

DREAM ACT—BAD DREAM

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, there are some in Congress who have gone to sleep and blissfully are dreaming of ways to get more illegals benefits that American taxpayers are going to have to pay for.

It's called the DREAM Act, or specifically the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act. You notice that word "alien." It only applies to aliens illegally in the United States, not to American citizens and not to foreign nationals who are here legally. It's a bill to give preference to illegals in our public universities.

Here's how it works under normal circumstances: Most States require that if you are not a resident of their State, you pay out-of-State tuition to go to their public universities. For example, if you are from New Jersey or from India and you go to school at Texas University, you pay out-of-State tuition because you are not from Texas. Most public universities have this rule.

The DREAM Act, however, will do something differently. It applies only to folks who are illegally in the country and who can attest that they came before they were the age of 16. If so, this person will be able to get a green card, later to get a permanent residence card, and then after that get a green card for the parents of this illegal who brought this child into the United States illegally in the first place.

It gives priorities to illegals over American citizens and foreign nationals who are legally in the country. It discriminates against Americans. It discriminates against foreign students because it only applies to illegals who are here so that they can go to our public universities and pay in-State tuition because if you are from some other State or some foreign nation and legally in the country, you pay out-of-State tuition, which, of course, is more.

It seems to me this violates the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. It treats illegals who are violating the law by being here in the United States already better than Americans.

Mr. Speaker, as college costs continue to soar, most Americans who have kids that go to college have to foot that bill. I just had my four children finish college not too long ago and just paid off the last college loan. I have one daughter who is still paying on her college loan after she received her doctorate degree.

There are many Americans who will not be able to go to college because it now costs too much for them to go. But the dreamers want it to cost even more because they want us to subsidize illegals so they can go to school with in-State tuition.

This silly law goes further. It repeals a law that this body signed into law in 1996. In 1996, the legislation was enacted by Congress, started in this House, stating that States cannot give preference to illegals and let them pay in-State tuition unless those same States treat foreign nationals who are legally in the country and out-of-State students, students from other States, the same way. The law applied saying you have to treat everybody equally and you have to treat Americans the same as illegals if you let them go to your university with in-State tuition.

In spite of this 1996 law, there are 10 States who defy this law and have ignored the law and have allowed in-State tuition for illegals. Those 10 States: California; unfortunately, my home State of Texas; Illinois; Oklahoma; Utah; Washington; New Mexico; Kansas; Nebraska; and New York. You see, these 10 States violate Federal law because they already allow in-State tuition for illegals that are in their State.

This is called "nullification." That's a legal term, Mr. Speaker, which means that a State ignores or passes legislation contrary to Federal law. Nullification is not a new concept. It started over 150 years ago when several southern States decided they could nullify Federal laws that they didn't like.

□ 1645

And so one reason for the Great War between the States was because of the nullification concept where States voted laws that were contrary to Federal law.

So this DREAM Act will legalize the conduct of these 10 States. It will then give amnesty and in-state tuition to illegals in this country at the detriment of American students and legal foreign students. Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be. Americans should not have to pay the cost for the education of illegals in this country. And illegals that come to this country and get in our universities should not get to pay less than Americans who live in other States.

And that's just the way it is.

"GREENSPAN"

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, the former Fed Chairman, Alan Greenspan, has recently released his memoir for the years of his time in public service. And it comes as a surprise to many that President Bush and the Republicans in Congress do not fair particularly well.

Reuters said the Fed chairman, Mr. Greenspan, in his book, "sharply criticizes the President, President Bush's administration and Republican congressional leaders for putting political

imperatives ahead of sound economic policies." The New York Times said of Mr. Greenspan's book: "The Bush administration was so captive to its own political operation that it paid little attention to fiscal discipline."

And the irony here is that when President Bush took office and the Republicans had control of the House and the Senate, they were left with \$5 trillion in surplus. And in a short period of time, they've added \$3 trillion to the Nation's debt; \$3 trillion, the fastest accumulation of debt and greatest amount of debt in the shortest period of time in American history.

Now, this is what he goes on to say about this administration, which I find almost intriguing, and also about the Republicans. He looked forward, he says, to working with this administration because at least he worked, as he said, with some of the best and brightest of this administration. And he shared memorable experiences with DICK CHENEY, Don Rumsfeld, among others. And on a personal basis, that is how it worked. But on policy matters, I was soon to see my old friends veer off in unexpected directions.

He was disappointed, he says, from the start. Mr. Greenspan notes that "little value was placed on rigorous economic policy debate or weighing the long-term consequences." He says that in George W. Bush's White House, the political operation was far more dominant.

Now, I will mention, since it's only fair, that he is quite complimentary of what President Clinton and the Democrats did in the 1990s of basically a pay-as-you-go process, weighing long-term economic consequences to their decisions, and always putting America's long-term economic consequences before political considerations. And he praises what was then the fiscal discipline that was adopted in the 1990s that led to unprecedented economic growth.

Now, Mr. Greenspan does not put all the burden of the \$3 trillion of debt on President Bush. He puts that burden also on the Republicans in Congress for what they did in conjunction with this President. And, again, let me read from his book. Greenspan says that "for many of the Republican Party leaders, altering the electoral process to create permanent Republican-led government became a major goal. House Speaker HASTERT and House Majority Leader Tom Delay seemed readily inclined to loosen the Federal purse strings any time it might help add a few more seats to the Republican majority."

Alan Greenspan notes that the Republicans led an earmark explosion and says Congress was too busy feeding at the trough. In the end, Mr. Greenspan says again, "The Republican Congress lost their way. They swapped principle for power. They ended up with neither." Mr. Greenspan praises the pay-as-you-go spending rules and the fiscal disciplines of the 1990s that resulted in the surplus I just mentioned.

That is exactly what this new Congress has done is adopt the pay-as-you-go rules, the fiscal discipline that put us on a path to again putting our fiscal house in order and in balance with our priorities as we go.

But Mr. Greenspan's book, I don't think any time soon will be on the best seller list or talked about in Republican clubs or Republican book circles, lays bare what a number of us have been saying about this administration and the Republican Congress, that they, or as JOHN MCCAIN quotes, "spend like a bunch of drunken sailors." And they have now left America stranded with mountains of debt.

The one thing that we can say about President Bush and the Republican Congress when it comes to the economy and the fiscal mess that they've left is that we will forever be in their debt. That is one thing that you can always say. But I find it most intriguing that Greenspan, who is a life-long Republican and served and worked with President Reagan, President Bush, President Clinton, President Bush, and President Ford, saw that this administration and this Republican Congress and cohorts, when they worked together for 6 years, left this country in a worse fiscal shape than the one they inherited. And all of us will be judged in our public life for the country we inherited and the country we left behind. And what we got left behind is nothing but a fiscal mess that those of us who have taken the tough votes and the tough decisions put America's long-term economic interests at the center of our economic policy.

IN SUPPORT OF ONSLOW VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of an important effort to honor our Nation's Vietnam veterans.

The Onslow County Vietnam Veterans Memorial Foundation in Jacksonville, North Carolina, is a nonprofit organization that was established by veterans and supporters in 1998. It was created to raise funds for the construction of a memorial to honor the brave men and women from all branches of the Armed Forces who served their country in Vietnam.

More than 9 million veterans of the Armed Forces served on active duty from August 5, 1964 to May 7, 1975. Of the 3 million men and women who served in the Vietnam theater, 300,000 were wounded and more than 58,000 were killed. The Veterans Administration estimates that nearly 200 of the surviving Vietnam veterans die each and every day.

Today, nearly 10 years after its formation, the goal of the Onslow Vietnam Veterans Memorial Foundation is

on the verge of becoming a reality. On the grounds of Marine Corps base Camp Lejeune, land has been acquired adjacent to the Beirut memorial, and the first phase of construction is expected to begin later this year.

The design of the memorial consists of a gazebo over a reflecting pool and fountain encircled by a glass wall inscribed with the names of all those who made the ultimate sacrifice for our Nation. Hidden within a dark gray granite base, lights will gently illuminate the engraved names on the curved glass memorial.

Once completed, the memorial will enhance the Beirut memorial and any further memorials built within the Lejeune Memorial Garden. By creating an environment where relatives and the general public can come to remember and reflect on the men and women who gave their lives in Vietnam, this memorial will attract thousands of visitors to Onslow County each year.

The Onslow Vietnam Veterans Memorial Foundation has raised and collected about \$1.2 million toward the \$5 million estimated cost of the memorial. In support of this worthy project, Mr. Kenji Horn and others who believe in this memorial have organized a fund-raising motorcycle run in Jacksonville, North Carolina, on Saturday, September 22 of this year. It is open to everyone, and all types of motorcycles are welcome. Registrations have come in from Florida, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Kentucky, and other States around the country; and more than 1,500 motorcycles are expected to participate.

Mr. Speaker, in today's world, we all are aware of the debt of this Nation, and we understand the reality that most worthwhile projects must be funded by the private sector. So it is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that people from around this Nation will be interested in learning more about the Onslow Vietnam Veterans Memorial Foundation. Our Vietnam veterans have earned this honor.

And I close, Mr. Speaker, by saying, please God, continue to bless our men and women in uniform, and please, God, continue to bless America.

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

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

A BIPARTISAN WAY AHEAD

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

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, there is a bipartisan "way ahead" in Iraq if viewed in terms of progress for America's security and not solely Iraq's, with a strategy that focuses on our

natural interests in this conflict, not just the interests of Iraqis.

Our troops have served our country courageously and brilliantly, but our engagement in Iraq has degraded our security, pushing our Army to the breaking point so that it cannot confront other pressing security concerns at home and abroad. My military service as a 3-star admiral, having led an aircraft carrier battle group in combat operations in Afghanistan and Iraq and served as Director of the Navy's anti-terrorism unit, convinces me that an inconclusive, open-ended involvement in Iraq is not in our security interests.

Ending this war is necessary, but how we end it is of even greater importance both for our security and our troops' safety. These two considerations, our security and our troops' safety, are the dual catalysts for a bipartisan discussion to end this war.

First, America's security. Our Army will rapidly unravel if redeployment from Iraq does not begin before spring, 2008. Today, 40 percent of all U.S. Army equipment is in Iraq. There is no Army unit now at home in a state of readiness able to deploy anywhere another contingency might occur in the world.

Second, the safety of our troops. Redeployment from Iraq will be lengthy. Moving 160,000 troops and 50,000 civilians and closing bases are logistically challenging, especially in conflict. To ensure our troops' safety, it will take at least a year, probably 15 to 24 months. The "long pole in the tent" is the closure or turnover of 65 forward operating bases. Conservatively, it takes 100 days to close one forward operating base. It will be important to balance how many to close at one time, with calculations about surrounding strife, and the fact that Kuwait's receiving facilities to clean and package vehicles for customs and shipment back to the United States can handle only two to 2½ brigade combat teams at a time, with the fact that there are currently 40 brigade combat team equivalents in Iraq today.

Redeployment is the most vulnerable of all military operations, particularly because this one will be down a single road leading from Iraq to Kuwait, "Road Tampa." Such vulnerability is why, in 1993, after "Black Hawk Down" in Somalia, it took 6 months to extract our 6,300 troops safely and only then after inserting an additional 19,000 troops to protect their redeployment.

And what of Iraqi stability in the aftermath of our redeployment, which affects the region and, thus, our security? Because the redeployment of troops will take a long time, we can have a bipartisan approach to Iraq's security. To do this, we Democrats must turn from pure opposition to this war and an immediate withdrawal and begin to help author a comprehensive regional security plan that accepts the necessity for a deliberate redeployment.

In turn, the Republican leadership must accept that the U.S. Government