



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 9, 2006

No. 55

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 9, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THELMA D. DRAKE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) for 5 minutes.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, in assessing the effectiveness of immigration policy, it is helpful to look at both the push factors and the pull factors which contribute to the phenomenon of illegal immigration.

In assessing the push factors, we must not overlook the role of the government of Mexico. On a human level, it is a sad fact that people are motivated to make what is often a dangerous trek north to the United States

because of the absence of economic opportunity in Mexico itself. Yet this flow of illegal immigration into the United States acts as a pressure relief valve by allowing the Mexican government to escape political accountability to those it has failed.

Ironically, the Mexican government's laissez faire attitude towards immigration out of Mexico is not reflected in its policy concerning its own southern border. When you hear the President of Mexico or other Mexican politicians rail against the House-passed border control bill, please keep in mind that when it comes to their own border policies, all of the rhetoric concerning the right to migration is suddenly nowhere to be found. In the end, the Mexican government's policy will prove to be shortsighted and will ultimately cause serious damage to their own country. Imagine the long-term effects of a nation losing millions of its hardest working younger people. The future of Mexico is sending its government a clear and unmistakable message of adios as they vote with their feet.

Furthermore, when one factors Mexico's demographic future into the equation, a dire picture emerges. According to an article by Philip Longman in the May/June issue of Foreign Affairs, "Mexican fertility rates have dropped so dramatically, the country is now aging five times faster than is the United States. It took 50 years for the American median age to rise just five years, from 30 to 35. By contrast, between 2000 and 2050, Mexico's median age, according to U.N. projections, will increase by 20 years, leaving half the population over 42. Meanwhile, the median American age in the year 2050 is expected to be 39.7." Thus, ultimately illegal immigration from Mexico into the U.S. is not good for either Mexico or the United States.

According to the Associated Press, President Fox has characterized the House immigration bill as, quote, stu-

pid. To his credit, the same AP story quoted President Fox as acknowledging that his government must "generate opportunities here in Mexico." However, it is the responsibility of the United States Government to control our own borders and to take action to reduce the pull factors which draw people to the United States. We must demagnetize the attraction of illegal employment in the U.S. Unfortunately, our track record here reflects a failure of government policy on our side of the border.

The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, IRCA, or Simpson-Mazzoli, for the first time imposed sanctions on employers for the hiring of those ineligible to work in the United States. Yet since the passage of that bill, administrations of both political parties have failed to enforce the law. The fact that there were only three cases last year, three, of a notice to file a prosecution for the unlawful hiring of illegal aliens is utterly indefensible. There must be a will to enforce the law.

I wish to recount what in retrospect was the death knell to an effective regime of employer sanctions. An amendment to Simpson-Mazzoli was accepted which completely undermined the employment verification system. In its place, a series of documents required to be submitted with the I-9 employment eligibility verification form was substituted. The end result was the creation of a new cottage industry for the production of false documentation. I would like to emphasize once again that it was the negation of an effective employer verification system, which in combination with the lack of enforcement, undermined the usefulness of employer sanctions as an immigration enforcement tool.

It was for this reason that the basic pilot project was created in 1996 by this Congress. The system allows employers to voluntarily check the names and Social Security numbers of its employees

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.

H2181

against the records maintained by the Social Security Administration and the Department of Homeland Security. Building on this project, H.R. 4437, the House-passed bill, would create a nationwide mandatory program. Unlike the watered-down language in the 1986 bill, the employment verification provisions in the House-passed bill offers a genuine prospect for effective employer sanctions necessary to demagnetize the attraction of unlawful employment in the U.S.

An effective employer sanctions regime, coupled with the need to fully fund the additional 2,000 Border Patrol positions authorized this year and in the out years, is essential if we are going to control illegal immigration. At the same time if we are to maximize the cooperation of employers with the implementation of an effective system of employer sanctions, it is necessary to ensure that in those cases where U.S. workers are unavailable, employers have the option of employing temporary foreign workers. Let me suggest that regulating the stream of workers which have crossed back and forth our southern border since the 1870s will facilitate the job of a larger Border Patrol and the implementation of an effective system of employer sanctions.

By definition however, in a temporary worker program, the workers should be temporary. Along the lines of an amendment I offered unsuccessfully in 1986, workers could work in the United States for up to 10 months of the year. During that time a portion of their wages could be withheld. The money would be placed in an escrow account and would only be returned to the workers upon their return to their home country—in most cases—Mexico. The proposal has a built in incentive for the temporary workers to return home to work their own small farms and to reunite with their families. In fact, Mexico and Canada have entered into a temporary agricultural worker program along these lines, which by all accounts has operated quite successfully.

Finally, we cannot avoid the issue of what we will do with those who have entered our country illegally and have settled in our communities. I certainly do not favor an amnesty. But the use of the word "amnesty" does not excuse anyone on this side of the argument from explaining exactly what they propose to do with as many as 11 million people.

By the same token, those who have violated our laws should not be allowed to cut in line in front of those who have obeyed them. A middle ground solution would allow those undocumented persons with sufficient equities in our society to remain. They could continue to work and travel back and forth between the United States and their home country. They would be legal residents, "blue card" holders if you will. However, they would not be afforded the legal equivalent of a diamond lane to citizenship. If they wish to become citizens, they would be required to return home, file an application and get in line like everyone else.

Such requirements are necessary to reassure Americans who have been turned off by the ideologically driven multicultural agenda of those groups promoting identification with the Mexican flag, an alternative national anthem, and celebration of May Day in solidarity with

leftist Mexican trade unions. It is hard for me to conceive of anything which could do more damage to the case one might make on behalf of those who demand acceptance by us to be equal partners in our society. For the common element of all immigrants who have come to this land has been a deep and burning desire to become Americans. The welcome mat extended to previous generations of immigrants was predicated upon a commitment to a common patrimony. Nothing less should be expected of those who currently seek to become a part of the tapestry of a larger tradition and history of American immigration.

ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 2006, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, Members of the House, as Americans are paying over \$3 a gallon for gasoline and have been doing so for a couple of months, we see the Bush administration and Congressional Republicans running away from their record of supporting the oil and gas industry and trying to convince the public that they are deeply concerned and on the side of consumers. They even went so far as to insult the public by suggesting that they would increase the deficit and give them back a \$100 check at the end of the summer. Fortunately, the Republican leadership in the House called the idea stupid and it seems to have waned.

What the American public really wants is a comprehensive energy policy that gives them choices about their transportation, gives them choices in the heating of their homes and the cooling of their homes, gives them choices in energy conservation. That is what they are looking for, but that is not what the Republicans have delivered over the last 6 years.

Why? Because 6 years ago, Vice President CHENEY sat down with the executives of the oil companies and made a decision that they would put the oil companies in charge of America's energy policy. They would put the oil companies in charge of whether or not we would have innovation, whether or not we would have new technologies, whether or not we would have alternative energies such as solar, biofuels and all the rest of that. And the oil companies basically decided we would keep doing business on our energy policy as we have since the 1950s and 1960s, that is, we would just let the oil companies continue to drill.

That meeting with Mr. CHENEY made it very, very profitable for the oil companies because since that time the Congress has done nothing but lavish tax breaks on the oil and gas industry. The policy seems to have worked because when you look at the profits, they have gone through the roof. Chevron netted \$4 billion in 3 months. That is a profit of \$44 million a day. But they look like

a small business alongside of ExxonMobil which reported a profit of \$8.4 billion, and that is after they gave the CEO of ExxonMobil a \$400 million pay package. And they were still able to get a profit into the billions. I bet they loved being in that meeting with Mr. CHENEY where they got the rights to do all this.

So Congress has continued to lavish tens of billions of dollars of tax breaks on the industry, income tax deductions for Humvee purchases, opening the California coast and other protected places for oil exploration, liability protection for the oil industry against MTBE contamination of cities' drinking waters that is occurring all over the country, and, finally, a royalty holiday, treating the oil companies like royalty. They won't have to pay the United States taxpayers for the right to drill oil on those lands that are owned by the taxpayer. They will get a royalty holiday. But, of course, today, now the Republican leadership is running around and the President has said that a royalty holiday makes no sense when oil is at \$70 a barrel. He actually said it when it was at \$50 a barrel. It makes no sense at \$50 a barrel, it makes no sense at \$60 a barrel, and it makes no sense at \$70 a barrel. But the fact of the matter is we don't see one step being taken in this Congress to end that royalty holiday and end it today and give that money back to the taxpayers and reduce the deficit.

No, what the Republicans ought to do is they ought to check their voting record and see how voted this last year when our colleague from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) offered that amendment in April, 2005, to make sure that we would get rid of the royalty holiday. But it didn't pass. It didn't pass because that is not on the oil companies' agenda. And as we now know, the oil companies are running the agenda for this Congress.

The Democrats have a better idea. We believe that working together across all of the talents of America, that we can provide energy independence within 10 years. But to do so you would have to dramatically encourage new technologies, alternative forms of transportation, of mass transportation, the use of solar, the use of biofuels, the use of these kinds of conservation efforts combined with new fuels and new technologies to let America be independent, to make choices about its energy future.

Today, the President of the United States walks hand in hand with the Sheik from Saudi Arabia and that is our energy policy: Don't do anything to upset the Saudis.

The fact of the matter is we have to take control of our energy policy. But we will only do that when we break the link between the Republican Party and the oil and gas industry in this country. We will only have the chance to bring new forms of transportation online, to bring solar energy at a much more affordable price for American