



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2013

No. 63

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RIBBLE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 7, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable REID J. RIBBLE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

WHAT WOULD REAGAN DO ABOUT ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, what would President Ronald Reagan do about illegal immigration?

Mr. Speaker, let me share verbatim with you parts of a 2006 editorial by Ronald Reagan's Attorney General, Edwin Meese, that is instructive:

What would Ronald Reagan do? I can't tell you how many times I have been asked that question, on virtually every issue imaginable.

Immigration is one area where Reagan's principles can guide us, and the lessons are instructive.

President Reagan set out to correct the loss of control at our borders. Border security and enforcement of immigration laws would be greatly strengthened, in particular through sanctions against employers who hired illegal immigrants. If jobs were the attraction for illegal immigrants, then cutting off that option was crucial.

He also agreed with the legislation in adjusting the status of immigrants, even if they had entered illegally, who were law-abiding long-term residents, many of whom had children in the United States.

Illegal immigrants who could establish that they had resided in America continuously for 5 years would be granted temporary resident status, which could be upgraded to permanent residency after another 18 months and, after another 5 years, to citizenship. It wasn't automatic. They had to pay application fees, learn to speak English, understand American civics, pass a medical exam and register for military Selective Service. Those with convictions for a felony or three misdemeanors were ineligible.

The lesson from the 1986 experience is that such an amnesty did not solve the problem. There was extensive document fraud, and the number of people applying for amnesty far exceeded projections. And there was a failure of political will to enforce new laws against employers. After a brief slowdown, illegal immigration returned to high levels and continued unabated, forming the nucleus of today's large population of illegal aliens.

So here we are, having much the same debate and being offered much the same deal.

What would President Reagan do? For one thing, he would not repeat the mistakes of the past, including those of his own administration. He knew that secure borders are vital and would now insist on meeting that priority first. He would seek to strengthen the enforcement of existing immigration laws. He would employ new tools like biometric technology for identification and cameras, sensors and satellites to monitor the border that make enforcement and verification less onerous and more effective.

One idea President Reagan had at the time that we might also try improving on is to create a pilot program that would allow genuinely temporary workers to come to the United States, a reasonable program consistent with security and open to the needs and dynamics of our market economy.

And what about those already here? Today it seems to me that the fair policy, one that will not encourage further illegal immigration, is to give those here illegally the opportunity to correct their status by returning to their country of origin and getting in line with everyone else. This, along with serious enforcement and control of the illegal inflow at the border, a combination of incentives and disincentives, will significantly reduce over time our population of illegal immigrants.

Lastly, we should remember Reagan's commitment to the idea that America must remain open and welcoming to those yearning for freedom. As a Nation based on ideas, Ronald Reagan believed that there was something unique about America and that anyone, from anywhere, could become an American. That means that while we seek to meet the challenge of illegal immigration, we must keep open the door of opportunity by preserving and enhancing our heritage of legal immigration, assuring that those who choose to come here permanently become Americans. In the end, it was his principled policy—and it should be ours—to "humanely regain control of our borders and thereby preserve the value of one of the most sacred possessions of our people: American citizenship."

According to Reagan Attorney General Ed Meese, President Ronald Reagan would learn from history and not repeat the 1986 amnesty mistake that created today's illegal alien problem, the very same amnesty that today's President and so many Senators and Congressmen demand.

President Reagan would insist that those who are here illegally must repent and atone for their illegal conduct by returning to their country of origin and getting in line with everyone else.

Mr. Speaker, America's most cherished right is American citizenship. Foreigners whose first action on American soil is illegal conduct are not deserving of that cherished right.

SEQUESTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to call on Congress to replace the dangerous and irrational sequester with a big and balanced deficit solution.

Ten weeks after the dysfunction of this Congress led to the sequester taking effect, our economy and the most vulnerable in our society are continuing to experience its effects. On a macro level, the sequester has added to the uncertainty businesses and markets were already facing, making it even more difficult to plan for the future and discouraging private sector investment and development that creates jobs.

Just this past Wednesday, the Federal Reserve issued a statement that “fiscal policy is restraining economic growth.”

But the ill-effects of the Republican sequester policy have been most devastating to those who are in the greatest need and rely on Federal assistance. 70,000 children who will be 3 once and 4 once will be kicked out of Head Start. \$115 million in subsidies that help low-income parents access child care while they work will be eliminated. Over half a billion dollars is being taken away from children and family service programs. Because of the sequester, our most vulnerable children are at risk of losing their shot at the American Dream.

It's not only our youngest citizens who are being hurt by sequestration. Low-income seniors will see 4 million fewer Meals on Wheels deliveries this year, putting at risk seniors who are sick and homebound.

The National Institutes of Health will have to reduce life-saving medical research, and 600,000 women, infants, and children could be dropped from the U.S. Department of Agriculture's nutrition program. What an extraordinarily perverse version of “women and children first”—an admonition to save first, not abandon first.

Congress, Mr. Speaker, must act to replace this stupid sequester. I tell people that sequester starts with “s,” which stands for stupid. Congress needs to replace it with a big, balanced agreement that every bipartisan commission that has looked at our fiscal challenge has recommended. Restoring financial discipline sets America on a fiscally sustainable path and enables us to invest in education, innovation, and infrastructure that will grow our economy, create jobs and keep millions out of poverty and lift millions of others from poverty.

□ 1010

In order for that to happen, of course, Mr. Speaker, I think you should appoint budget conferees so that negotiations on such a rational solution can begin in earnest.

Sadly, it's becoming increasingly clear that Republicans are in no hurry to complete the work on a budget as a result of the draconian, unrealistic, and damaging spending levels they set

forth under the sequester. Simply put, they cannot implement the budget they adopted, neither through the appropriations process nor through the Ways and Means Committee.

Sequestration, of course, was meant to be so unacceptable that we surely would not allow it to come into effect. But it has. It has because it reflects the spending levels Republicans have long sought.

Now, when I say that, some Republicans say, oh, well, the sequester was the President's idea. Not only is the President opposed to sequester, Democrats in the Senate and Democrats in the House are opposed. Most Republicans—that is to say, 229 Republicans—voted for H.R. 2560, Cut, Cap, and Balance. And what this bill that 229 Republicans voted for—and, by the way, 181 Democrats voted against—was to say that we set numbers. If we don't meet them, what do we have? A sequester.

Sequester was their policy; the across-the-board, irrational cutting of the highest priority and the lowest priority the same was their policy that they voted for, an unfortunate policy because it is so irrational and so harmful. Now they won't say how we can get there, of course, because it just isn't possible without gutting some of the most important programs that have a positive impact on our communities. The Republican Appropriations chairman, my friend, Mr. ROGERS from Kentucky, said, on April 25:

There will be some who are shocked. I don't think people yet understand how severe the numbers will be.

That's the Republican chairman, my friend, with whom I served for many years on that committee, HAL ROGERS from Kentucky. “How severe the numbers will be.” They're the numbers that were in the Ryan budget; they're the numbers that will be affected by sequester.

Republicans are setting up, in my view, a dangerous game of hide-and-seek in which they will hide what sequester levels actually mean and try to mitigate the ones they believe will have political backlash, very frankly, as we did just about 12 days ago regarding the FAA.

They know they can't achieve cuts their caucus can agree on and that the American people would support. And they seek, in my view, to blame the President and Democrats for what has been a wrong-standing Republican policy which I referenced in their Cut, Cap, and Balance legislation for which 229 of them voted for on July 19, 2011.

To do so, Republicans proposed shifting the defense portion of the sequester—to do so, meaning to get to the numbers that they proposed—by shifting the defense portion of the sequester on to domestic programs. In other words, the cuts that would normally be across the board, their solution is to simply shift them to some of the programs that I mentioned earlier in terms of Head Start, Meals on Wheels,

and other programs that are so necessary to make sure that some of the least of ours are taken care of.

Of course, this is a breaking of the agreement reached in the Budget Control Act of 2011. We all know the likely outcome of these partisan games, Mr. Speaker. House Republicans will once again be divided, as they were a week before we left, and prevent the adoption of a budget that includes a balanced approach.

Now, balanced approach, I won't like all of it. My friend, Mr. JONES, won't like all of it. None of us will like all of it because it will be balanced and we'll have to take the good with the bad. But what it will be is an effort and a reality of getting America on a fiscally sustainable, credible path. Democrats are ready to make tough choices necessary to reach a compromise, and both sides have a responsibility—my side, their side. Very frankly, we ought to be one side, the American side. Both sides have a responsibility to work together to meet our challenges in a sensible way, not a senseless, irrational way, which is what the sequester does, but in a smart way, worthy of our role as the American people's representatives.

OUT OF AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, like most Members of Congress, I was home last week and did two or three different civic clubs. Everywhere I went, when I said it's time to get our troops out of Afghanistan, save lives of our American soldiers, and save money, I would get applause.

Also, in the last couple of weeks, my office has sent out a survey, and 17,000 people of the Third District responded, and 70 percent of the 17,000 said the same thing: Why are we still in Afghanistan spending money we do not have and having our young men and women to give their life for a failed policy known as Afghanistan?

Mr. Speaker, a week ago, I was watching NBC News and Brian Williams broke the story that the CIA admitted that for the last 10 years, each month for the last 10 years they've been carrying cash money to Karzai—cash money. And they said that the best they could do was to estimate that this would be tens of millions of dollars. Poor Uncle Sam. I don't know how he can afford to continue to spend money of the taxpayers that we can't even account for so we can borrow more money from China to uphold Karzai, who's a corrupt leader to begin with.

I wonder where the outrage is in Congress? I have friends on both sides of the aisles that I think the world of and respect very greatly, but why isn't there more outrage by Congress on the money being spent and, more importantly, the lives of those lost?