

Barbara Jordan High School; Andrea Marie Garrity from Reagan High School; and Ashley Robinson from Jesse H. Jones High School.

I would like to thank the Houston community for assisting us in bringing these students to Washington. I would also like to thank Dr. Alma Allen, a member of the Texas State Board of Education and School Administrator from the Houston Independent School District who has accompanied the students as a chaperone.

I strongly urge my colleagues to participate in this conference to listen to the concerns of our young people. As I stated earlier, we have had many hearings, conferences, working groups and debates on this issue in which we relied on the expertise of trained adults to tell us about the problem. Now it is time to listen to our young people for their view.

I would like to thank the Democratic Leader DICK GEPHARDT and Caucus Leader MARTIN FROST for sponsoring this conference. Although the conference is being sponsored by the Democrat Party, we have bipartisan support in the form of Republican offices that have sent students. I thank everyone who has worked so hard since this summer to put this event together.

Finally, I thank the young people who came from all across the country to participate. I urge you to raise your voices against violence loud and clear—especially now because we are listening.

LANGUAGE AND COMMUNICATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, like no other creatures on Earth, human beings have the unique ability to communicate through language. We can communicate feelings of love or hope or anxiety or suspense or excitement, all conveying feelings of emotions, feelings of concern. We do that through language. We use the English language and all the other languages of the world which are spoken through human beings who try to convey those feelings accordingly.

We have over the years respected great writers like Shakespeare and people in politics like Lincoln and Kennedy and the poetry of Robert Frost, and the magic word of Byron and Keats and Shelley as poets. George Will in today's world is a master of the word, of speaking effectively and carefully and with great meaning.

□ 2000

The reason I mention this today, Mr. Speaker, is that over the years I think we have seen a reduction in the respect for the English language and what words mean, how grammar is expressed or not expressed, whether it is proper or not. And just last Thursday we saw, on CBS television, a new low in expression for millions of people to see and observe and listen to on national television.

There was a show called Chicago Hope, and there was a headline in USA

Today following that show entitled Chicago Hope Breaks the Barrier. Well, this is the barrier that Chicago Hope broke. It was the barrier of obscenity and foul language that I think we have not seen in any time in our history on television, on network television.

The actor involved, Mark Harmon, plays a doctor, apparently, and he was before a medical review board to explain why a promising teenage baseball pitcher had to have his arm amputated, the story says, when an infection set in and, following a series of operations, was unable to play, apparently. So this doctor on television, a revered profession in our society, by the way, said "blank happens." The USA article says, "Blank happens," Harmon said, using an epithet for excrement. Neither a CBS spokesman nor Henry Bromwell, executive producer of the series, could remember a time when censors had allowed the word to be used. "It's nothing I haven't tried a couple of times before, except this time I won," Bromwell said.

Apparently the word was expected to be used for artistic truthfulness. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the American public has, I hope, had a bit of enough about artistic expression on national television with a captive audience that breaks new barriers, not new high barriers but new low barriers. What a distinction for CBS television. How proud they must be that this barrier has now been reduced even lower. The standards for conduct, for language, for propriety, for dignity, for expression has now reached a new low for CBS and this so-called entertainment show.

Now, it is one thing to pay money and go to the movies and watch trash, which there is plenty of in today's society. If individuals want to do that, people have the right in a free society to do that. But on national television, before a national audience, to somehow be proud of the breaking of this new low barrier, I fear, says volumes about television today and the entertainment industry.

Are there no bounds in the entertainment industry on television? I suspect there may not be, as these new lows keep being reached by people who are somehow proud of this low-class artistic expression as defined by some producer who feels that he is somehow trying to make his mark. He has made his mark all right. He has made a low mark.

I would urge Americans who are disgusted with this kind of language and the lowness of it and the failure of the language to be expressive in a dignified and acceptable societal way to write CBS News and give them all that they can express about their disapproval for this kind of activity.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS VETO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Cali-

fornia (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there was not time allowed in the debate on foreign aid, and I wanted to make some comments, and so I will do so now.

First of all, the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), made a statement that more money was available to Ronald Reagan for foreign aid. Well, that is because the Democrats controlled spending. There was always more money available, without any regard to a balanced budget. Ronald Reagan decreased taxes, he did not increase taxes like the President plans to do, \$74 billion worth. And he only had control of the Senate for one term. The Democrats controlled Congress, where spending is originated and voted for.

After Ronald Reagan, the Democrats continued spending with no regard for a balanced budget. All additional revenue that the tax decrease brought in, they spent. And that was not enough, they raided the Social Security Trust Fund and used it as a slush fund to pay for such things as welfare, that was wasted in many cases. There are many families that need welfare, but not the 40 percent that was eliminated, and now the President lauds, after he vetoed our bill twice.

They are trying to do the same thing now that they did when they had control of the House, spend more than the balanced budget. To do so, they have to take it out of Social Security or the President has to identify where he would take the money from. He will not do that, because in each of his budgets he has said, I will make cuts in the fifth year, when he would not even be here. And then he refuses to tell where those cuts would come, except for defense, because he knows it would make people mad at him.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said that the Democrats did more for Social Security. I think that is a joke. In 1993, they increased the taxes on Social Security. For 30 years they stole the money out of the Social Security Trust Fund. There is zero money in that fund, but they will say, oh, there are notes in there and they are guaranteed. But they are not backed up with gold; they are only backed up by the U.S. Government. And the only way to make those Social Security notes valuable is to put the money in there. When there is a surplus, the money can be put back in there. The Republicans have said we are going to put a lockbox on it and make it a trust fund not a slush fund, but yet the President wants to take the money out.

Remember, in 1993, he not only increased the taxes on Social Security, he increased the taxes on the middle income. I think using the term middle class is a terrible term to use. There are no middle-class citizens in this country. They may be low income,

they may be middle income or high income, but yet the Democrat leadership continues to use class warfare, and I think it is wrong.

We are not going to take the dollars from Americans, but yet the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) said that the billions of dollars is just a little bit, a good investment. Well, that little bit we already funded Africa at the same level, but they want more. They want more money not for American citizens but for foreigners, out of the Social Security Trust Fund, and I think that is wrong. The President vetoed it. They also want back the majority, but I think it is going to backfire.

The President wants more spending for Africa, but yet the President, in his trip this spring to Africa, took 1,700 staffers and press, 1,700, at a cost of \$47 million. Africa would have loved the \$47 million extra and let the President stay home.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) quoted the Constitution of the United States. Well, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is our libertarian. I do not agree with everything he says, but he, if anybody, is a constitutionalist on spending. He votes against almost everything. But the Democrats vote against the Constitution every single day, in my opinion.

Remember when the President said he wanted 100 percent for Social Security in his address before Congress and the American people? Well, 3 weeks later he came back and said, no, 62 percent, and then 15 percent for Medicare. And what he does not tell us, and why we do not trust this President, is because he takes \$100 billion out of Social Security and Medicare. He increases taxes \$74 billion, and he spends it for brand new social spending. Not even the old social spending, new social spending. And we said no, Mr. President, we are going to put that money in a lockbox, not spend it, we are going to accrue those savings to protect Social Security and Medicare forever.

But yet now the President wants to take the money out. And we are saying absolutely not. We are going to send this bill back to the President. We are not going to spend money unless the President identifies where he wants those cuts to come from or unless he spends Social Security money.

I want my colleagues to look up WWW.DSAUSA.ORG, Democrat Socialists of America. They list the progressive caucus. There are 58 Democrats listed under the Democrat Socialists of America.

CONCERN ABOUT IMMIGRATION AND POPULATION GROWTH IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss an issue of great concern to me, I think of a number of people in the United States of America, but an issue that seldom makes its way to the point of being a topic of debate here in the Congress of the United States, and that is because, quite frankly, there are many, many people who are concerned, actually afraid, to bring this topic forward. I am talking specifically about the issue of immigration into the United States. And I mean massive immigration, immigration both legal and illegal.

I want to talk tonight about some of the effects of this particular phenomenon, because I believe they are detrimental; and I believe that we should confront them, even though it is sort of, politically anyway, very scary to do so.

Each year, close to 900,000 legal immigrants enter the United States from foreign countries; and these numbers have inflated our population to over 272 million. Mr. Speaker, the other day the world's population, we are told, reached 6 billion. Several cartoons have appeared in the papers in my State of Colorado depicting this phenomenon and saying that we are reaching a point where the resources of the country, of the Nation, of the world cannot support this kind of population growth.

Well, I do not know what is the critical mass in terms of population growth that the world can sustain, but I know in the United States we are reaching the point where growth is impacting upon us quite dramatically. Certainly it is in my State of Colorado. We are facing now at least two bond issues on our ballot in November dealing specifically with the issue of growth, both in terms of highway construction and how to deal with the massive increase in the numbers of people that have come to Colorado, and light rail construction totaling several billion dollars anyway, and then, of course, there are all the school bond issues we are going to face. This is just in Colorado. It is happening all over the country because of growth.

But where is this growth coming from? Is it from the population of the United States, the natural born population of this country? Are we experiencing just this kind of pressure because people in the United States are having children in such numbers that they are placing these burdens on our infrastructure? No, Mr. Speaker, it is not because of that kind of population growth. It is because of immigration policies.

We, tonight, are looking at immigration numbers that I just mentioned, of somewhere close to a million legal, and that is just legal immigrants. That does not count what we call refugee status, people coming in. It certainly does not count illegal immigrants. Every year there is a net increase. I mean we have a lot of people coming into the country illegally, everybody

knows that. Some of them leave, go back to their native country, but many stay. So there is a net increase every year of at least this amount of legal immigrants. And it is difficult to count, of course, but we know that the pressures are there.

One State in which this pressure is evidenced day in and day out, besides the State of Colorado, of course, is the State of Texas. And there are a number of border States across the United States that are heavily influenced by this and that things are changing dramatically in those States, not just in terms of infrastructure costs, but there are a number of changes that are impacting those States that I think deserve to be discussed.

□ 2015

With me tonight to do that is a colleague of mine, I should say a mentor specifically on this issue. Because the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) has been laboring in this vineyard for many, many, many years, far more than I; and I do look to him and his leadership in this area. I am pleased that he is joining me tonight to discuss this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), for yielding me time; and I appreciate his giving me the opportunity tonight to be able to make some comments of my own on such an important subject.

But first I want to thank him for his giving the attention to such a complex, sensitive and yet important subject that it deserves and also thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) for his expertise and for his knowledge of immigration, which I think provides a great contribution to those of us here in the House who certainly can benefit from his personal knowledge, firsthand knowledge, of immigration as it impacts his State of Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the destructive effect of our current immigration policy. It is having a destructive impact on recent immigrants and black and Hispanic citizens and also how a more enlightened immigration policy would benefit American minorities and, in fact, the overall American economy.

Each year, close to 900,000 legal immigrants enter the United States. Of these, about 300,000 have less than a high school education and their competition for scarce jobs does have a destructive impact on the opportunity of American workers with no more than a high school diploma who are disproportionately and unfortunately recent immigrants and black and Hispanic citizens.

Mr. Speaker, among reports of a growing, prospering economy are other more troubling reports on a growing