

And the United States Senate and a lot of the liberals here in the United States House would say, Fine. Here is your green card. Here is your path to citizenship. Forget about that part about breaking the law and getting your reward for breaking the law, but be a good citizen otherwise. How can anyone who is given a reward for breaking the law and gets to go to the front of the line, how can they respect the rule of law?

□ 1745

How can anyone who is given a reward for breaking the law and gets to go to the front of the line, how can they respect the rule of law? How can it be when you get stopped for speeding, if they give you a ticket to speed, or if you get arrested for robbing a bank and they say, well, okay, but we are going to give you amnesty, take the loot and go, be happy; but just forget that one time we didn't enforce the law on you, and so for now on respect the rule of law? Madam Speaker, it does not work that way. That is not the nature of humanity. Humanity is going to follow this path of least resistance; if they see an opening, they are going to go. And if they have an opportunity that we give them, that we grant them, they are going to take it.

And not only they will have contempt for the rule of law, a million back in 1986, that turned into 3 million because of the phony identification and the corruption in the Reagan amnesty, they and their descendants and their friends and their neighbors, almost all of them believe that amnesty is a good idea because they were the beneficiaries of amnesty; just like a bank robber that gets to keep the loot thinks robbing banks is a good idea and will go back and do it again if he runs out of money.

Now, think about doing that with 12 million or 20 million or, by the numbers that came out of the Senate the last time, 66.1 million would be legalized by the Senate version. That would be the cumulative total of all who were naturalized in the United States in all of our history.

I thank you for your focus, Mr. Speaker.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO ZIMBABWE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-16)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Alabama) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the

anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2007.

The crisis constituted by the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions has not been resolved. These actions and policies pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue this national emergency and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 28, 2007.

IMMIGRATION CONCERNS

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was certainly listening to my friend express himself on important issues. I believe it is important for this floor and this Congress to really turn on the light and have a transparent government. And so I will attempt this evening to share some of my concerns as they relate to a number of issues that I believe we have both the interest of the American people in making it transparent in its debate, but also an obligation, in some instances, to even save lives.

First let me say that with all of the missteps on immigration issues, there is no route left for this Congress to take other than to begin a debate on comprehensive immigration reform, because until we get an orderliness with the individuals that are in this country and the securing of the border, all of the frustration will continue. And so I think it is the right step to make to save lives of those who would come into this country undocumented, fleeing for an economic opportunity; for the needs of the Border Patrol agents in the northern and southern border, what I consider to be a plus-up. Inasmuch as the support system provided by the National Guard has a time certain to end, we need to be constructive and look toward comprehensive immigration reform.

I want to add to that discussion what I think is an injustice that has occurred to two particular Border Patrol agents who now languish in jail because they have been prosecuted by the Department of Justice and the U.S. At-

torney's Office. After the U.S. attorney prosecuted, he was heard to have said, I am sorry I had to do it, I wish there was another way. Well, Mr. Speaker, there was another way, and that is, of course, there could have been administrative action. And that is the issue surrounding the Border Patrol agents who fired at a fleeing alien, undocumented, across the border, wounded that individual, none of which I applaud, none of which I believe that any comments I make tonight sanction, but the harshness of 12- and 13-year sentences for what could have been an administrative proceeding to fire those individuals inasmuch as they were in the line of duty, this act of a prosecution and jailing does not speak to the sensibleness of addressing this question of inappropriate behavior, or, if you will, out-of-procedure behavior that might have occurred in this instance.

The real question is why did the U.S. attorney proceed for a criminal prosecution? That needs to be corrected. And I have asked the Attorney General for an explanation and a reason why his U.S. attorney proceeded in that manner. Prosecutorial discretion was used wrongly.

Let me conclude by suggesting that we are also wrongly in the Iraq war. There will be an opportunity forthcoming to make a very serious and deliberative decision about whether we continue the funding of this Iraq war. This is not in any way a diminishing of the heroics and the work of our United States military. I frankly believe, through my legislation, the U.S. Military Success Act, and the plussing up of diplomacy affirms that these individuals have done their job.

It is now time for methodical, deliberative debate on how we do not interfere with the leadership of the United States military and brass and leaders on the ground in Iraq, but begin to give them the assignment of a strategic redeployment of our troops. It is the right decision to make when you look at the debacle of housing conditions for returning injured troops, when you see the mounting numbers of 22,000, 23,000, 25,000 severely injured troops, many of them with brain injury, as we saw very eloquently put forward by Bob Woodruff, who did a wonderful exposé after himself being a real miracle of recovery, to show the imploded brain injuries of these soldiers.

We are not there to babysit the insurgent violence and civil war violence and possibly al Qaeda violence. We should be engaged in the war on terror, but not as, in essence, a sitting symbol for them to abuse and misuse. And frankly, that is what the Iraq war has become.

I applaud some of the diplomatic successes, determining how to organize the oil revenues, and some of the other steps that the Iraqi Government has made. They can continue to make that so that their reconciliation and the downing of the violence can be based upon a reconciliation diplomatic act. If