they will leave behind a facility rich with history and echoing with the voices of welders, painter, and engineers who built and serviced everything from copper-bottomed wooden ships to nuclear submarines. Hundreds of thousands of people have worked at or passed through the shipyard, from the first dozen shipwrights who arrived in 1892 to Mare Island's high point in World War II, when the shipyard population reached 46,000. These are the workers that made Mare Island the best naval shipyard in the country.

During its tenure as the Navy's oldest base on the west coast, Mare Island built 512 ships and repaired hundreds more. Those ships, both great and obscure, fought in every conflict since. Mare Island's first ship, the paddle-wheeled gunboat Saginaw, was launched before the Civil War, in 1859, and its last ship, the nuclear submarine U.S.S. *Drum,* was launched in 1970 when our country was divided over the Vietnam war. These vessels also included the small ferryboat *Pinafore,* which chugged between Mare Island and Vallejo for 30 years starting in the 1890's, and the battleship U.S.S. *California,* the only battleship built on the west coast.

It was during World War II that the shipyard quickly set a record that was never broken, building the destroyer U.S.S. *Ward,* in 17½ days. In addition to the *Ward,* Mare Island built 17 submarines, 4 subtenders, 31 destroyer escorts, 33 small craft, and more than 300 landing craft. In the 1960's the decision was made to build nuclear submarines at Mare Island. The U.S.S. *Sargo* was the first, with 16 more following, ending with the launch of the U.S.S. *Drum* in 1970.

To all of the workers over the generation that are a part of this proud history who have made so many significant contributions to the defense of the United States, I offer my thanks and that of this country.

A TRIBUTE TO DESIREE JONES

HON. WAYNE ALLARD

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 29, 1996

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, all too often we hear speeches on this floor about our troubled youth and problems that teens face.

Today I want to share with my colleagues a positive example of a teenager in my district.

I want to commend Desiree Jones, a teenager from my district who acted selflessly and who helped save the life of another teenager, in fact, a complete stranger.

Last Friday, March 22, 14-year-old Janet Westover, an eighth-grader at Bill Reed Middle School in Loveland, was riding through town when she slumped over and her heart stopped. Her friend flagged down another car in which Desiree Jones was riding.

Desiree, a 15-year-old sophomore at Rocky Mountain High school in Fort Collins, stopped to help. She stayed with Janet and helped her until police and paramedics arrived.

This kind of action by Desiree Jones merits recognition from this body and gives us all hope.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2202, IMMIGRATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1996

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2202. Let me begin by applauding my colleagues for separating the issue of legal immigration from the rest of the bill. However, I remain very troubled with measures in the bill that hurt children and families.

By stripping the bill of cuts made to legal immigration, the House has reaffirmed the invaluable contributions legal immigrants have made and continue to make to our Nation, ''stated chairman Pastor.'' This move has assured that our legal immigration system continues to support and prioritize family reunification.

I must remind my colleagues—immigrants are hard-working taxpayers, they go to war on our behalf, and they do not abuse the system. The truth of the matter is that the overwhelming majority of immigrants support themselves without assistance. Studies by The CATO and Urban Institutes indicate that immigrants are more likely than the native-born population to work and contribute $25 billion more in annual taxes than they receive in benefits.

First, I am extremely concerned with items in this bill that harm children and families. The Gallegly proposal added to the bill proposes to deny public education to undocumented children. This provision has a chilling effect by jeopardizing the education of children labeled as foreign. This requirement is seriously misguided since the role of our teachers is to teach, not serve as immigration enforcement agents. In addition, this requirement would deflect scarce educational funds to do the job of the INS.

Second, restrictions in benefits to legal immigrants in H.R. 2202 will hurt real people who work hard and contribute to this Nation. In addition, this bill adds great stress to State and local governments. The provisions that extend deeming requirements to all needs-based programs are too extreme. We are not looking at solving a problem here, but one created to divide our country and promote short-term political gain.

We are talking about stealing the American dream away from most immigrants. President Roosevelt once said, ''We are a nation of many nationalities, many races, many religions—bound together by a single unity, the unity of freedom and equality.'' H.R. 2202 proposes to greatly alter these American values. On equality and freedom will be no longer.

Third, the immigrant restrictions would add great stress to State and local governments. We are talking about adding more Federal regulations and verification burdens to comply with the immigrant restrictions. Private and public entities will be required to redirect scarce resources from running programs to meeting Federal mandates.

Listen to the concerns of the National Governors' Association, the National Conference of Mayors, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Association of Counties, and the National League of Cities. In a letter to Speaker GINGRICH, they say that the immigrant provisions create mandates and cost shifts for States and localities. They describe the immigrant verification requirements as a very burdensome, top-heavy approach to welfare reform.

Fourth, this bill makes the Federal Government irresponsible by placing the burden of serving some people solely on State and local governments. If the Federal Government excludes noncitizens from social safety net programs, the need for this safety net will not go away. State and local governments will have to serve them under State programs, translating into a massive cost shift. That, my colleagues, is promoting irresponsibility.

Last, this bill will advance a climate of intolerance, suspicion, and division. It will result in increased discrimination against anyone suspected of being a noncitizen. The courts are now reviewing constitutional concerns over California's proposition 187. In the aftermath of proposition 187, reports document the increase in hate crimes against people for simply looking or sounding foreign.

Mr. Speaker, a responsible Congress cannot accept this immigration bill. We must protect our borders, but these provisions take us beyond that. We must remain vigilant against excessive government intervention and continue to protect our most basic individual freedoms and needs.

I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 2202.

The following remarks note specific provisions and my concerns:

Deeming of all programs, including education and medical services: Legal immigrants' access to all programs would be restricted by extending deeming until citizenship for parents; for 7 years for spouses; until age 21 or until citizenship for minor children; or (in all cases) until the immigrant has worked 40 ''qualifying'' quarters (at least 10 years). There are few exceptions, but not for such programs as school lunches, student loans, or immunizations. In addition, there are very few exceptions for deeming to account for persons who become disabled after legally immigrating to the United States.

Denial of assistance to immigrants results in a cost shift to state and local governments. The loss of federal funds would need to be offset by state and local funds. This provision would also result in capital drain in high immigrant communities, since they would be required to pay taxes while being denied access to the safety-net they help support. In addition, these provisions would jeopardize public health. Public health programs cannot be successful if they exclude segments of the community.

Public charge provisions would make hard working persons deportable: Under this provision, most immigrants would be deportable if they used any needs-based assistance for an aggregate of 12 months during their first seven years of residency. Thereafter, the immigrant would remain a deportable as a ''public charge'' even after decades of taxpaying prosperity.

Immigrants who years later have a proven record of taxpaying prosperity would become deportable. It is absurd that an executive of a Fortune 500 company would be deportable as ''public charge'' because s/he needed some assistance years ago. At a minimum, a provision should be added that would allow a person who previously received public assistance to reimburse the government in lieu of deportation. This is in fact current practice, by case law and administrative interpretation.

Impedes naturalization: Applicants who obtained assistance can't naturalize until they