

American citizen. These glossy flash cards are read, and they will have on them questions like, Who's the Father of our Country? Snap it over and it's George Washington. Who emancipated the slaves? Republican Abraham Lincoln. Actually, it just says Abraham Lincoln on the other side, Mr. Speaker. What's the economic system of the United States of America? Flip that flash card over and it says free enterprise capitalism.

This is not a secret. We want people to be empowered by freedom, by God-given liberty, not dependent upon some political party that's going to hand out the largesse of government at the expense of other people and actually at the expense of borrowing money from foreign countries to drive us into debt of now nearly \$16.8 trillion in national debt.

So the cynical effort to expand the political base erodes the rule of law, erodes free enterprise, puts America in debt. So now that the babies that were born today in the United States of America owe Uncle Sam more than \$53,000 each. That's what we have and that's what we're dealing with. And we have a country that we need to pull back from the brink of bankruptcy. We're moving in that direction under I think good, strategic leadership here in the House. We have a budget that we've approved that balances. And it's too long for me. I don't want to wait that long—10 years. But meanwhile, the President's budget balances exactly never and drives us deeper and deeper into debt and raises taxes, Mr. Speaker.

So how do we bring out the greatness of America? The greatness of America was described by Ronald Reagan when he talked about the shining city on the hill. But Ronald Reagan never spoke about the shining city on the hill as being our destiny. He spoke about it as the America that we were and presumably the America that we are. I will argue that our job is to refurbish the pillars of American exceptionalism, to strengthen us in all of those pillars. We know what they are. They're very clear. Many of them are in the Bill of Rights. Freedom of speech is a pillar of American exceptionalism. I'm exercising it at this moment, Mr. Speaker. Freedom of speech, religion, the press and assembly; the right to keep and bear arms; the right to face your accuser in a court of law and be tried by a jury of your peers; single, not double jeopardy; the right to property; the right to see that the enumerated powers that are exclusively to the United States Congress, those other powers devolve to the States or the people respectively. Those are some of the pillars. I mentioned free enterprise capitalism as another pillar of American exceptionalism. But wrapped up within this, within this Constitution that I carry in my jacket pocket, is the supreme law of the land, our Constitution, and we would not be America if we didn't have all of these pillars that

I have described and also have the rule of law.

Now why would thinking people that were elected to come to this United States Congress and make good value judgments and good policy judgments, why would they be so willing and some of them eager to sacrifice the rule of law in an effort to cynically reach out and ask for a vote? Why would someone vote for someone who's willing to sacrifice the rule of law? It defies my logic application, Mr. Speaker. And amnesty is a sacrifice of the rule of law. And once you give it, once you grant it, it's almost impossible to restore it.

I remember when Ronald Reagan signed the Amnesty Act of 1986. And I was not in politics at the time. I was operating my construction company that was 11 years old at the time, raising three young sons, struggling through the farm crisis decade of the eighties. But I'm watching the news, and I'm seeing this debate take place that we have 800,000 to a million that are in the United States illegally. Generally, most of them at that time came across the southern border and stayed. And there was such a big problem that we needed to address it—800,000 to a million that were here illegally then.

So Ronald Reagan, I think under great persuasive pressure from some of the Cabinet members around him, conceded that he would sign that 1986 Amnesty Act. And when he did that, my frustration level went over the top. I believed that in spite of all the pressure that was brought on Ronald Reagan as President, he would see clearly that you can't sacrifice the rule of law in order to solve a problem that came about because of not enforcing the law, and that the promise of enforcement in the future was not going to be upheld adequately to compensate for the amnesty that they were granting in that bill.

Now the promise was this: every employer was going to have to fill out for each applicant an I-9 form. That I-9 form had—I gave it shorthand and called it name, rank, and serial number, but other data, too, of the job applicant. I remember my fear that the INS, the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the time, would come into my office and go through my files and audit me and make sure that I had every I-9 form exactly filed right, and I want to make sure I didn't miss it with anyone.

□ 1730

We religiously followed the new 1986 Amnesty Act requirements that there would be I-9 forms. We expected that there would be enforcement and penalties for employers that violated that because the premise was the Federal Government, enforced by the Justice Department at the time, would be there to audit employers and enforce the rule of law. That was the full-blown premise that came with Ronald Reagan's signature on the Amnesty Act of 1986.

I don't have any doubt that Ronald Reagan intended to follow through on the enforcement of the Amnesty Act. I can tell you that I followed my part. I've still got some of those records in my dusty files back there somewhere. Many other employers were concerned that they would not be able to follow the letter of the law. It didn't work out that way. They didn't show up in office after office, company after company. And after 20 years of the Amnesty Act that was 800,000 to 1 million. Because of document fraud and just a misestimation of the numbers, that 800,000 to 1 million became 3 million people that were granted amnesty in that act that was signed by Ronald Reagan in 1986.

Now, what did we learn from that, Mr. Speaker? And those who fail to learn from history are condemned to repeat it. Well, I have this document that's written by Attorney General Ed Meese, who was Ronald Reagan's Attorney General at that period of time and charged with enforcing the immigration law that was passed in Amnesty in '86. This is an op-ed that he wrote, published in Human Events on December 13, 2006. Among his dialogue here is this—and I'll read some of it into the RECORD, Mr. Speaker. I think it's worth our attention. It's Attorney General Ed Meese writing of Ronald Reagan's Amnesty Act.

From the article, he says:

Illegal immigrants who could establish that they had resided in America continuously for 5 years would be granted temporary resident status, which could be upgraded to permanent residency after 18 months and, after another 5 years, to citizenship. It wasn't automatic. They had to pay application fees. They had to learn to speak English. They had to understand American civics, pass a medical exam and register for military selective service. Those with convictions for a felony or three misdemeanors were ineligible.

Mr. Speaker, this language is almost verbatim the language that was plugged into the 2006 Amnesty Act and into what is likely to come out of the Senate.

I would be happy to yield for an announcement.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 716. An act to modify the requirements under the STOCK Act regarding online access to certain financial disclosure statements and related forms.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM—CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had to pause for a minute there. I was concerned that might be the Amnesty Act coming over from the United

States Senate, but I'm relieved to know that it might be a few more days.

Picking up where I left off, I had made the point and read into this RECORD, Mr. Speaker, the language that was used in the 1986 Amnesty Act is almost identical to the language that was copied and pasted into the 2006 Amnesty Act that they called "comprehensive immigration reform" because they knew the word "amnesty" would sink the bill then. Now they know that "comprehensive immigration reform" is code words for amnesty. The American people figured that out in short order.

I will continue with the op-ed written by Attorney General Meese in 2006. He said, as I remarked:

If this sounds familiar, it's because these are pretty much the same provisions that were included in the Comprehensive Reform Act of 2006, which its supporters claim is not amnesty. In the end, slight differences in process do not change the overriding fact that the 1986 law and the recent Senate legislation both include an amnesty. The difference is that President Reagan called it what it was.

We had an honest man in the White House who called it what it was. I continue from Attorney General Meese:

The lesson from the 1986 experience is that such an amnesty did not solve the problem. There was extensive document fraud; the number of people applying for amnesty far exceeded the projections. And there was a failure of political will to enforce new laws against employers. After a brief slowdown, illegal immigration returned to high levels and continued unabated, forming the nucleus of today's large population of illegal aliens. So here we are, 20 years later, having much the same debate.

Mr. Speaker, we're here right now having the same debate that we had in 2006, which was, according to Attorney General Meese, the same debate we had in 1986.

What would President Reagan do? I often ask that. Actually, I'd like to wear a wristband, What Would Ronald Reagan Do?

Attorney General Meese continues:

What would President Reagan do? For one thing, he would not repeat the mistakes of the past, including those of his own administration. He knew that secure borders are vital and would now insist on meeting that priority first. He would seek to strengthen the enforcement of existing immigration laws. He would employ new tools—like biometric technology for identification, and camera sensors and satellites to monitor the border—that make enforcement and verification less onerous and more effective.

That sounds like some things that a number of us have been advocating for some time.

Then Attorney General Meese continues—and I skip down a little ways:

To give those here illegally the opportunity to correct their status by returning to their country of origin and getting in line with everyone else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's appalling to me to think that the advocates—I understand the other side of the aisle; I understand the political motivation of the people on the other side of the

aisle—expand the dependency class, expand those who can vote for those who want to expand the dependency class. I understand those motives. They are not good motives. They undermine American exceptionalism, but I understand them.

On our side of the aisle, I don't understand—and I think it's because a lot of our own people don't have this figured out. They're looking for someone else to lead them, and they're looking for perhaps an easy way. But every proposal that has been brought forward here out of, let's say, the Gang of Eight or the "secret gang" in the House seems to have with it instantaneous legalization of 11, 12, 13—20 million people, all of them, with the exceptions of those who have been convicted of or perhaps charged with a felony, those who have been convicted of three serious misdemeanors. That goes right back to this language of the '86 Amnesty Act: "Those with convictions for a felony or three misdemeanors were ineligible," according to Attorney General Meese.

So nothing has changed here, except we have a lot more Republicans that think instantaneous legalization—and they'd argue that it's not a path to citizenship. I happen to have this little quote from one of the Gang of Eight where he made us this point, which is he says that a green card is not a path to citizenship. The reason they have to say that is because the path to the green card is a path to citizenship if the green card is a path to citizenship.

There has been an awful lot of misinformation that's put out here and erroneous conclusions drawn, unexamined by the American public that has forgotten, perhaps, about the 2006 Amnesty Act or the 1986 Amnesty Act.

I see the gentleman from California, who was engaged in the Reagan administration and knew Ronald Reagan as well as anybody in this United States Congress, is here on this floor. I would be happy to yield so much time as he may consume, even if he consumes it all. But I would suggest it looks like it's 4 to 5 minutes left.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Thank you very much.

First of all, I would like to make sure that those people who are reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or those people who are watching this presentation on C-SPAN, or our colleagues who are in their offices, watching from their offices, should take note of the courage and the hard work that Congressman KING has put into this issue. And it is not because Congressman KING or those of us who have worked with him on this issue have any animosity towards anyone else. Congressman KING is a strong Christian and knows that hatred and animosity is not a positive virtue.

But to the same degree, what is, then, Congressman KING's motive? Why does he put up with this? Why does he work so hard? Because he loves the

people of the United States of America. That's our job. We were elected by the people of the United States to watch out for them and to watch out for their families. That doesn't mean that we don't like people in other countries. That doesn't mean that we don't like or have some animosity towards someone who has come here from another country, and even those who come here illegally. But our first loyalty and our first consideration and our heart-felt support has to be for those people who are Americans, whether they were born here or whether they came here as legal immigrants and are now part of our American family.

□ 1740

There is nothing wrong with supporting your family. That doesn't mean you're being selfish by not selling your car or giving away your children's birthright to some other person down the block. No, you should be taking care of your family. And we Americans are a family that's made up of every race, every religion, and every ethnic group.

The people who are the real racists in this whole debate are the ones who want to, first of all, tie illegal immigration with legal immigration. The fact is that they say, well, look, the immigrants, this and that. The fact is, when you want to put those same groups together, that is not what this debate is all about.

Mr. KING and I know full well that what's happening here today is an effort to take, not people who have come to our country legally, not to change their status legally, that's not my effort, that's not Mr. KING's effort, but the effort that's going on is to take 11 million to 20 million people who are in our country illegally, whose presence oftentimes is a threat to the well-being of people that have elected us to watch out for their interests, meaning the American people in our country, that the only issue is what are we going to do with those 11 to 20 million people.

If we continue to take away from those American citizens, those seniors or those kids in school, with our very limited dollars right now, and we have 22 million people who are out of work, and we continue to take away from them and give benefits and jobs to people who come here illegally, who are not part of our family, we can expect even more and more and more people to come here until it is a disaster, which it already has been a disaster for many middle-income and lower-income Americans. It will be a disaster to them.

What we are trying to do is help secure the well-being of our people. As I say, I think that's done out of love. It's done out of the idea that you don't basically give away everything to somebody who is down the street when your own family needs some food. That's not being selfish.

I recently have been through some hardship in my family, in terms of

medical hardship. I've been able to visit and see what our hospitals are like. Our hospital system in the United States and our health care system is stretched to the breaking point. We're stretched to the breaking point. We cannot afford, if we try, to take care of all of the people in the world who can come here, whether they come here illegally or not. If someone has come here illegally, we cannot afford to take care of all of their health needs without actually hurting our own people. That's what this whole debate is about.

I was down in El Salvador. Ask Congressman KING. I was in El Salvador about 3 years ago. And I'll never forget, my wife and I were sitting there at the airport, and in about 20 minutes there's a direct flight between LAX, Los Angeles, and El Salvador and back. We were there in El Salvador waiting to go back to LAX. Twenty minutes before the flight took off, out come the wheelchairs, and about 20 infirm seniors are wheeled into that plane. None of them were Americans. They were, obviously, all El Salvadorans.

Now, no one can tell me today that those people, if they're still alive, are not consuming enormous amounts of health care dollars that should be going to take care of our own people. That doesn't mean that I have any animosity towards them. I wish the people of El Salvador well.

We need to make sure that we are watching out. The fundamental issue today is whose side are you on, or who's watching out for the people of the United States? And I would ask all of us to join Congressman KING in making sure that the American people are not damaged by this irresponsibility that we have towards people from another country who have come here illegally.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from California for coming to the floor. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

[From Human Events, April 11, 2013]
REAGAN WOULD NOT REPEAT AMNESTY
MISTAKE

(By Edwin Meese)

What would Ronald Reagan do? I can't tell you how many times I have been asked that question, on virtually every issue imaginable.

As much as we all want clarity and certainty, I usually refrain from specific answers. That's because it is very difficult to directly translate particular political decisions to another context, in another time. The better way to answer the question—and the way President Reagan himself would approach such questions—is to understand Reagan's principles and how they should apply in today's politics, and review past decisions and consider what lessons they have for us.

Immigration is one area where Reagan's principles can guide us, and the lessons are instructive.

I was attorney general two decades ago during the debate over what became the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. President Reagan, acting on the recommendation of a bipartisan task force, supported a comprehensive approach to the

problem of illegal immigration, including adjusting the status of what was then a relatively small population. Since the Immigration and Naturalization Service was then in the Department of Justice, I had the responsibility for directing the implementation of that plan.

President Reagan set out to correct the loss of control at our borders. Border security and enforcement of immigration laws would be greatly strengthened—in particular, through sanctions against employers who hired illegal immigrants. If jobs were the attraction for illegal immigrants, then cutting off that option was crucial.

He also agreed with the legislation in adjusting the status of immigrants—even if they had entered illegally—who were law-abiding long-term residents, many of whom had children in the United States. Illegal immigrants who could establish that they had resided in America continuously for five years would be granted temporary resident status, which could be upgraded to permanent residency after 18 months and, after another five years, to citizenship. It wasn't automatic. They had to pay application fees, learn to speak English, understand American civics, pass a medical exam and register for military selective service. Those with convictions for a felony or three misdemeanors were ineligible.

If this sounds familiar, it's because these are pretty much the same provisions included in the Comprehensive Reform Act of 2006, which its supporters claim is not amnesty. In the end, slight differences in process do not change the overriding fact that the 1986 law and the recent Senate legislation both include an amnesty. The difference is that President Reagan called it for what it was.

LESSON OF 1986

The lesson from the 1986 experience is that such an amnesty did not solve the problem. There was extensive document fraud, and the number of people applying for amnesty far exceeded projections. And there was a failure of political will to enforce new laws against employers. After a brief slowdown, illegal immigration returned to high levels and continued unabated, forming the nucleus of today's large population of illegal aliens.

So here we are, 20 years later, having much the same debate and being offered much the same deal.

What would President Reagan do? For one thing, he would not repeat the mistakes of the past, including those of his own administration. He knew that secure borders are vital, and would now insist on meeting that priority first. He would seek to strengthen the enforcement of existing immigration laws. He would employ new tools—like biometric technology for identification, and cameras, sensors and satellites to monitor the border—that make enforcement and verification less onerous and more effective.

One idea President Reagan had at the time that we might also try improving on is to create a pilot program that would allow genuinely temporary workers to come to the United States—a reasonable program consistent with security and open to the needs and dynamics of our market economy.

And what about those already here? Today it seems to me that the fair policy, one that will not encourage further illegal immigration, is to give those here illegally the opportunity to correct their status by returning to their country of origin and getting in line with everyone else. This, along with serious enforcement and control of the illegal inflow at the border—a combination of incentives and disincentives—will significantly reduce over time our population of illegal immigrants.

Lastly, we should remember Reagan's commitment to the idea that America must remain open and welcoming to those yearning for freedom. As a nation based on ideas, Ronald Reagan believed that there was something unique about America and that anyone, from anywhere, could become an American. That means that while we seek to meet the challenge of illegal immigration, we must keep open the door of opportunity by preserving and enhancing our heritage of legal immigration—assuring that those who choose to come here permanently become Americans. In the end, it was his principled policy—and it should be ours—to "humanely regain control of our borders and thereby preserve the value of one of the most sacred possessions of our people: American citizenship."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 12, 2013, at 10 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 113th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

ROBIN L. KELLY, Second District of Illinois.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1029. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clothianidin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0860; FRL-9378-6] received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1030. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security,