

people of south Mississippi in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. We have been the beneficiaries of tremendous generosity, and I don't want at any time for people to think that what they have done as individuals, through groups, through churches, through charities, and as taxpayers that we are in any way ungrateful for that.

Mr. Speaker, one of the continuing problems that persists in south Mississippi is the whole debate over insurance. When people lost their homes, when on the day after the storm there was nothing there and they tried to settle with their insurance company, in almost every instance the insurance companies refused to pay on homeowners' policies, citing those homes had been destroyed by water and not wind. And, of course, when your house isn't there, you don't have much of an arguing position.

That has affected the lives of tens of thousands of south Mississippians, and they suffer individually as a result of that. But, Mr. Speaker, what I am asking my colleagues to look into, and I will offer an amendment to the National Flood Insurance Program when it comes before this body next week or the following week, is to ask for the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security to look into whether or not a crime has been committed against the citizens of this country collectively.

Because when the Allstates, the Nationwides, the Farm Bureaus, the State Farms of the world refused to pay the claim on a homeowner's policy and shifted that cost to the National Flood Insurance Program, I suspect that they took costs that they should have paid out of their pockets and their stockholders' pockets and shifted those costs unfairly and, in my opinion, criminally to the taxpayer.

When an adjustment agent walked to any of the 10,000 slabs and said there is nothing there, your house was washed away, and there was no wind damage, that was completely contrary to what the Navy Meteorological Command tells us, that in communities like Bay St. Louis and Waveland there was 6 to 8 hours of 120-to-180-mile-an-hour winds before the water ever arrived. Even farther away from the eye, in towns like Biloxi and Ocean Springs, there were at least, according to the United States Navy, at least 3 hours of maximum wind before the high water arrived.

So when these agents looked the people in south Mississippi in the eye and denied their claims, they not only hurt them but they are hurting us all. Because, again, when that cost is shifted to the National Flood Insurance Program, billions of taxpayer dollars had to be shifted from other accounts and, more honestly, borrowed to help make up the difference. So it is not fair to them, and it is not fair to the American taxpayer.

I think, at the very least, this Congress ought to ask the Inspector General's office to look into it. I am going

to offer that amendment, and at this time I am asking for my colleagues' help on that. We will be going before the Rules Committee next week. I do want to thank Chairman OXLEY for his generosity in hearing me out on this. He has offered a Government Accountability Office investigation. But in total honesty, that is already going on.

I think that when you believe a crime has been committed, then I think it calls for a criminal investigation. And everything I see in south Mississippi tells me a crime has been perpetrated on the people of south Mississippi and the taxpayers of this Nation, and I am asking my colleagues to look into what I think is a crime.

#### BORDER IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States Congress. Our work here today, like it is every day, is exceptionally important. There are a number of subjects that are on the minds and the hearts of the American people, and one of those subjects is what I intend to focus on, Mr. Speaker.

That subject is going to be the subject that brought the President to Arizona yesterday, along with Air Force One that had a pretty substantial congressional delegation from Arizona on board it.

□ 1515

They visited down there around the Yuma area. I would hope there were some local people that had objections to the position that has been taken by the White House with regard to the guest worker, temporary worker, and I hope they had an opportunity to speak to White House personnel as well as our Commander in Chief.

I find myself occasionally addressing that White House from this microphone or other microphones, not as often directly as I think it should be. I am wondering sometimes if the message is actually heard.

But I have made several trips down to the border myself. I have made at least one trip which was essentially a red carpet trip, maybe similar to the one that took place yesterday with Air Force One. It is impossible as a President of the United States Commander in Chief to go into a location like that and be able to actually observe and experience the full, unvarnished events that are driving the issues at the border. It is not something that any President would be able to do unless he wore a disguise and went on his own because the security has to be so tight. Events have to be planned, strategized. There has to be security that has to be built in. It cannot be spontaneous.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, and more, the trip for the President yester-

day could not have been a trip that was rooted in fact-finding, but a trip that was rooted in sending a message to the American people that the President is committed to border security and border patrol. We know without doubt that he is committed to guest worker, temporary worker and a path to citizenship as we listened to his speech last Monday night.

As we address this subject matter, I have the privilege of exchanging some words with my good friend and colleague who I have known—grown to know and respect for his input to this process and the character that he brings to the floor, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman taking the time to take a look at this subject that obviously is so important to us, the whole area of border security and immigration. There are so many different facets to this. I just wanted to ask a question or two.

Aside from the technology of how do you enforce the border, how do you build at least from a physical point of view or a deterrent point of view, some of the different aspects of this question because the more that people look at it, it seems like there are more and more questions.

One is you have a couple of parents that are illegal immigrants. They have children. My understanding is that some of our judges have decided those children become automatically American citizens. But I also understand that could be very easily challenged, whether the Constitution should be understood in that way. I think that is one of the issues that we are dealing with.

Another one is the question of English as a language. Do we enforce the things that have made us unique as a Nation? Do we make English the official language of the United States? We assume it is, but we have never passed a law to do that very thing.

There are other questions. There are questions about the employees, whether employers should check Social Security numbers, names and birthdays before they hire somebody. Are we going to enforce that law or are we going to ignore it and go in the other direction?

All of these are significant questions. If it is all right, I would just inquire if you would like to talk about those questions in a little more detail with the time we have.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri. As I listen to the subject matter, I am interested in all of them. I point out first the subject matter that you brought up, what we call birthright citizenship. It says in the Constitution that any person born in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof shall be a United States citizen.

I have not done a thorough, scholarly analysis of that, but rudimentary analysis boils down to this: The language was written into the Constitution with

the idea in mind that Native Americans would not necessarily be citizens because they are not necessarily subject to the jurisdiction of the United States—being a separate nation. That is an issue that Native Americans can answer more succinctly than I can answer. But I understood that was the root of that exception clause in there, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

Yet today we have a practice of granting birthright citizenship, anyone born on U.S. soil is a United States citizen by practice, not necessarily by Constitution. Some would argue we would need to amend the Constitution to end birthright citizenship. I would argue that our most efficient path to that would be to pass a statutory change that would make it clear that it is not the intent of Congress and our interpretation of the Constitution would be to end birthright citizenship and confer that upon someone who was born in the United States if one of their parents is a citizen. That is the position I would take.

Mr. AKIN. My understanding is the same thing. The understanding of that section in the Constitution dated back about to the time of the Civil War and it was dealing with a different situation and it does not necessarily apply to two people who are here illegally, or just the automatic granting of citizenship just because of where are you born.

From my understanding, we could pass a law, and it might be challenged and the courts would have to take a look at that, but there is a good case that could be made to support what you are saying, which is if we are going to talk about birthright, there needs to be at least one parent that is a citizen of the United States.

Also, it troubles me that America, and one of the things I love about this country is the fact that America has always been a place where there is just one class of people. We call them Americans. From our Declaration of Independence it says "all men are created equal." That means equal before the law. Nobody is better than anybody else. We have one class of Americans.

Yet by us ignoring our own laws on immigration, de facto we are starting to move into or create sort of a second class of citizen that does not really have any rights. They are not subject to the minimum wage or any of those things. They do not have a chance to be part of organized labor or anything like that. They simply come here and if they say anything, they are threatened that they can be sent back over the border. We are almost creating a second class of citizenship, and that concerns me a lot.

I think it is absolutely time that we start to enforce the laws that apply to immigration in this country. There are some people who want to argue that we do not have a right to make any laws that control immigration. That is an interesting question, but we really have two choices. We either say we are

going to open the borders wide open and no law is legitimate whatsoever, or we are going to enforce the laws we have. If we cannot enforce them, we can take them off the books.

The thing that concerns me is this whole idea of shifting what America really is, which is one people, Americans, instead of us being so weak in terms of enforcing law that we are starting to create a different America and one where people are not all equal.

I do not know if you have thought about that concept of two classes of Americans. It is very distasteful to me.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I have given considerable thought to this and have done some research and a fair amount of writing on this subject matter. We have an upper class in America that has gotten richer and richer, and I am for that. I am for success. Some of those people pulled themselves up by their bootstraps, and they are at the economic pinnacle in this country and in the world. A person like Bill Gates, for example, is a fine and shining example of somebody who had an idea, some creativity and some business skills to put that all together, and he put some good people together. He and Steven Jobs both have done an amazing thing in this era, and they have gotten very wealthy, but they have also created a lot of jobs. And the trickle-down of that wealth has been wonderful for America, as well as how the technology that they have produced has made us all more efficient and improved the quality of our lives as well as our production.

Mr. AKIN. The American dream, live and well.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Entrepreneurship is growing. There are many more people at the upper echelons of our economic society than there was a generation or two ago. As I watch that happen, I think that is a good thing for America. But I would point out that the strength for America has been in the breadth for a prosperous middle class that began to grow in a dramatic way during World War II when Rosie the Riveter went off to work. The middle class grew. We had 1.2 percent unemployment rate back during those years.

As the paycheck came back into the household, and I should also credit Henry Ford because when he put his automobile into production, he wanted to make sure that the people he hired had enough money to buy one of his cars, so he paid them a good wage. That was competitive and that spread across this Nation. So the prosperity of the middle class grew, and it grew from the early part of the 20th century and it grew dramatically in the second half of the 20th century. As it did, the greatness of America grew with it.

You could maybe be a high school dropout but if you were a good worker, you could punch a clock at the local factory and take home a paycheck that was adequate enough that you could

buy a modest home and raise your family with dignity and pride and values. That middle class got broader and broader up until perhaps 10 years ago when we began to see it shrink. There was pressure on the middle class from the upper class. That is really not a bad thing, to have people moving from the middle class to the upper class. I applaud that.

But the other pressure comes from the lower side of this when many of the elitists in America figured out that with the click of a mouse, they could transfer capital around the world.

The impediments to business transactions diminished with the computer technology that was developed by Steven Jobs and Bill Gates and many, many others. As that happened, they began to feel the frustration that they couldn't transfer cheap labor as efficiently as they could transfer capital. So with that frustration, and business will always work on the most important issue, they began to transfer cheap labor. They wanted cheap labor in the United States because that is where the factories were. As they brought that cheap labor in, the wealthy got wealthier off that margin of profit they were making, and they had a competitive advantage against those who did not hire illegal labor. The Federal Government did not enforce that and so the wealth that came began to also put into people's minds that they had an entitlement to hiring cheap labor to work in their factories doing, quote, "the work that Americans won't do."

And I reject that concept. And at the same time, they wanted cheap servants to take care of their mansions and trim their lawns and nails. As this happened, this servant class which has been created by the elitists, the new ruling class, the servant class has grown and the elitist class has grown, and this has been at the price of the middle class. It has been at the price of the middle class so that an undereducated, American-born citizen that does not go off to college does not have nearly the opportunities that they had 10 or 20 years ago. Cheap labor has taken that away.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, some of the studies that I have seen, the people that get hurt the most by having illegal immigrants working are the people at the lower end of the wage scale, because those are the people taking the jobs that would have been taken by people who are legal citizens of this country, people who waited in line, people who took the classes on citizenship. Now all of a sudden they want to be able to take a job and there is somebody who is taking the job for a couple of dollars less. Those are the ones that are hurt the most by this process of what is going on.

I guess the bottom line is that one of the things that people say is if you want less of something, you tax it. If you want more of it, you subsidize it. My concern is that some of the discussion I am hearing from the other body

and not so much from the House here is the idea that we are going to make it easy for the illegals just to basically give them citizenship or amnesty. My concern is whatever you reward, get more of.

In 1986, we granted amnesty to a number of people, and then we had a huge wave of other illegals coming here saying pretty soon they will do that again.

We need to avoid making that mistake, make the tough decision and say no amnesty and say we are going to enforce our laws. We have to say we are going to let the people waiting in line trying to follow our laws, we are going to reward those people and not reward law breakers.

My concern is that any proposal we deal with would not be rewarding law breakers because if we do, we will encourage more of them. I think those reasons, economic reasons and many others, we need to take a very good look at our policy on border security and immigration.

I know that you have done some innovative work in terms of what can be done on the border.

□ 1530

In some ways to have certain crossings where everybody knows that is where you go through and we stop just these hordes of thousands of people coming across every day. I really appreciate your imagination and your good work and also your scheduling this time to talk about what I believe is one of the questions that is really foremost on the minds and hearts of many Americans.

We all have a great deal of respect for the American Dream and for the fact that we are really all Americans. I do not even like to use the word "class." I do not think it applies in America. But I know that you have that love and respect for this country, and I appreciate your taking a tough issue this afternoon and dealing with it, and I appreciate the fact that your views on this subject are ones which are going to strengthen our country overall. So thank you very much for taking a little time on that subject.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. AKIN, I thank you for your contributing to this debate in the fashion that you have and your willingness to be flexible in the manner that you delivered it. I really do appreciate that.

I would like to just take a couple of minutes and address the issue of English as the official language, which was part of the subject matter that you raised, and it is something that I have worked on for what is my 10th legislative year that I have promoted establishing English as the official language of the United States. And I spent 6 years actually working to establish that in Iowa to help paint our piece of the American map the color of English, so to speak. And that was a 6-year endeavor. It was far more difficult to accomplish than you would realize from

talking to the American people, who out there are almost universal in their support of establishing English as the official language of the United States.

And those numbers are something like, which I saw some today, Democrats, about 82 percent support English as the official language; and Republicans, about 92 percent support English as the official language of the United States. I did not see what the Independents think, but one would think being a little more independent minded they might want it even more than Democrats or Republicans, but I am confident they are in that similar zone between 82 and 92 percent. There are not many issues in America that we can find that kind of an agreement on, but official English is one of them.

And as I brought legislation here to the House and I ended up with 150 different cosponsors on the legislation that would establish English as the official language. I have been trying to find an avenue to bring it through committee and bring it out here.

But what happened in the United States Senate yesterday was Senator INHOFE's bringing an amendment to the immigration bill that was before the Senate yesterday and remains before the Senate today and presumably for several more days before such time that it might be ready for final passage; and he was able to successfully introduce his amendment that would establish English as the official language of the United States and bring it to a vote on the floor of the United States Senate.

Now, we all think in this House that we are the quick reaction group, that we are the ones that are the most in touch with the feel and the mood of the American people. That is how our Founding Fathers envisioned it. They wanted us to be responsive, and that is why they required that we go back for reelection every 2 years. And generally we are substantially more responsive. We feel the mood of the American people. We hear from them. We have to go back and look them in the eye and explain to them what we have done on their behalf and how we have conducted ourselves in office, and they explain to us what they want us to do. And I continually hear from them, they want English as the official language of the United States.

So, happily, yesterday the Senate heard them and they moved and with, I believe the number was, 63 votes, passed English as the official language of the United States.

Now, it is interesting that the President has called for immigrants to learn English and, in fact, to demonstrate a proficiency in English in both reading and writing, essentially the same standard, as I interpret him, that is provided in the citizenship requirements, which are statutory and something that we require of everyone who is naturalized. So with the President advocating for the learning of English for newly arriving immigrants, both

legal and illegal, and the Senate's passing legislation that establishes English as the official language of the United States, we sit here now in this House playing catch-up rather than being the leaders.

And I always want us to be the leaders in this Congress, Mr. Speaker. I want us to be the ones that are out there on the vanguard, out on the front, the tip of the spear, so to speak. We need to be the ones that initiate spending by the Constitution. It is our job to initiate the appropriations bills, and we need to be initiating the policy. But we have an opportunity now to link onto the initiation of good policy that was introduced by Senator INHOFE yesterday and introduced several days before, actually, debated to conclusion and voted upon yesterday with 63 votes. It is common sense.

And not only is it common sense; I did some research once to determine why does this make such simple sense to me and why does it make such simple sense to the American people. And I thought, well, I wonder how many countries have an official language. So I got out an almanac and I looked up the location where they have the flags of all the countries in the world. So there I found the names of the countries in the world, and I got out the only research that I had. This was several years ago, before the Internet, and I had the World Book Encyclopedia.

So I thumbed through there and I started with the first country, and I looked up every single country in the World Book Encyclopedia because there they have a list that shows the official language of each country as you look it up. I looked up every country that you could find in the almanac, looked up their official language, and I found that every single country according to that study, in the world, except the United States of America, had at least one official language. And for many of the countries, and it would be surprising, English is their official language. So I thought, well, there is one other sovereignty out there that I had not really checked on, and because of some issues that I had heard that were raised, I thought I should check out the official language of the Vatican. So I looked up the Vatican.

They are a sovereign state, yes. They have their independence within that part of Rome and that part of Italy. But the Vatican actually has two official languages. One is Latin and some of us grew up around Latin. And the other one is Italian. So if it is good enough for the Vatican to have an official language or two, it is good enough for the United States to have one. And throughout all of history, God recognized this, and I do not need to repeat the story of the Tower of Babel, but God recognized this when he scattered people to the four winds by confusing their tongues.

But a common language, a language that would be the same language for all

of us to speak, is the single most powerful unifying force known to all humanity. If you want to be unified as a nation, you need to speak all one language. And if we do that, we can work together, we can cooperate together, we can identify ourselves as Americans. There is a camaraderie involved there. There is a bonding agent involved in that language. And to be able to go anywhere in America and pick up a newspaper or go to a public meeting or walk into a business place and communicate in a single language is a very, very good thing for the future of this Nation.

And it is important for us to establish an official language. And I would tell you that if we had another language here that had the kind of penetration and usage that English has, I would be for that. If it were Swahili and 90-some percent of us spoke Swahili, I would be saying Swahili needs to be our official language. It is not the point of what the language is. It is the point of having one language that is official that binds you all together.

Now, the bill that I have and the bill that is in the Senate, as I understand it, does not preclude at any point utilization of other languages. It does not disparage any other languages. In fact, my bill, I believe, has language in it that says one shall not disparage any other language.

We think it is a good thing, and I think it is a good thing, for people to have multiple language skills. Those that are proficient in a number of different languages have an ability then to do business in other countries. And with the communications that we have today with the Internet and with the telephone prices being what they are with voice-over Internet, those who have more language skills have more business opportunities. That is a very good thing. Knowing that we need diplomats and diplomats that can go to foreign countries and be able to step in and understand the cultures of these foreign countries, it is important to encourage and promote the teaching and learning of languages in such a global country as the United States is, where we have people in every country of the world.

There is no country that has a more effective and more diversified diplomatic mission than the United States of America, and we need to draw for those missions from people that are trained in languages, and we need to exchange with other countries so that we can train our young people in languages.

But all of those things notwithstanding, Mr. Speaker, we must establish an official language for a number of good, logical, rational reasons. And among those reasons are, for example, if we do not have an official language, if we have two people that come together and they write up a contract on a business deal and one of those contracts is in German and the other one is in Japanese, and they say, Here, I

have my German version and you have your Japanese version, let us sign these. You can keep the one that is your language and I will keep the one that is in my language. And those two people get into a disagreement and they go to court.

Now we bring those documents before the court, and the court has to rule on which one is the one we are going to go by, the Japanese version or the German version. And if so, is it an appropriate interpretation of one or the other. And often we come up with disagreements on interpretations, and that is why we need to have one official language. That would be the English language, one that everything is anchored back to, one that everything that is interpreted is interpreted from.

So as we watch what is happening here, we will see the Voting Rights Act come up on this floor sometime relatively soon, Mr. Speaker. And in that is the reauthorization of the bilingual ballots. And I have taken a stand, and I will continue to take the stand, that there is no reason in the United States of America to produce a bilingual ballot for anybody. This is not something that was part of the Voting Rights Act. There are not people that were being disenfranchised because they did not have ballots in different languages. In fact, because we print them in different languages, people are being disenfranchised. The bilingual ballot provision should be stricken from this bill.

There are only two reasons by which you could even ask for a ballot in a language other than English. And one of them is if you are a naturalized citizen to the United States and you did not speak, read, or write English. You could say, I came over from France and I only speak French, so I want a French ballot, and I am a naturalized citizen. You have to be a citizen to vote in America. And I would say to those people, whatever they might be from, naturalized in the United States of America, welcome. Welcome here. We are glad we have you as a fellow American. But I am sorry, we are not going to give you a ballot in French or any other language because you have to demonstrate proficiency in English in order to gain citizenship in the United States. And if you have somehow duped the system, I do not want to reward you by giving you a ballot and making us jump through hoops and come up with an interpretation that may or not be an accurate one. That is one example.

So a naturalized citizen already had to demonstrate proficiency in English. Therefore, there is no reason for them to ask for a ballot in a language other than English.

So the only other scenario would be if there is a birthright citizenship that Mr. AKIN raised a little bit ago. Someone is born in the United States. That makes them automatically an American citizen, at least by practice today. Not by Constitution, but by practice.

And if that individual, by the time they are 18 years old, has not learned enough English to read a ballot that essentially has titles and names on it, for the Fifth Congressional District, STEVE KING, and my name is going to be the same whether it is in Spanish or French or English; so it is simply the title that you have to learn, if that situation where someone who is born in this country can get to be the age of 18 or more and not understand enough English to read a ballot, which I think I could learn to do, in at least anything but the Asian ballots, in a matter of a few hours, then I do not believe they understand the culture well enough in America to give them the authority to begin to contribute to establishing who will be the next leader of the free world, Mr. Speaker.

It would have only taken 527 different votes, half of them changing their minds in Florida, to give us Al Gore for President instead of George W. Bush. And how many of those instances does it take for people who are requiring a ballot in different languages, who have not learned the culture of the United States, and who were born here? So under no circumstances would I grant a pass, but I would encourage people to learn English, and that is the way we can do that. We do not need to be enablers. We do not need to be handing people ballots in languages when they did not request them, and we do that under today's bilingual ballot system.

We need to tie that all together, Mr. Speaker, and we need to have this single most unifying characteristic known to all humanity: a common language, an official language. The American people want it. The American people demand it. The Senate has reacted. The President has spoken favorably about learning English, although he has not endorsed the bill, to my knowledge. We need to bring it here to the floor of the United States Congress.

That would help bond us together as a people. And, Mr. Speaker, we are sorely in need of being bonded together as a people. We are so sorely in need that I am watching Republicans that are running scared, afraid that somehow they are going to alienate an ever-growing segment of the population of the United States. I think there is a lot more that qualifies people and a lot more to celebrate in people than necessarily their national origin.

I will argue this, Mr. Speaker, that we are all created in God's image. He draws no distinction between his creation. He blesses us all equally. We are born in different places in the world, citizens of different countries, but created in His image regardless of our ethnicity, our national origin, our skin color, whatever the case may be.

□ 1545

For us to draw distinctions between perceived differences in people based upon those things is an insult to God, because he draws no distinctions between his creation. He has created us

all equally. We are all created in his image. He doesn't draw distinctions, and neither do I, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I applaud everyone who can pull them up by their bootstraps. The spirit of humanity, the competitive nature, the need to take care of your family and the desire to do so.

But I also applaud patriotism. I applaud the things that made this Nation great. We very seldom talk about the things that have made this Nation great, but I submit in a short order this Nation derives its strength from a number of things, and that is the United States of America, of which Iowa is a vital constituent part, is the unchallenged greatest Nation in the world, and we derive our strength from Judeo-Christian values, free enterprise capitalism and western civilization.

When you anchor those things together, when our ancestors and the predecessors to us in this country came over across mostly the Atlantic Ocean and settled on the East Coast, where we stand today, they gave their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to building a nation that believed in manifest destiny, and that was a nation that had low, and in many cases no taxes; in many cases low, and in many cases no regulation.

One could invest their capital and sweat equity in work and watch it grow. You had to work hard at it and be smart, and surely there were fetters along the way, there always are. That is part of the system. Some will succeed and some will fail. If we were guaranteed success in everything we do, then it wouldn't be any fun and we really wouldn't try. We would sit back and let it come to us.

But because there is failure, there is also something to measure on the other side for success. And that success allowed for the manifest destiny, for the settlement of this North American continent, for the Transcontinental Railroad to be built and the golden spike driven, tied the two continents together, and this continent was settled in the blink of an historical eye because of free enterprise capitalism, low and almost no taxation, low and almost no regulation.

Free enterprise capitalism and manifest destiny, on the back of western civilization, which gave us the understanding of science and technology, it was a foundation for this dynamic economy that came and this robust American experience that was the characterization of this great American experiment, which still is a robust Nation, still the unchallenged greatest Nation in the world, with the unchallenged dynamic economy that is rooted in free enterprise capitalism, that has grown from western civilization and the science and technology that goes clear back to ancient Greece. We learned from that, we built upon that, the Age of Reason to the Age of Enlightenment, to the North American continent to the United States of America.

But what has been so good about us is that we would have become, I believe, the most imperialistic, power hungry conquering Nation in the world if we hadn't been limiting our appetites for imperialism and conquest because of our religious values and our religious beliefs, our sense of humility, our sense of duty, a sense of being blessed by God with this Nation, and the governing aspects of holding back and giving to the rest of the world rather than taking from the rest of the world. That is what is different about the United States of America, and that short background that I have given is the biggest reason why people want to come here.

We sometimes have people leave the United States to go live somewhere else in the world, but they are few and small in numbers compared to the people that will do about anything to come to the United States to live here. In fact, we have seen plenty of that.

We have the most generous legal immigration policy in the world, both in terms of sheer numbers and as a percentage of our population. We have been extraordinarily liberal with our immigration policies, and yet every Nation must establish their immigration policies.

There has been a backlash to that in Europe. You will see in countries like Denmark, where they have started to shut down their immigration. The Netherlands, they have shut down to some degree, they started again to shut down their immigration. We saw what happened in France with thousands of cars that were burned. That is the results of essentially having more of an open borders policy, and you will see them tightening that down.

We did that in this country too in 1924 when we saw that the massive legal immigration that was coming into the United States that started in the last quarter of the 19th century and ended in the first quarter of the 20th century, the wisdom of the Members of this Congress in this very Chamber, Mr. Speaker, took the position that we needed to allow a rest time, a time out, so-to-speak, a break, so that there could be assimilation take place and that newly arrived immigrants could be assimilated into the American civilization, to the American economy, to the American culture and the American way of life.

Had we not done that, we wouldn't have this distinct character and quality that we have. We wouldn't have had this robust Nation, this sense of togetherness and patriotism that allowed us to fight and win World War II and essentially emerge from that conflict as the world's only surviving industry. The world's only surviving superpower was the United States of America, up on the world stage because we got assimilation right, we got free enterprise capitalism right, we got our values right, our faith in God and the qualities of that foundation that grew from old English common law and their

faith that came with that, tied into our Declaration and Constitution and fused into the culture of America, and we have that dynamic, the Protestant work ethic some say.

But we emerged from World War II this dynamic Nation. And we held down the immigration throughout World War II and throughout the fifties, all the way up until 1965, and we did that because we wanted to allow for assimilation. We had a high birth rate. I am a product of the baby-boomer generation, as most of us in this Congress are, Mr. Speaker.

Then as the laws were changed in 1965, they put in place a thing that allows for the thing we now call chain migration. The chain migration, once you come into the United States, presumably legally, with the exception of the '86 amnesty and the six subsequent amnesties to that which we passed, you come into this country during chain migration, then if you become a citizen, even as a green card holder, you can bring in your spouse and your dependent children. When you become a citizen, then you can bring in your parents, your spouse, your dependent children and I believe your siblings.

But this allows for an uncontrolled immigration that is no longer controlled by statute, no longer controlled by Congress, it is controlled by the people who want to come to the United States, not by the people in the United States and not by the people in this Congress. At least we haven't intervened.

Yet we find ourselves today watching 11,000 people every single day pour across our southern border. I have gone down less than 2 weeks ago and sat in the dark on the border and listened as I heard the cars come up, and this is the Arizona-Mexico border, and sat and listened as I heard the cars come up across the desert with their lights out, about an a three-quarter, and I could hear the cars. I could hear one of them dragging a muffler, driving around the brush. They came to the same location each time, a larger mesquite tree, stop. You could hear the doors open, you could hear people get out, you could hear a little chatter. The doors would close, they would talk a little bit more and then hush. And then they would infiltrate through the trees and across the fence and into the United States.

I sat there and listened to load after load after load after load in one spot that I had, I will call him a guide pick, to take me down there to get a feel for what it is like.

Now, I don't know that they were bringing illegal drugs across the border, but I am very confident they were coming down there for the purposes of crossing the border. And all they had to do was take a five strand barbed wire fence and just cross through the spots that had already been stretched in the same places where the tracks already were and walk into the United States.

So some places we actually have a human barrier, a steel wall that is

maybe 20 feet high and actually in some cases, mostly, it is not that high. We installed it in a way that there are horizontal ribs, so they are like little steps to climb up. But those are short little sections.

Then we have some longer sections where we have vehicle barriers, and the vehicle barriers were a negotiation between the environmentalists, who wanted to make sure that you could get, well, let me see, I know for sure one of the species would be a desert pronghorn, so it could get down and walk underneath the barrier that is there. They did not want to upset the ecology.

Never mind all the damage that is being done to our natural resources. If the Members of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, could see the litter that is scattered over our national parks and the parts of our parks that are off limits to American citizens because they have been taken over by drug smugglers and illegals.

Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument is one of those places where they simply said we can't do this anymore, we are going to mark this off so that we will keep the Americans out of here. It is too dangerous, essentially owned by smugglers and coyotes, and I don't mean the fury kind, I people mean the people smugglers that are there.

I have been to those places when I had some security, and it is a tragedy that we can set aside American property, set it aside for illegals who have invaded that part of our world and not let American citizens go there because it is occupied.

In fact the regions down there, many of them, are occupied. The peaks that are good vantage points along the drug smuggling routes are occupied. There are lookouts there. I could take you to any number of them, several dozen lookout locations where there are two men on top of a mountain, 24/7, with AK-47s, with infrared technology, with fine optical equipment, with solar panels to keep the batteries recharged, and they are being resupplied on a regular basis.

They sit up there with their radios that have encrypted messages in them so we can't hear them talk, and they are listening with their scanners to everything that our Border Patrol says. They know where our people are all the time. We don't apparently know that they are there, or for some reason we don't go pick them up off of these peaks.

I would not let the sun rise on a single pair of them if I were in command of this operation. I would have them off of there every single time. If I had to mount a raid every morning, we would go up there and lift them off or we would do it in the night with our infrared technology.

But we cannot allow the Mexican drug dealers to occupy the military positions in the United States, as much as 25 miles into the United States of America, for the purposes of smug-

gling, according to our Federal Government statistics, \$60 billion worth of illegal drugs into the United States every year.

Ninety percent of the illegal drugs in America come across the southern border. Ninety percent, Mr. Speaker. That is \$60 billion. There is \$20 billion worth of wages, most of those wages earned by people that are in the United States illegally, that get sent back to Mexico. There is another \$10 billion that goes to other Central American countries.

But the economic force on that border is \$60 billion worth of drugs being sold, pushed into the United States. Now, the demand here is another subject entirely and it is something I am more than happy to address with my colleagues.

But I will address specifically the narrow part of this, which is drugs coming into the United States, \$60 billion going to the other side of the border, \$20 billion in wages matching that, \$80 billion for Mexico alone, add another \$10 billion to the Central American countries, there is \$90 billion worth of pressure on our southern border, \$90 billion.

And the cost in American lives is staggering. The loss of American lives to the people who came across the border illegally is in multiples of the deaths of September 11. That easily documentable. Twenty-eight percent of the inmates in our prisons in America, city, county, State and Federal, are criminal aliens; 28 percent. And they don't comprise anywhere near that percentage of the population. Perhaps 5 percent of the population are alien in one form or another.

But 28 percent of our prisons are occupied by criminal aliens. They aren't in the jail because they broke an immigration law. That hardly exists at all. They are there because they have committed murder, rape, assault, dealing in drugs, theft, grand larceny. That is costing us \$6 billion a year in order to incarcerate the criminal aliens in America; \$6 billion with a B, and that is a low number, Mr. Speaker.

We are spending another \$6 billion to guard our southern border, the 2,000 miles down there; \$6 billion. That comes out to be \$3 million a mile.

So I had this thought. Me being a capitalist, and I have spoken favorably of capitalism here, what would it be like if you would give me \$3 million and say pick your mile, STEVE KING, and go down and guard that. And you have got \$3 million to work with for that mile.

I believe that I could set that mile up real easily so that there wouldn't be one soul get across my mile. I would bond it and I would guarantee it and I would make a ton of money doing it, and I would end up the first year a millionaire. Easy enough. \$3 million a mile.

Why don't we open up a contract and allow entrepreneurs in America to bid these contracts and say pick out your section of the border that you want to

defend and we want to take the best deal we can.

We are spending \$3 million a mile. If you can come in here and protect a border for \$1 million a mile, that saves \$2 million a mile. That is a lot of capital to have left over.

If the Minutemen want to come in and bid that thing and sit in lawn chairs next to each other for a mile, let them bid that mile that way. Then we could count the footsteps, the tracks in the dust of those that get by. We will make them bonded, and for every one that gets by, we will dock their paycheck for that, because they did not do their job on that, and we will pay a unit price. Free enterprise capitalism. And whatever we dock out of the contract for those that get past that mile, we will give that money to the Border Patrol to chase them down.

□ 1600

We can set this structure up easily. And I can tell you what I would do. I would want to bid a lot of these miles. I would want at least 1,000 of them if they would let me do it. Maybe I could only get a mile. Maybe I could only get a demo, Mr. Speaker. But I happen to have, by happenstance, a demo next to me on what I think we can do with this border.

Mr. Speaker, this represents the desert. Pick your place. New Mexico. That is not the Rio Grande, so I do not presume it is Texas. I have to be a little gentle in this chamber when I talk about Texas. I do love Texas, and maybe one day maybe they will adopt me, not as a favored son, but just as a fellow colleague.

However, New Mexico, Arizona, parts of California, it is a desert. And it has got sand there. And now it has got a few rocks. But this would represent just the old flat desert. Now imagine a little brush growing back and forth here. So we go in there and we decide we are going to build a wall.

I do not want people going across my section, because I do not want my contract docked. I want all the money that I have contracted to earn.

So I go in here and I set a trencher in there on that end and I trench this on out. I cut myself a groove, at least 4 feet deep, a toe wall down through the middle. That is the hole we would have. I know there are rocks there. And we can kick some of those out, and some of them we are going to have to stop and go down and maybe drill and put some foundation rods in.

But we have this trench across the desert. Now, we have got a company up there that is a neighbor to me. And they can go in, and I talked to them the other day. I said, could you make me a machine that would slip-form a footing with a 4-foot deep trench and with the capabilities of going 6 foot deep, but also have it so I can have a 4-foot wide trench, 4-foot deep, 6 inches wide down below, but 4 foot wide up on top for 8 inches so that we can have a foundation to put in a 12-foot high concrete precast wall.



Now, here is what we have. This is the footing for the wall that I have designed, Mr. Speaker. And it is pretty simple. This is a 4-foot deep trench, 6 inches wide. Fits right in this trench. That is the trench. You go down, trench that out and pour that full of concrete with a slip-form. And that slip-form also lays the width of this footing, this side here is going to be another 2 feet on this side, and on that side, with a notch in the middle so we can put our precast concrete in there.

Now, as we run along with this trencher in this trench, and go right with the trencher integral with it, we come with a slip-form machine, and we pour this concrete footing. And it fits in the ground just like this, Mr. Speaker.

Now we have got a foundation for our wall. And that foundation will hold up to precast concrete. And it is at least 4-foot deep. And we can make it 6 foot or deeper if we choose to do that. That is actually a pretty cheap piece. That is a matter of the cost of the digging and the machine and laying the concrete. And you put some steel in here so it ties together. We let that cure for a couple a days, then we come along with these precast concrete panels.

They look like this. They are 12 feet high, they are 10 feet wide. And we simply set these precast concrete panels in this foundation with a crane or an excavator. And they go in just like this. And my little old construction company could do this. Now I am really out of the business, it is my son's construction company. I do not have any doubt they can throw these precast concrete panels together and drop them into this footing, they can pour the footing too, along with a lot of other skills that they have developed over the years.

But this is how you build this wall. Pick them up with a crane or the excavator, swing them in place, drop them down like this, sits right in there, put a little expansion in here so it does not buckle on you in that hot Texas sun, and keep throwing this wall together.

Now, we can build a mile of this a day, Mr. Speaker, with the operation that I have spent my life working with. And that is just a little old company. Think what you could do if you were somebody that was a little bigger, maybe like Haliburton or Bechtel or something like that.

But here we have now, in this little bit of time while I stood here, built this nice wall. It is 12 feet high, these are 10-foot wide panels. It is 6 inches thick. It has got steel in it. It has got reinforcement in it. We have got little eyes tied on top here. And that is not really a coincidence, Mr. Speaker, and the reason that it is not is because, you know, there are some folks that actually could find a way to get over the top of this wall.

And our military has determined that a safe and efficient way to keep people from going across those kind of places is if you just go in here and you

put a little concertina wire right there. Okay. Concertina wire right on top. And you string that along. Now this is not going to be too fancy, because I am not going to take your time up with a lot of artwork here. But you are going to get the idea when I get done, that this is not all that complicated. Then I am going to tell you what it costs.

All right. I am going to leave that just lay. You get the idea. We have a little wire here on top. We can do that three rolls on top, if you like, it does not have to be one. And it will be easily affixed so that it stays.

We can also put infrared sensors up here, vibration sensors, and motion sensors, inside or outside of the wall. We can monitor this thing. We can put lights on the inside of it. One thing they cannot do is shoot through a concrete wall so good. And so the optical equipment that we put on the inside would be protected from the kind of rifle shots that generally come from the Mexican side of the border shooting out the cameras we have down there now.

Now, build this wall, Mr. Speaker. And the reason is because there is no amount of Border Patrol people that you can put down there, and no amount of National Guard people you can put down there that are going to keep the hordes of people from infiltrating across 2,000 miles of border.

If you think you are going to do that, you might as well go to the barn with a fly swatter and swat flies and think you are going to finish your job. You are not. You have got to do something that will actually stop the flow of human traffic.

And I will say this wall itself will be 90 percent effective. And then you have got to support it. You have got to support it with border patrol people and you have got to drag the wall and track people, and cut that sign and chase them down and catch them.

And over time they will decide it is not worth trying. And they will do something else with their time, Mr. Speaker. So now I have built a wall here pretty fast for you. And you are wondering, this probably costs a lot of money. Well, the reason that I brought this to the attention of the Congress is because it does not cost very much money.

We are spending \$6 billion over the 2,000 miles of our southern border, \$3 million a mile. The President has asked for another \$1.9 billion to be able to start hiring more border patrol and fund 6,000 National Guard troops additionally.

That takes him up actually over \$8 billion for our southern border, over \$4 million a mile. This wall to these dimensions that I have drawn here can be put up, and I would bid it and I would bond it today, for \$500,000 a mile. 500,000, \$1 out of the \$6 we are spending today, or \$1 out of the \$8 they will spend tomorrow under the President's proposal.

Mr. Speaker, it will do far more than 6,000 National Guard troops. Far, far

more. It will be effective. It will be efficient. And it will send the right message.

Now, I am okay with putting a little website on the other side here in Spanish that tells how to come to the United States legally. I think we ought to do that on every single panel. Here is where you go to see the consulate to sign up for citizenship. I would cast it right in the concrete, just like it says, here is the boundary of the United States on those concrete pylons down there on the border from horizon to horizon.

I would put it right in there. Here is where you go. Hit this website. And then we have established now something that is due, the symbolism of a wall that says, you cannot come here. We are a sovereign Nation. We will establish our own immigration laws.

We are not going to allow people from other countries who have shown disrespect for our laws to establish immigration laws in the United States of America. That is our job here in this Congress, Mr. Speaker.

It seems as though as bright as they have been in the Senate in a few times in the last few days, it is not necessarily the way that they see that over there. And I am concerned. But we can build this cheaply, \$500,000 a mile, instead of wasting all of that money that we are spending swatting flies in the barn, as I said, Mr. Speaker.

So this sends a message. It sends a message to Mexico. And it says, clean up your act. Clean up the corruption in your country. Give your people an opportunity. Look around the world and see where it is successful. Emulate those people that are successful. Adopt the policies that you covet. If you want to come to the United States and you want to live with the prosperity that we have here, you also have to learn the reasons for the prosperity of the United States, it is not just because we are a few hundred miles north.

It is not because we are any different as human beings than anyone else. We are created in God's image, as I said. The difference is, we have far less corruption in the United States. We do not have in existence a patronage system like you have in Mexico.

You can learn from us. You can adopt us. But the people of Mexico have got to rise up and change their country. And the very people that will be the change and the salvation in Mexico, are the ones that are coming here.

So one of the good things that can happen is, this free education that is being provided to the children that are in this country illegally gives them the background and the skills to one day go back to their home country and help grow that economy. And when that day comes, when that day comes, then we can say, we can say then to the leadership in Mexico and points on south, Mr. Fox, Vincente Fox, General Fox, because I think he commands a lot of troops that he is sending up this way, you need to clean up your act, you

need to get prosperity in your country. And when you do so, Mr. Fox, then and only then can we tear down this wall.

Clean up your country, Mr. Fox, so we can then tear down this wall and we can live together in peace and harmony. And I would happily go down there and pull these panels off and stack them in piles and wait for the next corrupt government to show up in Mexico, Mr. Speaker, and put the wall back up when that time came.

We are fighting a corrupt government in Mexico that is sending us \$60 billion worth of illegal drugs, wiring at least \$20 billion down south of real earned wages, which I do not really begrudge that so much, and another \$10 billion to other parts.

But this policy that is over in the United States Senate today, this Hagel-Martinez policy, you can ask them how many people do they authorize into the United States? Is it 11 million? Is it 12 million? What is your number?

And they might concede 11 or 12 million. But I guarantee you they will not give you the real numbers. Robert Rector's study at the Heritage Foundation rolled out a number based upon language that was very conservatively founded. And that number was 103 to 193 million people legalized into the United States, not at the choice of Americans, but at the choice of the people from the other countries that want to come here.

And then they passed the Bingaman amendment, a Bingaman-Feingold amendment that capped the guest workers, took them from 325 and opened growth each year down to a 200,000 per year cap.

Then that number, when you only calculate that each of them would bring in 1.2 members of their family, then that number is only, only, only, Mr. Speaker, 66.1 million. Not 11 million, 12, million, 66.1 million people.

Ironically, when we go back to the beginning of the records of legal immigration in the United States of America, we only have records back to 1820. And we take those up to the year 2000. What is the number of people who have come into the United States legally in all of history?

66.1 million people. The very number that is authorized by Hagel-Martinez, if you low-ball it and each of them only brings in 1.2 people as their chain migration number for spouse, families, children. If you take it up to four, which is the number that is used by the United States Citizenship Immigration Services, four per every authorized guest worker, I will say illegal given amnesty, then that 66 million goes to 88 million.

And Lord knows when it stops. So I have to submit this question. And that is to the people that are advocating for open borders, is there such a thing as too much immigration? And, you know, you cannot get them to say yes to that question. They will not say yes, because they know the next question is, then how much is too much?

They will not put a number on that, because they do not want to discuss the numbers that they are legalizing and authorizing now. I will submit that there is such a thing as too much immigration. And 11 or 12 million is too much. We have our doors open to more than 1 million a year, the most generous of any place in the world. We have 66 also, well, this is actually a number that is not quite correlative, 60.1 million nonworking Americans between the ages of 16 and 65.

Now what country in their right mind, when they looked around and said we need the labor, and in fact if we do need the labor, would they go to a foreign country and bring in people that were illiterate and unskilled to do the work for people that have 60.1 million people that were sitting around not working?

And we would pay a good chunk of them not to work as American citizens and bring in other people to do our work for us. How rational is that? And they argue that there is work that Americans will not do? What is the most difficult, hot, dirty and dangerous job in all the world? I would say it is rooting terrorists out of Fallujah.

And what do we pay a young marine in 130-degree heat with a flack jacket on, his life on the line for you and me? \$8.09 an hour if he gets in a 40-hour week. But it is more like a 70-hour week, so he is down to about \$2.75.

There is no job Americans will not do, Mr. Speaker. And Americans will do the hot, dirty and dangerous work. We can seal this border. We can end birthright citizenship. And we can shut off the jobs magnet. We need to do all of that. Then and only then can we have a legitimate debate on whether or not we ought to have guest workers.

□ 1615

#### EFFECTS OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 60 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the United States is under attack. And like December 7, 1941, we are asleep on a Sunday morning. The reason, Mr. Speaker, is because this Nation is under attack by another nation. We are being invaded, we are being colonized, and there are insurgents from the nation of Mexico and their allies further south.

Mr. Speaker, in 1836, the State of Texas from which I hail from was invaded by Santa Ana and his Mexican Army, and they found those Texans who were seeking independence from Mexico in a beat-up old Spanish mission that was 100 years old at the time called the Alamo. They were led by a 27-year-old lawyer from South Carolina by the name of William Barret Travis. William Barret Travis knew the odds were against him, he knew that free-

dom was important, and he drew a line in the sand and he said, "All of those who wish to die for liberty, cross this line." And they all did, save one individual who unfortunately hailed from the nation of France.

Texas lost the battle of the Alamo, and Mexico continued its conquering of Texas. General Sam Houston, who hailed from Tennessee, Governor of Tennessee, came to Texas, led the Texas Army at the Battle of San Jacinto. Texas was liberated from the nation of Mexico and gained independence on April 21, 1836.

I bring that history to the floor of the House because history is important for us to understand what is now taking place in the year 2006 in our country. Texas remained an independent nation for 10 years, and then in 1845 became a State in the United States. This body, along with the body down the hallway, admitted Texas to the Union by only one vote. Some wish even now the vote had gone the other way. But be that as it may, Texas became a part of the United States. And in history, the Southwest was first and foremost claimed by the nation of Spain, and I have on this map over here this beige color on the southwestern portion. And Spain claimed what was Texas west and went as far as California, and of course claimed Mexico. And Spain claimed that area and was Spanish for 100 years or more.

In 1810, Mexico decided to gain independence from the nation of Spain. They wanted their own country, and they fought from 1810 to 1821 to gain their independence. Spain lost Mexico because they were at war with Napoleon over in Europe, and Napoleon was hammering Spain at the same time the Mexicans were hammering Spain here in the Americas.

So Mexico became an independent nation, and Mexico claimed much of this area that was formally Spain's. Of course, in this same area lived those people that we call American Indians, mainly the Apaches and the Comanches. Now, they didn't really have towns; they just roamed that entire area that is in beige. So you have the American Indians and you have Mexico claiming this territory. And, of course, Texas was a part of Mexico at the time because it was settled under Spanish rule.

Texas decided to gain independence from Mexico, because Mexico went from a democracy to a dictatorship. Sounds familiar, does it not? That dictator was by the name of Santa Ana. And when Santa Ana became the dictator of Mexico, he abolished what we enjoy as human rights, civil liberties. And that is why Texas gained independence and fought for independence, to have those basic rights that now all Americans have.

Anyway, after Texas spent 10 glorious years being the Republic of Texas and joined the Union, Mexico was upset with that conduct, and in 1846, invaded the United States of America in three