hate crimes against people for simply looking or sounding foreign.

Mr. Speaker, a responsible Congress cannot accept this immigration bill. We must protect our borders, but these provisions take us beyond that. We must remain vigilant against excessive government intervention and continue to protect our most basic individual freedoms and needs.

I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 2202.

The following remarks note specific provisions and my concerns:

*Deeming of all programs, including education and medical services:* Legal immigrants' access to all programs would be restricted by extending deeming until citizenship for parents; for 7 years for spouses; until age 21 or until citizenship for minor children; or (in all cases) until the immigrant has worked 40 "qualifying" quarters (at least 10 years). There are few exceptions, but not for such programs as school lunches, student loans, or immunizations. In addition, there are very few exceptions for deeming to account for persons who become disabled after legally immigrating to the United States.

Denial of assistance to immigrants results in a cost shift to state and local governments. The loss of federal funds would need to be offset by state and local funds. This provision would also result in capital drain in high immigrant communities, since they would be required to pay taxes while being denied access to the safety-net they help support. In addition, these provisions would jeopardize public health. Public health programs cannot be successful if they exclude segments of the community.

*Public charge provisions would make hard working persons deportable:* Under this provision, most immigrants would be deportable if they used any needs-based assistance for an aggregate of 12 months during their first seven years of residency. Thereafter, the immigrant would remain a deportable as a "public charge" even after decades of tax-paying prosperity.

Immigrants who years later have a proven record of taxpaying prosperity would become deportable. It is absurd that an executive of a Fortune 500 company would be deportable as "public charge" because s/he needed some assistance years ago. At a minimum, a provision should be added that would allow a person who previously received public assistance to reimburse the government in lieu of deportation. This is in fact current practice, by case law and administrative interpretation.

*Impedes naturalization:* Applicants who obtained assistance can't naturalize until they

can verify that their sponsor does not have outstanding payments due to the government for services rendered. This provision was added as part of making affidavits of support enforceable.

While there is no opposition to making affidavits of support enforceable, this provision places barriers on something as important as naturalization. Naturalization applicants should not be penalized for their sponsors' violation of the law. In addition, this provision does not discern between sponsors who fully intend to settle any outstanding obligation and "dead beat" sponsors.

*U.S. citizen children of immigrants denied equal benefits:* "Ineligible" immigrants would be precluded from collecting benefits on behalf of eligible family members. Thus, a U.S. citizen child or disabled person would be precluded from obtaining needed assistance unless that person's mother or father could prove eligible status, or unless the agency would undertake the administrative paperwork and expense of appointing a representative payee who could accept the benefit on behalf of the child.

Denying benefits to U.S. citizen kids because of the immigration status of their parents is a violation of the constitutional right to equal protection. This provision would force counties to find and monitor administrative payees to collect the benefits and distribute them to the children. This would be enormously costly and subject to abuse by unscrupulous payees.

*Only affluent Americans allowed to sponsor family members:* To sponsor a family member, an American would be required to earn more than 200 percent of the federal poverty level. Sponsors must demonstrate that they have an income above 200% of the poverty level for their family plus the immigrant(s) they seek to sponsor.

This is an anti-family provision that would affect one hundred million Americans. Family reunification would be unattainable for less affluent Americans who would be prevented from sponsoring their spouses and children.

*Proposition 187 requirements and INS reporting:* With few exceptions, schools, hospitals and others would have an added responsibility of verifying citizenship status of all program participants. *All public, non-profit, and charitable entities* who administer any government funded, means-tested programs would have this responsibility. In addition to needs-based programs, contracts, business loans, and commercial and professional licenses would be subject to the verification requirement. Public hospitals would also have to report the identity of any undocumented immigrant who receives emergency services, and have that status verified by the INS, to obtain reimbursement. In addition, provisions would allow federal, state, and local agencies to report to the INS the immigration status of individuals. Current law prohibits public agencies from exchanging immigration information with INS in order to ensure the integrity of such entities. For example, current law is in place to assure the protection of witnesses who are cooperating with a police or federal investigation.

This provision may discourage private-public partnerships at a time when these partnerships are growing. Charitable entities which feel these requirements are overburdensome may be discouraged from administering community-based programs.

Mandating localities to verify citizenship status and other requirements are federal, unfunded mandates, according to the National Governor's Association, National Conference of State Legislatures, National Association of Counties, U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National League of Cities. Enforcing immigration laws is a federal respon-

sibility. To comply with these federal regulations, state and local agencies would become *de facto* INS offices.

*Primary education Gallegly amendment to Title VI:* Rep. Gallegly plans to introduce an amendment on the House floor to allow states to deny primary education to undocumented children. This amendment would attempt to repeal the Supreme Court decision in *Plyler v. Doe* which ruled that undocumented children cannot be denied a public education. This amendment, if enacted, would be unconstitutional in our country's schools.

#### A TRIBUTE TO EDWARD D. LEWIS

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1996

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, when the opposition likes someone, you know he's a pretty good fellow. Ed Lewis was a strong Democrat, but he was so interesting, so nice, so friendly that very few Republicans in Indiana did less than like him too. He leaves an empty place in the Hoosier State.

[From the Indianapolis Star, Mar. 28, 1996]

EDWARD D. LEWIS WAS ATTORNEY WHO  
WIELDED POLITICAL CLOUT IN STATE

Edward D. Lewis, 73, Morgantown, an attorney known for his vast political influence in Indiana, died March 26.

He was the confidant and political mentor of Gov. Evan Bayh, was instrumental in appointments and recommendations for offices such as U.S. attorney and the Indiana Gaming Commission, and affected a myriad of other decisions on state business. His reputation included the title "godfather of judges."

Mr. Lewis, whose Downtown Indianapolis law office at 501 Indiana Ave. was dubbed the "Statehouse on the Canal," was an attorney for 40 years and a partner in the Lewis and Wagner law firm.

Bayh said in a statement: "Ed was much more than a friend to me; he was a trusted adviser, a man of great experience and wisdom and someone who I loved."

"His Hoosier roots were deep, his common sense was extraordinary and his loyalty and devotion to the people of our state was unmatched."

After losing races for Congress and a judgeship in the 1950s, Mr. Lewis confined his political career to being an insider, primarily in Democratic circles. He was closely aligned with former U.S. Sen. R. Vance Hartke, D-Ind.

He held no public or civic positions, and was described in a newspaper article as "probably the most influential person in state government about whom the least is known." And the Butler University journalism graduate did not talk to reporters.

Indiana Senate Finance Chairman Lawrence M. Borst, a Republican, said Mr. Lewis was "a special friend." We did a lot of traveling together and just had a good time.

"He was kind of like a hunk of glue. He had so many people he kept together. He liked people, he loved politics, he loved horses. We have one together now. He probably had as many friends as anybody I've ever known in my life."

Borst said Mr. Lewis dated to an era when political patronage was a young lawyer's key to survival. Mr. Lewis' first job, while in law school, was as a publicist for the Indiana Highway Department. Later, Borst said, law school friendships with people such as future Marion County Prosecutor Noble Pearcy and

others got his legal and political career started.

One of Mr. Lewis' earliest political associations was with Hartke, of whom Borst said. "When Hartke wanted a new post office or other building in Indiana, he went through Ed Lewis," Borst said he and Mr. Lewis were on a western trip when Bayh ran for his first term as governor in 1988, "he would stop twice a day to call back."

Another close friend was former Indiana GOP Chairman Rex Early.

"We had common interests, not only in politics. He was a man's man, a veteran of the Second World War and a great storyteller," Early recalled. "His maturity, experience and good political instincts played an important role in a lot of administrations."

Mr. Lewis, Early said, "believed in his party and was respected by his party."

Mr. Lewis was a Navy veteran of World War II, a 1949 graduate of Butler and a 1956 graduate of Indiana University School of Law.

Memorial contributions may be made to Big Brothers & Big Sisters of Brown County, Nashville, or the Harmony School, Bloomington.

Memorial services: pending. Calling: none. G.H. Herrmann Madison Avenue Funeral Home is handling arrangements.

Survivors: wife Dorothy M. Pitt Lewis; children Lance L., Linda L., Lora Lynn Lewis; stepdaughter Paula Lawrence; brother Donald I. Lewis; five grandchildren.

#### A TRIBUTE TO SEDALIA MIDDLE SCHOOL

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1996

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding educational institution in my district. Sedalia Middle School has been chosen as one of 266 1994-96 Blue Ribbon Schools. After a rigorous and lengthy selection process Sedalia Middle School was selected as one of the most outstanding schools in the country. The award will be presented at a ceremony to be held in Washington, DC, in May. I ask my colleagues to join me in a salute to all of the teachers, parents, and students who worked so hard to achieve this extraordinary accomplishment.

#### RETIREMENT OF EMIL P. MOSCHELLA FROM THE FBI

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1996

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this brief opportunity to recognize 28 years of dedicated Federal service by my constituent Mr. Emil P. Moschella from Vienna, VA. Today is Mr. Moschella's last day of work as a special agent in the Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI]. He has dedicated a lifetime career to keeping America safe from crime and has done so in exemplary fashion. He will be dearly missed by his colleagues at the Bureau, and I commend him for a job well done.

Whether he was working the streets of Chicago, touring the country on the inspection and audits staff, working in the Bureau's congressional affairs office, representing the Federal Government in Leon, France, before a