

give their children automatic citizenship with no processing at all? It just is not rational. It is not fair.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we must also recognize that the Supreme Court has never ruled on the issue of automatic citizenship for the children of illegal aliens. In fact, in the one case that is pointed out so often, the Wong Kim Ark case back in the late 1880's, the court ruled specifically that his parents were legal residents and that legal residents owe allegiance and owe loyalty and must obey the law. And by their legally immigrating, they showed that they were obedient to the Federal Government and the Government of the United States, and that they were "subject to the jurisdiction" by getting permission to enter this country legally.

That definition does not fall on those who have broken our laws and immigrated illegally. In fact, the case that we are referred to again and again is a 1608 case in England, the Calvin case, that says that people who have obligational loyalties get citizenship; those who do not do not get automatic citizenship. In the words of the English, in their flowery way of saying it, they say it is the loyalty and the obedience, not the soil and not the climate that render citizenship.

I think in all fairness we have got to understand that those who are obedient and play by our laws should be rewarded. But, Mr. Speaker, those who have broken our laws, violated our national sovereignty and refused to recognize that they must be "subject to the jurisdiction" of the United States should not today have the right of automatic citizenship.

This Congress should finally tackle this issue, address this issue and send a very clear message, not just to our own citizens, that we believe in fair and equitable treatment but that we will no longer reward illegal immigration with automatic citizenship. I ask everyone to contact their Member of Congress to address this issue and support H.R. 7.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to speak about a silent crime that victimizes 1.8 million individuals annually, most often in the place where they should be the most safe and secure, in their homes. This criminal act is multifaceted and non-discriminatory in choosing its victims. It knows no boundaries of age, race, social class, income level or education. Its predominant traits are those of emotional and physical abuse. I am speaking of domestic violence.

In recent years an increasing number of new stories involving public figures both as victims and as perpetrators of domestic violence have raised our awareness of this problem. Through

media coverage we are slowly beginning to realize the massive extent of this crime which is most often committed in secret. Although these stories are difficult to comprehend and painful to hear, we all need to be aware that this tragedy is more prevalent than we think and more horrible than we can even imagine.

Sometimes the evidence of this abuse is obvious. At other times it goes undetected and leaves its victims suffering in silence. Unfortunately, this problem still seems to be very distant to most of us until someone we know becomes a victim.

A few years ago in Hillsboro, Ohio I met a young woman who was in the process of rebuilding her life after the end of a very violent marriage. She returned to school, received her high school diploma and found a combination of jobs to support herself and her young child.

I was impressed that this self-assured woman had shown such incredible strength by removing herself and her child from a dangerous, intolerable situation. But only a few weeks after I met her, I learned that she had been killed by her estranged husband as she approached the Highland County Courthouse. She was on her way to seek legal protection from the man she had married, who on that awful night became her killer.

This incident impressed upon me the heartbreaking circumstances that many victims, usually women and children, are subjected to every day all over this country. Unfortunately, many victims feel that they do not have the resources and the support available to remove themselves from such threatening and dangerous situations, and all too often, even if they can escape the immediate circumstances, they remain potential victims.

Thankfully, domestic violence is being driven from the shadows and exposed for the heinous crime that it is. Many individuals and groups now focus their energies on seeking ways to prevent domestic violence and to reach out to the victims and their families.

In my district a community-wide domestic violence protocol is being developed. This will help outline how agencies can handle the incidents of domestic violence in a cooperative way. Our hope is that we can establish a stronger effort to break this cycle of violence. I am proud of the fact that in one of the counties in my district, Highland County, Ohio, men and women have joined together to help those in need.

□ 1745

They are committed to reassuring victims of domestic violence that they are not alone and that hope is available.

At the Federal level, the Department of Justice has developed programs that train law enforcement officers, emergency room attendants and family phy-

sicians on how to recognize a domestic violence situation and how to appropriately assist victims who have suffered from this crime. All of these local, State and Federal efforts are working to reach victims like the young mother who recently and unnecessarily lost her life.

Preventing domestic violence is a task to which all of us should be absolutely committed. I applaud all individuals and groups, especially my constituents in Hillsboro, Ohio, who are working to combat this despicable crime.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to use the time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION REGARDING BREAST CANCER

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of legislation that is in the House and the Senate which will do much to help the women of the United States affected by the terrible physical tragedy of breast cancer.

I am speaking of legislation that will prevent the drive-through mastectomies, where women who are being treated for breast cancer have been called to leave the hospital before 24 hours, sometimes the same day as the surgery.

Our legislation was put forth through the leadership of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANK LOBIONDO], Senator FEINSTEIN of California and Senator D'AMATO of New York, and earlier today they held a press conference to announce the importance of this legislation which would require a minimum of 48 hours for a stay in the hospital following a mastectomy.

We also have in that legislation a requirement for a second opinion from a doctor with regard to the length of stay and the treatment. And, finally, the legislation calls for reconstructive surgery for each woman that may be affected by the dreaded disease of breast cancer.

Much has been done and much more needs to be done in the way of treatment, detection and prevention of

breast cancer in this country. I am proud to work with the national breast cancer officials who are working on a cure and who are working to increase the funding, and I am working with them on the DOD funding, the Department of Defense funding, as well as the National Institutes of Health.

For me this is priority number one in this 105th Congress, to pass this legislation and all legislation which will lead to additional research funding so that in our lifetime we can have a cure, we can have a vaccine, we can have a discovery that will eradicate breast cancer in our lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, this is the number one cancer death causing disease to women in the United States: 44,000 a year. We must do whatever we can from a medical, legislative and public point of view to make sure we eradicate this disease in our lifetime. Tomorrow is not soon enough.

So I thank my colleagues for sponsoring and cosponsoring this legislation and for working for its passage.

LEGISLATION TO ALLEVIATE CONSEQUENCES OF WELFARE REFORM BILL ON ELDERLY NON-CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to alleviate the harsh consequences that many of our elderly noncitizens are experiencing as a part of the Welfare reform bill enacted last year.

At age 94, one of my constituents is now being threatened with the loss of food stamps because she cannot prove she is a U.S. citizen. She entered the United States in 1919 from Japan. Her husband is now deceased. She has no support documentation that would show she is a citizen or that she worked 10 years in this country. Soon she will lose her \$40 per month allotment.

The stated purpose of the welfare reform bill was to promote self-sufficiency and to eliminate the reliance of government assistance for able bodied individuals. The goal being to return these able bodied individuals back to work.

As a result of the Welfare Reform bill we witnessed a direct attack on our noncitizen elderly population. These individuals clearly should not have been included in the group targeted to return to work. Recognizing this, Congress and the President partially restored some of the benefits unfairly denied this population. However, even with the partial restoration of benefits, many of our elderly noncitizen population are still suffering.

This bill will remedy the unfair result imposed by Congress last year by restoring to a small group of our most vulnerable individuals their food stamps. These individuals are our most needy. We have a duty to assist them in their aging years. This bill eliminates these individuals from a law that clearly should not apply to them.

CONGRESS SHOULD DO MORE PROBLEM SOLVING

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, frequently I am asked, when I am in my district, if Congress is making any progress in solving the problems that this country faces. I wish I could be more optimistic in my answer, yet I am optimistic about the people in the district and the people in the country, because I think they are beginning to see the problems correctly and they are beginning to sense that we should be doing more to solve the problems.

Truthfully, I cannot give them an optimistic answer about the progress we are making here within the House of Representatives and in the Senate. For instance, yesterday we had a piece of legislation come up rather quickly. It was the FDA legislation. There was no announcement the day before. There was no announcement last week. It came up suddenly, under suspension, with only minutes to prepare.

Actually, I came to the floor hoping that I could at least make a statement, asking for 1 minute, but because it was managed by both majority and minority that supported the bill, there just happened not to be any time available to discuss anything in the FDA legislation.

This legislation involved 177 pages. It was not available to me on the Internet. It is a complex piece of legislation, and something that I think is a very important piece of legislation. I had received numerous pieces of correspondence critical of this legislation and urging caution on its passage. The bill was rushed through rather quickly. There was no vote taken on this and, actually, not one single thing said in a negative manner about this particular legislation.

The pretense of the legislation is to speed up the process, to get drugs approved more quickly, to avoid the bureaucracy of the Food and Drug Administration and, quite frankly, there probably is plenty of bureaucracy over there that slows up the process. But if they are not doing a good job, why would speeding up the process necessarily be helpful?

If they speeded up the process to get drugs out, like Dexfenfluramine, which is a drug now known to cause heart valve disease, I cannot see the purpose of trying to speed up a process that guarantees very little to the consumer. Quite frankly, the Good Housekeeping seal of approval that the FDA puts on it I question. I favor the original Good Housekeeping seal of approval, something done more privately.

But the serious parts of this legislation, which I believe will come back to haunt many in this Congress, and I am predicting they will hear from the constituents and from many groups interested in this issue, in the first way the bill itself internationalized regulations

for the first time. The regulations are to conform with all other nations when possible. I do not see this as a positive step in any way.

Unfortunately, it diminishes the State's role in regulation and in food labeling and it allows more Federal regulation rather than less. This, to me, is not going in the right direction. We talk a lot about reducing the Federal control, but here is a piece of legislation that comes up rather quickly, no debate, no chance to really debate the issue at all and, at the same time, it enhances and empowers the Federal Government over the States and, at the same time, it introduces this notion that some of these regulations may well become internationalized.

In another area that I think we have done a poor job has to do with the budget. If the American people would go by what is said from here, so much optimism, that we are on the verge of having surpluses and we are running around arguing about how to spend the surpluses, I have to take a different side to that argument. I do not see the surpluses.

For instance, this past year they say the national debt is down to \$30 billion, approximately. Well, \$30 billion to a lot of people is still a significant amount of money. So a \$30 billion deficit should not be ignored and, quite frankly, I think it is lower than was anticipated more by accident than by what we have done, especially if we look at the budget resolution, which actually introduced more welfare programs, not less. So the fact that we have a smaller deficit is not too reassuring to me.

If we look at the increase in the national debt, it suggests another story. The national debt has actually gone up nearly \$200 billion in this past year. The national debt went from \$5.22 trillion to \$5.41 trillion. So why the discrepancy? Why is the deficit so small and yet the national debt is increasing rapidly? There is a very specific reason for this. More money is being borrowed from the trust funds, such as Social Security. That is not the solution. That is a problem.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my time out of turn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate had a series of votes which temporarily killed campaign finance reform. I know the general public is confused over what happened over there, but the bottom line is the majority of the Members of the U.S. Senate