

since Franklin Roosevelt. This is the outfit that wanted to have a revolution.

Mr. Speaker, [www.housedemocrats.gov/30something](http://www.housedemocrats.gov/30something) for those Members. All the charts that were up tonight are on the Web site, [www.housedemocrats.gov/30something](http://www.housedemocrats.gov/30something).

Enjoyed it. Go Gators.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, with that, we would not only like to say thanks to Mr. DELAHUNT but Ms. JACKSON-LEE who joined us tonight from the great State of Texas, also Mr. RYAN and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for being here tonight.

We would also in the 30 Something Working Group recognize the great contribution of Dr. Martin Luther King who was assassinated on this date and Mr. Ron Brown who was our Secretary of Commerce that went down in a plane crash yesterday, the day before, on Monday. We want to let both families know we appreciate the contributions of these two great Americans to our country. We will be forever better because of their contributions.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the evidence that was just overwhelming tonight from the Members of not only what we are saying, because we are concerned as Americans, not just as Democrats, we are saying that we are willing to lead. We are also saying, Mr. Speaker, that when you have the past Speaker of this House, the first Republican Speaker in 40-something years coming before this body and make the statements that he believes the majority will lose the majority this time around because of what he identified this time of the evidence of why it will happen is just powerful and hard to defend on the majority side.

□ 2310

We are not asking for the majority side to defend what the past Speaker has said, but I think it is important to take note and that the American people take note of what is happening right now. So I think the American spirit will rise up over partisan politics and allow us to lead.

With that, I want to thank our vice chair, Mr. LARSON, of the Democratic Caucus; Mr. CLYBURN, our chairman; STENY HOYER, our Democratic whip; and Ms. PELOSI, who is the Democratic leader, for allowing us to have this time. We look forward to coming back to the floor to address not only the Members but the American people.

#### CUT UNNECESSARY TAB ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized until midnight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the privilege of being recognized to address this House this evening, and I would start out with some responses and some answers to

these questions that you have been advised you will never hear the answers to. I didn't come prepared to answer these questions, but I actually think I am prepared to answer them.

The remarks with regard to the need to balance the budget. I agree, and I have a plan to balance this budget. I don't want to balance it by raising taxes. I want to balance this budget by controlling our spending. That is the issue. That is what the American people want. That is what I want. That is what we would do if we were a family balancing our budget or a small business balancing our budget or a large business balancing our budget. We would take a look at our spending.

Of course, we would work on the revenue side. Our revenue side has been growing. It grew 14.5 percent more than anticipated last year because we kept the taxes down. So I would suggest my colleagues on the other side of the aisle join with me. I will be introducing a piece of legislation. It is called the CUT legislation, which means cut unnecessary tab. Cut the unnecessary tab of this Federal Government.

It is going to be a new process that has never been offered to this Congress before, Mr. Speaker. It is a process that will allow for a privileged motion to come to the floor under an open rule that would be a rescissions bill once every quarter. Once every quarter, leadership will have the first 10 days of each quarter to offer a rescissions bill. If they do not do that, any Member can offer a rescissions bill under a privileged motion. And if the Speaker recognizes them, they can bring forward a shell bill or a bill that has a thousand cuts in it, for that matter, but it will allow every single line item that has been appropriated by this Congress to be brought back before this Congress and removed from the budget under rescissions.

When an appropriation bills leaves the House and goes to the Senate, and the Senate works their will on the appropriation bill and it comes back to conference and we agree and do final passage on an appropriation bill, it then goes to the President for his signature. From the instant that that bill is enacted, and generally from the instant that the President's signature and ink goes on that bill, it will be subject then to rescissions that will happen four times a year in this Congress.

Four times a year Congress will take up a rescissions bill, and it will allow any Member to bring an amendment that will be ruled in order, provided it is in the proper sequence in the structure of the rescissions bill, which will allow actually for rescissions of all appropriations that have gone out that haven't been expended. So every Member then will have that opportunity to have their attempt at a line item veto. And when that budget is done and when the expenditures are spent, then a majority of this Congress will have had their say on every single line item.

If they object to a particular issue, like say, for example the Cowgirls Hall

of Fame would be one that comes to mind, they would simply bring an amendment that would be added to the rescissions bill, put it up, debate the amendment, and we would vote that amendment up or down. If the amendment succeeds and it is to strike the funding for the Cowgirls Hall of Fame, then that would become part of the rescissions bill that would come off this floor, presumably pass and go over to the Senate for them to act on it. Now, whether they do or not is an open question as well, Mr. Speaker. But certainly the public would put some pressure on the Senate to do the right thing and do the responsible thing.

That is one way to control earmarks. It would allow Congress to address every single earmark and rescind, if they chose, those earmarks that are not appropriate spending. So the pork and the fat that is in the bill, particularly the appropriations that come in in conference that don't have a vote on the House or the Senate, unless they are part of the overall conference report, those kinds of appropriations then could be singled out in our rescissions bill and we could strike the unnecessary spending.

It would be something that would empower the rank-and-file members of this Congress and help them offset some of the powerful tactics of the appropriations people when they sit down in conference and put these appropriations in the bill. It is appropriate. It is something I believe our Founding Fathers would agree with. It is something that will control, to some degree, the overspending of our budget.

Now, one can argue that it is entitlements that are the big part of this, and I will agree. Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security and interest, those four items, are swallowing up more than half of our budget. Our discretionary portion of the budget is getting smaller and smaller. But we can still address the overspending in our discretionary budget. And this doesn't mean we can't address our entitlements. I am for going down that path of addressing the entitlements too, Mr. Speaker.

Now, my CUT bill will be introduced sometime in the next 2 weeks, and that means Cut the Unnecessary Tab of Congress. It is new. I think it is unique. I do not think anything has ever been offered like this in Congress before. I don't want to go so far as to say that it is revolutionary, but I will go so far as to say that I believe it is necessary. It is necessary for us to shine some sunshine on the things we do here in this Congress and let the people see how we do business, and put people up in this Congress for a vote so we can read their voting record and determine where they really stand.

So these kind of nights when you hear this rhetoric go on over and over and over again, that we are spending too much money and we are irresponsible and the national debt is going up and up and up and up, I would say to the people that have been making

those statements night after night down here, what is your plan? What plan do you propose, other than raising taxes?

You are talking like we don't respond to you. We respond to you. I am responding to you right now and asking you to join me in my CUT bill. We will do something responsible. We will slow down Federal spending and make everybody in this Congress accountable, to have a vote on potentially every single line item in the entire \$2.7 trillion budget.

That is a responsible thing for us to do, and I am asking for support on both sides of the aisle. I actually think there will be some significant Democrat support on the other side of the aisle, and I am confident there will be significant support here on the Republican side of the aisle. That is one thing we can do.

Now, this foreign debt issue. Well, foreign debt just comes two ways. One is if we have deficit spending and then we are borrowing to keep this government going. All of that debt isn't foreign debt. A percentage of it is, and I have seen the numbers. It isn't a shocking piece that is foreign debt. But we have foreign countries that invest in U.S. Treasury bills because they believe in our currency. So you can declare that to be foreign debt, and I won't deny it. And I am not comfortable with an ever-growing foreign debt.

Another way we can get foreign debt is to have a negative balance of trade. A year ago it was a minus \$617.7 billion in a negative balance of trade. A lot of that is because of oil and another big chunk of it is because of China. Those two things added together, I believe, are nearing about \$400 billion between those two categories all together. That was a year ago, minus \$617.7 billion. This last year, it was just reported out a month or a little more ago, a minus \$725 billion imbalance in trade deficit.

So whenever we come with a trade deficit, that means that there are companies and countries, foreign companies and foreign countries that will hold collateral of the United States. We buy more than we sell, so that deficit becomes collateralized in collateral here in the United States. I know at one point the Japanese owned Rockefeller Plaza. So that would be an example. They have since sold it, but that kind of collateral is held here in this country and it grows: \$725 billion.

This kind of growth rate of our trade deficit, we are approaching that point where it will be \$1 trillion a year. And if you do \$1 trillion a year for 10 years, you have got, miraculously, \$10 trillion in debt. These numbers continue to grow. It can't go on forever. We need to reverse that.

Unlike my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I have a plan to address that as well. And it is not a difficult plan to understand. It is one that serious economists will not disagree with, and it is called the fair tax. The

fair tax is a national consumption tax. And what it does is it recognizes that what you tax, you get less of. Well, we're taxing all productivity in America under this policy that we have today under the Internal Revenue Code: The corporate income tax and the individual income tax and all of the taxes we have that roll around that.

□ 2320

I propose under the FAIR Tax, H.R. 25, to take all tax off productivity in America. Ronald Reagan said what you tax you get less of. So I want to take all tax off of all productivity. We will more than double the economy in this country in 10 to 15 years. If we do that and put the tax on consumption, then we are providing the incentive for savings and investment. To take the earnings, put it in savings and investment. People will decide when they will pay the taxes. But the important part is to untax productivity so we get more productivity. When that happens, gross domestic product jumps and doubles. People have 56 percent more money in their pockets because we are not withholding from their paycheck and they go out into the retail businesses and spend money. The tax is collected there, and it comes into the national treasury and that is a wash. We do not collect any more or less taxes than we do under the income tax system, but what we have done is taken this burden of our taxes off. We have gotten rid of a trillion dollars in anchor that we are dragging every year to fund our IRS and force our IRS, and then the disincentives when people will no longer work that overtime or invest that money in their production line.

The FAIR tax is the solution to this economy. It fixes the balance of trade. The way it does that, for example, if you had a Mazda on a dealer's lot with a \$30,000 price tag and you had a Chevy or a Ford sitting on a dealer's lot with a \$30,000 price tag. Competitively they have matched their prices so the vehicles are built with competitive value and competitive prices; \$30,000 is an example.

Then we pass the FAIR tax, and it will remove 22 percent out of that automobile because that is the embedded Federal tax that has to be built into that price so that the corporations can pay taxes: Their corporate income tax, their payroll tax, and a series of other taxes that are built into the burden of running a company. Passing the FAIR tax takes the income tax pricing component out of that automobile, the \$30,000 Ford or Chevy or American-made vehicle goes down to \$23,400. And the Mazda made in Japan stays at \$30,000.

Then we add the embedded tax back in, the 23 percent tax and you write the check for the Chevy or the Ford for \$30,420. You write the check for the Mazda for \$39,000. That is a 28 percent marketing advantage for the American-made vehicle. That means those \$800 million worth of Mazdas coming

over from Japan every year do not come in any where as near as great of numbers any more, and some of those Chevies and Fords go to Japan to be sold. And over there, they are priced at 22 percent less because we have taken the Federal tax out of the pricing component and put it on the sales size.

That is how we fix this minus \$725 billion imbalance of trade. And when we have revenue coming into the Federal Government, we also have repaired the problem with regard to balancing our budget. We will be able to do this. What we need, though, 44 percent of Americans are not paying taxes at all. They are not filing their returns. They do not have a tax liability.

It was Alexander Tyler who said that when Americans understand that a majority of them can vote themselves benefits from the public treasury, on that day democracy ceases to exist. We are closing in on that 51 percent number that Alexander Tyler was so concerned about. It is 44 percent today, and perhaps the number is larger. We need to turn that around. We need to make taxpayers out of every American. Get them vested in this. We can untax the poor in America at the same time.

But I want to point out an anecdote that I think illustrates how the face of America gradually would be changed. That is I have often said that little Johnny would have to put a couple dimes up on the counter when he bought his baseball cards or little Sally on her Barbie doll clothes, and they would understand that they had to fund the expensive Federal Government. That would change the politics of America one transaction at a time, one child at a time, growing to adulthood. Every time they make a transaction, they would realize they had to pay for this expensive Federal Government. That has been the story I have used and created because it illustrated something I wanted to express.

Well, last Friday night I was at a dinner in Iowa. A young candidate for Congress stepped forward and he told about his son, Michael, who was buying a package of Skittles for 85 cents. I believe Michael is 8 years old. He put the Skittles on the counter and the checkout lady said that will be 91 cents. And Michael said the Skittles are 85 cents, why do you want 91 cents?

You have to pay the tax.

I have to pay tax on Skittles, he said.

Yes. The answer is you have to pay tax on the Skittles, the baseball cards, the automobile, the Barbie doll clothes, the prom dress, the pampers and the limousine service if it is for personal service, all of those things. And every time we dug into our pocket and put that cash out for Uncle Sam, all of us would be reminded we have an expensive Federal Government and we would ask, can we get along without some of these services. Can we be a little more personally responsible? Could we get a little more efficiency out of our churches because we do not get much efficiency out of our Federal

Government? Those kinds of questions would go on one at a time by the tens and hundreds of millions over the generations, and the face of America and attitude of America toward government would change.

So two things, fix the problems which have been laid out here tonight by the people on the other side of the aisle, and one of those things is the CUT bill, the Cut the Unnecessary Tab that America has so we can do a rescissions bill under an open rule so we can cut the earmarks that are unnecessary, the pork that is unnecessary, and put a final stamp of approval on a budget and all of us be proud that we voted our conscience and our needs.

The other side is let us reform our taxes. Serious economists will not argue with the position I have taken here tonight. But what I do recognize is we have had a long, strong economy. This long, strong economy, we had ten quarters in a row where we had 3 percent or more growth in our gross domestic product. Unemployment has been ratcheting down. It is about 4.7 percent right now. When you get that kind of smooth sailing for 10 quarters, and now the 11th quarter was the last one and I think that settled in around 1.6 or 1.7. You cannot carry that run on forever, but no one can find a better run in this economy at least going back to the early Reagan years and perhaps well before that because even before a similar kind of 3 percent run of growth for 10 consecutive quarters did exist in the early 1980s, it existed in an environment of 22 percent interest and high unemployment and high inflation rates. We had to get that under control.

A strong growth and economy was not doing as much as the strong growth we have had over the last 11 quarters here in the United States of America. So this solid economy that we have really works against us in a way because I do not believe we will find the political will to reform our taxes under this kind of an economic environment.

So I will say there are only two ways we can pass H.R. 25, the FAIR tax bill, and one of those ways is if we had an economic collapse or a dramatic economic downturn. That would cause us to look for solutions to bring our economy out of the potential doldrums.

That is not something I anticipate nor do I desire. I do not want to do business and get tax reform under that kind of an environment, although I think it would be better for us to go through that kind of pain and come out the other side with the FAIR tax as a policy.

I want to avoid an economic collapse or a downturn, so the other alternative is if we had a Presidential candidate who runs for the candidacy on the FAIR tax and wins the Presidency and receives a mandate from the American people. That kind of mandate from the American people would bring it to this Congress, good economy or not, and we could hammer out a good fair tax pol-

icy that would be a reform. That fixes our balance of trade and our deficit spending and it fixes the borrowing from foreign governments and lets us pay all of that back. It makes the United States of America the destination Nation of choice for the capital in the world. It brings back \$11 trillion in stranded American capital that is in foreign economies.

□ 2330

All of those things happened good out of this. These are solutions, Mr. Speaker, to the problems that were raised over here on the other side of the aisle tonight. I ask again, what is your plan? I have laid out my plan and there are clear solutions. There are well thought out solutions, and I present them to this Congress, Mr. Speaker, and ask for endorsement and support of those clear and logical and rational and, in fact, with regard to the FAIR tax, irrefutably solid economic plan, one that serious economists will not challenge.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I didn't come here to the floor to talk about taxes. I came here and listened to the statements made by my colleagues and that, Mr. Speaker, is my rebuttal for their remarks.

I came here to talk about immigration because I think it is important for us to look ahead to the future of this Nation. And I have watched people marching in the streets across this country. It sounds to me as though they have a series of marches that are planned in the near future.

I recall in my mind's eye the television shots of a half a million people in the streets of Los Angeles, a half a million pouring into the streets to march and march under the Mexican flag in a big way. And as I looked across there and tried to do my count, my judgment was that perhaps there were 10 Mexican flags for every American flag in the streets of Los Angeles.

These protests went on in other cities around the country as well. Students walked out of school in places like Marshalltown, Iowa, for example, and marched with Mexican flags. I don't know how many of them actually knew what they were doing or understood the issue at all. Part of it might have just been a reason to get out of school. And I don't know how many of them salute our American flag, put their hand over their heart and pledge allegiance to the flag. Perhaps most of them do.

But I also saw anger in the streets of Los Angeles, and it reminds me that was the place where the American soccer team some years ago played the Mexican soccer team, and the American soccer team, when they came through the tunnel, were pummeled with garbage and trash and food wrappers and anything that the people in the stands in Los Angeles could throw at our American soccer team.

There is a friction there, Mr. Speaker. And the people that are marching under Mexican flags aren't marching

with a request that we accept them underneath the American flag. If they were, they would be marching under an American flag. I think that is a simple piece of logic.

The questions that are not asked on this immigration issue, it is much rhetoric. It has been an intense effort to repeat over and over again certain fallacies, and those fallacies seem to be, they seem to believe if they repeat them enough, soon or later people will accept them and regard them to be true.

For example, we can't deport 12 million people. Yes, we can. We could do that if we mobilized our Nation. We could deport 12 million people. It would be the largest human deportation ever in the history of the world. We don't have the will to do that. I don't propose that we do that, but I don't accept the idea that we could not deport 12 million people if we chose to do so.

But I will submit instead, Mr. Speaker, that we set policies in place that shut off the jobs magnet. The 12 million people and, in fact, I believe that number is significantly larger than 12 million people. But the 12 million number that the Pew Foundation has put out within the last couple of weeks, and now we have adjusted our 11 million to 12 million, they came here on their own. They got here on their own dime, so to speak and maybe on \$1,500 or so to a coyote to get them across the border and up into the United States. But they came here on their own. They found their own resources to get here on their own, and we can set up policies that shut off this jobs magnet and they can find a way to go back home on their own. That's the right kind of policy to have.

We don't want to go out and pull people out of houses and load them up in buses and haul them back down to south of the border. We want to set a policy that we should have had in place a long time ago, and we want to enforce the policy that we should have had in place a long time ago.

I sit on the Immigration Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee. I sit on immigration hearings, sometimes two, three, perhaps even more per week. I have done that for more than 3 years, listening in these hearings, and you get educated about immigration policy if you are listening in that fashion and asking questions and reading and probing.

And I will say the part that is missing is this: Employer sanctions. I cannot determine that the Federal Government has sanctioned a single employer in the last 2 years. I did get a report that they have sanctioned three employers in the last year. But then I got a report that there were none in the year before. And when I drill down into that information I tend to find out they were civil actions that were brought, not other actions from our Department of Justice. And so I would ask the Department of Justice demonstrate what employers have been

sanctioned, how many and for how much and what are the violations, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to live with the belief though that there are no effective employer sanctions. That is probably the most accurate way to state at least the last 2 years, and the years prior to that there have been a few sanctions but they get less and less as the years go on, and it demonstrates the administration has no will to enforce these laws in the workplace. So I submit that we need to enforce employer sanctions to the fullest extent the law. I support enhancing those employer sanctions.

I do not know how to get the administration to do their job and enforce the law. And so since Americans know that there is no enforcement of employer sanctions, employers know that they can hire illegals with impunity. They are not accountable.

Now if you are an employer and you are competing against other businesses, perhaps in foreign countries or maybe across town, and those other businesses have a cheaper labor supply than you have, if they are across town they might be hiring illegal labor.

Say, perhaps you are a landscape company and you go out and cut grass and spray lawns and fertilize them and trim trees and lay sod and do yards for new houses and those kind of things where it takes a lot of labor, labor that can go out and be effective in their work. If you do that, Mr. Speaker, and you are competing against someone who is paying half the price for labor that you are, you have got to get twice the work out of your employees in order to be able to compete with that. And you can only push people so hard.

And I have spent my life in the construction business and hired a lot of men and we have done a lot of work. And I met payroll for over 28 years, over 1,400 some consecutive weeks, signed pay checks, met the cash flow, hired people, took on all the liability, the Worker's Comp, the Unemployment, the health insurance, the retirement fund and the liability insurance that goes with that, the H.R. issues that go with hiring personnel when you know you want to keep them there. I put my people in a seasonal business, giving them 12 months out of the year work with vacation pay and benefits because I wanted to keep those employees and have them on hand when I needed them.

Now, some of my competition looked at it the other way and decided, well, if STEVE KING has to pay \$17 an hour to start out an unskilled employee, we can go out here and get ourselves one for 7 or \$8 an hour, and we will put them on the job and we can have twice as many. Actually they could have three times as many because the illegals don't carry with them those burdens of health insurance, unemployment benefits, you know, I gave you the list. So smart money will go for the cheap help.

And they don't have to maintain that help throughout the winter, the non

working season. They can just simply work them when they need them, cut them loose when they don't need them. And I won't say that is necessarily abuse because these people are willing to accept that wage. They are glad to. It is the opportunity that they have. But it puts the worker who is working legally at a disadvantage. It puts the employer who wants to hire legal employees at a disadvantage. And we are doing a tremendous disservice against the people who are complying with our laws. And I don't hear anything coming out of the United States Senate these days that would change that, Mr. Speaker. I don't hear a word that would change that with regard to the guest worker/ temporary worker policies that are coming.

There are those who stand with me on this issue certainly. And those I applaud for standing for American sovereignty.

Borders. If there is any institution that has survived and thrived in the 20th century, it is the nation state. The nation state has come through all of the chaos of two world wars and a Cold War and numerous other battles and economic collapse that we saw in 1929 and other blips in our economic bubble that we have had, and throughout all of that and through all the strife and the stress that goes on, the nation state survives.

A nation state must have borders. And you can't call them borders if you don't enforce them. If you simply draw a line on a map but people cross that border at will, if they haul goods and services across the border at will, if they haul contraband across the border at will, you don't have a border, and pretty soon you don't have a nation.

I made a point before a group in Texas last weekend on Saturday night down in Dallas, and I asked them to forgive me if my precision on Texas history wasn't exactly right. But I am going to make another attempt here tonight on the floor of the Congress, Mr. Speaker, and it is going to be close, if not precisely correct.

I would take us all back to 1821 in Texas. Texas was a territory of Mexico at the time. And one of the earliest Anglo settlers in Texas was the father of the famous Steven F. Austin. His name was Moses Austin.

□ 2340

He negotiated with the king of Spain for a permit to establish an Anglo colony in Texas, the first nonHispanic, I guess we could call it, or they all called it the Anglo colony in Texas. In 1821 he negotiated to establish that settlement. He began to establish that settlement, and then there was a revolution in Mexico. Spain lost control of Mexico later that same year, in 1821, and the successor then to the king of Spain was the new king of Mexico, King Augustin de Iturbide. And that new king of Mexico honored the agreement with Moses Austin and allowed them to continue with their colony

that they were establishing, I believe, near Nacogdoches, Texas.

So as these years unfolded and there was a contest and a battle for who could be the leader of Mexico, in 1825, Texas still being a territory of Mexico, they issued an offer out to the rest of the continent, and the offer was this: If you are married and you will come to Texas and promise to pay \$30 over the next 6 years to the government of Mexico, we will give you a league of land. A league of land being 4,428 acres. Well, that is a pretty good offer even back in those days when \$30 was really \$30.

So that started a vast land stampede, and people came from the United States, all over the United States, but, of course, we always think of Davy Crockett from Tennessee and Colonel Travis and Jim Bowie. Those folks poured into Texas. They came in to seek their fortune. They came in to claim that league of land. I do not know how many of those guys were actually married so they could do that, but a lot of Anglos poured into Texas. That was 1825 when that offer came, and Texas was well on its way to independence by 1836, 11 years later. Only 11 years after an open borders plan that was offered by the territory of Texas, which was a territory of Mexico, they said, Come down here. We will give you some land. We need some folks to settle here. It will be good for our economy. We cannot get along in Texas unless we have some settlers down here; so we are going to take them from wherever we can get them, and it does not matter if they do not culturally match the people that are there. Well, it was clear that that was the clash that came at Goliad, the clash that came at the Alamo, the clash that culminated down at San Jacinto.

So I posed that question in Dallas Saturday night. Texas is not part of Mexico anymore, is it? Or is it yet, Mr. Speaker? That is the question that is before this Congress. That is the question that is before the Senate today. It makes a difference when you open borders up. It makes a difference when you allow in perhaps 4 million people a year that have contempt for our laws.

Their very first act upon setting foot in the United States of America is to violate our laws, and we think they are going to respect our laws if we grant them a free pass?

Thomas Sowell wrote some words. He said, What if bank robbers who were caught were simply told to give the money back and not to do it again? What if murderers who were caught were turned loose and warned not to kill again? Would that be proof that it is futile to take action when no action was taken? Could it be that it is impossible to enforce our border laws when no one has tried? That is Thomas Sowell, Mr. Speaker.

And I think I have quite a lot of material here, but I am not so unique in my presentation that I would not love to concede some of this time to the gentleman from Texas, my good friend Mr. GOHMERT.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I appreciate very much my friend from Iowa for sharing this Special Order. And I appreciate the things that you have been pointing out.

Of course, as you talk about Texas history, you are talking about my State. It is where I was born, reared, grew up. Except for my 4 years in the service and the summer I spent in the Soviet Union on an exchange program, it has been home. And when you talk about Nacogdoches and San Augustine, right in that area where the first settlement in Texas occurred, that is my district. That is my home. That is my district. So it is interesting. And I love history. I was a history major in college.

And one of the things we were taught in elementary school, one of the things we were taught in junior high; high school; and college; Texas A&M, where I attended, we got the same thing all the way through schooling: What two words in common language are the basis for America's strength? "Melting pot." We are a melting pot. People came from all over the world to America. They assimilated. They came together through heat and difficulties and problems of the day. And the heat that tests people and makes them pure and stronger, that heat brought us together and melted us together into one Nation under God, indivisible, and, yes, there was liberty and eventually justice for all.

But I thought about it as you mentioned earlier, Mr. KING, the discussion about immigration. Immigration has been a lifeblood to this country, and that does not need to stop. But as we have gotten wise in our own eyes, as you can find reference in the old Testament, "wise in our own eyes," we quit using the melting pot metaphor and gone to using something that some people today like to say is even better: We are now a tossed salad, where each ingredient retains its individuality and just mixes together.

A tossed salad. That was never the strength of America. The America that became strong, the America that we studied, the America that made it through world wars, the America that is responsible for France not speaking anything but French now and Germany speaking German, the great America that has allowed England to speak the language that it was accustomed to, the America that has not been imperialist, as some French people would say. Some French people say, You are imperialist. I say, Then why are you not speaking English instead of French? That is because it was never our intention. Why do Iraqis not speak English? Because that is not our intention. We are a great country and have always been.

And if you would allow me and indulge me, the thing that I would like to share further is the oath of allegiance that is taken when someone becomes a citizen, and if the gentleman

would continue to yield, I would like to go through that.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for people to be reminded. This is the oath. You want to assimilate in this country? You want to be a citizen of this country? Take this oath. And you have got to mean it. It is under oath.

"I hereby declare, on oath, that I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure," and, of course, in Texas we do not abjure a lot, but we know what "renounce" means, "renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or which I have heretofore been a subject or citizen." That is pretty strong language.

And if you have any comments on that first part of this oath.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, thank you, Mr. GOHMERT. I have got to speak to naturalized citizens in the courthouse. Sioux City is a location where we have the most activity there in my district, and I look forward to those events and take that very seriously.

In fact, I bring a Constitution to every one of those new students, and this will be an example of it. And I will sign that and date that and present that to them as a cherished document.

And in the Constitution, of course, we have also the Declaration of Independence as part of that. And I talk to them about the immigrant heritage of my family and how we had opportunities here and how my ancestors and myself and my children and then my grandchildren, hopefully, will remain grateful for the privilege that this country has offered.

And I know that my grandmother came from Germany, and she reared six sons. She sent one to the South Pacific. That was my father. And one was physically unable to serve in the military, and the other four went back to Europe to fight against the old country.

□ 2350

They put their roots down in this country solid and hard from the beginning. And my father went his first day to kindergarten speaking only German. And when he came home from school that day, he said "hello" to his mother in German. And she turned to him and said "Speaking German in this household is for you from now on verboten. I came here to become an American, and you will go to school and learn English, and you will bring it home and you will teach it to me. That is the only way that I can learn."

She never really came away from her German accent, but she spoke English well, and I could always understand her.

I yield back to you, Mr. GOHMERT, if you have other comments.

Mr. GOHMERT. The gentleman from Iowa understands what it means then through his heritage to absolutely, entirely renounce fidelity to any foreign state or sovereignty. That is critical. And my great grandfather came over,

was a European immigrant, in around 1870, came to South Texas and settled there. He didn't speak English and he had about \$20.

Within 25 years, he built one of the nicest homes that is still there, it has a historical marker, State of Texas and national historical marker, because he learned English and he worked his tail off and he assimilated and he made the community better, the State better and the country better. And that has been the legacy of immigrants.

But it goes on. That is not enough. That means I am going to wave my American flag. That American flag is what is going to be the most important flag to me in my heart and soul. That is what in that oath means, American flag.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I might point out that in one of my travels around Iowa, I pulled down around in Keokuk, and there used to be an old Federal hospital there that was built and put in place during the Civil War. They would bring the wounded up the river and then offload them there at the hospital in Keokuk and take care of them.

So one of the monuments there, down in the river bottom near the Mississippi River, is a big stone, a great big heavy stone, and there is a big brass plate in there, and it is mounted in there by the daughters of the American Revolution. And it says "One Nation, One Flag, One Language." That was established just after the Civil War.

They understood how important and powerful it was to have a common, unifying language. That is something that has been recognized by all nations in the world. They all have established an official language, except here in the United States. It becomes more and more important for us to bond each other together by having that common form of communications currency.

"One Nation, One Flag, One Language." That was the creed in 1865, and it should be the creed today.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentleman, my good friend. I would continue on with the oath. That I will support and defend the Constitution, not just the Constitution, it goes on, I will support and defend the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America. All laws. The Constitution and the laws of the United States of America.

Gee, that would seem to include immigration laws, wouldn't it?

It goes on, against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I will bear arms on behalf of the United States when required by law.

It is not enough simply to pledge allegiance. You have to be willing to risk your life for the American flag and all that it stands for. You have to be willing to pledge allegiance to the United States, the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

It goes on, and I know your time is running short and I don't want to intrude on the gentleman's time. I guess

we have got about 7 minutes, but I did want to point this out, at least this point of the oath of citizenship.

If this Nation is going to continue to be stronger, I would only submit to you the Hispanics that have settled in my district from Central America, from Mexico and assimilated, have made East Texas a better place in which to live.

I have some dear friends. As a judge I presided over the wedding of some dear Hispanic friends that had come in and assimilated. I am telling you, they have made Tyler, Texas, and East Texas a better place. They have assimilated. They are wonderful people. They bring family values, and they are strong in their faith and love and joy and mirth. It has just been wonderful. But they assimilated.

That would be the one thing I just wanted to add. Melting pot is the strength, and that is what we need to get back to.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the gentleman coming to the floor at this hour of the evening to add to the dialogue here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pick up with that. Certainly assimilation, we are the nation that has been successful in assimilation. The Israelis established their country in 1948, and in 1954 they established Hebrew as their official language. They did that because they needed a common language to tie them together.

I asked them, why did you do that? Where did you get that inspiration? They said, well, we saw the success the United States had with assimilation, so we wanted to adopt a similar policy.

They resurrected a language that wasn't used functionally other than in prayer for 2,000 years and put it in the workplace, and everyone that comes to Israel learns Hebrew, and that is how they tie themselves together as a nation.

But I would like to point out another statement that gets repeated that is not challenged often, and that is we can't replace all these workers, the ones that are here illegally. If we shut off the jobs magnet and they go home, we can't replace them.

Here are some numbers that one might work with to give us an idea on whether we can replace them or not. The Pew Foundation put out some numbers, this is a year ago, so they have raised them a little bit, but at that time they were working with 11 million illegals in America. 6.3 million of them were working. About the same proportion if you want to go to 12 million, but I don't have that factor figured in.

If you are were going to replace the 6.3 million working illegals in the United States, the first place we would go would be the unemployment rolls. That is 17.5 million on unemployment. We are paying them not to work. One would think we could just simply pay them to work and replace the 6.3 million. Maybe they continue to have the

skills necessary and you can develop some skills in them, but there would be 7.5 million there in that category.

Then of those who have exhausted their unemployment benefits, that is another 5.2 million that are looking for work but they are not on the unemployment roles. So we are at 12.7 million.

Another 9.3 million teenagers between the ages of 16 and 19 are not in the workforce, even on a part-time basis. We would go to them to help work in our fields, for example, and flip some burgers. Add to that 4.5 million who are the young seniors, ages 65 to 69. Some of those people would go to work if they didn't have a disincentive, Mr. Speaker.

Then of those between the ages of 20 and 64, the really prime work age, there is another 51 million in America that are simply not in the workforce. They could be retired, they could be working on the black market, they maybe are doing some kind of dishonest enterprise, but they are not in the workforce in any meaningful way. They would also become part of that force that we could hire from.

Added up altogether, 77.5 million non-working Americans between the ages of 16 and 69. We could surely tap one out of every 12.3 of those to fill the gap for the 6.3 million illegals that are working in this country. That is before we bring technology to bear. That is before we find other solutions for any kind of gaps we might have in our hiring practices. So there are solutions out here, Mr. Speaker.

And it is not true that there are jobs that Americans won't do. Americans are doing all of these jobs right now today. For example, in the construction business, 12 percent in the construction industry are illegal workers. Thirteen percent is the unemployment rate in the construction industry.

There are the other comparable rates. In those kind of sectors where there is a high concentration of illegals, there is also a high unemployment that corresponds with that. The reason is because those American workers have been displaced by cheaper labor and they can't afford to go do that work for that kind of money.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is piece after piece of this immigration issue that needs to be discussed. It is a very, very complicated issue. It is a very emotional issue. I stand on enforcement first. Let's establish that we can defend and protect our borders. Let's build a fence. Let's eliminate birthright for citizenship. Let's shut off the jobs magnet. Let's pass my New Idea bill, which removes the Federal deductibility for wages and benefits paid to illegals.

If we can do those things and establish that we can enforce the law in this country and respect for the law, then we can have a legitimate debate on what kind of workforce we need and where they need to come from.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCGOVERN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. TANNER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Ms. WATSON (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of official business.

Mrs. EMERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of inspecting tornado damage in her district.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RANGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SOLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCHENRY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today and April 5 and 6.

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, today and April 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and April 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, and April 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, April 7.

Mr. KELLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LATHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution designating the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, as America's