

rights and also protect our own rights as a Nation by determining who comes and how many and how long they stay by establishing a good guest worker program.

But they do not want that. They simply want us to abandon the border. They do not want people just coming to the United States working and then going home; they want them just coming to the United States. And, as I say, there are political reasons for that in Mexico; there are political reasons for that here in the United States. But we should at least speak out on it. We should at least speak out against it.

For one thing, Mr. Speaker, we would be giving the task of determining who is eligible for this amnesty to the Department of Justice and, more specifically, to the, guess what, to the INS. Now, Mr. Speaker, what more do I have to say about this organization that could possibly convince the people here that this is not the right organization to give such a responsibility to?

I cannot imagine that anybody thinks that fraud would not be rampant in all of the applications, or at least a huge majority that would be approved by this organization. Because, after a while, they just get the stamp out. As the clock winds out, they just get the stamp out. I would go back to this last comment that was made about the INS, about their only real intent is to move the paperwork quickly and efficiently. That is all they care about.

So they get the stamp out, they will let people in, and they will not have gone through a background check that is the same kind of background check they would have in the country from which they originated. And, therefore, we become even more vulnerable to the kind of terrorist activity that we have seen and that we anticipate.

Mr. Speaker, there are many, many battles that we will fight with regard to this immigration issue, some very, very broad in nature, some very specific. This is a specific one. Extension of 245(i). People listening to this might hear that, but that is simply a euphemism for the word "amnesty." This is not a good thing for us to do. It is not good public policy. Most people in the United States agree with that statement.

Why are we doing it? What is the reason we are in such a rush to get this in front of us? Why is there so much pressure being placed on us to do something most people in the country are absolutely opposed to, and in their heart of hearts, I think most Members are absolutely opposed to it? How they will vote, I am not sure, because there is, of course, this element of having the administration backing it. But I assure my colleagues that whether this administration or any other supports this kind of proposal, it is the wrong thing to do. And I for one will speak out against it as loudly as I can, as vociferously as I can, and as often as I can.

I recognize fully well that there are only two things I have in this body,

and that is my voice and my vote; and I will use both of them as effectively as I possibly can to stop what I believe to be a tragedy in the making, and that is the disuniting of America, as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., puts it in his brilliant essay, "The Disuniting of America."

That is really what the issue is about here, whether this Nation will actually sustain itself. And, therefore, it is my responsibility to speak out against it regardless of who is pushing it, the President or Speaker.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1983

Mr. SIMMONS (during special order of Mr. TANCREDO). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1983.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON H.R. 2646, FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the Chair appoints additional conferees on the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011, as follows:

From the Committee on the Budget, for consideration of section 197 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. NUSSLE, SUNUNU, and SPRATT.

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of sections 453-5, 457-9, 460-1, and 464 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. CASTLE, OSBORNE, and KILDEE.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of sections 213, 605, 627, 648, 652, 902, 1041, and 1079E of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. TAUZIN, BARTON of Texas and DINGELL.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of sections 335 and 601 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. OXLEY, BACHUS, and LAFALCE.

From the Committee on International Relations, for consideration of title III of the House bill and title III of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. HYDE, SMITH of New Jersey, and LANTOS.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 940-1 of the House bill and sections 602, 1028-9, 1033-5, 1046, 1049, 1052-3, 1058, 1068-9, 1070-1, 1098 and 1098A of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin and Ms. BALDWIN.

From the Committee on Resources, for consideration of sections 201, 203, 211, 213, 215-7, 262, 721, 786, 806, 810, 817-8, 1069, 1070, and 1076 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. HANSEN, YOUNG of Alaska, and KIND.

From the Committee on Science, for consideration of sections 808, 811, 902-3, and 1079 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. BOEHLERT, BALLENGER, and HALL of Texas.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of sections 127 and 146 of the House bill and sections 144, 1024, 1038 and 1070 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. THOMAS, HERGER and RANGEL.

There was no objection.

MIKE PARKER FORCED TO RESIGN

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, when I was a kid, and when a guy named Mike Parker was a kid, it was fairly common for schoolteachers to talk about a story. We do not know if it is true or not, but they certainly told kids about a young man who, as a child, had a hatchet, and he took that hatchet to his father's favorite cherry tree and chopped it down. And when his father confronted him very angrily over whether or not he had done that, he said, Sir, I cannot tell a lie, I chopped down that cherry tree.

We do not know whether or not that is true, but it certainly is an important lesson. The important lesson is that the person who is said to have told the truth went on to become the father of our country, and this town is named after him. I regret to say that that sort of reward seems missing in this town right now.

I know of another person who in this town just last week told the truth and for that he was asked to resign. That person is my fellow Mississippian, Mike Parker, a former member of this body who served in both the Democrat and Republican Parties.

Mike appeared before the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations last week. As the head of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Under Secretary of the Army for that job, Mike told the Members of that committee that he did not feel that the budget was enough. He went on to say that he felt like the Office of Management and Budget had intentionally underestimated the amount of money that would be needed to run the Corps of Engineers.