

Arizona has not adopted a new immigration law. All it has done is to enforce existing law that this President refuses to enforce. It's hardly a radical policy to suggest that if an officer on a routine traffic stop encounters a driver with no driver's license, no passport, and who doesn't speak English, that maybe that individual might be here illegally. And to those who say we must reform our immigration laws, I reply, We don't need to reform them. We need to enforce them, just as every other government does, just as Mexico does. Above all, this is a debate of, by, and for the American people. If President Calderon wishes to participate in that debate, I invite him to obey our immigration laws, apply for citizenship, do what 600,000 legal immigrants to our Nation are doing right now, learn our history and our customs, and become an American, and then he will have every right to participate in that debate. Until then, I would politely invite him to have the courtesy while a guest of this Congress to abide by the fundamental rules of diplomacy between civilized nations not to meddle in each other's domestic debates.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege and an honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House. I listened intently to the dialogue that took place before with Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California and Mr. POE of Texas. And as I sat back here and listened to the speech of President Calderon, I had some thoughts of my own that I wish to impart here into the record and for your attention, Mr. Speaker.

First I want to say that on the plus side of the speech that was delivered here to this joint session of Congress by President Calderon of Mexico, there were some up sides to it. He made some points that I think were constructive and needed to be said. One of the things that he said—and I am just going from my scratch notes—was that they are going to finally reestablish the rule of law in Mexico. Excuse me. To correct that, I want to make sure I'm accurate for the record, Mr. Speaker. I have the text of the speech here. It says, "firmly establish the rule of law in Mexico." That's an important point.

As I go to some of the worst places in the world, and I go there intentionally because I think to have that contrast, to understand where it's the toughest place in the world to operate, then it gives us that contrast to understand how well we're blessed here in America, and it helps us understand the functions of the institutions here in America and the functions of the culture and our values. Those pillars of American exceptionalism need to be understood

and polished and refurbished, and we need to do that on a daily basis here in this Congress instead of have them chiseled away at by the other side of the aisle.

But the contrast of how bad it might be, AIDS villages in southern Africa where there's not a single person there of reproductive age unless they're a missionary because the rest have died of AIDS. I go to Iraq, I go to Afghanistan, I go into those places in the world where poverty is a dominant force. Up into Tibet, for example. And most of those places that I go to—in fact, almost every place I go to, I can at least put together a formula on how to fix it, to be able to identify what's wrong and processes and procedures to put in place to put it on the right track. Most of us in this Congress believe we can at least gather the information to address these situations. When I come back from Mexico, I have this other sense. It's a different feeling. I can see a lot of the things that are wrong, but I don't know how to fix it, because the corruption goes so deep, it threads through so many components of their society. Unless there's a good formula to fix the culture of corruption, I don't know how you fix the rest of the institutions in Mexico.

I want to give a hats-off to President Calderon for taking on the drug cartels. I know, being down there in part of the exchange program, as he was a candidate for office shortly before he was elected, one of the things that I was advised, sitting in those meetings and sometimes it was one-on-one with the door closed, was that he is going to have to take on some of the forces that helped get him elected in order to straighten things out in Mexico. So when I see the numbers that show the thousands of casualties in the drug cartel wars that are going on and the federal officers that have been lost in that battle and the local police departments that are either afraid to enforce the law or are corrupt and wrapped up in the cartels, it's a very difficult task that he has faced.

I will give another point to the point that he has made that the consumption of illegal drugs here in the United States is one of the huge forces that drive the illegality that comes through Mexico. I have to concede that point. We need to address the illegal drug consumption in America. We lack the ability to do that. Our society, our culture, our civilization has accepted a certain level of illegal drug consumption and abuse in America. We've accepted the violence that goes with it. We've accepted the child abuse, the domestic problems that go along with it as simply a component of our society, as we accept the rotting inner cities in America, and we essentially send money there to start a new inner city economy that isn't based on something productive as a rule. Those are American problems that we need to address. He spoke to those lightly. He spoke to those gently. He referenced them. But

President Calderon came on very strong against the Arizona immigration law. And I'm wondering who briefed him before he gave his speech here today. It almost looks as though the speech was prepared by the Obama White House.

□ 1745

When you look at the language that was used and the language that he emphatically disagrees with Arizona's immigration law, SB 1070, that's the bill, he emphatically disagrees with the bill, even though he says that he recognizes our constitutional right to pass laws and establish immigration laws and enforce those immigration laws.

So I am wondering what it is that offends President Calderon so much about the Arizona immigration law since it mirrors the Federal immigration law. Was he offended then by the Federal immigration law? And when he sat down in the Oval Office with President Obama, did he say, I think you ought to amend the Federal immigration law so people here as legal immigrants don't have to carry their papers after the age of 18. That is the law. It has been the law for a long time. It is not something that offended people before. I hadn't heard about it before Arizona stepped forward and made it part of their State law.

So if President Calderon is offended and disagrees with Arizona immigration law, which mirrors Federal immigration law, if he hasn't voiced an objection to Federal immigration law, by the law of deductive reasoning, you would just boil it down to he is only offended because local law enforcement in Arizona will be enforcing the mirror of the Federal immigration law, because it can't be the law itself that he is offended by or he would also be offended by the Federal immigration law. I think that is a simple law of deductive reasoning to take it down to that. I am not sure that the people on the opposite side of the aisle from us have the capability to do that deductive reasoning any more.

And when I look at the people in the administration who have taken on Arizona's immigration law and willfully misinformed the American people, and I will include President Calderon of willfully misinforming the American people on the Arizona immigration law, but I look at the President of the United States who made comments that there could be a woman in Arizona taking her daughter off to get some ice cream and apparently because of the way they looked, they could be called over and asked to produce their papers.

Now that was playing the race card, and that divides the American people. And that recognizes a statement made by Mr. MCCLINTOCK a few minutes ago that there is an intentional effort to divide people for political purposes. The President has done it. And I can't imagine that he had read the bill until last night. He sounded a little more like he had, but he couldn't have read

it if he was going to say the things that he said.

He knows Arizona law doesn't allow for a woman or her daughter to be stopped for no other reason than their skin color when they are going off to get some ice cream. It specifically states that in the bill, not the ice cream part. But it specifically states there has to be probable cause; and in order to investigate the immigration status, there has to be a reasonable suspicion.

We understand reasonable suspicion. I happen to have written reasonable suspicion language in Iowa's workplace drug-testing law. We didn't ask a trained law enforcement officer to evaluate the reasonable suspicion. We simply asked an employer to either appoint himself or designate an employee to take 2 hours of course training in identifying reasonable suspicion. And then with that 2 hours of training and 1 hour per year refreshing training could be able to point to an individual and say I have a reasonable suspicion you are a drug abuser; you have to provide a urine sample. Here is the clinic. Here is the nurse. Go in there and we are going to test you.

For 12 years it has been in the law in Iowa, and I heard all of the same things when we passed that law. That reasonable suspicion would be used to discriminate against people because someone didn't like them because of their skin color, sexual orientation, gender identity, or whatever it might be. All of this hysteria that gets built up around this legislation and the willful misrepresentation of the language and the effect of the law turns out to be—what do we call it, a tempest in a teapot in the end, not something that is going to produce substance on the other side of this, but a lot of hysteria created.

As Tom Tancredo, who used to say these things on the floor of this House, he said the level of hysteria is proportional to the degree to which they are afraid the law will actually work and that Arizona will be able to enforce the mirror of Federal immigration law and they will be able to effectively outlaw sanctuary cities in Arizona. That is what this is about.

The people who object to Arizona immigration law are lying to the American people. Many of them know it. The Attorney General sat right here in that seat today and when President Calderon said that he objected to Arizona's immigration law, who led the standing ovation, the Attorney General of the United States who confessed to the gentleman from Texas that he didn't read the bill.

But he would commit the resources of the Justice Department to investigate Arizona for constitutionality questions, statutory questions, case law questions that had to do with Arizona's immigration law, not having read the bill, not having examined this or been even briefed by his own people, but having been directed by the Presi-

dent of the United States to use the full—well, use the force of the Justice Department to examine Arizona's immigration law and could not to me in that same hearing respond to a question, Could you point to a single place in the United States Constitution that causes you concern? Can you point to a single Federal statute that you think might preempt Arizona's immigration law? Can you point to a single piece of case law that would indicate that Arizona doesn't have the authority to enforce Federal immigration law.

He could do none of those things, and subsequently the gentleman from Texas asked him if he had read the bill. I thought when that question was asked that it was a question to set up something else because I thought it was a given that the Attorney General of the United States would have read the bill before he misrepresented it to the American people.

I yield to Judge POE.

Mr. POE of Texas. Regarding the Attorney General not reading the bill, he is a knowledgeable lawyer. Any knowledgeable lawyer who read the Arizona statute would know what he was saying was incorrect. That is why I asked him the question because I believed he hadn't read the law.

The law states in four places that racial profiling is prohibited under the statute. In four different places it says that. To make it very clear to everybody in Arizona and the world that will read the law, that racial profiling is prohibited under Arizona's new illegal immigration law that they have passed which, as you have said, is a mirror copy of U.S. immigration laws, and because the Federal Government does all kinds of things except protect the border, they are desperate in Arizona to protect their citizens; and, therefore, they passed that legislation.

I just wanted to mention, part of the problem with the Border Patrol in Arizona and other places along the Texas border, and why States like Arizona have decided they must enforce immigration laws is because of what is occurring.

Here is a chart of the assaults that have occurred against our Border Patrol agents. Border Patrol agents, as you know, the gentleman from Iowa, patrol the border within 25-30 miles of our southern border.

In the year 2004, there were about 380 assaults on our Border Patrol agents. I think that is a lot.

Then in 2005, there were 687.

In 2006, there were 752.

And then in the last 3 years, 2007, 2008 and 2009, there have been almost a thousand assaults on border agents. And those are folks that protect the dignity of the U.S. These assaults primarily come from people crossing the border illegally and they assault our Border Patrol agents who are just trying to protect the dignity and sovereignty of the United States. People are not supposed to come here unless they have permission. They are supposed to come here legally.

It has gotten so bad down at the border, they have improvised—and being in the construction business, Mr. KING, you would appreciate this—they call these Border Patrol vehicles “war wagons.” And the reason they call them war wagons is because these patrol right up next to the Texas-Mexico border and also the Arizona-Mexico border. And people crossing into the United States illegally pelt the Border Patrol with rocks, heavy rocks.

So they have put all of these meshed wire contraptions on their vehicles to protect the windows and protect themselves from bodily harm from the rock throwers who are arrogantly coming into the United States illegally. They see the Border Patrol, they start throwing rocks, and they come into the United States anyway.

So that is just one example of why the State of Arizona and other States are in dire straits. They want to protect the dignity and sovereignty of their State. They want to protect it from people coming in, from everybody, the good, the bad, and the ugly. And right now we are getting everybody, the good, the bad, and the ugly; a lot of bad and a lot of ugly.

It just seems to me that our government, rather than criticizing the State of Arizona, ought to be supporting Arizona, ought to enforce the rule of law on the border. If our government, the Federal Government, enforced the rule of law on the border, we wouldn't be having any of these discussions, but it doesn't. It is unfortunate that our Attorney General, and also the Secretary of Homeland Security, talked about this legislation and neither one of them before they made all of these statements about how bad the law was had read the legislation.

I yield back to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas for bringing that perspective in.

I have also spent time down on the border and ridden in the war wagons. I have seen the screen that hinged that goes over the windshield, and you can tip it back over the hood when you get away from the border and out of rock range.

I have watched them climb the fence, come into the United States, take a look and watch the Border Patrol move towards them, and they run at the speed they need to run to climb back over the fence, hang over the fence, and smile and wave and smirk. Sometimes the same individuals get caught, and they come to the Border Patrol station.

It is interesting to note that the Border Patrol in the Nogales area in particular, they will go out and pick people up, and they have a private contractor that comes and does the transport. They have paramilitary or military-type uniforms on these officers, gray uniforms, and they are riding in a white van. It has a cage built inside it. They will come along and pick them

up. When a Border Patrol officer picks them up, they will call the wagon and the contractor picks them up and delivers them to the station. And they walk in there. They already know the drill. They have their personal items in a Ziploc bag. They waltz in. Some have a smirk on their face. They know that the consequences are zero.

They will sit down along the wall. They know there is a little time while they take their turn to get fingerprinted and get their digital photograph. Then they will be sorted into cells and then loaded back on sometimes the same van, within an hour or so and taken back down to the port of entry on the border. They turn the van sideways, open the door, and they walk back into Mexico to come back again the next day or the next hour. We don't have catch and release any more the way we used to have it. We have now catch and return.

It occurs to me that we aren't really making progress. The mission statement down there on the border is not that we are going to get operational control of the border, even though Janet Napolitano seems to think that they are doing so because they have fewer interdictions, but I know you don't measure border crossings necessarily by how many people you stop coming in. You do it by how many people actually make the attempt and/or get through.

So to lower the law enforcement and interdict fewer people doesn't mean there are fewer attempts necessarily, but that is the metric that we are using.

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana who has some comments on this issue.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I would like to state emphatically here this evening, Mr. Speaker, that I support the law of Arizona. Just as the gentleman said, it is really a mirror image of the United States law. I would say that those who are against the law who criticize it, some in our own government, do so for very interesting reasons. It is not really the law that they have such a problem with. It is the fact that we are enforcing a law that already exists. If that were not the case, then why, Mr. Speaker, do these people who are against this Arizona law, why don't they simply bring a bill to the floor and vote to repeal the existing American law. But that is not happening.

What we have had is a wink and a nod for many years, in which case we have a law on the books—I think it is a good law, it is not a perfect law—but a law that if we enforced it, we wouldn't have the problems that we have today. Let's just take a moment to understand why we have the problems that we have.

I lived in the San Diego, California, area some years ago, and it was very interesting. When you would leave San Diego and drive across the border into Tijuana, here we are, two cities that

are so close together that they abut one another, and yet on one side of the border you have beautiful homes, million dollar homes. You have wonderful bridges and infrastructure. And then as you cross the border, you find poverty. You find dirt roads. You find people in some cases living in the streets.

□ 1800

So there is such a chasm between the standard of living below the border than above that border, no wonder people try to cross the border for opportunity. I can't blame them for doing that.

But the problem is that it's a cultural and political problem that exists in Mexico today. And so rather than pointing his finger at us, President Calderon should, I think, address the problems in his country, and that is the fact that they have a high level of corruption, a high level of poverty.

I do agree with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) that he is doing a much better job about the drug cartels and enforcing those laws than any President in modern times from Mexico, so I definitely tip my hat to him for that.

But there is also no middle class in Mexico today. And like many third world countries, it's mostly a poverty-driven country, where many people are desperate for work and desperate for opportunities. But on the other hand, there is 10 percent or so of the population that lives a wealthy lifestyle. But there's very few opportunities for upward mobility.

And let's just finally look at it. We're all descendants of immigrants at one point or another, and our ancestors came here because they were looking for opportunity. And we have many people around the world who come here looking for opportunity, and we have a way for them to do that.

I think it was the gentleman from California earlier that mentioned that 600-something thousand legal immigrants came to this country last year. So we have a way of doing that, although we, I think, could make it better. We could make it more efficient. But the truth is there is a legal way to immigrate to the United States, and we should make that available, and we do make that available.

On the other hand—and I welcome those immigrants. But on the other hand, those who come across our borders illegally, inappropriately, and who, in many ways, create danger for our own citizens, create problems for our own economy in terms of the need for education for their children and for health care, doing that illegally is not a solution to the problem. It may be a short-term solution for their immediate economic problems, but Mexico has got to address its own economic and cultural problems. And we, on the other hand, have got to take care of our borders, our sovereignty here.

And so, again, I would just reiterate that I do support Arizona's bold move,

I think a necessary move, to protect their borders, to protect their economy. I believe it's Phoenix that is considered the kidnapping capital of at least the United States, if not the world. And who can blame the people of Arizona for doing for themselves what the Federal Government refuses to do, even though it has an obligation to do that?

And then, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) points out, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) as well, we have the Attorney General sitting here today right in front of this body and having already admitted, confessed that he didn't read the law to begin with; and, after all, it's essentially the same law that he's agreed to uphold and defend as Attorney General, and somehow agreeing with the President from another country who says we should turn a blind eye to the illegal immigrants who are coming across the border.

So I would just say that I agree with the two gentlemen here tonight. It's time something is done. And I agree with the efforts of Arizona, and I do think other States are going to take this up as well and come up with similar laws.

And I think we here in the body of the U.S. Congress should also move forward with immigration reform, but not in the form of amnesty that we hear about from the other side, but a true reform where we can more efficiently allow people to come across the border to work here temporarily if there are jobs for them in a legal way, but make sure that they return when they're done; and, on the other hand, those who are here illegally return and never come back in an illegal status.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

A number of things come to mind as I listened to the dialog here. One of them was lurking in the back of my mind that I had to go back and find. It was a statement that was made by President Calderon that I'd like to have a sit-down conversation with him on, when he said in the early part of his speech today, he said, As you can see, Mexico was founded on the same values and principles as the United States of America. I don't think I can see that. I'd like to know what he's thinking about and talking about when he makes that statement. There are certainly principles that are similar and principles that are identical, but there are principles on the way the United States was founded that are unique to the United States of America. And that's a conversation for another time.

I pose that question out there, and if anybody has an answer to that, I'm not illuminated enough on that subject matter to see into his mind to understand what he's actually saying so that I can agree with him. No, I disagree with him until I can find a better explanation.

When the gentleman earlier, Mr. McCLINTOCK, talked about 600,000 legals, he must have been referring to 600,000 naturalizations a year in America. And when I look at the numbers of people that come into the United States legally, under a visa, we're up now to about 1.5 million in the last 2 or 3 years. That number over the last 10 years averages about 1 million a year. There is no nation in the world that is as generous with its legal immigration as the United States of America is, and there is no nation in the world that we're more generous to with legal immigration than the nation of Mexico. Those are simply facts.

We saw some facts, I think, today that showed about 111,000 legal immigrants from Mexico on an annual basis. And I remember seeing some data that showed about 14½ percent of the legal immigrants into the United States come from Mexico. Those numbers would comport pretty closely to each other. That's pretty generous.

And we saw also, our economy, we've had an increase in the numbers of unemployment, up to 470,000 new applications for unemployment. It was interesting that President Calderon talked about their economy creating 400,000 new jobs in the last quarter in Mexico, and here we're watching 470,000 new applicants for unemployment in the United States of America. And if I go back to the workforce in the United States 10 years ago, the workforce was 142 million, and today it's a little over 153 million in the workforce. And if you would add up the legal immigrants that have received green cards and processed through this process of, some to naturalization, some not to naturalization, about half that come to the United States legally actually follow through on the citizenship application component. But the legal immigration over the last 10 years and the jobs that have been opened up for people that came here that received green cards or workers' visas almost mirrors the size of the growth in our workforce.

And so we have 15.4 million unemployed in America. We have another 5 to 6 million that are looking for jobs. Around 20 million or more in America would meet my definition of unemployment, people that need work and are looking for it. We have a workforce that could be expanded dramatically if we would simply take those of working age who are not engaged in the workforce, that aren't working for one reason or another. That's about 80 million.

So we have 20 million looking for work in America, unemployed, and those that have given up trying to look, and then you add another 60 million that are simply not in the workforce for one reason or another that are of working age. That's 80 million Americans we can draw from. And we have 8 million illegals in America, at least, that are going to work on a regular basis.

Now, enforcing immigration law would open up 8 million jobs. That

would be half of the unemployment problem, roughly that 15.4 million that are technically unemployed. About half of those could go to work to fill the slots of those that are now being occupied by illegals.

And when people say that there's work that Americans won't do, there's not a single job they can point to that they can't say an American won't do. And about 3 years ago, I looked into that when President Bush was making that statement constantly, there's work that Americans won't do and so we have to bring in immigrants, and the illegal ones are the ones that first come and he wants to legalize them.

So I asked the question: What is the toughest, dirtiest, most dangerous, most difficult job there is that any American would be asked to do? And the answer to that, as I polled the people around me, came back, well, rooting terrorists out of places like Fallujah would be about the toughest job there is.

And so, well, what do you pay the lowest ranking marine to go into Fallujah and put his life on the line to root the terrorist out of there?

Well, if you paid him a 40-hour week instead, and it's 60 or 70 hours a week or more, but a 40-hour week, that comes to about \$8.09 an hour. So if a marine will go in and root terrorists out of Fallujah, for his country, granted, at \$8.09 an hour, I don't think you can find a job picking lettuce that an American won't do for the going rate.

And what's happened is our economy has gotten so distorted, we've become such a welfare state that, according to Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, a study that he did a couple of years ago, if you would take a typical family of four that was headed by a high school dropout, without regard to their immigration status, legal or illegal, American, natural born, naturalized, but a high school dropout heading a household, a typical family of four, the net draw—well, first I have to say, they pay taxes. They pay about an average of \$9,000 in taxes. But they'll draw down an average of \$32,000 in benefits, and the net cost to the taxpayer is \$22,449 a year. That's \$1.5 million over the 50-year span of heading that household.

And so now America's become a welfare state. And the lower skilled people, natural born, naturalized, legal or illegal, can't sustain their household in this economy because their skill level isn't high enough. And we would argue, we need more unskilled people in America so we can pay more people not to work and subsidize more families because the pressure on those jobs at the lower skills is so high that the highest percentages of unemployment in America are exactly in the lowest skilled jobs that we have.

I would say we need a tighter labor market so the wages and benefits can come up in the lower skilled workers so they can sustain themselves. And those other folks, the taxpayers don't have

to subsidize that household and the households of the people that aren't working at all. That's one of those economic equations.

Mr. FLEMING. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. The gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. I'd just like to expand on that point real quickly, and that is that we're moving rapidly in this country towards paying people not to work. So, obviously, that creates that vacuum that you're talking about where people from Mexico want to come across the border illegally to find jobs.

But what's very interesting about President Calderon is, as I understand it, that the rules for immigration into Mexico from its southern border are far more onerous than our own laws. In fact, ours are much more generous, and yet he's again criticizing us. That really makes no sense. It doesn't add up. It's hypocritical, of course.

So I think you're absolutely right, Mr. KING, because not only should we make sure that the opportunities are there for our own citizens, but we should take away, I think, any incentives for people not to work when, in fact, they're fully able bodied to do so.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I'd just make this point, and that would be that when we have people that are being subsidized, their families are being subsidized because they can't make enough wages to sustain their household, and, for example, working in the packing plant in my neighborhood 20 years ago paid about the same amount that a teacher makes today. It paid about the same amount as a teacher 20 years ago, but today a teacher makes about twice as much as the person that works in the packing plant. The person that works in the packing plant now has trouble sustaining themselves without some kind of support.

There was a day when a young person growing up in my neighborhood, if they wanted to, they could go get a job in the packing plant and they could buy a modest house and pay for the home and prepare for retirement and send their kids off to college. There'd be some student loans in that, and significant ones, but they could manage their life and they could go to work and, with respect in the community, be able to sustain their family. Today, that's been driven out because of an oversupply of cheap labor.

I'd yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

A couple of points. One thing that President Calderon said today that I totally agree with is that the rule of law is important. He said he believed in the rule of law. So do I. But I think the rule of law ought to be enforced not only in Mexico, but ought to be enforced in the United States.

And as the gentleman from Iowa has mentioned, the United States is the

most generous country on Earth when it comes to legal immigration. It is a policy of this country to allow people to come here. And if you travel around the world, everybody wants to come to the United States, and that's a good thing. And they want to come for a lot of reasons. As the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) says, opportunity is one of those reasons. But they want to come also for other reasons, including the word "liberty" that we don't talk about too much.

But, in any event, we allow people to come here the right way. And when people come here the right way, they appreciate being here, especially those who have gone through that long process of becoming citizens. They make fine American citizens because they are Americans after they take that oath to uphold the Constitution.

□ 1815

But the rule of law should also apply in the areas where people want to come here illegally. People who cross our borders illegally disrespect the rule of law. They disrespect our rule of law. They should come here the right way. They should get in line the right way. And they should not disrespect not only Americans, but those who do it the right way.

You know, one of the things we do in our office, as both of you do in your offices, we help people come to the United States legally. We probably do more case work on immigration issues than everything else put together except maybe veterans and military issues. We help people come here all the time. We get those calls, and people want to come to the United States to visit, to work, to be a tourist, to go to school, or to become citizens. And we do everything we can to help those people come the right way.

I too, like I think most Members of the House, are for legal immigration. But people should not sidestep that process and ignore the rule of law, as President Calderon says he is for the rule of law, and come around that process and just come in the United States any way they can and then take the benefits of being in the United States without being here legally.

So I think when it comes to legislation, we hear about comprehensive immigration reform. What that means is, really that's disguise for the word amnesty. I think what we ought to start doing right now is before we start with more legislation, why don't we just enforce the laws we already have? We have plenty of laws already that talk about the rule of law and securing the border and making sure people don't come in here. We just don't enforce those laws. I think those laws are not enforced for political reasons. That's my opinion.

But I will yield back to the gentleman from Iowa because I can tell you want to say something.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time from the gentleman from Texas,

actually I was looking to see if I could come up with within the text of President Calderon's speech, it seems to me that I heard him say, and it wasn't clear enough in my memory, that our immigration laws were broken or needed to be repaired. And I want to find the exact text of that. And I will do that.

But I wanted to add to the dialogue here on amnesty. Because amnesty has been the central word in the immigration debate from the beginning of immigration debate, and we go back to 1986, when President Reagan signed the amnesty bill. And even though I disagreed with that act, it was one of the very few times that President Reagan let me down, but he was in a position where he believed he had to sign the bill. And the bargain was if we would grant amnesty to a million people that were in the United States illegally, then they would turn up the enforcement of immigration law, and there would never be another amnesty again. And that's been, well, 1986. So 24 years ago when he signed that bill he was at least straight up and honest about it and said it's amnesty.

Now, we understood what amnesty was in 1986, but I watched them try to change the meaning and the definition of the word amnesty throughout this debate going back to President Bush's immigration speech that he gave in about January of 2005. And throughout all of that I heard them argue, many people from that administration, and then the concept was pushed forward from the Obama administration that it's not amnesty if you make them pay a fine, learn English, and pay back taxes.

Well, what is it that you wouldn't require of an American citizen? Learning English is something we would require of someone that would want to be naturalized. So that's not an extra burden to give somebody a path to citizenship to require them to learn English. That's already law. You have to demonstrate proficiency in both the spoken and the written English language. So paying your back taxes? We wouldn't accept somebody as a naturalized citizen that had back taxes that they didn't pay. That's an obligation to pay your taxes.

So the only other thing, the thing that makes it not amnesty in the minds of the people that argue that it's not amnesty to give somebody amnesty, is to require them to pay a fine. So the fine started out at \$500. And I pointed out that a coyote's average price is \$1,500. Could you at least get it up there to where if they can pay a coyote \$1,500 to bring them into the United States, to smuggle them in, couldn't they at least match the pot to become a citizen of the United States? Well, then they raised the ante to \$1,500. Now they said it's not amnesty, surely, because now it's the going rate for citizenship.

You can't sell citizenship to America. You cannot do that. Citizenship is pre-

cious, it's sacred. It's something that when you go and speak at a naturalization service, and I have done that on a number of occasions, and I presume my colleagues have done that as well, it's a very, very rewarding thing to do. I recall one in particular in the Old Executive Office Building right across from the White House itself, in the Indian Room. This was presided over by the Secretary of Citizenship Immigration Services, USCIS, Emilio Gonzalez at the time, who happens to also be an immigrant from Cuba. And he understands this in perspective.

And as he gave the speech to the several score that received their naturalization that day. He said, When they ask you where are you from, you tell them, "I am from America." From this day forward, you tell them, "I am from America." Tell them you are the first American. Don't answer you are from anywhere else; you are an American. You are the first American, you are the first generation of Americans in the lineage that will follow from you. And when you look out that window and you think of the person that lives in that House next door, the President of the United States—he didn't say President, but that's the scenario that we were in—to remember, from this day forward you are as much an American as he is.

I have never heard it so eloquently put how much we embrace the naturalized American citizen that comes through and follows through the right way. And when we embrace American citizenship, we also embrace the Declaration, the Constitution, our history, the rule of law, the experiences that bind us together. And we should understand that words mean things, and you can't redefine them because they are inconvenient. And the word amnesty, to grant amnesty is to pardon immigration lawbreakers and reward them with the objective of their crime.

Now, if their objective is citizenship and you grant them a path to that, and they broke the law and you give them a path to citizenship, that's a reward. If the objective is they want to work in the United States, and you tell them you can do so and we are going to leave you alone now, then you have rewarded them with the objective of their crime. If they falsified their identity, stolen someone's identity, and you waive that identity theft that steals from someone else their security, their credit rating, their confidence that they can be secure in their person and you waive that because you would give them a path to citizenship, that's amnesty. Time after time again rewarding people with the objective of their crime.

They might have come here just to deal in drugs. Well, so are we going to let them falsify their identification documents and become part of the—last time it was two-thirds of those who came in under the amnesty plan falsified their records. There was that much corruption. About a million that were designed to receive the amnesty,

and then the fraud and corruption expanded that to about 3 million all together in the 1986 amnesty act that rewarded them for violation of their crimes.

And when I ask the illegal immigrants that come into the United States, We want to do a background check on you, how do we do that? Can you get me your birth certificate? We want to track and see if you have any violations in your old country. And their answer would be, well, yeah, I can get a birth certificate. Well, then why don't you get me one? Well, first, what do you want it to say? What do you want this birth certificate to say? Why do you ask me such a thing? Well, I want to make sure I get you a birth certificate that says what you need it to say. How old do I need to be? Where do I need to be born? Can I have a clean record?

And so you can't trust the data that comes from a country that only half the people are born in hospitals, and the ones that aren't don't have birth certificates as a rule. And so there are many myopic things going on in this country.

You have people over on this side of the aisle that are completely pandering for political power. And some will argue that Republicans want cheap labor and Democrats want all the political power that comes with that. I will argue there are a lot of Democrats in business that think they have a birth-right to cheap labor. And it isn't even a majority I don't think any longer of Republicans that take that position.

Sometimes they just simply have to compete because the people that they are competing against are hiring a lot of cheap labor. Then they rationalize and they decide I will hire some of this cheap labor, too. And pretty soon it becomes a virus that just takes over the economy, and the rule of law is the victim.

But I would like to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank you for yielding.

To expand on that point, I have spoken to a number of business owners who have said just that. They really do not want to hire illegals but feel compelled to because the only way they can compete is to do the very same thing that their competitors are doing as well. So even those who wish not to be corrupt and wish not to break the laws are forced either out of business or forced to violate those laws that we should be enforcing in the first place.

But the other thing, just to touch on amnesty again, it seems like we have gone through this cycle twice before. And the first thing that we do towards a solution has been to generate amnesty. And where has it gotten us? We have more illegals in this country and more problems with illegals than we have ever had before. So if starting with amnesty with or without a fine was a solution to the problem, the problem would be solved already. So

obviously amnesty is not the answer. So I oppose amnesty.

I support the enforcement of the laws on the book, both Federal and the Arizona State laws, and perhaps other States that will take up those laws.

And the other thing, Mr. Speaker, that I support is that English should be our national language. It's really I think insulting when you are in your own country and you have to sort through all sorts of phone messages to just get to the right language you should be in. If someone is serious enough about coming to this country and staying or working here, then I think they should at least make the effort to learn our language, at least the basics of our language. And rather than citizens being forced to in effect learn other people's languages just because they are coming here illegally, or in some cases legally.

So those are I think three solid requirements that we should have: That we should have English as our official national language; that we should not grant amnesty under any sort of reform bill; and that we enforce the laws that exist on the book today.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana as I reclaim.

I certainly agree. And I would add to this that it is one of my very solidly held beliefs, and if you look across history and the forces of culture and civilization, that the single most powerful unifying force for humanity known throughout all of history is a common language. When you look, the most successful institutions over the last 200 years have been the nation states. And the borders of nation states have been shaped around the lines where people speak a common language.

Why is France France? Because they speak French there. Why is Germany the reunified Germany? Because they speak German there. In Switzerland it's a little bit different. But that's a lot longer story. And they have actually not had a lot of agreement there for the last 700 years until after World War II. But it's a powerful unifying force.

And if you look back 2,500 years ago in China, there was an emperor there. He was the first emperor of China. And I can never pronounce this in Chinese, so somebody out there is going to cringe. I can probably spell it, but it's close to Qin Shi Huang, the first emperor of China. It was actually about 245 B.C. when he lived.

And he looked at that vast area of China, and there were 300-some different dialects and languages that were spoken. They had all of those separate provinces. They were not unified. But as he traveled around, he looked and he realized these are similar people. They look the same. They don't speak the same language. They wear similar clothes, they eat similar food, they are of a similar ethnic background just by looks. And he decided he wanted to unify the Chinese people for the next 10,000 years.

So he hired some scribes to produce a language that could unify them. And that's where all of these 5,000 characters in the commonly used Chinese written language that are common to all the Chinese, or up to 50,000 different varieties of all these 5,000 characters, came from. That's why it's picture writing. The intelligent people that he hired were intellectuals. They sat down and decided, well, we don't know how to make this make sense unless we draw a picture. So they did these pictures. Now we have the Chinese language. And the goal to unify the Chinese people for the next 10,000 years has been pretty effective. He is a fourth of the way along the way.

He is also the one who standardized the width of the axles on the oxcarts so they could fit in or out of the ruts. And he standardized a number of things. The terra-cotta guards are another component of that. But it's a piece of wisdom that has been holding together for a quarter of a millennia. And it's a piece of wisdom that we can't seem to get figured out here in the United States of America. It's the only country in the world that doesn't have an official language. That's my research. Some others will disagree with that. But that's, again, a longer story.

□ 1830

But I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas to add to this wisdom, as we have about 12 minutes left on the clock.

Mr. POE of Texas. I agree to the comment that we all should speak the same language. Now, being from Iowa, you would probably think those of us in Texas and Louisiana don't speak the same language you do even though it is a version of English, they tell us.

I'd like to make one more comment about how difficult it is to live on the border.

Everybody in this House needs to go down to the southern border and just travel the border and just observe what's taking place. The border, as a local Texas Ranger tells me, he says after dark, the border gets western. And what he means by that is it gets violent on both sides. Good people in Mexico and in the United States live in fear if they live close to the border, primarily the drug cartels. But it's also the international gangs that operate freely back and forth across the border.

And the brunt of that, of course, occurs in the border counties, all the way from Brownville, Texas, to San Diego, California. So there are 14 counties in Texas that are close to the border or border the northern border of Mexico. And periodically I will call the Texas sheriffs and I ask them this question. Pick the same day every month, and I call them and say, How many people are in your jail today that are foreign nationals? Don't distinguish between legal or illegal or where they're from. But how many are foreign nationals?

So the most recent call that I made—called all 14 sheriffs on the same day—

and they told me how many people, percentage-wise, were in their jail. It goes all the way from Terrell County, where a hundred percent of the people in the jail are foreign nationals. True, small county, small jail. But the average across all of the southern counties in Texas on the day certain about 3 weeks ago, 4 weeks ago, was 37 percent. Thirty-seven percent of the people, Texas border county jails, are foreign nationals. Now, that's expensive to take care of these people.

Now, these aren't people charged with immigration violations. These are people charged with felonies and misdemeanors committed in the United States. These are poor counties. They can't afford to prosecute these folks.

And so that is just one of the problems that occurs in the southern portion of the United States when the Federal Government does not enforce the rule of law on the border. Secure the border so that people come here with permission or they don't come. And that includes folks who come over here—not all, by any means—but those who come over here illegally to commit crimes.

And because the border is porous, many of these people in the county jails down there, when they make bond, they head back south, commit crimes back and forth across the border on both sides of the border. If they commit a crime in Mexico, they hide in the United States. If they commit a crime in the United States, they run back to Mexico.

So this, I think, is a phenomenal statistic. Thirty-seven percent of the people, border county jails, on this one day were foreign nationals.

So I think the obligation of the Federal Government is to quit talking about this, get rid of the politics, and do what governments are supposed to do: protect the people, especially the people of the United States, not just the ones on the border but all of the people in the United States from those who wish to come over here illegally, primarily the criminal gangs and drug cartels.

With that, I'll yield back to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the judge from Texas as I reclaim.

I came across the language that I said I would look for in President Calderon's speech where he said, I fully respect the right of any country to enact and enforce its own laws, but what we need today is to fix a broken system.

I would argue that, yes, there's a lot of burden on the system, but I am not seeing the Department of Justice come to us and ask for more money for judges, more money for prosecutors. We also heard in our dialogue today that they are bringing charges and prosecuting if someone has 500 or more pounds of marijuana they are smuggling into the United States.

I have personally pulled out of the false bed of a pickup about 240 pounds

of marijuana. That wasn't enough to get him prosecuted when the threshold was 250.

It's astonishing for me to think how much is 500 pounds of marijuana and how you might let somebody go and not prosecute. No wonder there's not a restraint there if we're not willing to put these resources in.

And I'm not getting a number when I ask how much money are we spending on the southern border to defend that border. I want to know how much a mile. I can't get that answer back from Janet Napolitano because the budget is broken up in different categories and they mix and match and slide it around.

We put this together and we've just tracked now the increases. But about 3 years ago, the numbers turned out to be \$8 billion on our southern border. Now it's increased by an additional 50 percent. So one has to presume that 8 and 4 is 12—\$12 billion on our southern border. Instead of it being \$4 million a mile, now it's \$6 million a mile. \$12 billion.

With all of that money that's being spent with boots on the ground, and we're doing a catch-and-return and we're not able to prosecute in some of these sectors of the border unless they have 500 or more pounds of marijuana with them, how can we expect that that is a deterrent or that it is effective? I don't know that the system is broken, but neither can I see that we're using the laws that we have and enforcing them to their fullest effect. And neither can I see that there's a mission understanding on the border that is articulated from the White House on down to the Border Patrol agents who punch the clock, go in and do their job. And some of them do a great job. But it's a difficult thing to do if there's not an overall mission understanding.

We've got about 5 minutes, and I'd yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman. I won't need much time to close out my remarks, and that is that, again, the Federal Government has failed to do its job. It's failed to protect its citizens, it's failed to protect its borders, it's failed to protect its sovereignty. And we have a State, the State of Arizona, which has stepped up, very carefully crafted a law that mirrors that of the Federal Government that's not being enforced. They've stepped up to the plate and said this is costing us in terms of human lives, really. And in terms of other costs, financial and otherwise, we're better off to step forward and do something about this even though the Federal Government refuses to send troops or whatever protection we need to have.

So I think that that is the beauty of this Republic, and that is that each State has its own government and becomes a test tube for the entire Nation. It's going to be very interesting going forward to see what the results of this in Arizona are, and I think the results are going to be very good. And I think

very soon we're going to see other States replicating this, and it will force the hand of the Federal Government to finally step up and do the right thing.

And with that, I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I briefly reclaim and make the point also that the ACLU and a number of other left-wing organizations have filed a lawsuit against Arizona's immigration law, and they intend to press that in the courts. So if they're worried about discrimination taking place, I don't know why they're out there beating the drum.

We've got other organizations out there that have announced, as of today, that they're going to continue and accelerate civil disobedience against Arizona's immigration law.

And on top of that you have some of the cities in the country that are boycotting Arizona. You saw the basketball players that weren't able to go down to Arizona even though they'd earned their place in the tournament because apparently the school administration wants to make a political statement.

All of these huge mistakes that are made to pit Americans against Americans. And we should stand together and stand behind and stand with the rule of law, which is represented so well by the judge of Texas, who I'd offer a final word to.

Mr. POE of Texas. Thank you, gentlemen, for yielding briefly.

I want to comment about our border protectors.

The Border Patrol, the sheriffs all along the border do everything they can to secure the sovereignty to protect us from those who come into the United States illegally. The Border Patrol has asked, and we have asked—myself and others—have asked the President to grant the request of the Texas Governor to send the National Guard to the border. We need more boots on the ground. The National Guard can do that. The President has not answered that request, a yes or no or we're looking at your letter.

So I would hope that the National Guard could work together with the Border Patrol, the sheriffs, secure the border. Let's mean it when we say we want border security and protect the people of the United States.

I'll yield back the remaining time to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming and thanking the gentlemen from Texas and Louisiana for being here tonight to add so much to this dialogue that we had.

We're a Nation. We can't call ourselves a Nation if we can't define ourselves by borders; and the border must be defended, and we must protect it, and we must control who goes in and who goes out.

The Constitution has a couple of places where it addresses immigration. I'd point that out if the Attorney General were still sitting in this seat here that we're required, the Federal Government, is required to protect us from

invasion. That's one of the components. And then in article 1, section 8, it says that Congress should establish a uniform naturalization law. Well, we have done that for a uniform naturalization. That means whatever nation you come from, you go through the same tests and meet the same standards and there won't be different criteria from one State to another, so that people can become Americans under a standardized formula.

But it doesn't say anywhere in the Constitution that the States cannot support Federal immigration law.

And I add that there was a lot of misinformation that was presented around this country, and it continues to be presented around this country that argues that local law enforcement doesn't have authority enough to enforce immigration law. And it's never been true in this country. It's been something that's a fabrication, but it's never been true. The case of *U.S. v. Santana Garcia*, 2001 establishes the implicit authority of local government to enforce Federal immigration law.

I appreciate the attendance and the dialogue and the contribution of my friends from Louisiana and Texas and the job they do in this Congress.

I appreciate your attention, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of bereavement leave.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, May 27.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, May 27.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

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

S. 920. An act to amend section 11317 of title 40, United States Code, to improve the transparency of the status of information technology investments, to require greater accountability for cost overruns on Federal information technology investment projects, to improve the processes agencies implement to manage information technology investments, to reward excellence in information technology acquisition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in addition to the Committee on Armed Services for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in

each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 21, 2010, at 9 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 111th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

MARK S. CRITZ, Pennsylvania, Twelfth.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the first quarter of 2010 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Lale Mamaux	1/04	1/06	Turkey		344.00		7,220.40				7,564.40
	1/06	1/08	Syria		308.00						308.00
	1/08	1/11	Egypt		419.00						419.00
	1/11	1/12	Jordan		542.82						542.82
	1/12	1/14	Israel		364.00						364.00
	1/14	1/18	Ukraine		1,664.00						1,664.00
Hon. Lincoln Diaz-Balart	3/11	3/14	Lithuania		577.91		6,230.27		729.55		7,537.73
Muftiah McCartin	1/14	1/18	Ukraine		646.00				960.00		1,606.00
Brad Smith	1/22	1/28	Republic of Georgia		1,940.00		10,794.00		1,223.00		13,957.00
Committee totals					6,805.73		24,244.67		2,912.55		33,962.95

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER, Chairman, May 5, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND GLOBAL WARMING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Edward J. Markey	1/28	1/31	Switzerland		1,700.28		1,115.50				1,815.78