

the balanced budget bill; to have another contributor who was an individual family contributor who contributed about \$1 million in the spring of this year, and then come along in month 7, and they got a pretty good tax break buried in that balanced budget bill, also.

□ 1930

That is the way this system has worked, and that is what is wrong with the system. Too much time is focused on fund-raising and not enough time on good public policy. We can change that by bringing campaign finance system reform to this floor for full and open debate.

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

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

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

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

CITIZENSHIP REFORM ACT OF 1997

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Madam Speaker, let me first say, as one of the original cosponsors of the bipartisan campaign finance legislation, I would ask those of us on both sides of the aisle who truly want to see this body finally address that issue to go to our colleagues and ask them to quit the dilatory procedures in asking for adjournment after adjournment so we can get through the budgetary process, not have to have a CR, not have to be threatened with the close-down of the Government. And then we can address the issue that we all want to take a look at, especially those of us who cosponsored the bipartisan campaign finance reform.

That set aside, I am here to specifically address an issue of fairness and an issue of common sense. It is the bill that is called H.R. 7. It is the Citizenship Reform Act of 1997. It amends the Naturalization Act to stop giving automatic citizenship to the children of illegal aliens and tourists. It is basically there because those of us who have worked in local government and had to address this issue in local communities realize that it is a much bigger issue than what most people say.

I served as a county supervisor in a county in California. We came to the conclusion that Washington has to quit giving incentives to people to break our immigration laws. Madam Speak-

er, in California, in fact in Los Angeles County alone, there are over 250,000 citizen children of illegal aliens who qualify for such benefits as Medicare, AFDC, WIC, SSI. And, de facto, their parents get that money rewarded to them for breaking the law and having a child here. We are talking about two-thirds of the births in the largest populated county in the United States, Los Angeles County, and those public hospitals, are children of illegal aliens. We are talking about a cost in California alone to the State of California of over \$500 million annually in providing health care services to the children of illegal aliens.

Now, some people may say that 40 percent of all births paid by Medicare in California going to illegal aliens is not that big a deal because it is California. But, Madam Speaker, all of the United States pays for this and all the people of the United States bear the responsibility of sending the wrong message, and that is, we will reward people for breaking our laws and punish those who wait patiently.

This loophole needs to be closed. It is not the responsibility of an illegal alien to close this loophole. It is not their fault that Washington has invited people in to get paid for breaking the law. The fact is, this loophole falls on our shoulders. It is not the mother of illegal aliens that should be blamed. It is Washington and our lack of commitment to fairness and common sense.

In Texas alone, there were fraudulent birth certificates sold to foreigners just so they can gain access to these public benefits. In fact, in one county in Texas, over 3,800 phony birth certificates were sold to the mothers so their children could get this automatic citizenship. Eighty-nine people today are being indicted, and over \$400,000 worth of welfare fraud has been identified.

Now, granting automatic citizenship to the illegal aliens in this country is one of those terrible bait and switches that we say, come on in, break our laws, and we will reward you. We are talking fairness here, because there are thousands of would-be immigrants who are waiting patiently to immigrate into this country who do not get these benefits because their children were born while they were waiting.

The other issue is, what is really the difference between an illegal immigrant who comes in with a child who is 1 year old in their arms? Do they not have as much need for service as somebody who came across and gave birth right after getting on U.S. soil? It is totally absurd, and we have got to talk about the fairness.

Madam Speaker, there are those who will say that it is unconstitutional not to give everyone on U.S. soil automatic U.S. citizenship. I remind you, the children of diplomats do not get automatic citizenship and the children of certain tribes did not get automatic citizenship until 1924. The 14th amendment has never been clarified by the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has

never ruled on the right of illegal alien children to get automatic citizenship.

I think it is the obligation of Congress, under the fifth section of the 14th amendment, to raise this issue, bring it forth, and let the chips fall where they might. Why are people so scared of fairness? Why are they so scared of taking care of this?

Madam Speaker, I close with the fact that we have 51 bipartisan cosponsors. A hearing was held on June 25. We are looking forward to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH] chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, setting a date in October. I encourage everyone to join with us, call your Congressman, let us address this issue fairly and up front.

DEMOCRAT RECORD ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. FARR of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to continue the discussion on campaign finance reform. As you have heard earlier, there is a big effort here in the House to come up with a meaningful package.

I would like to remind everyone that this is not the first time that we have debated this issue. In fact, in the last Congress, in the 104th, which is the Congress that was elected in 1994, a bill came to the floor, a bill that I authored so I am very familiar with it, that was a repetition of the bills that had been here before that had been passed out of this House when Democrats were in control. And I think that the approach that we need to be reminded of, in this era when everybody wants some campaign reform, they will take the cream off the top and try to do something immediately, trying to do an easy fix. We do not even seem to be able to do the easy fix.

We were shown the now historical handshake where the President and the Speaker of this House agreed that it would be campaign finance reform done in the last session. It has not been done. It was supposed to be done in this session. We have not even had a committee hearing or a scheduled vote.

I want to remind people that the bill that has always gotten the most votes in this House, and that in the 103d and the 102d and the 101st sessions of Congress got off of the floor of this House only to be filibustered by Republicans in the Senate or vetoed by President Bush, was a campaign finance reform bill that was comprehensive that did set campaign spending limits.

My colleagues, we are not going to have a meaningful campaign reform bill until we can limit how much candidates can do. We know from case law and the Supreme Court decision that we cannot, as a Congress, limit free speech, but we also know that we can set up a process where one can volunteer to set the limits for themselves in

a campaign, and, with that volunteering, you trigger in such things as spending limits, as new PAC limits, as new individual contribution limits, as public benefits that have never been given before for those who voluntarily limit their campaign spending.

It eliminates things like bundling provisions, it eliminates the soft money provisions, and it requires for independent expenditures for those organizations outside of this system, outside of a candidate's campaign, who are going to come in and comment on the campaign, who are going to run literature that says this candidate is a good or bad candidate, it requires them to disclose who they are and where their sources of funding are coming from. This is comprehensive campaign reform.

What you have heard so far are bits and pieces of that. The bipartisan freshman bill, it is a good bill. It is a step in the right direction that deals with independent expenditure; other bills that deal with elimination of soft money; other bills that deal with public benefits. But none of the bills are comprehensive, that go all the way throughout the spectrum from campaign spending limits to overhaul of the benefits that candidates should get.

Mr. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for making this point.

Many have tried to say that somehow those of us who are asking that the House debate and pass campaign finance reform are somehow doing it to change the subject because the President and the administration have their own problems with how the money was raised and given to them in the last election.

As the gentleman points out, when the Democrats were in control of this House, in three successive efforts they made to pass and did, in fact, pass campaign finance reform, it was vetoed by the President, it was filibustered in the Senate.

The fact of the matter is, knowing even then that this was a system that was headed into a meltdown, we tried to take some efforts to get comprehensive finance reforms and they were thwarted by the other party. But now it is even worse.

We just heard Members from the other side say that they want to make this effort, and we had a press conference, a bipartisan press conference, supporting bipartisan legislation. We cannot even debate that legislation on the floor of the House, the so-called people's House, because the Republican leadership will not let us. Yet we have numerous Members from the other side of the aisle who have worked many years on this problem. They cannot even be heard.

Mr. FARR of California. Madam Speaker, I think the point is so well

taken, the fact that there is no effort in this legislative body, the only body that can change the law. We are having hearings here where people want to hear and smear or just listen and say, we will finish with that and come up with something. This House has been doing campaign finance reform when the Democrats were in control year after year after year. Why can we not do it now?

Mr. MILLER of California. Because the Speaker is determined that it will not be on the schedule, that it will not be on the agenda of this House. That is what we are trying to change with many of these procedural votes, to call the attention to the public that we are being gagged in the House of Representatives from talking about this problem.

Mr. FARR of California. Continue the effort.

THE IRS

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, the Nation has been outraged by the disclosures of IRS abuses of power expressed in last week's hearings in the other body. Yet very few people have really been shocked because almost everyone either has been mistreated by the IRS or has a close friend or relative who has been.

Leaders of both parties have promised some type of legislation, possibly even before we break this year. But IRS browbeating of citizens is so bad that we need more than some quick fix, cosmetic type change. We need to change the entire system.

The IRS' ability to mistreat people comes primarily from three sources: First, a Tax Code so complicated and confusing that no one understands it and not even the IRS itself; second, a Civil Service system that protects Federal employees so much that they can get away with almost anything; and, third, the fact that the Congress keeps giving the IRS huge increases in funding.

Let me speak briefly to those points in reverse order. First, it is almost unbelievable, because almost everyone knows how bad the IRS is, how abusive it is, yet we are rewarding them with a \$548 million increase in funding. This is in the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill, and the conference report on that bill is scheduled later this week.

I voted against this bill the first time, primarily because of the IRS increase and because it also contained a congressional pay raise. I hope we will vote the bill down this week, if we can get enough Members to request a vote. This IRS increase is almost three times the rate of inflation and is totally unjustified, especially for an agency that just squandered billions, billions on a computer system that it admits will not work in the real world.

Second, the Civil Service System that we have now really does nothing for good, dedicated employees but it serves as a protection for lazy, incompetent, rude, or abusive employees.

There is really very little that can be done to a Federal employee no matter what he or she does or does not do, and, unfortunately, far too many take advantage of this. Federal employees cannot be held accountable for their misdeeds or wrongdoing, and thus nothing is done for huge mistakes that would cause quick termination in the private sector. About the only real violations that are acted on in the Federal bureaucracy today are violations of political correctness.

Thus, the IRS makes a megabillion-dollar foulup on its computer system, but what happens? We give it a \$548 million raise and no heads roll, as they should. Also, we sit around and see the IRS used as never before to get back at enemies, so 12 conservative think tanks are being audited while no liberal ones are and Paula Jones gets audited and the IRS goes merrily on its way.

Third, the Tax Code is far too complicated and confusing. Many of the answers the IRS itself gives out are wrong. Honest people make honest mistakes on their returns and then are pursued like criminals by the IRS and zealous prosecutors trying to make names for themselves.

We need to drastically simplify our Tax Code. We need a very simple flat tax or a national sales tax. Much about the flat tax appeals to me, but a national sales tax has one big advantage in that it would enable us to do away with almost all of the IRS. I voted for the most recent tax cut, the first since 1981. Yet one major disappointment for me was that it made our Tax Code even more complicated.

□ 1945

I hope people all over this Nation will call or write Members of Congress and demand that we drastically simplify our Tax Code. I hope they will also tell their Members of the House and Senate to stop giving the IRS huge increases in funding. I hope they will tell their Representatives that we need to make major reforms of our civil service system so that IRS and other Federal employees cannot get away with rude, arrogant, abusive behavior any longer.

And I hope we will finally start cutting Federal spending. We have had much false publicity about cuts, but Federal spending is still going way up every year. This is why Federal, State, and local taxes combined, plus regulatory costs, now take half of the average person's income.

Big government breeds the types of abuses we are now hearing about by the IRS and many other Federal departments and agencies. The only long-lasting solution is to bring our government back home, closer to the people, and let the private sector and local governments solve most of our problems once again.