

day effectively when the Committee on Commerce was asked to mark up the bill.

It is incredible to think that such an important change, not only in terms of the cuts, but the changes, the substantive changes being proposed in Medicare that would have effectively gutted Medicare, and we could not find out about it and the public could not find out about that.

We saw that time and time again with so much legislation, so many of the major changes being proposed, that we succeeded eventually in stopping once we found out what they were and once we could tell the American public what this was all. That stealth strategy continues today.

As you point out, the Dole economic plan is the same way. We hear about the tax breaks, if you will. But the details of how they are going to go about implementing those cuts, what they are going to do to various programs, whether they are discretionary programs or entitlement programs, I think at one point in the plan that was put forth, when Mr. Dole put forth his plan, he actually admitted it was based at least initially on this year's budget, on the Republican budget that was passed this year. That budget itself would continue the major cuts in education, environment, Medicare, and Medicaid.

But this would have to go way beyond that. We would see a lot more in terms of negative impacts on those programs, and particularly Medicare, because there is so much more that has to be found to reach that level of tax breaks, primarily for wealthy Americans.

Mr. STUPAK. If I may, if it is based upon the Republican budget that was passed this year, that budget was already vetoed and rejected by the American people and by the President. I am glad to see him stand tough to protect the issues like Medicare, Medicaid, education, the environment and our veterans.

If nothing else, for the listeners back home just again, let's go back to Medicare, something that affects all of us, our grandparents, our parents. We cannot have a hearing, but yet we will spend 59 days on Whitewater, 12 days on Waco, and 14 days on Ruby Ridge? Those are hearings that were for nothing more but to divide this country, to foster unfounded allegations, to just rip apart this country.

But yet something that affects all of us, that we should be concerned about and actually could unite the country, balance the budget and yet still provide for our seniors and parents and grandparents, we do not get any hearings on that, but we want to talk about Ruby Ridge and Waco and Whitewater. The priorities have been backwards. They have been upside down.

So, hopefully, as the fall unfolds, there will be a new majority come January, and we can get back on the right track of looking forward to working

with the American people, not against them, not deceive them, not be decisive, but work forward and move this country forward.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman. I just want to say one thing: As the gentleman mentioned, being in the minority for the first time, because I was here before when we were in the majority for several years, as were you, but one thing that I learned and one thing that renews my faith, if you will, in our democracy, is that once we were able to get the word out, either on the floor here or back in our districts at town meetings or with the media or whatever, once we were able to get the word out to the American people, and even to some of our colleagues on the other side, about what the impact of these Republican leadership proposals were and how they were going to cut Medicare and how they were going to change the program, how they were going to cut back on environmental protection, what they were going to do to student loans and education programs, we were able to change the dynamics of what goes on here.

That is why, even though we are coming to the close of this Congress, when I am asked, and I am often asked by reporters or constituents, "What did the Democrats accomplish in this Congress?" And I say we halted, we stopped, these extreme measures from becoming law, collectively with the President. That is an accomplishment, and that is something we can be proud of. I think it is also an indication that this democracy works, that once you are able to speak out and get the truth out, it really does make a difference.

Mr. STUPAK. Their contract of America, you never hear them talk about that anymore. You never hear them brag about it, as they did for the first 9 months, this contract is going to do this and that. They are running away from that contract, because it was not a Contract with America, it was a Contract on America.

Now you do not see them campaigning on it. There are not all these wild promises, extreme positions. I think the American public, like us, learned in the last 20 months and said the truth has finally come out, as Mr. D'AMATO said, and they are trying to bail themselves out with their little gray buck-ets. We look forward to the next few weeks.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman for joining me in this special order tonight.

---

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 104TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

REPUBLICANS HAVE NOT RUN AWAY FROM THE PROMISES MADE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues who just took the previous hour chose not to engage me in debate. I asked them if they would yield to me, and of course they did not have time, because what they said simply will not stand muster. So I am now going to spend a little bit of time setting the record straight as they leave the hall. I would have been happy to engage and debate them, but unfortunately, they do not want to debate the issues.

I would like to say the majority of this hour is going to be given to my friends from California, who have a lot to tell my colleagues about, and people of this country, regarding immigration reform.

Immigration reform is absolutely essential. We have so many illegal aliens coming into the country, costing this country so much money, and we have passed a bill and the President said he would veto it, keep us here, shut down the government if it passed and was put on his desk, rather than sign it into law. I will let them talk about that in a few minutes. What I wanted to do right now is set the record straight on some of the things that my colleagues previously just said.

First of all, we are not running away from the promises that we made to the American people. We kept those promises. Seven of the 10 things we promised in the Contract With America passed both houses and went to the President. Four of them became law. Nine of them passed this body, and we acted upon all 106 of them in the first 90 days of this session of Congress. So we did not run away from them.

Let us talk about what we passed. We passed a law which said that every law Americans have to live by, we have to live by. Congress is no longer a special entity. Before, under the Democrats for 40 years, they had special privileges. We changed that. We came up with lobbying disclosure, so the American people would know what is going on in this body.

We were the first ever to vote on term limits. For 40 years they talked about it, but they would not vote on term limits. We did. We downsized Congress itself. We downsized congressional committee staffs. We put term limits in for the Speaker of the House and for committee chairmen. We put a ban on proxy voting. We opened all committee hearings to the public, which was not the case before. We eliminated three committees and 20 subcommittees. We cut total congressional spending two years in a row, and for the first time in many years, we had a comprehensive House audit. That may not be great information for a lot

of Americans, so let us talk about the Contract With America that we promised.

We promised a line item veto. It is the law of the land. There is a line item veto. They never did it; we did. We passed a balanced budget amendment in this House, and because of Democrats it failed by one vote in the other House. Otherwise, we would have a constitutional amendment passed and sent to the States that would mandate that we live within our budget. They do not want that, because they like to spend a lot of money, and they have not changed.

They talked about welfare reform, but they never did anything about it. For 40 years we had a welfare state that grew and grew and grew. Remember Lyndon Johnson saying we are going to do away with welfare in 10 years when he passed the Great Society program? Welfare is about 500 percent higher than it was when he passed the Great Society. Instead of solving the problem, he merely compounded it by putting more and more and more people into the system, to the point where every taxpayer in this country is burdened up to here paying welfare benefits. We changed that. We passed welfare reform. The President has tried to take credit for it, but he vetoed that bill twice. The only reason he signed it the third time we sent it to him was because the American people demanded welfare reform. And he signed it because he saw in the polls that about 78 percent of the people wanted welfare reform because they could not stand that socialistic trend anymore. But that was in the Contract With America. We didn't run away from that pass.

We passed health insurance reform. They did not do it. They wanted everybody in this country to be dependent on a national, socialistic health care plan. We passed health care reform so people who have cancer or some life threatening disease that leaves one job, they could not take their insurance with them. Now if they have another job opportunity, they can go from one job to another, and there is portability with their insurance. They can have that.

Megan's Law, that dealt with child abusers and nailing them, we passed that.

Let us just run down a few things. They said we do not care about the environment. We passed safe drinking water reform update, clean water reform, private property rights protection, food safety enhancement, national wildlife refuge improvement, coastal zone management, mercury battery recycling, conservation and environmental reform in the farm bill, and Florida Everglades protection.

Regarding education, they said we did not care about kids, that we cut the school lunch program. We increased the school lunch program. What we did was cut out the waste and fraud in Washington, and we turned control of the school lunch program

back to the States where they could handle it more efficiently. But there was more money put in there for the school lunches.

The only thing is we cut out the bureaucracy. But they do not want to worry about that, because that is their political base. They say we do not care about the kids. We do not care about the bureaucracy. We care about the kids, and that is why we sent the money back to the States where it could be more efficiently spent.

We expanded student loans. We increased Pell grants; we increased Head Start funding; disabled students education reform to help disabled students. We extended tax deductibility of employer-provided educational benefits. It does not sound like we are against education to me. But they do not like us when we start cutting the big education bureaucracy here in Washington. That is what they are concerned about.

On women's issues, they say we do not care. The Sexual Assault Prevention Act, increased day care funding, child support enforcement, covering breast cancer treatments under Medicare. That is one of the epidemics, breast cancer. I have that in my own family. We cover that now under Medicare. Women's health research, funding for Violence Against Women Act.

Adoption promotion. A \$5,000 tax credit for people who adopted children to get them out of the people who adopted children to get them out of the welfare system, out of the foster care system. It costs up to \$35,000 a year, \$15,000 to \$35,000 a year to keep a child in foster care, depending on the State. For \$5,000, a one time tax credit, people can adopt a child, pay their legal expenses, and get that child into a loving home. Everybody wins. The taxpayer wins, the child wins, and the person who wants to adopt a child wins. They do not mention that.

□ 2130

Sexual Crimes Against Children Act; that passed. Domestic violence victims insurance protection and interstate stalking punishment and prevention for people that stalk women and follow them around the country to try to molest them. They do not talk about that.

They talk about Medicare and say we do not care about senior citizens. They do not care about the senior citizens because they are not doing anything to protect Medicare. Medicare is going to go bankrupt in less than 5 years if nothing is done. They do not mention that they are not doing anything about it.

So what did we do; what did we propose? We proposed not cutting Medicare but reducing the growth of Medicare, the growth of Medicare, from 13 percent a year down to 7 percent a year. It is still going to grow at 7 percent a year. That is not a cut. It is a cut in the growth, but it is still going to grow at 7 percent a year. That is 3 or 4 percent above the rate of inflation.

We are going to increase the amount of money seniors get per year from \$4,500 a year to \$7,100 a year. Now, how can that be a cut? We are increasing the amounts they are going to get from \$4,500 to \$7,100, and they say, well, that is a cut and we do not care about senior citizens.

What we want to do is put Medicare on a fiscally sound basis, and we are going to do it if we stay in the majority. But they have stopped us every step of the way.

Hillary Rodham Clinton; her health care plan increased Medicare at 6 percent. We are talking about a percent higher than her, but we can still make it fiscally sound in 5 years and not have it go under. The alternative that they have come up with is nothing. And if we do nothing, what will happen in 5 years is it will either go bankrupt or everybody in this country will have to pay more in taxes to pay for Medicare. We believe our approach is much sounder.

We give senior citizens four choices, they give them nothing. We give them the choice of staying in the Medicare Program, or they can go into a medisavings account, where if they do not spend their money they get it back at the end of the year in less taxes. What does that do? It gives you money back, it puts accountability in the system. You are going to ask questions about your coverage, about what your doctor is doing, whether or not that procedure is really important. Because if you do not spend that money, you get it back.

So they can go into a medisavings account, stay in the Medicare Program, or go into an HMO or a PPO. We give them four choices. They want the one choice now. Nothing but the one choice in a system that will go bankrupt, and they are doing nothing to address that issue.

Mr. Speaker, then they said that Senator Dole does not have a good economic program. He wants to give a 15 percent tax cut to every American. Now, I hope all my friends in America and my colleagues will be thinking about this. Americans work long hours just to pay the bills and feed their kids, and it is not right that Americans spend 5 months a year just paying their taxes. They do that for 5 months.

Everybody in America works 5 months of the year just to pay their taxes. That is why the Republicans and Bob Dole are proposing a 15 percent across-the-board tax cut, including a \$500-tax credit for every child in America. That means \$1,600 more in your pocket if you are an average American family.

Now, do American families want to put \$1,600 into the IRS or do they want to keep it for themselves for things they need? They are already paying 5 months a year just to pay their taxes.

So this November, when we get the message out, I believe the American people are going to say, hey, the Republicans did accomplish a lot, they

did live up to their promises, they did keep their agreement with the Contract With America, and they are going to give me some of my hard-earned money back instead of putting it into the IRS coffers and to the Treasury.

Now, the Democrats will say that is going to run the deficit up. When we cut taxes in the early 1980's, we were bringing in \$500 billion a year in tax revenues. The tax cut stimulated economic growth and we created 21 million new jobs, that is 21 million new taxpayers. That brought the revenues from \$500 billion a year to \$1.3 trillion a year. It almost tripled the tax revenues because of the tax cut.

When we put disposable income in businessmen's pockets and Americans' pockets and families' pockets, they are not going to put it under the mattress. They are going to spend it or they are going to invest it. And if they buy more refrigerators, we will have to make more refrigerators. If they buy more cars, we will have to make more cars. And if we make more cars and refrigerators, then there will have to be more people working to put those cars and refrigerators in the marketplace. That is called economic expansion.

That economic expansion in the past has proven that we triple, triple the tax revenues when we give American people more money back in their pockets. Conversely, when we raise your taxes, as Bill Clinton did, after saying he was going to give you a tax cut, he gave us the largest tax increase in history. That is money that comes out of your pocket, that is money you cannot spend, and so the economy starts to contract. That is why we have the slowest rate of growth that we have had in years and years and year. It is not going to get any better unless we stimulate the economy.

So let me just say to my colleagues who left, who would not debate me, they are full of prune juice. We did live up to our commitments, and we are going to do more for the American people by reducing this big Government, this bureaucracy and cutting taxes, saving Medicare, and providing a growth in Medicare that is tenable, something we can do to make sure other seniors are protected and still give them four choices.

It will be better for America next time after this election. It has been better now, but it will be a lot better once this election is over and we have control.

I would just say about Bob Dole, he will keep his word. We will get the tax cut, and the Americans will have more disposable income and, hence, a better standard of living.

Now, I am going to furnish this over to my colleagues in California. But let me just say, as a person who is not from a border State, I am concerned about the illegal aliens that are coming into this country. We are getting as many as a million or a million plus a year coming across our borders.

Twenty-six percent of the Federal prison populations are illegal aliens,

and each one of those people costs the taxpayers of this country \$25- to \$35,000 a year. We are spending billions and billions and billions of your tax dollars, Americans' tax dollars, just to take care of illegal aliens.

My good friend, the gentleman from California, ELTON GALLEGLEY, came up with an immigration reform bill that will solve a lot of those problems. There was one provision in there which said that, I think after July of next year, any new illegal alien coming into the country whose child they put into school, will not be able to go into school. But up until next year any illegal alien's child who is in a school will still be able to get their education through the 12th grade.

The President said, hey, I cannot swallow that because I want these kids to continue to come in as illegal aliens, even after next July, to still be able to go to school at taxpayers expense, even though they do not pay taxes, to get an education.

So ELTON GALLEGLEY agreed to take that provision out of the bill so we could get an immigration reform bill passed that would help protect Americans and stop the massive flow of illegal aliens coming into this country that is costing billions of dollars. What did Bill Clinton do? He said, if they took out that amendment that I just talked about, he would not object to the bill. So ELTON GALLEGLEY of California took it out.

Mr. Speaker, what did the President say? What did the minority leader in the Senate say, Mr. DASCHLE? What did the Democratic leadership of this House say? Before they said, if you take it out, the bill will be OK. Now they have backtracked and said, and the President said, if you send it to me we are going to veto it, and if you send it to me we may shut down the Government.

I think everybody in this country ought to know that this President is prepared to shut down the Government if we pass meaningful legislation dealing with illegal aliens coming into this country at taxpayers expense.

I think it is wrong what he said, and I hope my friends from California will carry on this message so that everybody, particularly the people in California, will know that the Republicans are doing their dead level best to stop massive illegal immigration.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague [Mr. GALLEGLEY] from California.

Mr. GALLEGLEY. I thank the gentleman [Mr. BURTON] from the great State of Indiana for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have served in this House, this is my 10th year. In those 10 years I have never availed myself the microphone to address the House in special orders. This is the first time in 10 years. But I say to my colleagues, tonight there is a real need to address the House on an issue that I have worked on for several years.

In fact, a large portion of my tenure in Congress has been devoted to ad-

ressing the unchecked flow of illegal immigration coming into this country, a problem that is facing California probably more severely than any other State in the Nation.

California, by most accounts, is the home of over half of the entire illegal population in the entire Nation. We have half a million students that are illegally in this country. Not the children of illegal immigrants, but those that have illegally entered the country themselves, that their own status is illegal in this country is what is crowding our classrooms.

Two-thirds of all the births in Los Angeles County operated hospitals, public-funded hospitals that are completely paid for by the taxpayers, over two-thirds of every birth in the last 6 or 7 years, the mother has no legal right to be in the country.

As Mr. BURTON said, 26 percent of our entire Federal penitentiary population is made up of illegal immigrants, not for immigration violations but for hard crimes, murder, rape, robbery and mainly, to a large degree, drug trafficking, and so on.

This is an issue that we have to address. We have worked hard and we have worked long. I would like to first say thank you to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working in a bipartisan way to aggressively address this issue. In March of this year this House passed a historic immigration reform bill addressing many of the problems that we face in this Nation. It passed this House in a bipartisan way 333 to 87.

Mr. Speaker, there are very few things that we address in this House that 333 of us collectively can agree on, so I think that there was a clear message. It was a good bill. It was a tough bill. It addressed the needs for more Border Patrol, providing up to 10,000 new Border Patrol agents. It provided for document fraud, one of the things that provides access to jobs and welfare benefits.

On any street in most of the metropolitan cities in this country for 35 bucks you can buy a card like this, Mr. Speaker, that even most Federal officials cannot detect as being counterfeits. We correct that in this bill.

In this bill we make it a crime equal to the crime for manufacturing, counterfeiting, or using currency that is counterfeited. The same penalties would apply for counterfeiting this Federal document that would provide you access illegally to jobs and Federal benefits.

We stopped access to welfare benefits in this bill to folks that have no legal right to be in this country. We have not denied anyone emergency medical care. I think as humanitarians we all agree that you cannot deny somebody that is critically ill or injured from being treated in a humanitarian way. However, we do say once that person is treated and nurtured back to health, they should be escorted back to their native country. It should be explained

to them, if they want to come to this country, how they can do it in a legal fashion.

Mr. Speaker, we are a very generous Nation. We allow more people every year the right to legally immigrate to this country. I wholeheartedly support that. We are a country of immigrants. But there is a movement because of the tremendous influx of illegal immigrants, those that do not pass health examinations, they violate the laws coming here. Because of that, there are a lot of folks that want to close the front door to legal immigration because the back door to illegal immigration is off the hinges.

Mr. Speaker, that is just the reverse of everything that this country was founded on and what I believe all my colleagues would agree is in the best interest of this country.

Well, we worked the past few months after we passed this omnibus historic bill to work with our colleagues in the Senate. They passed a similar bill, and I believe their bill passed 97 to 3, if I am not mistaken.

□ 2145

And then we started merging the two bills. We went to conference, and there were some issues that were maybe not quite to the agreement or to the satisfaction of our colleagues in the other body, and we worked in a bipartisan way to try to get to that point to where we could merge these bills and move this vitally important legislation ahead.

In this omnibus bill that the House passed out was one provision that only in the last month or so met with great objection from our President. I might add that, putting modesty aside for a second, with the help of my colleagues I have 28 provisions in this bill, so the Gallegly amendment that we talk about is not the only thing that I have an interest in this bill, but it has been the target as one of the Gallegly amendments, the one that has received the greatest amount of attention.

Let me tell my colleagues what the Gallegly amendment does, because there has been much misinformation about the so-called Gallegly amendment over the months. The so-called Gallegly amendment does not deny anyone access to education, does not say you should deny anyone access to education and so on.

What the Gallegly amendment does merely, and it passed out of this House in the omnibus bill 333 to 87 in March, in an unmodified version, said merely that in the future, after enactment of this bill, the Federal Government could no longer force States to provide a free public education to those that have no legal right to be in this country. It does not say to the States they cannot. It does not say they should not. It only says that we at the Federal Level are no longer going to force them to do this, particularly since the States bear 95 percent of the cost of education to start with.

This is a cost to the State of California of \$2 billion a year, \$2 billion a year, \$2 billion that could hire 53,000 teachers, \$2 billion that could put a computer on the desk of every elementary school student in the State of California.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It does grandfather those children already in school.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Let me just say to the gentleman, I am talking about the original version that passed the House in the bill, that said the States no longer would be forced to. It did not say they should not, did not say they cannot.

Well, the President said, "I do not like that." And there were some Members on the Senate side that said, "I am a little uncomfortable." There was a lot of misinformation that said we are kicking kids out of school. All we were doing was changing the venue for the debate to where the bills were being paid.

So we sat down and, not to my pleasure but in the sense of comity and with the attempt to reach a compromise that could bring this bill to fruition, I agree with my Senate friends to modify this bill that would grandfather every one that is currently in school in K through 6 and 7 through 12, so no one can say we are removing anyone from school, and they agreed. Now we have an agreement; let us move to the House and we will pass this very important piece of legislation.

The President says, "I will veto any bill that has any modification that would not force the States to provide a free public education not only to those that are illegally in this country today but anyone that illegally enters the country in the future." Not the children of immigrants or legal immigrants but those that illegally enter the country themselves.

Well, I thought that was too bad that the President is advocating an entitlement in perpetuity to the States that cost billions and billions of dollars to the States, not the Federal Government, but even at that point I said, wait a minute now, this bill is too important. This bill is too important to the country. So I suggested that we remove the Gallegly portion from the bill and allow it to be a freestanding bill. We did that with the President's assurance that "You take the Gallegly provision out and I will sign the bill quickly."

Senator DASCHLE said, "You take the Gallegly provision out," it is on the front page of almost every paper in the country, "it will sail through the Senate and the President will sign it." Leon Panetta, the chief of staff said, "You take the Gallegly provision out and the President will sign this faster than a heartbeat."

Well, my colleagues, here we are tonight, we are ready to go, and now with the Gallegly provision out, this passed the House yesterday in a historic vote of 305 to 123, with the support of Demo-

crats and Republicans. Tonight the President has said, "I want to reopen negotiations," and I am sad to announce to my colleagues that the President says if we do not reopen negotiations, my words, I have kind of changed my mind. I guess we would say he is flexible. He says, "If we do not reopen negotiations, I threaten to shut down the Government," not the Congress shut down Government but the President. Our President has put support, welfare and benefits to illegals ahead of keeping Government open, and my colleagues, that is wrong.

I have taken more time than I had, than I wanted to, but I thought this message had to be made to my colleagues. I have other colleagues here from California and I would like to yield to them. If I have a little more time I would like to say a little more.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for laying out the background on this. I think most people in this Chamber, Republicans and Democrats, know that when I bring a bill from my subcommittee to the floor, it is a bipartisan bill. It comes in here usually with the full support of both sides. I have conducted myself that way to bring people together across the aisle and build coalitions, to get something accomplished, and we have had a very productive record this year.

So when I heard that an emissary of the President of the United States had come up here, talked to some of our leaders and said the President will shut down the Government over this issue, I was outraged. I am not going to raise my voice on this, but I am just going to say what Mr. GALLEGLY has laid out is the history of this situation.

One of the things you learn, if you have not learned it before in life, is when you are in a legislative body and you give your word to a colleague, you better keep it or you are done for. Apparently that type of thing does not exist between the legislative and the executive branches. In good faith, people of both parties have been negotiating. The original Gallegly amendment was changed substantially. Members of both parties supported that and supported the immigration bill, as my colleague [Mr. GALLEGLY], noted, 333 to 87.

Illegal immigration is one of the great problems of our society. California probably gained five congressional seats in the 1990 census as a result of illegal immigration. Under the Constitution it is "persons" who are counted.

My colleagues from the east increasingly realize this. For years they said, "So what, that is Florida problem, that is a Texas problem, that is a California problem." Colleagues, it is a national problem. Every citizen knows it when their taxes go to pay the education, health, and welfare costs because of the influx of illegals in California and, in particular Los Angeles County.

The gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] gave the figures in just one area, education where we have an unbelievable burden that amounts to over two billion dollars. In our health system we also have unbelievable burdens which probably amount to one billion dollars. In our States and local prison systems we have thousands of illegals who are in custody for serious crimes.

But the worst example of administration policy in this area lately occurred when my Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology held a hearing near the border, we had a variety of witnesses come and testify on one issue: how we have become so lackadaisical about the border in this administration. After administration officials said a lot about what they will do to help us on the illegal immigration problem, testifying under oath one Border Patrol officer noted that they are instructed by their supervisors not to stop illegals coming across the border unless they are specifically told to do so even when they see 100 illegals. Border Patrol officers have also been told that if they are writing in a report that 150 illegals had been seen last night, they are to knock off the last digit. In other words, 15, not 150, were seen.

I realize we are in an election year, but to have supervisors pervert the reports of civil servants who have been faithful to their duty is shameful. Those in the United States Border Patrol have a tough job. It is an almost impossible job. They have been underpaid and understaffed. Congress has been providing the resources for the last 3 years.

So the border is still a sieve. The people in San Diego feel pretty good because Operation Gatekeeper has moved the problems east into the mountains, into the canyons, into the ranches of eastern San Diego County. The United States Attorney has not been bringing charges on the illegals who are bringing drugs across the border.

I first became interested in this problem in the mid-1970's when I was vice chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. In those days, the illegals crossed the border looking for jobs. But our own youth were having their jobs taken out from under them—especially in Watts. African-American youth were being bumped out of their positions in filling stations, restaurants, and hotels. Illegals were replacing them. So we soon had substantial teenage youth unemployment and gangs.

Now what we see at the border are people no longer coming here simply for a job. They are now bringing drugs across the border. The responsible officer of the United States in the area is the United States Attorney based in San Diego. He is also the Attorney General's special representative for the southwest, covering Texas to the Pacific Ocean. He is President Clinton's personal appointment. He ought to be enforcing the Federal anti-drug laws

when violations come to his attention. We know from other people who have spoken in this House that drug violations by illegals have not been a high priority. The anti-drug effort at the national level does not seem to have any priority in this administration unless an election is around the corner.

Thus, we have a situation right in the field in San Diego that parallels what has happened here in Washington in terms of national decisions. They do not take illegal immigration seriously. The effects of that Clinton administration decision is tragic. The effects on the employment opportunities for our youth are catastrophic.

So what we need is a strong illegal immigration bill. We do not need more people on welfare, be they legal or illegal. If they have been sponsored to come into this country, the sponsor should be paying the welfare bills in the early years. That is the duty of the sponsor.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. We have some other colleagues here and I know we would like to hear from them.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX of California. I thank the gentleman from Indiana. I certainly want to join in the comments of my colleague from California. We are here tonight addressing the House of Representatives on an issue that could not be of greater importance to every one in this country. That is whether or not we can come to agreement on a funding bill for the whole Federal Government. After that is accomplished, obviously we will have an election. We will see if we have a new President. But for the meantime we are trying to work in a bipartisan cooperation to fund the Federal Government's operations.

The leadership of this Congress, the other body and the House, have both said under no circumstances will we tolerate a repeat of what happened last year. We will not shut down the Federal Government and, as a consequence, the leadership in the other body and in this House of Representatives have been asked by the President of the United States and acceded to his request to add billions of dollars, specifically \$6.5 billion to our spending bills that was not approved by the House, was not approved by the Senate, complete add on, complete derogation of our interest in fiscal responsibility and balancing the budget and so on. But in order to get the President to sign our spending bill, we added all the billions and billions that he said he had to have in addition to what Congress wanted, every single penny. An agreement today was reached on that.

And after agreement was reached on that, what happened? The President of the United States through his legislative counsel told the leadership of this Congress, "We are not going to sign the big piece of spending that you added billions to at our request, even though

it contains all the money we have asked for, unless in addition," and this is the first time they have spoken these words or made this demand or placed this ultimatum, "unless in addition you reopen the illegal immigration bill and make a whole lot of changes."

Specifically they said, "You have to drop title V of the bill." They did not say they did not like paragraph 6 or line 1 or 2. They wanted title V, the whole title, out of the bill. They want it dropped. Let us ask ourselves, what does title 5 do?

This bill has been already been negotiated by the House and the Senate. The conference is over. We voted it out of here with a huge historic bipartisan majority. The President knew that. The President had his opportunity while the conference was on, and said he wanted the Gallegly amendment out, and it was dropped. Now after the vote, after we are finished, the President says take title 5 out of the bill.

Title 5 prohibits illegal aliens from receiving public assistance. It is the guts of the bill. The President of the United States is saying, "I am going to shut down the Federal Government, even though you have given me all the spending, billions more than you passed in the House and Senate than I asked for, I am going to shut down the Federal Government unless I get my way, and we can start giving public assistance to illegal aliens because that is what I want to do."

There is no way to describe this other than Bill Clinton's war on California because California, as my colleague Mr. GALLEGLY pointed out, is home to over half of all the illegal aliens in America.

□ 2200

Title V does not just make sure that public assistance does not go to illegal aliens, it does more, and this also the president wants dropped from the bill. It prohibits illegal aliens from receiving Social Security benefits.

Now one of the things that we know illegal aliens do not do because they live somewhere else, whether it be in Europe, or Asia, or Australia, or Canada, or wherever they are coming from, we know one thing for certain: they are not paying into our Social Security system. But Mr. Clinton wants to delete the portion of this very very sound illegal immigration bill that prohibits illegal aliens from getting Social Security benefits.

What else does title V do? What else does he want dropped from the bill after it was passed by a historic bipartisan margin in this House of 305 to 123? The President wants to drop the provision that says that—now listen carefully to this because it is a shocker, that the President would be in favor of this kind of public benefit to illegal aliens, people who have broken the law here in this country. He wants to drop the part of the bill that says that when

somebody comes from Thailand, when somebody comes from Russia, when somebody comes from, you name it, it is a big world, into your State, they will not get in-State tuition benefits at your State college.

Now if I move from California to Indiana, I am not going to get in-State benefits because I am from California, but illegal aliens, unless we pass this bill, are going to get in-State tuition. Title V says illegal aliens are not eligible for in-State tuition at public colleges, universities, technical and vocational schools.

Well, my friends, the President wants this dropped from the bill. In other words, he wants them to get it.

What else does title V do? It imposes stiff penalties on people who forge immigration documents.

My colleague, Mr. GALLEGLY, held up his fake ID card, which is so easy to get in America. We need tough penalties. That is why Democrats and Republicans got together and passed this historic legislation, the House and Senate agreed on it, the White House commented, said they were agreeable. And now, after we passed the bill here in the House and it has been agreed to in the House and the Senate, the President says drop that provision. He wants to drop all of title V and take it out.

And Mr. HILLEARY says, "If you don't drop title V, you're going to be in indefinitely, all next week. Try and get your bill up in the Senate, and try and get it out, because our Democrats are going to filibuster it," and so on.

Well, colleagues, the President may want to shut down the Government to get his way in gutting the illegal immigration bill, and I hasten to add, I know that we all are aware of this, that the Gallegly provision is not what we are talking about. That was dropped before we voted on it. The President asked to have it out; it is out. We all agreed this was a fine bill and we wanted to get it passed. Now the President is saying he wants to carve it up still more.

Obviously, the President is not interested in California's major social problem of illegal immigration. Obviously, this President does not act in good faith. He has broken his word. Today, when asked by the press, "Will you sign the immigration bill?" he said, "I can't talk about that because we're going to negotiate it."

Some of us here in Congress said, "How do you negotiate a bill that has already been negotiated, that is already through conference?" In fact, the conference report has already been voted on. There is only one way.

He is not talking about vetoing the bill. He is negotiating it by blackmailing us with a Government shutdown. He will not sign the Government funding bill, which includes the billions more that he asked for, unless we drop title V. That, as my colleague from California just stated, is the only thing you cannot do in a legislative process. When you give your word, you keep it.

Now Bill Clinton has broken his word on many things, but usually it takes a little longer. Usually he promises as a candidate he is going to give you a middle class tax cut and then breaks his word a few years later with the largest tax increase in American history. Usually he says he is going to end welfare as we know it and then goes through a whole Congress with a Democrat majority, majority of his party, and does not even bring up a bill before you figure out what is going on, and it takes a Republican Congress to give you welfare reform.

Mr. HORN. Takes credit.

Mr. COX of California. For which he then takes credit. But he hardly ever breaks his word this fast.

I mean this is so fast, it is blinding. Days ago, he sent a letter up here and said all you need to do is take the Gallegly amendment out, and that is great. And we have got a copy of that letter. But of course the President now, today, has broken his word, and the consequences could not be more grave. We are talking about shutting down the—

Mr. GALLEGLY. If the gentleman would yield, I would just like to make one point about the Gallegly bill that was dropped because I think it is an important point.

The White House referred to this so-called Gallegly bill as nutty. Yesterday, after we removed it from the bill, we surprised the administration by bringing the bill to the floor as a free-standing bill and let the democratic process take place on the floor of this House, full and open debate.

With the President whipping all of his Democrat Members, and with all of the abuse and lies that have come through the media in the past 5 months about the Gallegly bill, after the debate, we had a vote. It passed overwhelmingly, a bill the President called nutty, that he was holding the immigration bill hostage with. It passed by a margin of 254 of 175 on this floor, with 41 Democrats supporting the bill he referred to as nutty before. His excuse today was the excuse he was going to use to try to kill the immigration bill.

The facts remains, the objective here is to kill meaningful immigration and tell the people of California, "You be damned."

I would only make one last comment. I wish that the polls in California were much closer, at 4 or 5 percent, not just because it is obvious to all my friends that I do support Bob Dole, but not for that reason; for the reason, if it was four or five points behind, we would have a President that was on Air Force One headed for California as we speak tonight, headed for the San Diego border, telephoning the Senate to get this bill out so he could sign it on the border, with the troops there standing off any illegal aliens coming into California. Unfortunately, that is not the case.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Does the gentleman [Mr. COX] need additional time?

Mr. COX of California. I just want to underscore what my colleague has said. The President obviously does not feel California is paying when it comes to illegal immigration. He is the cause of it. By gutting the immigration bill or attempting to do so after it has already gone through House-Senate negotiations, after it has passed by a bipartisan record majority here in the House of Representatives, after the Gallegly amendment was dropped at his request, to now say he wants to carve the bill up and take out Proposition 187, the guts of it; that is, prohibition on welfare for illegal aliens, prohibition on social security for illegal aliens, a prohibition on SSI benefits, on food stamps, on AFDC for illegal aliens, a prohibition on free housing, taxpayer supported for illegal aliens, a prohibition on cash assistance for illegal aliens, a prohibition on subsidies including contracts and grants and loans and licenses for illegal aliens; that is what he wants to take out of the bill. He wants illegal aliens to get all of these things.

I think we in California understand this much. If you pass a law and you expect it to be obeyed, then there needs to be a penalty. The penalty in the case of breaking our immigration laws is deportation. That is, we are supposed to send you home.

But the Clinton administration, which, we want to remind ourselves, controls the Justice Department and the INS, is not deporting illegal aliens. They are funding ways to give them taxpayer-supported benefits in reward for breaking our laws. And never has it been more clear than in this instance today when the President said: I am willing to shut down the Government. Even though you have given me a spending bill that includes billions of dollars more that I asked for in House and Senate levels, I have one more request, and that is that you take out the ban on welfare benefits for illegal aliens, that you take out the ban on social security benefits for illegal aliens, that you take out the ban on SSI benefits, food stamps, housing, cash assistance, and so on for illegal aliens, because I care so much about giving taxpayer-supported benefits to people who have broken our immigration laws that I am willing to sacrifice the good of the whole Nation.

I think that sends a very terrible message to this Congress, to the Democrats and Republicans who worked so hard on this bill, and to the American people, and particularly the Californians, Texans, Arizonans, people in New Mexico, all the border States, who are so hard hit by the illegal immigration problem, and I would certainly thank my colleague from Indiana for bringing this to the attention of the full House of Representatives.

Mr. BURTON on Indiana. I thank all my colleagues from California. Every taxpayer in America ought to be concerned about this.

And with that, I yield to my colleague, Mr. BILBRAY from California.

Mr. BILBRAY. I appreciate the gentleman from Indiana, and I think we need to say that this is not just a California issue.

If, frankly, by this action, the President is indicating that we have enough money for social security, there is more than enough money for college, college tuition and college benefits for everyone, including those who are illegally here, that the concept that benefits and welfare programs and social programs are so overflowing with resources that it does not matter if we give to those who are illegally here.

Now, I do not think anyone in this room believes that we have a surplus of resources for all these programs. In fact, I think there are a lot of us here that think there is not enough for those who deserve to get it. The question is, do we have an administration that says I am willing to expect Americans who have played by the rules to do without so that those who have broken the law get their part because I want them to get it?

And I do not think anyone is going to look at the fact of the mixed message, as a woman who is illegally in this country said to me, "Mr. BILBRAY, you wouldn't be giving us all these benefits if you didn't want us here." What a mixed message.

But we are talking about certain things. Let me say this to San Diego. I live on the border. I can see the bull ring by the sea from my front yard. This is very real and very personal. If you do not care about the tax dollars, if you do not care about social security, if you do not care about our kids and the law-abiding children here getting college benefits, think about the hospitals in San Diego County.

This bill, with title 5, this section that the President is talking about cutting out, is the part that reimburses for emergency health care that the Federal Government mandates that my hospitals provide the people who are illegally in the country.

This is how absurd it is. Somebody jumps the fence at the border and breaks their ankle. The immigration people call the local ambulance service that serves the working class community. And this is not rich neighborhoods; these are working class neighborhoods; they need these services. But those services are being used to transport somebody to the hospital in a working class hospital, not a wealthy neighborhood hospital, and that that hospital then provides the service for free because we mandate they get it for free, and then when immigration officers are called to come pick up these individuals, Immigration does not come pick them up, because then they would have to pay the bill. The Federal Government would have to pay for the expense of somebody who got injured jumping a Federal fence because they are illegally in this country.

And so the Federal Government is a deadbeat dad that walks away from it, and who ends up doing without because

of it? Well, it is not the rich white people in the wealthiest neighborhoods, it is the poor and the needy, the people in this House and people in the White House say they care about. But this President would deny the fact that this Federal Government would finally start reimbursing those poor hospitals that are being impacted so severely.

One case, one case that is reported to be where an immigration truck had hit a person, could not be proven, was over a million dollars that came out of the hospital that serves the poor of San Diego County. And let me tell you right now I will send you the report that hospital is on the brink of bankruptcy because it is constantly being required to carry a burden.

And there are a lot of burdens, but one of them that is absolutely unforgivable is the Federal Government playing the deadbeat dad and dumping this on the people.

Now let me say the reimbursement for the ambulance service is in this, that is we start dropping off patients at a hospital, our Federal agents, our Federal Government, should start footing the bill. Now that may not seem like so much, but let me just say this to you. In 1988 and 1989, in California, the taxpayers of California paid \$21 million providing emergency medical care. In 1996 to 1997, the costs reached \$376 million. That is a 13-fold increase in just 8 years.

Now some people say, well, that is just money. Well, let me tell you what that money would buy. In California, if we were not having to provide this service, we could provide substance abuse treatment for an additional 19,000 pregnant women, 19,000, to avoid positive talks to try to prevent positive toxic children. We can provide perinatal care for 40,000 women and their babies, 40,000, and we could provide early mental health counseling for 18,000 young children.

So when someone says you just are insensitive, I provided these services as a county supervisor for over 8 years. I have seen who has been hurt by this issue, and it is the poor and the needy that everybody says they care about and have walked away from this.

I ask that the President reverse his position, do not hold us hostage by trying to strip us of title V. This is what the people of California say clearly, and this is what the people across this country say. Let us not deny the people that need these services who are here legally and have played by the rules. Let us not take away from the bright people that are playing by the rules and give it to somebody who has broken the rules. And let us not, for God's sake, be the biggest deadbeat dad in America and walk away from our responsibility to reimburse these poor working class communities for the unfair burden that they have been required to bear for so long.

□ 2215

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that very eloquent and accurate statement.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I am just so angry tonight that I am almost beside myself, so it is hard to contain my anger. When the people of California find out the betrayal that has happened to them, they too, I believe, will be so angry that it will overflow and be at least reflected in the upcoming election.

The President tonight had better start worrying about the State of California, because they are not going to elect a man that has betrayed them and lied to them so blatantly as what the President of the United States has been doing on this issue of immigration.

I would like to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY]. It has been a long, hard battle for the gentleman from California on this issue. When I first came here in 1989 he pulled me aside to talk to me about this issue. He has been struggling all these years. Until we had a Republican majority in this House, we were unable to get any type of meaningful immigration reform through this body. He has struggled so hard.

Mr. Speaker, we fought and we have worked for the last 2 years under a Republican majority to come up with a good bill, to come up with something that the Democrats would not block, because it would be so reasonable to the people of this country. Now we have the President of the United States threatening to close down the Federal Government if we pass a meaningful immigration bill, the same President of the United States who went to California and proclaimed, promised the people of the State of California, that he would do everything he could to confront this challenge to our well-being.

Mr. BILBRAY. San Diego, 1993, channel 8.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. He was not only in San Diego but he was in Los Angeles and he was throughout our State telling people, I am going to work with Congress and we are going to try to protect you from this flood of illegal aliens that is draining all the money from our health care.

The health care system in California is breaking down. The education system is breaking down. We have illegal immigrants coming to our country and immediately going on SSI, draining billions of dollars which should be going to our own senior citizens. Instead, it is being drained away. Believe me, a few years from now, if this President has his way, we will find the Social Security system is in a crisis, and he will be like, oh my gosh, it is in a crisis, and he will not relate it back to this decision today.

He promised us he would help us solve this problem. Tonight he is telling us that he will shut down the government unless we agree to give welfare payments to illegal immigrants

into our State. He will shut down the Government unless we agree to let people who have never paid into the system receive Social Security benefits, that he is going to shut down the government unless illegal aliens get the same tuition as local residents.

Whose side is he on? What he is doing tonight is adding injury to insult. The insult is that he lied to us in the first place. The injury is that we have a wonderful immigration bill, something that will come to grips with this terrible problem that is threatening the well-being of our citizens, and he is threatening to close down the Government unless we trash that bill. The people of California had better understand what is going on here.

We have a Democratic process. This is still a democracy. The news media has not been doing their job in getting the word out, but tonight this act is so blatant I do not even believe that the news media ignoring it is going to be able to cover up this wrongdoing that the President is involved with.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit upset, people can see that, but my people are hurting, as the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] said. In San Diego, in Orange County, in Los Angeles County, all throughout California, people are sending their kids to school and their kids are not getting an education, because we have \$2 billion a year that we have to spend on kids who just came from a foreign country. They might be good kids, but we have to care about our own kids.

Mr. Speaker, here we have a chance to come to grips with that, and the President is threatening to close down the Government unless we back down. It is just absolutely a terrible thing. ELTON GALLEGLY who has worked all of these years to accomplish this, you probably feel worse than I do, ELTON. It is just beyond me.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his fire tonight. I think he should be angry more.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, in my district is a city named after the grandmother of Jesus Christ, Santa Ana, St. Ann. In this city, which once won the all-American city award, and it is an all-American city, we have people living in garages, illegal aliens, and as my colleague, the gentleman from California, DANA ROHRBACHER said, good people fleeing a socialist government. It has had one corrupt government following another for all of my life in poor, politically ridden Mexico. But they live 14, 15, in one case the police officers of Santa Ana told me 18 people to a garage, the garage; who knows how many in the house.

They have a crack house three blocks from the civic center, which is the civic center for DANA ROHRBACHER's district, CHRIS COX's district. That is where they are going to complete next year the Ronald Reagan Courthouse, a

civic center for six Congressmen here, ED ROYCE, RON PACKARD, part of JAY KIM's, DANA's, mine, and CHRIS COX's district.

Three blocks on Third Street from that district is a crack house that when I was doing a ridealong in a police car, I asked this black belt police officer to stop. I said, if we put that in a movie, if an art director finished that as a movie set and said, there is your crack house, a good director would reject it as ridiculous looking, too colorful; graffiti from the grass level to the eaves of the roof. It would be absurd. Yet, we have these crack houses, very close to neighborhoods where you see little children and perambulators around.

What we are asking, what the citizens, the Hispanic heritage citizens who are legal, the second, third, fourth, fifth, and tenth generation Hispanic Americans in California are asking for, is fairness. We are bankrupting every citizen, including Hispanic American citizens, and we must have relief.

I cannot see the bull ring, of course, in Tijuana, as the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] can, but you can drive around some nights and hear gunfire in Santa Ana. The crime is going up, and get this, some illegal aliens form gangs to protect themselves from the Lobos, or the American Hispanic gangs, because they do not think the illegals can go to the police, so they are preyed upon, murdered and beaten up by other gangs. It is mess.

For the arrogance of this man, who I will do 47½ minutes on, after the gentleman from New York, [Mr. OWENS] does his 47½ minutes, we will end at midnight here, the title of my speech will be, Follow the Money and Look at the Nose; follow the money, Whitewater, and look at the swelling red nose, and I will tell you what causes that before we close out at midnight.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, let me just end by saying I really and truly feel for my colleagues in California and their constituent, and I hope all of their colleagues paid attention to this special order tonight, because they are right on the money. It is an absolute tragedy what this President is perpetrating on this country and particularly the citizens of California.

We need immigration reform. We should not be using Americans taxpayers' dollars to pay all of their bills, to the detriment of all of your citizens in California.

#### THE CLOSING DAYS OF THE 104TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 47 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, these are the closing days of the 104th Congress. I just wanted to again congratulate the American people or their common sense.

As we close out the 104th Congress, the situation in American political life is very different from what it was when we opened up the 104th Congress in January 1995. These are the closing days. It is important to note that we are going through the process of a large number of suspension bills. The public does not understand that fully.

Suspension bills means that we suspend the rules and do not follow the rules. These are not bills that have necessarily gone through the full procedure. They are expected to be so popular that there will be overwhelming approval, to the point where two-thirds of the people will vote for them and they will be able to pass.

The suspension process this year, large numbers of suspension bills at the very end of the session, is fraught with danger, because the abuse of the rules that has gone on all year in the 104th Congress is also taking place here, with some very important items that are being slipped into some of the suspension bills. That is nothing new. The abuse of the rules is one of the characteristics of the 104th Congress.

The biggest action is yet to come, in the next day or two. We hope tomorrow the continuing resolution will be on the floor. That continuing resolution will take all of the agencies and programs that have not yet had appropriations bills passed and lump them all together in one resolution, and will go forward, I hope, without having the agony of a shutdown.

I think my colleagues who spoke earlier, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] did a very good summary of the highlights of what has happened during the past year. They talked at some length about the agony of the shutdown of the Government because of the refusal to deal with the budget in a responsible way by the 104th Congress.

The Republican majority of the 104th Congress will go down in history as being one of the most unreasonable groups. They sought revolution through a budget process. They sought to blackmail and force the President to do something that should have been debated, discussed, and negotiated.

Despite all that, we have something big we hope to celebrate when this continuing resolution comes forward. There are rumors, and I hope that they are true, that within the continuing resolution that is coming there may not only be a sustenance here, maintenance of some very vital programs that we feared might be cut, but there may be some increases in the budget for very important programs, especially in education.

There is a rumor that at least \$1 billion in increases will take place with respect to education programs, and maybe more. That is something to celebrate. The 104th Congress can go out celebrating the fact that it found its way. It got lost for a while, the Republican majority was lost, and they came