

I applaud Martha Page's accomplishments in public education, an occupation of great responsibility and even greater reward. On behalf of so many in the Hodgenville area, I would like to express my profound appreciation for her service and inspiration as she motivates young people to recognize and develop their talents and abilities.

It is my great privilege to recognize Martha Page today, before the entire U.S. House of Representatives, for her achievements as an educator. Her unique dedication to the development and well-being of young people and the communities they will someday serve make her an outstanding citizen worthy of our collective honor and respect.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE AMERICAN FISHERIES MANAGEMENT AND MARINE-LIFE ENHANCEMENT ACT

**HON. RICHARD W. POMBO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 28, 2006*

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, today my Colleagues, BARNEY FRANK and DON YOUNG, and I are introducing the American Fisheries Management and Marine-Life Enhancement Act. This legislation will reauthorize the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act—the Nation's premier fishery conservation statute.

This legislation continues to build on the tradition of allowing for regional solutions to regional fishery management problems by using a system of Regional Fishery Management Councils. These Councils offer a transparent process where those with a stake in the resource can be heard and can see how decisions on the management of the resource are made.

This legislation keeps in mind a number of important principles which have kept the Magnuson-Stevens Act as relevant and dynamic as it is. We have tried to maintain a number of these key themes including: management must be science-based (with peer review that includes the public); there must be an open and transparent decision-making process with stakeholder involvement; there must be flexibility which recognizes that there is a need for regional solutions to regional problems; there is a need to minimize potential for lawsuits—fisheries management decisions should be made by the professionals not by the courts; there needs to be a balance between conservation and economic considerations; and finally, the Act needs to consider the impacts of management decisions on those communities which are dependent on the resource to remain viable communities.

The management of our Nation's fisheries has always been a matter of balance. It is important to continue the balance between the health of the resource and the interests of the fishing industry to provide a healthy, sustainable protein source for the world. Without a sustainable, healthy resource, the fishermen would be out of business and without a fishing industry, the Nation would not have seafood to consume. This legislation maintains this balance and makes sure that the management decisions to maintain the balance are based on science. These decisions need to be made

with adequate peer review and with the input of the affected and interested participants and this bill continues those ideals.

Ten years ago, Congress passed the Sustainable Fisheries Act (SFA). That legislation was the first major reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and made major changes to the statute. The SFA amended or added 15 definitions, added three new National Standards (and amended one existing National Standard), added 8 new provisions which the Councils were required to comply with in drafting new fishery management plans (and required that all existing plans be amended to comply with the new provisions), included 5 new discretionary provisions for Councils to consider when developing fishery management plans, required thirteen new reports, and for the first time, included disclosure standards, conflict of interest standards, and recusal standards for members of the Regional Fishery Management Councils.

The SFA focused on three major themes—the identification overfishing and a requirement for rebuilding overfished fisheries, the identification and conservation of essential fish habitat, and the reduction, to the extent practicable, of bycatch in our Nation's fisheries. All three of themes were important to making sure that fisheries were sustainable.

The Sustainable Fisheries Act required major changes to the way the Nation's fisheries were managed—changes for the better. While the SFA was not perfect, it pushed the Councils and the Secretary to address some key issues to make our fisheries more sustainable. Since 1996—only ten years ago—we have seen tremendous progress in all three of these areas and the Nation's fisheries are in much better shape than they were less than a decade ago. But we can still do better. The American Fisheries Management and Marine-Life Enhancement Act will allow the Councils to gather better data, provide for the use of new technologies, provides new funding for “clean gear” technologies and does so without creating new areas for litigation.

Congress has continued to discuss ideas which would make our fisheries more sustainable since the SFA was enacted. Members of Congress have participated in two major fisheries conferences here in Washington, D.C. that focused on how well or how poorly fisheries were being managed in the U.S. While the overall picture was getting better, these conferences sparked debate on the new steps that could be taken to make our fisheries better. This legislation builds on the recommendations of those conferences.

The American Fisheries Management and Marine-Life Enhancement Act builds on the progress made by the Sustainable Fisheries Act, from the recommendations of the national fisheries conferences, from ideas floated at meetings with interested user groups, and from the report of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy.

The Senate Commerce Committee, led by Co-Chairmen STEVENS and INOUE, has passed reauthorization legislation that is clearly headed in the right direction and I compliment their leadership on this issue. I hope that the American Fisheries Management and Marine-Life Enhancement Act will be as well received as theirs was and I look forward to resolving the few differences we have before the end of the year.

The American Fisheries Management and Marine-Life Enhancement Act takes a number

of provisions from Senators STEVENS' and INOUE's legislation, a number of provisions from the administration's proposed legislation, a number of recommendations from the Regional Fishery Management Councils, and recommendations from hearings both in Washington and in fishery-dependent communities.

This bill addresses or touches on 11 of the 16 recommendations of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy which suggest changes to the Magnuson-Stevens Act and 6 of the remaining 11 recommendations that suggest changes to agencies' activities related to fisheries conservation or management.

While this legislation may not be perfect, I believe it will move fisheries management in the right direction. I look forward to working with my House Colleagues and my Senate Colleagues to develop consensus legislation to reauthorize this important act before the end of the year.

#### CALL FOR ROADMAP FOR LEGALIZATION OF UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRANTS

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 28, 2006*

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to echo what the vast majority of Members of Congress believe: Our country is in need of a solution to address the influx of undocumented immigrants into the United States. I would also like to enter into the RECORD a Wall Street Journal editorial advocating for amnesty, a letter signed by esteemed Members of Congress calling for orderly, legal venues for new immigrants and earned legalization for those in the United States and an opinion piece by Cardinal Archbishop Roger Mahoney of Los Angeles explaining his archdiocese's stand against proposed legislation that would penalize social and religious organizations that help undocumented immigrants.

This Nation was founded by immigrants fleeing religious persecution. Ironically, today this country has evolved to one that persecutes undocumented immigrants who, like our forefathers, came here searching for a better quality of life. Upon arrival, if undocumented immigrants are so lucky to cross the border alive and evade exploitation by drug smugglers and coyotes, they are forced to live in the shadows without access to health care or employment benefits at a job that pays little salary. In fear of detection by law enforcement, they cannot live normal lives.

This is an unjust burden imposed on persons who are welcomed with open arms into this country by U.S. employers to perform unskilled labor. As George Melloan states in his opinion piece, “The U.S. needs labor; immigrants supply labor. So the solution is to find ways to bring the two together in some legal, orderly way.” While it is true that this country is suffering from astronomically high deficits, the American entrepreneurial spirit drives an economy that embraces cheap labor. There is no reason to believe that the labor demand will subside and as a result immigrants will continue to be attracted to employment opportunities here. We in turn will continue to depend on immigrant labor to harvest our crops, tend to our gardens, clean our homes and offices and even take care of our children.

We cannot deny that immigrant labor is vital to our economy. As leaders of this Nation, we also have a moral obligation to those within our borders. Undocumented immigrants have suffered sufficient hardship to arrive here and are forced to lead secret lives to put food on the tables. This cannot continue. As Cardinal Archbishop Mahoney eloquently states in his piece, providing humanitarian assistance to those most in need, such as undocumented immigrants should not be a crime, as is stipulated in H.R. 4437. This bill so vaguely proposes punishing those who offer aid to undocumented immigrants, that it would penalize acts of mercy such as offering a meal or administering first aid. I admire Cardinal Archbishop Mahoney's stand for instructing priests not to follow the proposed law. I can only hope similar conviction will be found in Members of Congress as they oppose such legislation.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in agreeing that the only way to right the wrong endured by undocumented immigrants is to take them out of the shadows and offer them a way to achieve citizenship. As Melloan states, this is the "only practical solution."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 21, 2006]

EXAM WEEK FOR THE GOP CONGRESS

(By George Melloan)

Immigration reform is on the Senate agenda this week. The issue has been festering for years and probably will still be when Congress takes its Easter break, once again demonstrating the weakness of Republican congressional leadership.

It hardly needs saying the U.S. immigration policy is a mess. An estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants are among the 300 million souls who inhabit the Nation. Most fill jobs U.S. citizens disdain. It would be hard to run U.S. hotels and restaurants without the maids and busboys who have made their way from places like Quito and San Salvador.

Yet their presence annoys what Weekly Standard editor Fred Barnes aptly calls "paleocons," conservatives of the Pat Buchanan stripe who go hysterical over these brown-skinned, Spanish-speaking toilers. Vigilantism has broken out on the Mexican border, with macho guys packing six-guns searching for wetbacks. More seriously, the hysteria has infected Congress, resulting in House passage in December of a bill that would, along with other drastic measures, authorize the construction of a 700-mile Berlin Wall on the Mexican border.

One guy who really loves that wall is a Yankee-baiting Mexican leftist named Andres Manuel Lopez Obrador. The highly visible testimony to gringo abhorrence of Mexicans is feeding his campaign for the July 2 Mexican presidential election. If he makes it, the U.S. will have only a few friends left in Latin American capitals. The aging, tottering Fidel Castro will have finally achieved his life's ambition of turning the Spanish-speaking world against America.

Illegal immigrants are indeed a problem, although also the principal victims of their illegal status. Because they don't have documents they can be easily exploited in ways offensive to the American sense of justice and fair play. The industry that has developed for sneaking them into the country is used for other purposes, such as smuggling drugs. A few, partly because of attachments to the smugglers, turn to crime in places like Los Angeles and Albuquerque.

The inability of the U.S. to devise a sensible set of immigration policies has broader repercussions beyond Latin America.

Microsoft's Bill Gates complains that the U.S. is shutting out foreigners with needed skills. Colleges and universities say that Immigration and Naturalization Service bureaucracy complicates the admission of students, limiting the ability of the U.S. to earn foreign currency and international goodwill by offering the world's youth first-class educational opportunities. Employers protest at criminal penalties if they fail to detect document forgeries and thus don't fulfill their "duties" as surrogate law enforcers.

If Congress had been living up to its responsibilities, these problems would have been addressed long ago. The first requirement is for members to accept the fact that unfilled jobs in a booming economy are going to attract individuals seeking better lives. That's a normal and powerful drive in homo sapiens. Spending taxpayer billions on a hideous wall and more cops might reduce the flow, but it won't stop it or deal with the issue of what to do about those already in the country.

Lawmakers of course have a natural predilection toward exercising police power. Large construction projects appeal as well, especially in a Congress that seems mainly focused on finding ways to pass out federal dollars to key constituencies. But it should be evident by now that those kinds of approaches are limited in coping with honest human instincts.

The equation is simple: The U.S. needs labor; immigrants supply labor. So the solution is to find ways to bring the two together in some legal, orderly way. President Bush understands this, which is why he has proposed the restoration of a guest-worker program. But for some reason—perhaps because the president's staff is not sufficiently skillful or vigorous enough in pressing his case—the Republican leaders in Congress seem deaf to the wishes of their own president.

The second part of the equation, what to do about existing illegals, is a bit more difficult, politically at least. The first bit of advice worth taking: Stop treating it as a police problem. Nearly all of the illegals sneaked into the U.S. for nothing more heinous than to offer their honest labor. They violated U.S. immigration laws but they aren't criminals in the sense of posing a threat to persons and property. If approached seriously and with sufficient goodwill, it should not be beyond the mind of man to find ways to make them legal.

In other words, they need to be given amnesty. The paleocons immediately object that doing so would reward them for breaking the law. How about changing the phrasing a little bit? Let's say they are to get amnesty in recognition of the fact that they already have suffered sufficient hardship in getting into the U.S. and living secret lives. Various other schemes that have been mentioned, such as sending them home to wait in a queue, have one fatal defect: They won't convince illegals that it is safe to come out of hiding.

Offering to give illegals green cards and wipe the slate clean is the only practical solution. If they come forward, they can stay on their jobs and travel back and forth to their homes legally. Some who have been trapped in the U.S. by their inability to travel freely will choose to go home permanently. There will be less incentive to sneak in family members, since it will be possible to visit relatives or send remittances. Restoring something like the old bracero program for temporary farm workers would further regularize the flow of labor.

Let's admit that Beltway politics has gone crazy. Aside from the paleocons, there are the labor unions and their "liberal" friends. Most unions long ago gave up representing working people in favor of representing

themselves, which is no doubt why they are losing membership. It is hard to think of a class of workers more in need of union support than poor Latinos with no legal rights. But politics are what Congress is paid to manage. It's too bad this Congress is making such a hash of it.

## THE CRIMES OF BUREAUCRATIC ETHNIC CLEANSING

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 28, 2006

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 2006 there will be a march with world significance in the battered city of New Orleans. Thousands of marchers from all over the Nation will assemble to force a laser beam of conscience to focus on the horror of ethnic cleansing now underway in that region. While it is true that Hurricane Katrina was an act of God and the collapse of the levees was an accident resulting from years of Federal underfunding, incompetence and local corruption, some have charged, and I agree, that the present blunders and stagnation in the recovery and rebuilding operation is the result of an "ethnic cleansing mindset." The plot you will find nowhere on paper or in any set of email messages; however, there is an understanding within a powerful "government-real estate complex" that African Americans who have been displaced by the ravages of Katrina should not be encouraged to return. This unwritten plot begins in the White House where chief political strategists have pinpointed the obvious fact that without the Black voters of New Orleans, Louisiana will become a permanent Republican "red" state.

The April 1st march is designed to confront this bold ethnic cleansing by planned neglect and abandonment. The march will also dramatically highlight the overarching racist mindset that nurtures the ethnic cleansing process. On several different occasions, during the early flooding in New Orleans armed law enforcement officers blocked the paths of fleeing Black evacuees and forced them back toward the murderous flood waters.

Waving and firing their shotguns uniformed officers of the law blocked evacuees attempting to escape the floods by crossing the Crescent City Connection Bridge. High-level elected officials later condoned this behavior by their police. These inhumane, unspeakable actions combined with the present planned ineptitude related to the rebuilding of the 9th ward and the refusal of support for evacuees who wish to return, have generated numerous angry voices, especially among the youth, in New Orleans and across the Nation. In the language of RAP poems, I have tried to translate and convey the message of three of these angry voices:

ANGRY VOICE ONE: NAZIS ON THE BRIDGES

Armed Nazis  
On steel bridges  
Blocked paths to  
The highest driest ridges.  
Each uniformed gangster  
Had an official gun  
Black fathers forced  
To watch their  
Flood soaked children run.  
They drew a hard line  
Between Black and White blood—