

1840s and the Southern Europe phase of 1890–1920s were assimilatable unlike the present wave of Mexicans.

The previous immigrant waves generated the same histrionics. In the 1840s, the Know Nothing Party was created to purge the country of the foreign ad unassimilatable Irish Catholics. White Anglo-Saxon Protestants argued that Italians and Jews were not assimilatable. Italians and Jews were not seen as white and were not given that status until after Hitler's genocide in World War II.

Huntington sees the Mexicans as constituting a threat to values that made America great—the values of hard work, love of family, and a unitary cultural system. According to Huntington's weltanschauung, the concentration of Mexicans in the southwest constitutes a threat to American loyalty. He perceives that the loyalty to Mexico, the difference in culture, the language clash will invariably lead to two Americas. He throws data into the mix and argues that Mexicans have not shown a propensity to learn the language or a willingness to show loyalty to America. In the 2004 Presidential election, a majority of the Hispanic community supported the war in Iraq. In contrast blacks overwhelmingly opposed the war.

The response to the mass mobilization on the part of the Hispanic community on May 1, 2006 and previous demonstrations reflects the deep asundering in the American society. The detractors have been critical of Mexican or other foreign flags. The singing of the national anthem in Spanish sparked vehement emotions and brought to the fore issues of patriotism and dual loyalties.

White America likes to be flattered. Martin Luther King and the civil rights leadership understood the importance of flattery to persuade a majority of Americans to the correctness of toppling Jim Crow. Black people sought to be assimilated into America. The civil rights movement was about building an integrated society consolidating the cultural system. The immigrant movement is about Mexicans and others taking their rightful position in American society. Immigrants have taken great risk to enter America's borders to become American. One sees the magnetic force of American culture and by the second generation of immigrants, they become indistinguishable from indigeneous Americans.

The black commitment to integration did not ease the white backlash and the immigrants to assimilation will not mitigate the resistance to the browning of America. There is a convergence of the civil rights movement, the immigrant rights movement and the movement for social justice. Although the civil rights movement accomplished the abolition of de jure segregation with the passage of the Civil Rights Bill in 1964, the Voting Rights Act in 1965, the Housing Rights Act of 1968 and the Immigration Legislation of 1965, institutionalized racism has not disappeared.

Racism persists but in a less truculent form. In the post civil rights era, the black community finds itself in a far more variegated state. There has been some expansion in the ranks of the black middle class. The working class has become more precarious and even though there is a reduction in poverty, there has been a sharp rise in the ranks of the incarcerated. Nonetheless, there has been no change in the power relationships with white America. Power is far from being variegated.

There is increased black representation in politics but the black community finds itself still in a state of powerlessness. Black people are not catching hell in America because of the massive influx of legal and illegal immigrants. There are sectors of the economy where illegal immigrants occupy niches such

as in construction that black workers could fill that void. There are black spokespersons who see illegal immigrants as the reason why black men are being left behind.

The immigrant struggle is synonymous with the black struggle. The struggle of the immigrants is about first class citizenship. In American society, like so many other societies, there is a need to have someone beneath to stomp on perennially. That is what whites sought to do with blacks from the genesis of the society until now. That is what poor whites relished in the Jim Crow years and continue to sustain that asymmetrical relationship. If black labor is degraded, then all labor is degraded. The immigrant movement is about worker's rights and the recognition that illegal workers who have been for decades are entitled to emancipation from deportation, to live in human dignity. That is a condition that black people and all people of color in American society can identify. The caricaturizing of Mexicans is no different from age-old dehumanization of black people. Huntington and others of his ilk are oblivious to their supremacist worldview which is so entangled with America's view of military hegemony.

This other worldview is possible but the possibility for this other world is enhanced if white supremacy on the national stage and on the world stage is obliterated. It will only come about when America recognizes the pluralistic state of the world and that America's role is not about the building of walls or engaging in inhumane forms of mass deportation. America has had to adapt to the millions of Africans who came ashore beginning in 1619 and now constitute an integral part of America's multi-racial society.

The 12 million immigrants must become an integral part of America. The change in status from their undocumented precarious position will enable them to have access to higher education and social programs to improve the conditions of their existence. America is split down the middle on the rights of immigrants. This is a difficult time for America. It is confused about its role in the world. Frederick Douglass, the great abolitionist recognized that no entity gives up power willingly. The significance of the black and brown movement is the capacity to forge links with the other America to force America from the trappings of white supremacy. The test of the immigrant movement will be its staying power. The battle for immigrant rights has only just begun.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

SPEECH OF

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2006

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 729, Supporting National Tourism Week. National Tourism Week, established by Congress in 1983, celebrates tourism to our country, the hospitality of the American people, and the hard work done by the many Americans who are involved directly and indirectly in the tourism and hospitality industry. This resolution highlights some of the major economic contributions that tourism from domestic and international visitors has upon the U.S. economy, at the Federal, State and local levels.

To quantify the U.S. tourism industry as one industry is challenging. In fact, the tourism in-

dustry in the U.S. is a conglomeration of many different industries, the leadership of many individuals at the national, State and local levels, and the myriad dreams and interests of all those who come to enjoy America's vacation spots, its natural wonders, and its historical areas of interest. The strength of the U.S. tourism industry is in its diversity and the diversity of the visitors it hosts.

Tourism is vitally important to Guam. The Guam Visitors Bureau, led by Chairman David B. Tydingco, Vice Chairman Bruce Kloppenburg, General Manager Gerald S.A. Perez, Deputy General Manager Mary C. Torres, and its board members and other officers, continues its excellent work toward increasing the numbers of visitors to Guam. The Guam Hotel and Restaurant Association, led by President David B. Tydingco, Chairman of the Board of Directors Bartly Jackson, and members of the board of directors, continue to ensure that the visitors to Guam receive a world-class level of hospitality, service, and entertainment during their stay on-island. The Guam Chamber of Commerce, under the able leadership of Chairman Michael T. Benito and President Eloise Baza, remains as the lead organization promoting the economic benefits of tourism to Guam and the general economic development of the island through the growth and diversification of Guam's private sector.

The vibrant, capable, and professional tourism industry in the United States provides individuals, families, and groups the ability to see, to experience, and to become a part of the many wonderful tourist attractions located across the United States. In doing so, the U.S. tourism industry facilitates greater understanding of, respect for, and identification with American history, culture and society by both Americans and guests from foreign countries. National Tourism Week is the celebration of the effort to foster better relations between communities within the U.S. and around the world while growing, diversifying, and strengthening the U.S. economy by promoting travel and tourism to the United States.

DESIGNATING JULY AS SMART IRRIGATION MONTH

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2006

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with the Irrigation Association in designating July as Smart Irrigation Month.

Since 1949, the Irrigation Association has been charged with and has been successful in leading the advancement of water-use efficiencies to create smarter solutions for agricultural, residential and commercial landscape irrigation. The Irrigation Association is dedicated to developing the irrigation industry and effectively utilizing our most vital resource.

With such charge in mind, the Irrigation Association has named July Smart Irrigation Month to raise awareness about the importance of using efficient watering practices, technologically advanced irrigation products and water conservation. In addition, Smart Irrigation Month is a great opportunity to educate constituents and consumers, including homeowners, garden clubs, growers and farm irrigation managers, with valuable watersaving irrigation information, products and services.

Additionally, Smart Irrigation Month serves to recognize advances in irrigation technology and practices that produce not only more but also higher quality plants with less water. Given that July is a peak month for the use of water irrigation; this designation also stands to encourage the adoption of smart irrigation for substantial water savings. Consequently appropriate irrigation technology combined with efficient practices can significantly reduce water usage and runoff while creating healthy lawns, landscaping, sports turf and increasing agricultural production.

Water is a finite resource that is essential in the advancement of agriculture, and is vital to human life. Smart Irrigation Month will showcase the importance of smart irrigation practices to the health and well being of communities and individuals. I would like to commend the Irrigation Association for its continued promotion and advancement of efficient water and irrigation use and therefore ask that you join me, together with the Irrigation Association, in designating July as Smart Irrigation Month to be recognized annually from July 2006 forward. Water is the lifeblood of resources that gives sustenance to life. We must wisely use this resource for the future of mankind. Therefore, smart irrigation technologies allows us to do just that.

OPPOSING THE REPEAL OF THE
ESTATE TAX

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to repealing the estate tax. It is fiscally irresponsible and would drive higher an already swelling deficit. Repealing the estate tax lacks rigidity that is desperately needed to reduce the national deficit and balance the budget. On the heels of passing consecutive tax cuts for the wealthy, repealing the estate tax would grant further tax relief to the most affluent in our country while the poor and the working class continue to struggle to make ends meet. Contrarily, estate tax repeal would save the estate of Vice President DICK CHENEY between \$13 million and \$61 million. It would save the estate of Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld between \$32 million and \$101 million. The estate of retired Exxon Mobil chairman Lee Raymond would save a comfortable \$164 million. Additionally, tax relief for the wealthy does not materialize in gains for the poorest in America.

I urge my colleague in the Senate, JON KYL, to abandon the pursuit of legislation that would permanently repeal the estate tax for the wealthiest Americans. If adopted, Sen. KYL's bill would plunge the government into another trillion dollars into the red during the first decade (2011–2021) that the legislation would be in effect.

As boomers are retiring from the market place, Congress should mount a concerted effort to preserve Social Security and Medicare rather than giving tax cuts to the wealthy who are not demanding them. Health care needs are not being met by employers and a growing number of Americans are without adequate access to vital care. Repealing the estate tax will not bring these services and other needs

to the most disadvantaged in our nation. Repealing the estate tax is misguided public policy. Democrats and Republicans should focus on strengthening education, Social Security, Medicare and restoring discipline to budget spending.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce an op-ed article written by Harold Meyerson, titled "Estate Tax Lunacy" in the Washington Post on May 31, 2006.

[From the Washington Post, May 31, 2006]

ESTATE TAX LUNACY

(By Harold Meyerson)

Spring has given way to summer's full-fur-nace heat in Washington, apparently taking with it any scintilla of sense that Congress may yet possess.

In the House, Republicans who could not even raise an eyebrow at reports that the National Security Agency has been conducting warrantless wiretaps of Americans became instant civil libertarians when the FBI conducted a search of a congressman's office.

The Senate, meanwhile, is scheduled next week to take up legislation by Arizona Republican Jon Kyl that would permanently repeal the estate tax on the wealthiest Americans. If enacted, Kyl's bill would plunge the government another trillion dollars into the red during the first decade (2011–2021) that it would be in effect.

Behind the scenes, the action has been on the Democratic side in the Senate, as the party's leadership has sought to dissuade Montana's Max Baucus, ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee, from forging a halfway-house compromise with Kyl that would deplete revenue by only \$500 billion to \$600 billion during that decade. The Republicans would need Baucus to bring roughly a half-dozen Democrats along with him to reach the magic number of 60 votes required to overcome any filibuster that the vast majority of Democrats would mount to block any such measure.

Even a paltry \$500 billion, of course, is a lot of money to drain from public coffers just when boomers are going onto Social Security and Medicare and the number of employers providing health insurance, if present trends continue, might have dropped to a virtuous handful. To cover those and other needs, Congress will either plunge us deeper into debt or increase some other levies—payroll taxes, say—that will come out of the pockets of the 99 percent of Americans whom the estate tax doesn't touch.

A decades-long campaign by right-wing activists (brilliantly documented by Yale professors Michael Graetz and Ian Shapiro in their book "Death by a Thousand Cuts") has convinced many Americans that the estate tax poses a threat to countless hardworking families. That was always nonsense, and under the estate tax revisions that almost all Democrats support—raising the threshold for eligibility to \$3.5 million for an individual and \$7 million for a couple—it becomes more nonsensical still. Under the \$3.5 million exemption, the number of family-owned small businesses required to pay any taxes in the year 2000 would have been just 94, according to a study by the Congressional Budget Office. The number of family farms that would have had to sell any assets to pay that tax would have been 13.

On the other hand, an estate tax repeal would save the estate of Vice President Cheney between \$13 million and \$61 million, according to the publicly available data on his net worth. It would save the estate of Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld between \$32 million and \$101 million. The estate of retired Exxon Mobil chairman Lee Raymond would pocket a cozy \$164 million. As for the

late Sam Walton's kids, whose company already makes taxpayers foot the bill for the medical expenses of thousands of its employees, the cost to the government for not taxing their estates would run into the multiple billions.

The Baucus split-the-difference measure wouldn't repeal the estate tax, but it would still cut the tax rates on the estates of the super-rich by 15 percent. The Montana senator spent much of last week trying to line up a handful of his Senate Democratic colleagues to support his proposal, in the hope of being able to announce an unshakable 60 votes favoring this folly when the debate begins next week.

Why any Democrat would back such a measure, however, is a deep mystery. From the policy standpoint, it would make it vastly more difficult both to shore up programs that Democrats believe need shoring up—better educating the nation's children, for one—and to get the nation's fiscal house in order. Politically, backing the measure is even wackier. The Democrats are running this year as the party of comparative fiscal sanity and greater economic equity and security. Baucus's compromise would undermine all those premises. Republicans might very well attack Democratic senators up for reelection this year for failing to repeal this hideous death tax, as they call it, but any Democratic senator who can't rebut that charge in what is shaping up as a very Democratic year should probably be in another line of work.

Last Friday Baucus's staffers assured the Democratic Senate leadership's staff that their boss would back off his compromise campaign. Still, given Baucus's penchant for mischief (it was largely he who rounded up enough Democratic votes to enact Medicare Part D and its Big Pharma giveaway), those assurances have met with some skepticism on Capitol Hill. The Democrats' capacity to undermine themselves has not vanished with the final days of spring.

MILL RUN ELEMENTARY D.A.R.E.
PROGRAM

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 2006

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me today to recognize the recent D.A.R.E. graduates from Mill Run Elementary School in Ashburn, Virginia. D.A.R.E.—Drug Abuse Resistance Education—has a long history of providing children with the information and skills they need to live drug-and-violence-free lives and I was pleased to recently visit the fifth graders at Mill Run as they completed this program.

I would like to recognize Mill Run principal, Paul Vickers, and fifth grade teachers, Ms. Garofalo, Ms. Neely, Ms. Page, Ms. Sovereign, Ms. Williams, Ms. Wolff, and Mr. Wolslayer. Special acknowledgment also goes to D.A.R.E. officer, Deputy Lynette Ridgley, who is specially trained to work with students, answer their questions, and establish a positive relationship between students, law enforcement, and the community. The D.A.R.E. program, supported by dedicated school faculty, has helped to address the critical need to educate our youth on the consequences of involvement in drugs, gangs, and violence, and how to avoid risky behavior.

Several students at Mill Run Elementary received special awards for poster and essay