

and going across those borders, that is where a danger to our country, to our security, actually exists.

Those of us who are parents know that you do not reward bad behavior. I am just not certain that that is the slogan in the Senate, because it appears as if they are rewarding bad behavior. You break the law, you come here, you stay here, we do not know anything about your criminal background, and we are going to reward you. That just is not in the American tradition of fairness. That is not what our citizens want. If the Senate bill only benefits those who came here illegally, overstayed their visa or violated their visa terms, that is not what our citizens want.

Do we really want these law-breakers as new citizens of our great Nation? Should we cave to law-breakers who take to our streets waving other countries' flags and demanding rights?

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to legal immigration in any way, shape, or form. As a matter of fact, everyone here, their ancestors were immigrants. I have certainly come to respect the process that people go through to become Americans. Obviously, we in Florida, in particular, have a lot of immigrants who came here from a very dictatorial country, Cuba, and these people are some of the most passionate people about the rights of citizenship in America and how the illegals should go through the process legally. They want to make sure that their neighbor, the person who may be driving their children on a school bus, that they have had some sort of a background check. They are angry at people who kind of sneak in the back door and that those people might get preference to those patiently waiting in line.

And you know what? They are right to be angry. Toying with mass amnesty is a slap in the face to those who are fighting to keep our borders secure. If Congress condones the crime of crossing our borders illegally, then what have we been fighting for? If we do not mean what we say and illegal entry is okay, why even have immigration laws at all?

The Senate bill is kind of like some fashionable religions that think that the Ten Commandments are just suggestions because they totally ignore the fact that these people have broken the law. So many of us in this House believe that the key to our homeland security is border security; and I cannot agree with and I cannot support the Senate plan that pits border security against a free-for-all amnesty plan. We do not have the resources to hold back the tide of illegal immigrants, and promising amnesty will only bring millions more rushing to our shores.

The gentleman from Texas and I worked and spoke very favorably about the bill that we passed in this House, H.R. 4437. And it is a good bill that secures our borders. It is a bill that sends a very strong message that we are not

going to tolerate illegal aliens, and one that does not give away citizenship like free candy.

When I started receiving these bricks, I initially wrote back to my constituents suggesting that they send them over to the Senate. But I am afraid that once the Senate passed that bill, they will not be sending them. They might be throwing them.

Judge Carter, I appreciate the opportunity that you have given me this evening to join you in discussing the differences between the Senate and the House plan.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for joining me here and giving a very good presentation of what a Representative of another State besides Texas feels about this, one that is not on the border, but sees the crisis on the southern border of the United States. And, again, I thank the gentlewoman for joining me.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that my time is about to run out. I want to tell you that one of the things we all in the House should be proud of, and we over on this side of the aisle, the word I am hearing is we are going to stand fast and we are not going to reward unlawful and illegal behavior by giving a free ride to anybody. We are going to say we will enforce our border, and then we will take a hard, studied, intelligent look at what we need to do to deal with the rest of these, part of the big picture, but not crisis issues that are addressing our country today.

And we have got great thoughts and great ideas, biometric identification on your Social Security. Many, many great ideas, all of which we should take our time, do it right, because with all I have talked about, about enforcement of the law, which is my background, I still remember we are talking about human beings. And if we do not plan right, with compassion, do it to where it makes sense, then a couple of questions come to mind. If our bureaucrats get overwhelmed, what happens to the people that are here? They are going to be overwhelmed too. And what are they going to do? Stay in the shadows.

I hear so many people using the rhetoric, "You can't deport them all." I have not heard anybody in this House talk about deporting them all. But if they do not get in the program because it is so overwhelming and it is not well planned and they stay in the shadows, then what do we do with them? Nobody has even talked about it. They assume everybody is just going to just step up and say, It works like a clock, no problem, we will all be processed in 30 to 60 days, hallelujah, praise God, we are Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it has not been thought out. The plan submitted to us, the Reid-Kennedy bill, it does not have any of these hard questions thought out. And it will bring worse chaos to a chaotic system that has laws in place we could enforce today.

I hope that our friends across the country will contact our friends in the Senate and say, please, let us think this national issue out long and hard and right, always promising we are going to resolve it. I am not saying run from it, but let us go where the bleeding is.

Go to the border. Stop the bleeding. Enforce the House bill, border security first. And with that, Mr. Speaker, we will be walking down the road to making a better life for all those who wish for liberty, freedom, and economic security of the greatest Nation on Earth.

I thank the Speaker for giving me the time to address this House tonight.

□ 1800

### 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCAUL of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the opportunity again for the 30-something Working Group to be down here to talk about issues that are pressing not only to the country but to those people who are in their 20 somethings or 30 somethings and how some of the policies here in Washington, D.C., are playing out in their day-to-day lives.

The previous speakers talked a lot about making sure that we secure our border, and the Democratic Party has been very supportive of trying to fund Border Patrol and take different measures that we are going to make sure that we did actually secure the border. I think all Americans can agree that if we do not secure the border, any policy that we try to deal with afterwards will not be effective until we actually do secure the border.

I would like to go through a list here of different amendments that Democrats have tried and tried and tried to get passed since 2001 that the Republican majority has voted against. Now, this is not a partisan issue. You would think it is an issue all Americans should be concerned about, but sometimes when you get one-party control of the House and the Senate and the White House, you get obstruction and this is what happened. These are all dated and these can all be found on our Web site.

In 2001, vote 454, November 28, Republicans voted against consideration of an amendment that would have added \$223 million for border security. In 2003, another one, Republicans voted against consideration of an amendment that would have added \$300 million for border security. 2003, vote 305, Republicans once again voted against consideration of an amendment that would have added \$300 million to enhance border security, adding border agents and inspectors along our border. June 16, 2004, vote 243, Republicans voted against

consideration of an amendment that would have added \$250 million, Mr. Speaker, in order to meet the promises that the Republican majority made regarding the PATRIOT Act. Again in 2005, vote 160, Republicans again voted against a motion to send a report back to conference with instructions to add \$284 million. And for fiscal year 2006 and 2007, Republicans have repeatedly broken the promises they made on border security in the intelligence reform bill, the 9/11 Act of 2004, which included 2,000 additional border patrol agents, 800 additional immigration agents and 8,000 additional detention beds per year from fiscal year 2006 to 2010.

Democrats have consistently tried to increase border security, and the Republican majority has consistently voted against it. I am not done. Again, 2005, vote 174, Republicans voted against consideration of an amendment that would have added \$400 million for border security to meet the promises that Congress made for the 9/11 Act, again increased immigration agents, increased border patrol agents.

2005, vote 187, Republicans voted against a Democratic substitute to the homeland security authorization bill that was designed to fulfill the promises again in the 9/11 Act, and it goes on and on, again vote 188, in 2005; vote 56 in 2006; vote 210 in 2006 in May, where the Republicans finally voted against consideration of an amendment that would have added \$2.1 billion for border security.

We have tried and tried and tried to put the proper legislation and the proper funding in place, Mr. Speaker, to secure our border, and that needs to be the message. Before we get on to any other discussion regarding immigration in the United States of America, if we do not secure that border then nothing will matter, and that is exactly what we have been trying to do.

I think, Mr. Speaker, when you look around the world, and it hit me as I was reading the Sunday Times from this past Sunday, why it is so important for the United States to maintain a strong position in the world, promoting peace and democracy and liberty and freedom and capitalism, all of the basic tenets of our society, all the basic structures of our society. If America does not do it, it will not happen, and it will not happen.

All you have to do, if you do not believe me, we like the third party validators here, look what is happening in Russia. We hear a lot about what is happening in China, crackdown, dissent, human rights abuses. We hear a lot about what is going on, currency manipulation, suppression of religious freedom, but look what is going on in, quite frankly, state-run enterprises that are putting American businesses into bankruptcy.

We also see what is happening in Russia. Russia offered to help North Korea protect their nuclear weapons with technology, and then this is a special report in the paper, the Kremlin

tightens reins on free market, where President Putin is having a Cabinet meeting and those major members of the Cabinet are also running major enterprises in the state.

It is imperative for the United States of America to maintain this position of strength, and it is nice to see that I have been joined here by my friends from Florida and from Boston and our other friends who made it here, too, to have this discussion about why it is so important for America to maintain this position. The Democrats have consistently tried to take this country into a new direction, into another direction and get ourselves out of this wageless recovery and this endless occupation that we are in.

I would be happy to yield to my good friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. RYAN for yielding the time.

As I was waiting to come over, I had an opportunity to watch our friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle speak about immigration, and I discovered something tonight, and that is that they really have a great sense of humor.

Now, we know individual Members over there that are friends of ours, we enjoy them, and they have a sense of humor, but collectively they have a sense of humor. They were eloquent in their comments and their observations, and I noted that they continued to refer to the Senate bill, Mr. Speaker, as the Reid-Kennedy bill. Well, I guess we must be playing some sort of funny game because I am going to ask my colleagues to help me.

Whatever happened to JOHN MCCAIN? Did he just disappear? I thought it was Senator MCCAIN, who there is a rumor, Mr. Speaker, that he might be a candidate for the Republican nomination for President, that he had something to do with that Senate bill. Has anybody seen Senator MCCAIN? Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, have you seen Senator MCCAIN?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I am going to have to get out the bloodhound.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Congressman RYAN, have you seen Senator MCCAIN? It used to be the McCain bill, and now it is the Reid-Kennedy bill. I mean, who is kidding who?

Now, you have a Senator, I believe, from Florida by the name of MARTINEZ, Senator MARTINEZ. I thought that he was involved in the amended version of the Senate bill that eventually passed. Am I correct?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. My understanding, Mr. DELAHUNT, is it was Senator HAGEL, Senator MARTINEZ, Senator MCCAIN. So how this became the Reid-Kennedy bill—

Mr. DELAHUNT. Do you think it has anything to do with politics?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. No.

Mr. DELAHUNT. You are all silent. I mean, can you help me, please? I am just confused, Mr. Speaker. Whatever happened to JOHN MCCAIN? Does he

still support this bill, this possible candidate for the Republican nomination for the presidency in 2008? Whatever happened to Senator MCCAIN?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, well, let me just say that it is an honor being here tonight with my colleagues and 30-something Working Group, and I am so glad that Mr. RYAN was here to catch the hour. I notice that he has taken the high road here or the high ground here tonight, and it is so good to be in the well.

But I just want to say to Mr. DELAHUNT, it goes back to our discussion the last two evenings. Our Republican colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, which is the majority, what is not a great value of that majority and the leadership is being straight with the American people.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, yeah.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. So this is a consistent theme of not being straight with the American people. They take value in not being straight with the American people, need it be deficit spending, record breaking borrowing. I read an article just last night or the night before as it relates to the President saying that we have to send a message to Congress that we want control on spending and their appetite on spending the taxpayers' dollars, to let the American people know that we are fiscally responsible. Then the next day signing the largest pork barrel bill, transportation bill in the history of the republic. Being straight with the American people. Not a week later, but the next day.

Telling us here on this floor that a prescription drug program costs one thing, find out a week or two later that it has doubled in costs, and then months later, several hundred million dollars more.

So when we start looking at being straight with the American people, and I think that is the frustration of Republicans and Democrats and Independents, and voters, period, out there is the fact that the Republican majority has decided that being straight with the American people and leveling with them is not a value. Oil prices, price gouging, protecting special interests, K Street Project, a number of other issues that are here on this floor with the special interests takes the high ground, and they are protected and the American people are not.

When we talk about the minimum wage, Mr. RYAN has the charts over there, 1997, there has not been an increase in the minimum wage since 1997, and on that chart we have the Republican leadership saying not over my dead body is this going to happen, in so many words, that we are not going to allow it to happen.

Here on this chart you have the minimum wage down here. Mr. DELAHUNT is familiar with this. 1997, you know, starting with the oil, starting with the minimum wage here, zero. Here in 2006, it has been that way since 1997. Whole milk has gone up 24 percent; 25 percent,

bread has gone up; 4-year public college has gone up 77 percent; health insurance has gone up 97 percent; and regular gas has gone up 136 percent and still climbing.

We have folks here that are saying, hey, give us a pay raise. I am going to tell you right now, if someone has to keep two homes and travel between and do all of those things, yeah, I would like a pay raise, but at the same time I have a conscience about this.

Our leadership has said, and we have said that we are not going to take a pay raise unless the American people get a pay raise.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I interrupt only because I want you to read the quote from the Republican majority leader about where he is and his conference is on the minimum wage increase.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, he is a good friend of mine, but I am just going to read this because I think it is important. I guess this is the position here: I have been in this business for 25 years and I have never voted for an increase in the minimum wage. I am opposed to it, and I think that a vast majority of our conference is opposed to it. That was just June 20 of 2006.

I mean, obviously this is the philosophy that has been picked up all the way from the former Member of this House who was the majority leader because it has not been increased federally since that time.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I have to get back to the point that you made when I yielded to you about the missing JOHN MCCAIN. Since tonight listening to their remarks about immigration, somehow they want to put it on the Democrats that the problem is and was created by Democrats.

□ 1815

Well, nothing could be further from the truth. I mean, if you want to give this Senate bill a label, the truth is, it is supported by President Bush. Now, can you help me? Is President Bush a Republican, Mr. MEEK, or is he a Democrat?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I think the President and some members of his party are struggling to know what his party affiliation is. Because I know some Republicans that are very concerned about what the President has done and what he is doing. But he says he is a Republican under the line that he is a fiscal conservative, but that is not the case.

So we do not know what to believe. Ideological wise, he is a Republican President, but at the same time some of the stuff we hear here on the floor would say that it is some other kind of party or philosophy that is out there.

But to the answer your question, yes, he is a Republican President.

Mr. DELAHUNT. So he is a Republican. So why do not we refer to it then as the Bush-McCain bill that is distinct from the other bill?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I personally, I am representing the 17th Congressional

District of Florida, you know Dade and Broward County. But, you know, I do not want to be them, Mr. DELAHUNT. I do not want to come to this floor and start talking about what they are saying, so we are going to rebut what they are saying. I do not want to be them. I want to make sure that we are who we are.

We are being straight with the American people. If it is the Bush-McCain or it is the Kennedy-Martinez bill II, Arlen Specter bill II, so that if someone sees us here on the floor and they heard, well, they call it the Bush-McCain bill, they say, well, they left the Democrats out, and then we have just done what they have done. I know how that can be contagious sometimes because it happens so much here on this floor.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I am not going to refer to it again as the Bush-McCain bill.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I know you are just making a point, sir.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I am so glad that you were witnessing that. I was in the oversight committee and I could not see it.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I know that we worked hard. And I will yield to the gentlewoman in a moment. That we have worked hard to secure the borders. That is what we have been trying to do for the past 6 years.

I am going to refer to my notes here for a minute.

We, as a party, have filed amendment after amendment as appropriations bills have come to the floor. If they had been adopted, there would be 6,600 more Border Patrol agents today patrolling our border, 14,000 more detention beds, and, Mr. Speaker, 2,700 more immigration agents along our borders than now exist. But those amendments were not adopted because the Republican majority voted against them. That is why. That is why we have the problem today that is causing this contentious atmosphere in this Chamber and in the other Chamber.

But let's speak to the truth. Let's not just simply politicize this debate. Let's put the facts out. Who has been in charge of this institution for the past 12 years? It is the majority Republican party, Mr. Speaker. And across this Capitol building, who has been in charge, Mr. Speaker? It is the Republican Party, and George Bush has been the President of the United States since January of 2001.

Today we have a problem with illegal immigration. Who is responsible?

MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. DELAHUNT, let's play a game. Let's see which caucus is really for border security and which conference is playing "let's pretend." And we will deal just with facts here, just with factual information, unlike what they do, which is either, A, make it up as they go along; or, B, say something that is not true enough times so that people believe it; or, C, just pick and choose the numbers that work best for them and represent that they are doing something when

they are really not. So any of those three things is what happens on the other side.

Here is the reality on border security, Democrats versus Republicans: From 1993 to 2000, under the Clinton administration, on average, 642 new Border Patrol agents were added every year. Despite the fact that 9/11 highlighted the need for more border security, in its first 5 years the Bush administration added, on average, only 411 new Border Patrol agents.

Under the Clinton administration, 642 new Border Patrol agents were added every year. Under this administration, since 2001, since 9/11, only 411.

It gets better. Between 1999 and 2004, we are talking about enforcement, you know what, the Republicans talk a good game about it, we have got to increase enforcement, we have got to make sure that we crack down on illegal immigration, we have got to make sure that employers are not harboring illegal immigrants and breaking the law in hiring them. Well, let's see if they really mean that.

Between 1999 and 2004, work site immigration enforcement operations against companies were scaled back 99 percent by INS. Subsequently, INS was merged into the Department of Homeland Security and now it is called CIS. But in 1999, the United States, this is the year before President Bush took office, the United States of America initiated fines for hiring illegal immigrants against 417 companies. Mr. DELAHUNT, in 2004, it issued fine notices to three companies. Three.

1999, the year before President Bush took office, the United States initiated fines against 417 companies for hiring illegal immigrants. In 2004 they initiated three.

Mr. DELAHUNT. So in the space of some 5 years, enforcement actions against employers who were hiring illegal immigrants—

MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I have another one. The Bush administration also has a worse record than the Clinton administration on pursuing immigration fraud cases. In 1995, during the Clinton administration, 6,455 immigration fraud cases were completed. In 2003, guess how many? One thousand three hundred eighty-nine, 78 percent fewer immigration fraud cases completed.

And then if you take the statistics that they brag about, the Bush administration brags that in its first 5 years it caught and returned 6 million undocumented individuals. That is actually a drop from any 5-year period that you can demonstrate during the Clinton administration.

So that is what I mean when I say they just put up the statistics that make them look good and leave out all the other relevant information.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, number one, we need Mr. Manatos and others to get us a chart on that.

MS. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We have got to have a chart.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We have got to have a chart. Because, folks, they cannot quite capture those numbers on that small piece of paper you have. If a Member was in his office or her office watching us here on the floor, we want them to visually see their track record on what they have done.

It reminds me of when the President flew over the Hurricane Katrina-affected area and came back to the White House and said, We are sending food and water down, and blankets, and this is just the beginning.

Well, that was 3 days after the storm. And I can tell you this right now, in the heat of the summer, I do not know what good blankets would have done, but that is a whole other issue.

The bottom line is, just because they say it, and I am taking from Gingrich, just because they say it, "they" is what Mr. Gingrich is calling the Republican majority, just because they say it does not necessarily mean that it is true. It does not necessarily mean, just because they say it, that it is true.

I will share what Mr. Gingrich has called this Republican majority. We do not have to do it; Republicans and Americans are saying it. This is the former Speaker of the House, Mr. Speaker, who said in the Knight Ridder newspaper, Friday, March 31, 2006, "They," talking about the Republican majority, "are seen by the country as being in charge of a government that cannot function."

And this is what we are seeing, Mr. DELAHUNT. Folks coming to the floor seeing things that they know are altered. They are altering it. They are saying, well, this is the written word and these are the facts. But that is not good enough for me; I am going to erase it, and I am going to go to the floor and I am going to fool the American people. I am going to mislead the American people, because it is an everyday occurrence here by this majority.

And the reason why so many Democrats, and I would say a very few Republicans are outraged by the fact, when they hear the facts, when we all sit in our offices and we hear altered information; we have third-party validators. If we say the U.S. Department of Treasury came up with these numbers, they came up with the numbers. If we say that the deficit is record-breaking borrowing in the history of the Republic, we have third-party validators.

Some Members come to the floor, and it is their prerogative, and if they want to mislead, let them mislead. But we are going to make sure that we continue here in the 30-Something Working Group and on this side of the aisle, in sharing the truth with the American people. This is not a place where someone comes up and says, this is a Democratic Party meeting or this is a Republican Party meeting or this is a Reform Party meeting, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, this is the U.S. House of Representatives, the People's House the

only Chamber that you have to be elected to.

You can be appointed as Senator by a governor. But you have to be elected to the House. There are no appointments here. So I think it is important that folks really appreciate what we are doing here.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I want to thank you for bringing those numbers, and I want to make sure that we get it into a chart.

Let me just say this real quick. I have got this chart here, just as an example of who we are as it relates to sharing information that is accurate, versus some on the majority side that are well documented for not sharing accurate information to not only the Members of Congress and the minority side and some of their own Members, but also the American people.

Case in point: \$1.05 trillion that President Bush and the Republican Congress that you see here, borrowed from foreign nations, foreign nations, between 2001 and 2005. \$1.05 trillion have dethroned—that is the new word—42 Presidents before this President; 224 years of the history of this country, they have only been able to borrow \$1.01 trillion.

Now, Mr. DELAHUNT, this is my point. This is from the U.S. Department of Treasury, it is right here. Folks can go on the Web Site and get it. Now, if we were meeting in the 30-Something Working Group and say, well, \$1.05, well, maybe we need to, even though it happened all in 4 years and it took 224 years for this to happen, let's say \$1.09, that sounds better. That would be misleading the American people and the Congress.

Members are on the floor, and they take what we say to be truth to power, that we come and we are here leveling on behalf of the American people. We are not here to say what sounds good or what would sway a certain segment of the population to feel one way or another.

Folks woke up early one Tuesday morning from representation, not for someone to mislead them through statements here on this floor that are not accurate. That is the reason why we are in the situation that we are in now. Even when it comes down to the war in Iraq. Even when it comes down to the pursuit of Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan.

The information is not accurate that has been shared with the American people and that is the reason why so many individuals are suffering as it relates to gas prices. These gas companies and these petroleum companies have been allowed to come into this Chamber with Members carrying their will and voting the way that they want them to vote against their constituents.

This is something that we all feel passionate about and the American people feel passionate about. And, Mr. RYAN, as I yield to you, as they go to the pump and hesitate before they put

their debit card or credit card or whatever it may be into that pump about, how much is it going to cost me today to fill my tank up, they need to think about the individuals that are allowing these petroleum companies to take advantage of the American people, misleading the American people. And if I had my way and we were in the majority, I tell you, I guarantee you, that that practice would no longer take place. And when it does take place, we will come to the floor and knock it down.

I commend Mr. DELAHUNT for bringing the misleading of the American people as it relates to information on who is sponsoring immigration bills in the Senate, and pointing out the fact that there would not be an immigration bill that passed out of the Senate if it was not for the Republican majority voting in the affirmative for the legislation, the same way as here in the House.

□ 1830

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The same thing with the deficit. With the fourth largest annual deficit in the history of the United States of America, the President makes his way out, Madam Speaker, and touts it like it is some great success, like we should all be pounding our chests and proud of this. The fourth largest deficit in the history of the country. And we are borrowing the money from Japan and China and OPEC countries and all these other countries that give them real leverage on us when we try to act in a diplomatic way, whether it is with North Korea or Russia or China or whatever it may be.

What would the Democrats do and what have the Democrats attempted to do time and time again? The Democrats have tried to reestablish the PAYGO rule, and we have tried to do it numerous times in the past several years.

Now, what is PAYGO? PAYGO basically says that we will not spend any money in Congress unless we can pay for it. We are not going to go out and borrow the money. We have got to pay for it. Here it is, and there have been numerous—this is just a couple: The Spratt substitute for the budget resolution in 2006 failed, not one Republican voted for it, rollcall vote number 87.

We are not making this up. We tried to put PAYGO rules into the budget process and the Republican Congress voted against it, because that would limit their ability to provide corporate welfare to the oil industry, to subsidize tremendously the health care industry. Again, Congressman SPRATT, vote rollcall number 91, failed again for the budget resolution in 2005, 194 to 232. How many Republican votes? Zero.

And I know DENNIS MOORE has tried to do it, Charlie Stenholm, when he was in Congress, he tried to do it. Time and time and time again, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Democrats have tried to implement basic structural

changes so that we could balance the budget.

It is not a coincidence that when President Clinton was in and the Democrats passed the budget in 1993 and we began to implement some of these rules, we had a tremendous explosion of economic expansion that lifted everyone up; and then, in 1997, passed an increase in the Federal minimum wage which, actually—there is a statistic here that I just love from American Progress, 4 years after the last increase in the minimum wage, the economy enjoyed its strongest growth in over 3 decades, adding 11 million new jobs. And, the small business employment between 1997 and 2003 grew more in States that had a higher minimum wage than the Federal minimum wage.

Raising the minimum wage is good for the economy. It is a different philosophy, it is different, but it works.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That makes me want to pull out another third-party validator, because this week we got to experience the exciting midyear opportunity to hear the President with his Republican leadership surrounding him to cheerlead the supposed success they have on the economy.

Now, it would be one thing if we were standing up here as DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and TIM RYAN and KENDRICK MEEK and BILL DELAHUNT and saying, well, that is a lot of baloney. Anyone in America looking at this economy and looking at this deficit would say, what is there to celebrate about?

But it is not just us. This morning editorial page in USA Today had this to say about the midyear review of the economy that the administration just trotted out.

They say, "Forgive us if we don't break out the party hats. It is hard to get excited about an abysmally large deficit in the range of \$300 billion that is somewhat less gargantuan than earlier predicted. Even accepting the administration's assurances that it does not purposefully overestimate the numbers in a Wall Street-like game of beating expectations, this habitual midyear crowing masks the seriousness of the Nation's bleak fiscal outlook."

Well, if that doesn't say it, all right there in a nutshell, I don't know what does.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. There was a gentleman at work who worked for President Bush, Douglas Eakin. Holtz-Eakin, former director of CBO for President Bush said, "The long-term outlook is such a deep well of sorrow that I can't get much happiness out of this year." This guy used to work for President Bush.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And what they were doing this week is saying, Wow, the deficit wasn't \$423 billion, it was only \$300 billion.

Now, what is clear, and what USA Today is not letting the President get away with, is that they began by inflating the number that they said the deficit would be at, so that when what

happened occurred, when they knew it would be much lower than that, it would look like an accomplishment.

Well, if they are excited about a \$300 billion deficit, then I really want to know what their definition of fiscal responsibility is, because that apparently for years has been the cornerstone of the Republican Party's platform, that they are fiscally responsible. A \$300 billion deficit is fiscally responsible. And then on top of that they are passing tax cuts for the wealthiest among us? And this is how those tax cuts break out for folks?

I mean, we just passed a tax reconciliation bill just a few weeks ago that, if you look at how it benefits people by their income, this is what it really boils down to: That tax cut bill, which virtually all the Republicans voted for, if you make between \$10,000 and \$20,000 a year, which is around minimum wage, the one that they haven't raised since 1997, you get about enough back to buy a Slurpee. If you make between \$40,000 and \$50,000 a year, somewhat more than minimum wage, you get enough back in that tax cut bill offered by the Republicans to buy a gallon of gas.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Maybe.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Maybe. Because depending on how high the price goes, you actually might not get all that back.

But then let us look at the folks who make more than \$1 million, you get enough money to buy a Hummer.

Now, I don't know about you, but I really think, if we are going to pass tax cut legislation at all, if we are going to give tax dollars back to the people, first and foremost, let's eliminate the deficit. Do you keep passing—I mean, tax cuts are spending, Mr. MEEK. It is not free. We don't just print more money.

I just took my 7-year-old son to the Mint yesterday, and I watched them print the money. But the tour guide didn't tell us, "You know, when we run out, we just print more." It doesn't work that way. They obviously didn't go to Econ 101; otherwise, they wouldn't think it was responsible to do what they have been doing.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And just to clarify, if you don't mind, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, as you stated, we do not have the money to give to these millionaires to go out and buy a Hummer. So where do we get it? I don't know even if we have a chart here.

Mr. MEEK has a chart. I will yield to the gentleman in a minute.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I will give you my chart.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We don't have the money to give, so we have to go out and get it somewhere. We borrow this money from China, OPEC countries, Japan, to give to a millionaire so that he can get a Hummer.

No American, I can guarantee you, believes that that is a good idea. That can't be a good idea. Because now we owe China money, and we have given

the wealthiest people in our society a Hummer, and our kids are left to foot the bill.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. RYAN, you have people in America who, the agony and the angst in the pit of their stomach that they have over their credit card debt and the things that they actually need, like the ability to fill up their gas tank, I mean, the churning that we know is going on inside of mothers and fathers across this country over how much debt they have versus what they have coming in.

I guess that churning isn't going on on the Republican side. There doesn't appear to be any angst, there is no hand-wringing, there is no worrying about it. Where is the outrage? It is nonexistent. They just keep spending and spending and spending. The deficit keeps ballooning, and then they say, Yeah, the deficit isn't \$423 billion, it is \$300 billion.

Well, it is just, it is too shocking for words. And then they have the nerve, Mr. MEEK, to call themselves the party of fiscal responsibility. It is a joke.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Just because they say it, "they," going back to what Mr. Gingrich has called the Republican majority, he who used to be Speaker of the House but now calls his former colleagues "they" because it is foreign to him now, "Just because you say it doesn't necessarily mean that it is true."

Now, Mr. DELAHUNT, this is true. What is true is the fact that we have borrowed \$53.8 billion from Canada because we can't afford to pay our bills, so they bought our debt. Korea, \$66.5 billion. Germany, \$65.7 billion. OPEC nations.

Who are these OPEC nations? We hear about them on the news, but we don't know who they are. They are Iran, they are Iraq, they are Libya, they are Saudi Arabia, they are Venezuela, Nicaragua, Kuwait, United Arab Emirates, Ecuador, and on and on and on, Qatar, on and on and on. They have said, since America and the United States majority House of Representatives and the President wants to overspend and give away the money and they can't afford to do what they are doing, we will buy their debt. Taiwan, \$71.3 billion. The Caribbean, \$115.3 billion. The U.K. is at \$223.2 billion. And you have China that is at \$249.8 billion and Japan which is at \$682.8 billion. And folks wonder, why are we in the situation where we are now?

It pains me to silhouette the country, silhouette of the continental United States and put those countries over it, but we have to break this down and let the American people know this is not about party, this is not about what you may feel about a man or a woman representing you.

This is about representation for you. Forget about what convention you went to last time. Forget about if you have an R or an I or an Independent. It is about America. And what the Republican majority has done effectively,

they have borrowed themselves into a situation so that when parents are going to schools, let us just look at this, here is the education budget and what we invest in education and this is in the billions as relates to this chart.

This is what we invest in homeland security. This is in the billions. Our veterans allowing us to salute one flag, Mr. RYAN, this is what we invest in veterans and their health care and their needs. And, this is what we invest, thank you, a la the Republican majority here in this House, the rubber-stamp Congress and the President of the United States, who I do not fault personally. I don't fault the President for doing what he does. I fault the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate for allowing it to happen with very little oversight.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I wouldn't be too complimentary. This President hasn't vetoed one spending bill, and he comes to the Rose Garden and says the Republican Congress needs to control their spending. He has not vetoed one spending bill.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Because you came in on the back end of my words, I am telling you this. The President is the President of the United States. At the end of his term he can no longer run for President of the United States.

Guess what the difference is between Members of Congress and the President. We are up every 2 years. The American people can bring about change in November, and then a transition of power in January for representation. No matter what their party affiliation is, I know Republicans personally that I know that I represent in my own district and outside of my district that have a problem that we are spending more on the debt, paying down the debt, than we are investing in education, homeland security of all things, and veteran affairs.

There are individuals right now, and I just went through the veterans hospital during the Fourth of July break to go visit those individuals that just returned to Iraq and Afghanistan and those individuals that fought before them, and I can tell you they are not getting what they deserve. They are having to wait in some rural areas because the rural clinic is only open 2 days out of a month.

These are the people that have laid their blood down. These are the people that their friends have died beside them, and they are asking them to suck it up.

Meanwhile, back at the ranch, the Republican majority is allowing this debt to overwhelm. You can stack eight of the veteran investments up to the debt, you can stack lower homeland security probably 10 up to the stack as it relates to the \$250 billion that we are paying on the debt. And as it relates to education, you can go two more times as it relates to investment in education. And, meanwhile, folks come down here with a straight face, Mr. DELAHUNT, and say that we are fis-

cal conservatives and we know how to govern?

□ 1845

The American people know it. That is the reason why the polling is showing they are fed up with what is going on here. They are willing to give Democrats or somebody else an opportunity to lead.

Mr. RYAN, that is the reason why I said that I am not concerned with the President of the United States. He is going to do what he has been doing and will continue to do. Just like he said, if there is going to be a change in Iraqi policy, that is something for future presidents, not him. He said that as though he lives in a kingdom. This is a democracy.

The only way we will be able to represent those troops and those individuals that deserve representation is that the American people are fully aware and educated with the facts, and that is the reason why we are on this floor, to share that.

Mr. DELAHUNT, thank you for yielding, sir.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, I think you have summed it up. What irony that at this moment in American history the American people are borrowing from Communist China so that the most affluent among us, truly the most affluent among us, 1 percent of the population, receives a disproportionate tax cut. I mean, if this was written in a novel 10 or 15 years ago, people would be shaking their heads.

We are borrowing money from Red China so that the wealthiest Americans can buy a Hummer, because that is really what is happening. That is connecting the dots. Of course Democrats support tax reduction, or tax cuts, tax cuts that are fair. That is the difference. You know, a family that is supporting their sons and daughters in terms of their tuition bills for college education, there should be tax credits, there should be tax deductions. I mean we could list a vast number of thoughtful tax cuts that would benefit everybody, that would benefit the middle class rather than creating a society in these United States of those that have and those that are getting less and less every day. Real income, real income for that family right square in the middle of our population has declined, and that is why people are unhappy.

And of course we are all supporting with our tax dollars the war in Iraq. It is costing us \$8 billion a month, or \$2 billion a week. Just imagine if that money was going into building roads here, to rehabilitating schools, to providing scholarships for American children to go to college, to invest in our national health system what we could do with that money. But we are doing all of those things not in the United States, we are doing it in Iraq. And we are losing the war on terror because of the distraction by this administration from the real enemy, because they wanted to go to war in Iraq and remove

Saddam Hussein, and that is what is happening in this country.

Yet you are so right, Mr. MEEK. What do we hear? We hear, boy, there is an immigration problem and it is a hot button issue. And it is a hot button issue. But they refuse to accept responsibility. It is like they live in an alternate reality. It is not the real world. How did we get to the point where there are somewhere between, the numbers I hear are 10 million to 12 million illegal immigrants? Because they refused to provide the funding for detention centers, for immigration agents, or for border control officials.

When we brought them to the floor, and I know that I voted for those increased fundings, yet we hear from our friends today about they are standing up, but I wonder how they voted. I would hope that each and every Member of this Congress on both sides of the aisle would go back, review their voting record on all of the amendments that we put forth to increase border security and see how they voted, and then come to this floor and acknowledge that vote before they speak.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentleman would yield, it is not just the eight or nine that I listed, as you were probably walking down here, the eight or nine times that Democrats have offered to increase border security and border patrol and actually fund it and not just make the promise to do it. Think about the Medicare prescription drug bill. One of the first things we will do when there is a change of power in January is make sure that with the Medicare prescription drug bill we will allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services the ability to negotiate down the drug prices to save the taxpayers' money.

Now, that is good policy from any party that is running the government, but our friends on the other side have refused to implement that basic thing. So we have tried for border security, we have tried to reduce the cost of the Medicare prescription drug bill, giving the Secretary of HHS the ability to negotiate down the drug prices, and we will increase the minimum wage on the first day we are here when we take over in January. That means a pay raise for all Americans because that will trickle up and push everybody's wages up.

That was proven. When we raised the minimum wage in 1997, the economy grew 11 million new jobs. And in the States that had a higher minimum wage than the national minimum wage, there was increased numbers of small businesses that were created, new start-ups, and retail small businesses were increased. This is good for the economy.

In the first week we will be here in January, we will reduce student loan interest rates and we will cut them in half, both for parent loans and for student loans. We will have a significant impact in the lives of many, many Americans just in the first couple of



days from what we are going to pass out of the House: Increase in minimum wage, lower student loan rates for you and your family, increased border security, and allowing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to begin to negotiate on behalf of all the Medicare recipients.

This is not brain surgery. We are not saying we have this grand elaborate scheme that we cooked up somewhere and we are bringing it before the American people. This is basic fundamental stuff. But when you are not so attached to the special interests, when you don't have a K Street Project in which there is this give and take with the big lobbying firms down here, you are able to govern in a way that benefits all of the American people. And that is what we are trying to get at.

Let us take the country in a new direction, where we have a philosophy where everybody contributes to America and everybody benefits. We are actually looking out for the common good. We will provide for the common defense and we will increase the common wealth.

You know, I go to some of these States like Virginia and Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, and they are all commonwealths. That philosophy, what do we have in common, how can we pool the common wealth to benefit everyone? Everyone contributes and everyone benefits. And what we have now, Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. MEEK, is a situation that has set up a system that has been corroded and corrupted. Now, I am not saying by individual Members. I think over time this happens.

Jefferson said that every few years we need to have a revolution. Well, we need a bloodless rebellion to shift power out of the hands of the Republican controlled House, Republican controlled Senate, and the Republican White House. This is George Bush's Congress, Mr. DELAHUNT. Let us make no mistake about it. They do what he says. They follow his lead. They are afraid to stand up to him.

He hasn't vetoed one spending bill or one bill that this Congress has passed out. They rubber stamp the Bush philosophy and they consistently agree with the President. This is his Congress.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, I think that is underscored by the fact when we hear them express concerns about immigration, about illegal immigration, we have not heard a single voice from our friends on the Republican side criticizing the President for the failure to enforce. Well, maybe one voice. Maybe he is here tonight. But no criticizing the President for the failure to enforce our immigration laws, particularly against employers.

Imagine, three enforcements against American businesses for hiring illegal immigrants in the year 2004 when in the last year of the Clinton administration there was far in excess of some 400. That is a disgrace. And it is the respon-

sibility of this Republican Congress to criticize their lack of aggressive oversight on this issue. The problem has become all of ours, but it was created by the lack of funding to strengthen our borders while Democrats have been putting forth proposal after proposal to increase those numbers.

With that, I yield back to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I appreciate your yielding as we begin to wrap up. Maybe Mr. MEEK could get that chart down there and give us the Web site as we begin to close.

I think you can be an amateur historian to recognize what has happened here; that in 1994 there was a move afoot to change things. Newt Gingrich, Dick Armey, and there was a crew of them who came to this floor, like we come to this floor, and like we will continue to come to this floor, to talk about issues. They were talking about balancing the budget and they were talking about instilling fiscal discipline. Mr. MEEK showed earlier the quote from Mr. Gingrich, and I read last week in the Boston Globe a comment from Dick Armey, the former House Republican leader, who said "I'm not sure what this Congress has accomplished."

These are two of the main leaders of that revolution. The Republicans have gotten very far away from what they wanted to accomplish and, I think, what this country deserves. And when that happens, Madam Speaker, it becomes time for a change in America. I think that is where we are.

Again, if you just look at what the Democratic Congress will do within the first couple of days that we get in, that this Republican Congress has failed to do in the past 5 or 6 years under complete Republican dominance, we will raise the minimum wage, we will cut student loans in half for both student loans and parent loans, we will implement the 9/11 recommendations to make sure we provide for the common defense of the United States of America, and we will allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate down drug prices for the Medicare bill to not only save the taxpayers money but drive down drug costs for everyone.

We are going to invest in the small business, as our small businesses are trying to retool themselves. We need assistance for them with the Manufacturing Extension Program and with the SBA 7(a) loan program. We want to give local community development organizations the tools they need to help their small businesses, and some of these programs help businesses. They send out a couple of engineers to help them retool, to make sure that they are streamlining their businesses, to make sure they can find export markets. This is a positive thing, because many small businesses can't afford to do it.

So we've got an agenda. Put us in, coach, we are looking for an oppor-

tunity to play. We have an agenda, and I think the American people will recognize in just a few short days what the difference is between the current Republican leadership and what the Democrats will do.

Our Web site is [www.HouseDemocrats.gov/30something](http://www.HouseDemocrats.gov/30something), and all of these charts and statistics are available on that, Madam Speaker.

□ 1900

#### SHORTEN REAUTHORIZATION OF VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to have the opportunity to address you this evening and take up a number of issues that I believe are important to the American people.

As I come in here and listen to the tail end of the dialogue that takes place here on the floor, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), my friend whom I serve with on the Committee on the Judiciary, for acknowledging that some of us will stand up and speak to the lack of enforcement on the part of this administration.

In fact, in our private conversation, I reiterated something that I put into the RECORD the night before last in that if you are an employer in the United States and you are knowingly and willfully hiring illegals, you were 19 times more likely to be sanctioned under Bill Clinton's administration than you are under the current administration. That is the level that this enforcement has drifted to. That is the issue that they speak to.

However, I would say on the other side of this argument, we have seen an acceleration of enforcement on the border. It is too little too late to satisfy me and many of my colleagues here in Congress. But the point missing from this dialogue is when amendments are offered on the floor; if they are serious about passing those amendments, it takes homework to get that done. You have to reach across to the other side of the aisle and identify some people to work with on the other side of the aisle and get those sponsors and cosponsors for those amendments so when it comes to the floor it is ready for passage.

A late-arriving amendment that is not designed to pass, but makes a statement has very little opportunity to actually make it into law, and some of those amendments are viewed that way by myself and many others. So I am looking forward to a bipartisan effort on this enforcement. It is one of the reasons that I have talked so long and relentlessly on many things that we need to do.

But I came tonight to talk about another issue, and that is an important