

Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman

Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Volkmer

Vucanovich
Walker
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOES—207

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Billrakis
Bishop
Blute
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Davis
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Fox
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt

Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchee
Hoke
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lantos
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Mink
Mollohan
Morella
Murtha
Nadler

Neal
Oberstar
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Spratt
Stupak
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waldholtz
Walsh
Ward
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
White
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—15

Bliley
Brewster
Chrysler
Collins (IL)
Ford

Hostettler
Johnston
Moakley
Obey
Radanovich

Stark
Stokes
Studds
Waters
Wilson

□ 2102

Messrs. PORTMAN, DAVIS, MCDADE, and JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Ms. DUNN of Washington changed their vote for "aye" to "no."

Mr. BASS and Mr. PORTER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."
So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I was unavoidably away from the Chamber and missed a number of recorded votes. On rollcall No. 73, the Bryant of Tennessee amendment, I would have voted "no"; on rollcall No. 74, the Velázquez amendment, I would have voted "yes"; on rollcall No. 75, the Gallegly amendment, I would have voted "no"; on rollcall No. 76, the Chabot amendment, I would have voted "yes"; and on rollcall No. 77, the Gallegly amendment, I would have voted "no".

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the second amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by a voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 359, noes 59, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

AYES—359

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono

Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)

Combest
Condit
Cooly
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn

Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Forbes
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchee
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly

Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman

Poshard
Pryce
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stenholm
Stockman
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Woolsey
Yates
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—59

Andrews
Beilenson
Billrakis
Bonior
Brown (FL)
Canady
Clay
Clayton

Clyburn
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Fields (LA)
Foglietta

Foley
Fowler
Gephardt
Gibbons
Goss
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hefner

Hilliard	Pastor	Skelton
Jackson (IL)	Payne (NJ)	Spratt
Jefferson	Peterson (FL)	Stearns
Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (MN)	Thompson
Lewis (GA)	Quillen	Thurman
Martinez	Rangel	Torricelli
McCollum	Ros-Lehtinen	Watt (NC)
McDermott	Rose	Williams
Meek	Rush	Wise
Mica	Scarborough	Wynn
Miller (FL)	Shaw	Young (FL)
Owens	Sisisky	

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop	Livingston	Studds
Brewster	Moakley	Waters
Collins (IL)	Radanovich	Wilson
Hostettler	Stark	
Johnston	Stokes	

□ 2111

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BROWN of California and Mr. ENGEL changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Immigration in the National Interest Act, H.R. 2202. This bill is a misnomer, for it denounces a historical tradition of the United States—to welcome different cultures that add to the richness of this diverse land. On the contrary, H.R. 2202 is not in the national interest of the United States. It further reinforces the modern conservative tactic for solving the Nation's current economic and social woes: Blame the poor, our children, African-Americans, women, and immigrants.

H.R. 2202 is an underhanded assault on the foreign-born, in general. This bill would punish those who illegally exploit America's generosity, along with those who legitimately seek an opportunity in America. By unifying the illegal and legal immigration problem, H.R. 2202 makes the mistake of lumping everyone together, whether they commit a crime or not. The bill reflects a number of misconceptions that have infiltrated the policy debate on immigration.

Unconscionably, H.R. 2202 would reduce the number of legal immigrants by 30 percent. This reduction unreasonably implies that the United States is plagued by an illegal and legal immigration invasion. The number of foreign-born that enters this country each year is 1 million. Of that number, 700,000 are legal immigrants. Currently, the foreign-born represent only 8 percent of the total population as opposed to the period between 1870 and 1920 when nearly 15 percent, or 1 out of every 7 individuals was foreign born.

H.R. 2202 would limit the immigration of people under the Immigration and Naturalization Service's [INS] family sponsored category. This bill would restrict entry for parents, adult children, and siblings. In effect, this new policy would impose America's definition of a family onto the culture of immigrants. Excluding more than 100,000 children, parents, and brothers and sisters from reuniting with family members in this country is not a pro-family policy.

It is distressing that the term immigrant has been smeared to connote a terrible meaning. My Republican colleagues have resorted to ignoring the contributions that immigrants have made to this country.

Immigrants do not come to America just to hop on the public dole. In fact, according to the Urban Institute, immigrants generate an

estimated \$25 billion in surplus revenues over what they receive in social services.

Furthermore, immigrants create more jobs than they fill by starting new businesses and buying U.S. goods and services. No conclusive data have proven that even illegal immigrants have an adverse effect on job opportunities for native workers. Ironically, the person most likely to be displaced in a job by an illegal immigrant is another illegal immigrant who has resided in this country for some time.

Clearly, the United States must address the dangers of illegal immigration; but, in the interim, legal immigrants should not have to defend their rights, integrity, and culture. In light of the imminent rollback on affirmative action, possible abolishment of the welfare and Medicaid entitlement, and this current unfair immigration reform proposal, I challenge my colleagues to stop this Congress from going down in history as the most vicious and regressive Congress since reconstruction.

We must not forget the 1987 Hudson Institute's pioneer study, *Workforce 2000*; in the next century, America's workforce will be more female and more ethnically diverse with native-born white males comprising only 15 percent of the new labor market. It is time to accept this fact and addresses the real problem. I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 2202.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, the immigration bill, H.R. 2202, that we are debating this week in the U.S. House of Representatives exploits the deep hostilities felt across this land, that the problem of illegal immigrants has grown out of control needing drastic measures to curb, and seizes upon this issue to justify other changes in current law which drastically change the family reunification principle which has governed how we decide to grant visas for new entrants.

This merger of the issue of illegal immigration with changes in the family preference categories currently allowed is unwarranted. These two matters should be separated. H.R. 2202 should be confined to a debate on how to deal effectively with the problems of illegal immigration. There is no disagreement that this is a matter of concern which must be dealt with on the national level.

But to be asked to vote for changes in family preference categories because you support proposals to curb illegal immigration is unfair to families who have waited for years for their numbers to be called up so that they could call for their adult children to join them in America.

H.R. 2202 repeals family preferences which currently allow reunification of family members including adult children, and siblings. For a Nation concerned about family, it is unjustifiably cruel to cut off this long-awaited hope that the family could be reunited. Legal immigrants deserve to be treated better.

Even more punitive is the provision in H.R. 2202 which although allowing parents to be included in the definition of family allowed entry, requires that before they are issued visas they must have prepaid health care insurance.

H.R. 2202 reduces the number of immigrants allowed in next year under the family preference category from the current 500,000 to 330,000. This number would be reduced each year until it reached only 110,000.

H.R. 2202 limits the number of adult children admitted to those who are financially dependent on their parents, are not married and are between the ages of 21 and 25 years. An

exception is provided for adult children who are permanently physically or mentally impaired.

Employment-based visas will be issued each year to 135,000 immigrants. Refugee visas will be limited to 50,000 per year.

These measures dealing with changes to legal immigration should be separated out and dealt with under a separate bill. There is no justification for repealing the family categories and denying adult children and brothers and sisters from ever being reunited.

All sections of the bill that deal with legal immigrants should be eliminated from H.R. 2202.

The 1990 Immigration Act established a worldwide annual immigration limit of 675,000, not including refugees and other categories. Within this limit, 480,000 are family-related immigrants, with 226,000 set aside for: unmarried adult sons and daughters of U.S. citizens—23,400; spouses and children of permanent resident aliens—114,200; married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens—23,400; and brothers and sisters of adult U.S. citizens—65,000.

The 1986 amnesty provisions of the immigration law increased the number admitted to a high which occurred in 1991 of 1,827,167. But this was due to amnesty and not because of the family reunification policy.

There are currently 1.1 million spouses and minor children of lawful permanent legal residents on the waiting list.

The backlog should be cured by allowing all spouses and minor children to be admitted irrespective of country limits.

The committee bill argues that the need to allocate numbers to other family members prevents spouses and minor children from being admitted. This is the reason they state that they are repealing the other preference categories.

The family unit for most Asian families includes all children. It does not arbitrarily exclude adult children. It does not arbitrarily exclude siblings. Any family reunification policy must allow for these members of the family unit to be admitted. No matter how long the wait, these family members deserve the hope and expectation that U.S. immigration policy does not cut them off without any hope of reunification.

The Committee Report states that the State Department records indicate the following wait listings: First, unmarried adult sons and daughters of U.S. citizens: 63,409—annual admissions allowed is 23,400; second, unmarried adult sons and daughters of permanent resident aliens: 450,579—annual admissions allowed is 36,266; third, married adult sons and daughters of U.S. citizens: 257,110—23,400 annual allowed admissions; and fourth, brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens: 1,643,463—65,000 annual admissions allowed.

Because of this backlog of 2.4 million persons eligible for admission but denied due to category or country limits, the Committee report concludes that this large backlog undermines the integrity of the immigration policy and therefore repeals them.

To rescind these categories undermines our national integrity. These persons, heretofore found eligible for admission being forever barred is a cruelty beyond description. Destroying their hope they have clung to 10 or 15 years that someday they would be reunited with their families is without justification.

I urge the separation of all provisions dealing with immigration policy from this bill. Let's today deal with the issue of illegal immigrants, and leave to another time the matter of what changes are needed regarding the family preference system.

I urge this House to support the Chrysler-Berman-Brownback amendment which deletes title V from this bill.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, earlier in this debate I signaled my support for the guest worker program involving American agriculture.

This can be a potent solution to two pressing needs: assuring an adequate labor supply for the farm fields of our country and delivering a body blow to illegal immigration.

We of California's San Joaquin Valley recognize the critical requirement for farm labor during certain seasons. Allowing those from abroad to fill the gap from shortages of American workers makes good sense—economically, agriculturally, and socially.

Noteworthy, I believe, is the strong stance of the Nisei Farmers League. Its president, Manuel Cunha, has told me, "this is the ideal program to meet the seasonal employment needs of agriculture."

This amendment is good on all sides. It has safeguards that protect domestic employees, that provide payment of prevailing wages, and to see workers return when the work is over. I support it and urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairman SMITH for his hard work on the illegal immigration provisions in H.R. 2202, the Immigration in the National Interest Act of 1995. I would like to draw attention to the role played by the U.S. Customs Service on our borders in the processing and interdiction of illegal passengers, conveyances, and cargo. While H.R. 2202 calls for additional Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] inspectors and certain infrastructural improvements along borders, it should not be forgotten that primary responsibility for policing our borders falls on the Customs Service. Customs inspectors and agents protect American citizens from the entry or importation of illegal goods. In fact, the Customs Service seizes more illegal drugs than all other Federal agencies combined. A lesser known fact is that in addition to their own obligations along the southwest border, Customs has a cross-designated responsibility with the INS to identify and detain illegal immigrants. Customs holds the line on our borders, and INS plays its role, too.

In considering H.R. 2202, I ask my colleagues to remember these facts. First, unlike the INS, Customs deploys its personnel along the border according to changing threats, not the absolute numbers of passengers in any given period. Customs has targeted inspections based on intelligence from its agents, some of whom operate beyond our borders to protect vital national interests. Second, decisions by the INS to build commuter lanes, open new ports, or establish additional preinspection facilities must be made in consultation with the Secretary of Treasury and the Commissioner of Customs. Third, INS infrastructural needs at the border are much smaller than those of Customs, which must process people, vehicles, and cargo. Appropriations for the INS for changes in infrastructure or personnel at our borders must take into account any new demands placed on Customs by these changes. I am confident that

the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury will consult with each other to ensure the continued coordination of interdiction efforts along our borders.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2202, the Immigration in the National Interest Act of 1995. This bill is badly flawed in numerous ways.

H.R. 2202, for the first time, would combine two entirely different issues in one bill. Combining efforts to secure our borders with reforms to our system of legal immigration serves only to confuse the debate. It plays on the public's understandable concern over illegal immigration but twists that concern into the misguided notion that all immigration is harmful and all immigrants are undocumented, sneaking into our country by night. Neither notion, of course, is true, but dealing with both illegal and legal immigration in one bill serve to fuel hostility and even prejudice toward all immigrants.

The sponsors of this legislation appear to hope that the always-popular issue of fighting illegal immigration will be a strong enough engine to pull unnecessary and unwise changes in our process of admitting legal immigrants to the United States through the legislative process.

I would not argue against reasonable improvements in enforcing our national borders; indeed, border enforcement is one of the principal obligations of a sovereign nation. But I cannot support such micromanagement as mandating a particular type of fence—and one that the Border Patrol considers dangerous for its officers.

Nor can I support that bill's system to enable employers to confirm that newly hired workers are eligible to work in the United States. Voluntary or mandatory, such a system ultimately can't work without databases that are far more accurate than those we have, as well as a national ID card to tie a person to the name and number he or she present to a potential employer.

Moreover, such a system is likely to lead to discrimination, especially now that the tester program has been taken out. After all, if I'm an employer, and I've gone through the entire hiring process—interviews, testing, reference checks, and all—and I've hired my top candidate only to learn that he or she is not authorized to work and that I must begin the process all over again, why should I include anyone who might turn out to be ineligibile in my next candidate pool? Why should I risk wasting time considering anyone with an accent, or a foreign-sounding surname? No, I will support the chabot amendment to strike this system.

Another major national obligation is to screen would-be immigrants and admit those whose relationships to American citizens or legal permanent residents the Nation wants to foster or whose skills the Nation needs to prosper, as well as refugees fleeing their homelands for valid reasons. Immigrants, despite faulty statistics that have been used during this debate, are a net plus for this country, working, creating jobs, paying taxes, becoming Americans. H.R. 2202 turns its back on this tradition by sharply reducing the numbers—and even the kinds—of legal immigrants permitted to enter the United States each year.

Particularly with family-based immigration, when did children and siblings cease to be parts of the nuclear family? Why should we

deny American citizens and legal permanent residents the opportunity to bring these close relatives together? H.R. 2202 would also increase the income a family must have to bring a family member into a level that would deny 40 percent of Americans the change to reunite with loved ones.

H.R. 2202 would also cut the number of refugees admitted each year by almost one-half from the 1995 level and change our system of determining eligibility for asylum that would make it impossible for most bona fide refugees to qualify. This is both in conflict with international law and immoral.

H.R. 2202 would also unfairly deny public assistance to legal immigrants—in some cases, legal immigrants would be denied assistance that undocumented immigrants would remain eligible for, because Congress has recognized the benefits to the public health and safety when everyone living here is served.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I must assert that this bill is most definitely not in the national interest. The list of its defects goes on and on, and, worst of all, the Rules Committee and the Republican leadership have denied this House the opportunity even to debate changes in important areas of the bill—especially the public assistance provisions of title VI.

I urge my colleagues, at a minimum, to vote to remove the provisions reducing the number and categories of legal immigrants and to the employment eligibility verification system. But the better response is simply to reject this misguided bill. Vote no in the national interest.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this immigration reform bill, H.R. 2202.

I agree with my colleagues that we have a legitimate national interest in ensuring that people come to our country through legal means. There is ample need for a reasoned and balanced debate about reform of our immigration system. However, the provision in this legislation fall far short of achieving the goal of effective immigration reform in a responsible, fair, and humane manner.

I have many areas of concern in this bill. H.R. 2202 goes too far in placing extreme restrictions on legal immigration, decreasing by 30 percent total annual number of the legal immigrants admitted into this country.

Legal immigration has been of central importance to our development as a nation. We began as a nation of immigrants, and our country continues to reap untold benefits from the energy, ideas, talents, and contributions of those who arrive in this country seeking the opportunity to prove themselves and to contribute to the greatest Nation on Earth.

H.R. 2202 sanctions discrimination against the families of legal U.S. residents who have paid their taxes, served in the Armed Forces, and contributed to the growth of the Nation's economy and to the cultural diversity of our society.

In a Congress which heralds family values as its prevailing theme, this bill is extreme antifamily legislation. Restrictions to family reunification in this bill ensure that American families may be forever separated from their loved ones. Under this legislation, virtually no Americans would be able to sponsor their parents, adult children, or siblings for immigration. Not all Americans subscribe to the restrictive definition of family imposed in the bill—nor should they.

The bill will cut annual refugee admissions in half. Can we be so cold as to tell these victims of persecution to go away, our doors are

shut, our country is full? This extreme cap would severely limit the flexibility of the U.S. refugee system to respond to unpredictable humanitarian crises.

The proposal for summary exclusion included in the bill would eliminate many of the procedural protections to ensure that legitimate asylum seekers receive full consideration of their asylum claims. Nervous, frightened, exhausted victims are charged with one chance to prove their claims of persecution. If an error is made, they face immediate deportation. A victim of rape, torture, or gender persecution may have difficulty effectively discussing his or her case under restrictive procedures.

The severe restriction of benefits to immigrants is yet another point of great concern in this legislation. Only 3.9 percent of immigrants who come to the United States to join their families or to work, rely on public assistance, compared to 4.2 percent of native-born citizens. Yet, the myth persists that welfare benefits are the primary purpose for immigration to the United States.

This bill does not achieve the goals of real and rational immigration reform. It hurts families, it hurts children, it hurts hard-working Americans. For the reasons just mentioned and for many more, this legislation is not good for our country. I urge my colleagues to oppose this harmful legislation.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, illegal immigration hits my district harder than just about any other in the country. It is estimated that more than 43 percent of all illegal immigrants reside in California—and there may be many more.

Today we face a major crisis. California public hospitals must deal with an overwhelming number of births to illegal aliens—almost 40 percent of their deliveries. Incredibly, illegal immigrants cross our borders at a rate which could populate a city the size of San Francisco in less than 3 years. Half of the 5 million illegal aliens in the United States use fraudulent documents to obtain jobs and welfare benefits.

We have finally found the resolve to make the much-needed overhaul of the Nation's immigration laws. Chairman SMITH and I have worked very hard to ensure the bill contains provisions crucial in securing our borders. The first of these provisions increases the border patrol to 10,000 agents. The second initiative cuts off all Federal benefits—except emergency medical care—to illegal aliens. By eliminating benefits to illegal aliens, we eliminate the incentive for them to cross our borders.

Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleagues and I have worked with unprecedented resolve to clamp down on illegal immigration. I urge all of my colleagues to do what is right for California and the Nation—support H.R. 2202.

Mr. FLANAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Lipinski amendment to H.R. 2202, the Immigration in the National Interest Act, and commend Congressman LIPINSKI for his leadership on this issue. This amendment will rectify a problem that should have been resolved long ago. In late 1989, some 800 or so Polish and Hungarian citizens were paroled into the United States by our Attorney General. They have been stuck in this status, which gives them the right to reside here indefinitely, ever since.

As parolees this small group of people cannot obtain citizenship or even obtain perma-

nent residency status. These people have lived in this country for over 6 years, established homes, and become productive members of American society. Yet without action by Congress these Polish and Hungarian parolees can never obtain legal immigration status.

These 800 or so parolees did not come here illegally. Our Attorney General saw fit to grant them parolee status and they have been here ever since.

Although these people have the right to live here for as long as they like, it is time for this group of people to have the ability to obtain residency status. The Lipinski amendment does that, it provides residency status for these Polish and Hungarian parolees.

There is precedent for such action. In 1990 Congress changed the status of Indochinese and Soviet parolees. This amendment will allow us do the same for these Polish and Hungarian parolees who have been in a state of limbo since their arrival in the United States. It is not fair to these individuals to have to continue living their lives in our country not knowing if they will ever have the opportunity to become legal permanent residents of a country they dearly love, the United States of America.

I urge my colleagues to support the Lipinski amendment to provide legal residency status for this small group of Polish and Hungarian parolees.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2202, the Immigration in the National Interest Act of 1996. This act is one of the most important pieces of legislation this Congress will consider this year.

Illegal immigration impacts my State of California more than any other State in the union. In fact, it is estimated that 1.7 million or 43 percent of all illegal immigrants reside in California. That is why the voters of California overwhelmingly supported proposition 187 which denies State-funded benefits to illegal immigrants.

I have been involved in combating the illegal immigration problem since I first became a Member of Congress. On the opening day of the 104th Congress, I introduced a legislative package aimed at solving the illegal immigration crisis. I am pleased that Chairman SMITH has chosen to incorporate some of my ideas into this legislation.

First, this bill before us will increase the size of the border patrol to 10,000 agents. I wholeheartedly support this effort to effectively control our borders. For too long, the Immigration and Naturalization Service has been unable to stop illegal immigration at our borders. By increasing the resources at the border, by increasing the number of border patrol agents who must patrol our borders every day, we can begin to stem the rising tide of illegal immigrants who cross our vast border unchecked.

Second, this bill will help put an end to one of the greatest lures our country provides to immigrants who would attempt to cross illegally—and this is our Federal social safety net. It is no secret that in California, illegal immigrants pose a serious burden on both State and Federal benefits programs. Immigrants as a whole account for over 20 percent of all households in California but they account for 40 percent of all benefit dollars distributed.

By ending this incentive and allowing Federal agencies to take reasonable steps to de-

termine the alien status of those seeking benefits, we will be making great strides toward stopping illegal immigration. No longer will American taxpayers have to support people who are in this country illegally.

Again, I want to thank Chairman SMITH and his capable staff for their dedication and hard work in crafting such a fine bill. In addition, I want to mention ELTON GALLEGLY and the Immigration Task Force which provided another avenue for Members to present ideas to help solve the illegal immigration problem. Let there be no mistake, illegal immigration is a national problem. This is landmark legislation will go a long way toward ending it. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I rise in strong support of the Tate-Hastings-Roukema amendment—an amendment which will finally bring force to our Nation's immigration laws. The United States has always been a beacon of hope for millions of people worldwide. And although immigration laws may not be popular, they are nevertheless vital to America's efforts to control our Nation's borders and protect our national interest for all citizens. Unfortunately, every year, millions of illegal aliens intentionally break these laws.

According to the U.S. Border Patrol, the estimated number of illegal aliens in our State of Washington has jumped from 40,000 to 100,000 in the past decade, and many of these illegal immigrants have settled in my agricultural district. In addition, many aliens not only enter the United States illegally, they thumb their nose at the system by forging documents and falsifying Social Security numbers to obtain employment and social welfare benefits. Yet, even when these individuals are apprehended and returned to their native country, many return again and again without additional penalty.

As a result, additional burdens are placed on our local law enforcement officials, jails, and local and State governments. Illegal immigrants cost taxpayers more than \$13.4 billion in 1992—draining the budgets of State and local governments. What's more, illegal immigrants make up more than 25 percent of the Federal prison population, and over 450,000 aliens are criminals on probation or parole. Breaking the law also undermines the incentive of all immigrants to enter the United States legally.

This amendment is fair, and is simply common sense. Our immigration policies were enacted for a reason, and must be enforced. If individuals want to risk breaking our immigration laws, then they ought to face the consequences if they are caught. It is no longer enough to give illegal aliens a free trip back to their homeland with the hope that they will not return. We must also send potential illegal aliens a clear warning: "one strike, and you're out." In other words, if you break the law, you forfeit the privilege that millions of Americans have struggled to achieve.

I strongly urge the passage of this important, commonsense amendment.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Michigan) having assumed the chair, Mr. BONILLA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of

the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2202) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve deterrence of illegal immigration to the United States by increasing border patrol and investigative personnel, by increasing penalties for alien smuggling and for document fraud, by reforming exclusion and deportation law and procedures, by improving the verification system for eligibility for employment, and through other measures, to reform the legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 2115

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 165, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996, AND WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-489) on the resolution (H. Res. 386) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 165) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, and waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE WEEK

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises to recognize the millions of men and women who comprise the agriculture community. I will remind my colleagues that this week we celebrate National Agriculture Week, and thus it is certainly appropriate to take some time to recognize the importance of U.S. agriculture and agribusiness. This year's theme of "Growing Better Everyday, Generation to Generation," truly captures the forward-looking spirit of agriculture today.

This Nation's farmers and food processors have continued to make tremendous strides in recent decades in producing and distributing food in an efficient manner. This efficiency is reflected by the fact that today 1 American farmer produces enough food for 129 people.

In addition to providing for the needs of today, farmers also have the responsibility of serving as stewards of our land and water resources for future

generations and most are excellent stewards. Clearly, the American agriculture community is producing what the world needs to survive while preserving and enhancing our natural resources for the future. This Member commends the many individuals in the agricultural community for their hard work, perseverance, vision, and dedication.

The following is an excellent editorial from the Norfolk (Nebraska) Daily News relevant to these remarks.

AGRICULTURAL LINKS PAST AND FUTURE

ENTREPRENEURIAL SPIRIT CONTINUES TO BE A GUIDING FORCE FOR FARMERS AND RANCHERS

As one drives through the countryside in Northeast and North Central Nebraska, the sight of those familiar farms may seem to be unchanged from years and decades past.

But appearances can be deceiving. Farming is anything but a static enterprise.

Changes in technology and mechanization have profoundly changed family farming operations. In 1900, for example, the average farm size was 147 acres. Today, the average farm has almost 500 acres. Technology is helping farmers to track weather conditions through satellites and gain access to information and research through the Internet computer network. Computers are also helping farmers to maintain detailed records, thereby boosting efficiency and profitability.

The Agriculture Council of America also points out that farming is also changing in response to consumer demands. Farmers and ranchers are producing meat lower in fat and cholesterol to fit with today's health-conscious consumers.

Today's hog, for example, is bred to be 50 percent leaner than those produced 20 years ago. That results in retail cuts at the grocery store that are 15 percent leaner. Leaner beef cuts are also being produced. Meat with 27 percent less fat reaches the retail case than in 1985. Farmers have also met consumer demand for ethnic foods, such as corn chips and tortillas, by increasing production of food-grade corn. And through biotechnology, consumers can now enjoy a fresh tomato that is tasty—even when out of season.

This week marks National Agriculture Week—a yearly occurrence that, for some, prompts memories of how it used to be in agriculture. We're all for that. The history of farming and ranching in this nation and elsewhere is an integral part of where we are today.

But National Agriculture Week is also an opportunity to realize just how much farming and ranching is changing—thanks to the foresight, flexibility and entrepreneurial spirit of those involved in production agriculture.

This year's theme for the week is "Growing Better Everyday, Generation to Generation." It's so appropriate because it links the past with the future, which is what agriculture is all about.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GOODLING addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. CHRISTENSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SHAYS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CUTS IN ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this evening I would like to talk about the environment and my concern over cuts that the Republican leadership has made in environmental programs and in the various agencies of the Federal Government that are involved in environmental protection.

I should point out that just a couple weeks ago, our environmental task force, within the Democratic Caucus, issued a report on the impact of Republican budget cuts on the environment. What this report points out very vividly is that the House Republican leadership so far in this Congress, with particular attention to 1995, basically from a budget point of view and in terms of authorization bills and various amendments that came to the floor, was involved in a systematic effort to turn back the clock on the last 25 years of environmental protection.

This is affecting every State and the various Government shutdowns and the level of funding cuts for continuing resolutions that fund the Environmental Protection Agency, the Interior Department, and other departments and