

economy intangibles are included, the positive economic outlook becomes all the brighter for us as a Nation.

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

(Mr. McDERMOTT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### CAMPAIGN REFORM LEGISLATION

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

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I come tonight because I am concerned over this Republican Congress that is now speaking about having further campaign reform legislation put before us tomorrow, and I rise tonight to clarify the myths and to speak the truth about the reforms that we have done, the reforms that are not needed, and the reforms that this Republican House is about to undertake.

You would think, Mr. Speaker, that the scandals that are permeating the Congress would be a wake-up call for the majority not to continue their business as usual in terms of running the people's House. Yet, they have introduced H.R. 4975 as a feeble answer to their ethics problems.

Unfortunately, the bill that is going to come before us, called a reform campaign bill, will not only be a bogus bill, but it includes language that restricts the first amendment rights of Americans.

Instead, the majority reveals their ongoing and reckless infatuation by thwarting the constitutional freedom of speech and association rights of concerned citizen groups. Now, we know these groups were under the BCRA law that are called 527s, and these groups, Mr. Speaker, were groups that had never really had a voice in the political process.

In this last election, they came out and they were a very strong force in providing an increasing voter participation, giving voice to the voiceless and becoming more involved in this democracy of ours.

When I hear the Republicans talk about gaping loopholes that they must close, how do you close gaping loopholes when we have a chart that speaks about total U.S. voter turnout? This is not gaping loopholes, for heaven's sake. This is democracy.

In 1990, we had a 105.1 million voter turnout. In the 2000 election year, we had a 110.8 million turnout. In 2004, we had a record-breaking 125.7 million people become involved in this political process. So why are we now trying to pass legislation that merely muffles the mouths and the voices of those who want to take part in this democracy?

When the majority of Democrats and a handful of Republicans voted for this Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002, we sought to sever the connections between Federal office holders and the raising of non-Federal money, which is so-called soft money. BCRA, which is the campaign bill, was necessary, Mr. Speaker, to cut the perceived corrupting link between office holders, the formation and adoption of Federal policies, and soft money; and yet the majority is bringing us a bill that is so broad in its application that it stands to severely hamper voter registration and get-out-the-vote activities for civic-minded, nonpartisan organizations. It casts such a wide net that it will ensnare groups whose activities Congress should be promoting, not impeding. This is America. We should be promoting democracy, not impeding it.

By failing to distinguish between groups whose activities are designed to influence the election of clearly identified Federal candidates and those whose sole purpose it is to enhance participation, this legislation imposes too high of a price on election activities.

Now we have heard that the 527s do not have to report. So wrong, Mr. Speaker.

The Internal Revenue Service suggests that during an election year the political organizations have the option of filing on either a quarterly or a monthly schedule, and these organizations must continue on this same filing schedule for the entire calendar year. So it is absurd for them to say that these organizations do not have disclosure and do not file. In the last 6 years, Congress has increased the regulations of independent political committees organized under the section of 527s of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. Speaker, we must not allow this legislation to pass this floor. We must continue to allow the American people to have a voice in this democracy. We must continue to have American voices heard.

When the majority of Democrats and a handful of Republicans voted for the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002, they sought to sever the connection between Federal officeholders and the raising of non-federal money, so called "soft money." BCRA was necessary to cut the perceived corrupting link between officer holders, the formation and adoption of federal policies, and soft money.

The majority's legislation is so broad in its application that it stands to severely hamper voter registration and get-out-the-vote activities of civic minded non-partisan organizations. It casts such a wide net that it will ensnare groups whose activities Congress should be promoting, not impeding. By failing to distinguish between groups whose activities are designed to influence the election of clearly identified Federal candidates and those whose sole purpose is to enhance participation, this legislation imposes too high a price on election activity.

My particular concern is that the fundamental rights and needs of all Americans, including the voices of women, the elderly, and

the poor, not be left out of the political dialog merely because of the perceived notion that a few millionaires are funding all 527's. Americans are playing an ever-increasing role in holding public officials accountable for their actions through 1st Amendment protections, public policy debate, and the shaping of American democracy.

The proponents of this bill like to argue that by passing this bill, it will be impossible for wealthy individuals to "unfairly" impact elections. Wrong again. Ending 527's will not end the ability of wealthy donors and wealthy corporations to impact elections. They still have a multitude of ways to do so by donating to trade associations like 501(c)(6)'s, many of which have less stringent, not more stringent, reporting requirements than 527's. The majority seems incredibly troubled by the independent voices of concerned citizens, but there is nothing in the law that could stop any individual from financing TV ads on her own. Nevertheless, the real truth is that many 527's are predominantly financed by small donor contributions from individuals who are concerned about holding their elected leaders accountable for failing to address the very issues important to them.

The majority's priorities are misplaced. Without our assistance, few victims of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita will be able to vote in the upcoming elections, wounded war veterans still struggle to obtain adequate health care, and gas prices continue to soar skyward.

The majority should not be in the business of legislating for partisan gain at the expense of the American people.

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

(Mr. LATHAM addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to assume the time of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, people sometimes resort to scurrilous personal abuse or childish sarcasm when their case is weak. Let me repeat: people sometimes resort to scurrilous personal abuse or childish sarcasm when their case is weak.

For instance, on foreign policy, you know instantly when someone uses the word "isolationist," they are resorting to name calling, rather than a serious discussion on the merits or the lack thereof.

On the issue of immigration, the scurrilous, personal abuse is when people imply or say that someone is a racist or a bigot if they want our immigration laws enforced.

The childish sarcasm is when a columnist or someone else says we would have to line up 200,000 buses to remove 12 million immigrants.

No one thinks you can enforce all our immigration laws overnight or instantly solve this problem, but just because we cannot solve this problem all at once does not mean we should just give up and open up our borders.

Our government estimated several years ago that half the people of the world would come here very quickly if allowed to do so. Our schools, hospitals, roads, jails, sewers, our entire infrastructure simply could not handle such a rapid, massive influx of people.

A couple of years ago, Newsweek magazine said half the people of the world have to get by on \$2 or less a day. Consistent with this was a column I read a few months later that said half the people in the world do not even have a second pair of shoes.

We are blessed beyond belief to live in this country. We all have great sympathy for those who have to live under difficult circumstances in other countries.

God has blessed every nation with natural beauty and/or natural sources that can make those countries rich. However, in most countries, people have fallen for the myth that government could solve all problems, and they have voted in liberal or left-wing governments or they have had dictators who forced big governments on them, and the economies have been ruined.

You cannot blame so many people for wanting to come here, and we all admire the work ethic of many who come here from other countries; but we cannot take in half the people of the world, especially in a short time. We have to have a legal, orderly system of immigration, and it has to be enforced.

Rush Limbaugh said a few months ago that if you do not have borders, you do not have a country.

Thomas Sowell, writing about this a few days ago, said, "We could solve the problem of all illegal activity anywhere by legalizing it. Why use this approach only with immigration? Why should any of us pay a speeding ticket if immigration scofflaws are legalized after the fact for committing a Federal crime?"

"Most of the arguments for not enforcing our immigration laws are exercises in frivolous rhetoric and slippery sophistry, rather than serious arguments that will stand up under scrutiny."

Mr. Sowell continues, "How often have we heard that illegal immigrants 'take jobs that Americans will not do'? What is missing in this argument is what is crucial in any economic argument: price.

"Americans will not take many jobs at their current pay levels, and those pay levels will not rise so long as poverty-stricken immigrants are willing to take those jobs."

And he went on in this column to say, "The old inevitability play is

often trotted out in immigration debates: it is not possible to either keep out illegal immigrants or to expel the ones already here.

"If you mean stopping every single illegal immigrant from getting in or expelling every single illegal immigrant who is already here, that may well be true."

Mr. Sowell said, "But does the fact that we cannot prevent every single murder cause us to stop enforcing the laws against murder?"

Mr. Speaker, with the Simpson-Mazoli Act 20 years ago, we tried the same type of law that some who want to be soft on immigration are advocating today, but that law led to a quadrupling of illegal immigrants. We simply cannot afford to let that happen again.

President Theodore Roosevelt said many years ago, in fact in 1919, "In the first place we should insist that if the immigrant who comes here in good faith becomes an American and assimilates himself to us, he shall be treated on an exact equality with everyone else, for it is an outrage to discriminate against any such man because of creed, or birthplace, or origin."

□ 2030

But this is predicated upon the man's becoming in very fact an American and nothing but an American.

And Theodore Roosevelt continued. He said, "There can be no divided allegiance here. Any man who says he is an American but something else also isn't an American at all. We have room for but one flag, the American flag, and this excludes the red flag, which symbolizes all wars against liberty and civilization, just as much as it excludes any foreign flag of a nation to which we are hostile."

And Theodore Roosevelt concluded this statement by saying, "We have room for but one language here, and that is the English language. And we have room but for one sole loyalty, and that is the loyalty to the American people."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would say that if people want the rights, privileges, and opportunities of American citizens, they should wave the American flag. If they want to be Mexicans and wave the Mexican flag, and there is nothing wrong with that, but they should go home to Mexico to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SOLIS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### LEGISLATION TO FIX THE MEDICARE MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague and friend, Representative MARCY KAPTUR, in talking about the trip to Ohio this week of Michael Leavitt, who oversees Medicare and Medicaid and our Nation's various health agencies as America's Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services.

Michael Leavitt is a decent man, but he is manning a ship weighed down by wrongheaded laws and misplaced priorities. Take the so-called Medicare Modernization Act, the legislation written by the drug industry, written by the HMOs in this Congress, pushed through Congress in the middle of the night by literally one vote. The Federal Government, through that bill, the Federal Government is hand-feeding the prescription drug and HMO industries literally hundreds of billions of dollars of our tax dollars to manufacture or to make up and to build a new private insurance market for seniors' drug coverage, and not to provide the coverage directly through Medicare the way people choose their doctor in Medicare, the way people choose their hospital. This is done through 30, 40, or 50 different private insurance companies instead of being done the way that history shows works best.

Why? Because the drug and insurance industry want it that way. This new drug law, this new Medicare law, as I said, written by the drug industry and written by the HMOs, with seniors barely given a second thought, prohibits the Medicare program from negotiating bulk discounts on prescription drugs. And according to the Congressional Budget Office, it overpays insurers, the HMOs, by tens of billions of dollars. So much for fiscal responsibility.

The new drug law also undercuts the core Medicare program. If you want Medicare to wither on the vine, as former Speaker Gingrich said, wall it off and force seniors into the private market, force them out of Medicare, put them into the private market to give them additional benefits. It is ingenious. It is also underhanded and it is fiscal suicide.

Do my Republican colleagues really believe that when the private insurance market controls Medicare that they will give the government and they will give seniors a good deal on coverage? Do they really believe the drug industry will voluntarily charge lower prices for prescription drugs?

The new Medicare drug law isn't about seniors, it isn't about modernization, it isn't about fiscal responsibility. It is about a Republican-run Congress that is a little too cozy with the drug industry and the HMOs.