to Japanese and European companies, will not be available to those companies that invest significantly in the Iranian petroleum sector.
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Moreover, as the Act applies to Libya, the authority upon which the bill depends is a resolution of the United Nations. So, any member who is concerned with UN power should vote against this extension.

Furthermore, the sanctions are being extended from a period of five years to ten years. If the original five year sanction period has not been effective in allaying the fears about these governments why do we believe an extra five years will be effective? In fact, few companies have actually been sanctioned under this Act, and to the best of my knowledge no oil companies have been so sanctioned. The actions in the Act are not against these nations but are actually directed at "persons" engaged in certain business and investments in these countries. There are already Executive Orders making it illegal for US companies to undertake these activities in these sanctioned countries, so this Act applies to companies in other countries, mostly our allied countries, almost all of whom oppose and resent this legislation and have threatened to take the kinds of retaliatory action that could lead to an all out trade war. In fact, the former National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft recently pointed out how these sanctions have had a significant adverse impact upon our Turkish allies.
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Well, Mr. Speaker, if they had been here a long enough period of time. Well, that trial balloon was met with a great deal of resistance, to say the least. Certainly our office received many, many calls. I am sure the offices of many Members of the House and Senate were similarly affected by this trial balloon, and the response was almost uniformly in opposition to such a proposal.

There is a basic fairness issue here, a fairness issue that I think most Americans see. And it does not matter how one feels about the whole issue of immigration in general, those who are not pro-immigrant, as I think most of us are. As a matter of fact, I think all of us have to be very cognizant of and very sensitive to the fact that we are all here as a result of someone’s decision to come to the United States to be a long time in the recent past. Even those of us in the country who identify themselves as Native American probably came here, their ancestors, over a land bridge from Asia. So we are all in one way or another immigrants to this country.

The issue of immigration in general is not the point in this case. The point in this case is whether or not we are going to simply ignore the fact that people have chosen to violate the law of the United States to come here and then be rewarded for that action by being given amnesty. Now, we recognize that that, as I say, is at least unfair. I think most people would agree that it offends their sense of justice. And it should. It should.

What would happen if we would suggest that any other kind of crime be treated in such a manner? If someone comes here, if they were in the United States and involved with some criminal activity and for a long enough period of time and they did not get caught, would we simply say, King’s X, it is okay, they were able to avoid the authority long enough, so we should give them amnesty? Well, we do not do that. Of course not. And we should not. And we should not do that in this case, and I think a majority of Americans feel the same way.

Well, as a result of the kind of reaction that that proposal had, we saw that today another proposal has been floated. This one is designed to be a compromise proposal, and it says, all right, we will not just go ahead and grant three, four million people, and by the way it will be far more than that when all is said and done, but let us just take their numbers for the time being, we will not grant three to four million people amnesty who are here illegally just because they are here illegally, we will establish some sort of guest worker program into which these people can enroll and then we will grant them amnesty.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is really not a compromise. That is really not something anybody can get too excited about and say, oh, in that case, absolutely, all right, I see that it is worthy of doing. It is, of course, exactly the kind of compromise that I am going to reward illegal behavior by providing amnesty if they have been here long enough.

The other interesting aspect of this whole thing. Mr. Speaker, is that we have tried this before. The idea of giving amnesty to people who are here illegally and who have been here for a long time, or some period of time anyway, and can prove that they have paid rent here or a variety of other criteria that we establish to determine how long someone is here illegally, has been tried before. In 1986, we did this, exactly the same plan, and it was a result of the fact that people were concerned about the massive number of people who were coming across our borders illegally. And in order to get a handle on that and to strike a compromise with people who want massive immigration, people who essentially frankly want to essentially en masse, in order to strike a compromise with them and to not look as though we were being too antagonistic to these people who have arrived here and come in here illegally, we decided to have an amnesty program.

That was 1986. We adopted exactly the same thing. And it was designed to stop the flow of illegal aliens into the country. At that point we were going to get a handle on it and say, okay, if someone is here, if they have been here a long time, we are going to give them amnesty. Eventually they can become a citizen of the United States, even though they broke our laws to get here.

Well, of course it did not work. As anyone may have guessed, to suggest that rewarding someone for that kind of behavior would stop that kind of behavior is counterintuitive, to say the least. It is hypocritical. I suppose, to suggest that we should think that somehow or other the millions of people waiting outside our borders to come into the United States, tempted to do so illegally if they need to, are told if they do that, they come in illegally, and if they can hide from the authorities long enough, they will be given legal status.

That was the message, right, that is the message we send. Just exactly as anyone would have expected, they came. They came in massive numbers. Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say I do not blame them for trying. I do not blame them at all. I happen to believe that that is an important aspect of nation state. I believe it is okay to, in fact, have that line, and to have it where it is or not. The reality is if we are going to have a line that we call a border, then there is a responsibility of this House and of the other body and of the President of the United States to establish the policy of who comes across that border.

That is the true and one unique responsibility of the Federal Government. It is to decide who can come in and who does not have whatever it is we believe is important for entrance into this country. It could be on any set of criteria you want to establish. It could be because we need workers in various industries. We need farm workers. We need workers in the construction industry. We need workers in the high tech industry. All of these things can be used as a reason for immigration.

We establish a policy. We say, okay, here is how many we need this year for this particular task. Here is who we want to come into the United States. We want people that perhaps are going to bring capital into the United States. That is a pretty good thing. Maybe we need more lawyers, I do not think so, but, whatever it is, if it is lawyers, if it is agricultural workers, it does not matter.

What is important, Mr. Speaker, is that we make that decision who it is we believe with what attributes we think necessary to come into this country, the attributes we believe would be important and enhance life in the United States. That is why we have borders. That is why we pretend to have an immigration policy. But, Mr. Speaker, if you ignore that, if you pretend as though that border does not exist and you simply allow people to come across in the kind of numbers we have seen for the last 2 decades, many things happen.
Massive immigration into the United States both legally and illegally has been a factor in certainly the growth of the Nation. A matter of fact, 50 percent of the Nation's growth in the last census was a result of immigration legally, legal immigration, and illegal immigration, 50 percent or more.

That is the census figure, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the census figures are far too conservative. But let us use them for the time being.

Fifty percent of the growth in the Nation is due to immigration, legal and illegal, far more illegal than legal.

That means that 50 percent of the pressure applied in communities all over the Nation for more highways, more hospitals, more schools, the infrastructure that has to be built to support that, brought about by the immigration pressure. It also has other ramifications.

The day before yesterday I happened to pick up the paper in my hometown, Denver, Colorado, and I read a story about the fact that several police agencies are having to either hire or ask volunteers to come on board that would go out with policemen on their calls, especially domestic violence calls or, in the case that was cited in the paper, it was an accident, a boating accident. People were drunk and they crashed their boat and about 8 or 10 had fallen overboard and some were drowning.

When the police got there, when the rescue teams got there, they could not communicate with any of the people who were in dire straits, and there was a lot of concern about the fact that this is not unique, that this particular situation is not unique, that there had been many times when police had been called to a variety of different situations but had trouble communicating because the people did not speak English.

So now police departments all over the country, this is not unique to Colorado, they are putting people on who have a variety of language skills so that they can perhaps respond to these issues. They are becoming concerned.

Businesses are becoming concerned because they are fearful of lawsuits being brought by people who cannot speak English or read it; and, therefore, cannot read the safety warnings or whatever kind of instructions are on the product. So consultants are telling businesses that now they should be hiring people, they should be, of course, printing things in different languages and/or hiring people to be able to communicate in various languages.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how many languages will we have to try and communicate in order to satisfy this sort of legalistic tendency on the part of many people in our country and to avoid lawsuits? In my district, I have school districts where there are over 100 languages that are spoken right now.

Mr. Speaker, we can handle immigration. I am not for a moment saying that we have to slam the door shut tight behind us and that no one else can come into this country. We can and should continue to allow people to seek access to the United States and to the freedom and the economic opportunity we offer. We should do so mindful of the fact that there is a certain number above which we cannot really accommodate that.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that a million legal immigrants, plus those that we bring in under the status of refugee, plus the four or five million that stream across our borders illegally, I suggest that it is too much. We cannot handle the massive numbers coming in here. That does not mean that we in fact, are opposed; or that I am opposed to any sort of immigration, but we cannot handle it at these numbers. There are ramifications to it. There are ramifications to it in our schools with attempts to impose bilingual education in classrooms, teaching children in a language other than English so they accomplish very little in terms of achieving the skills necessary to be successful in our society.

The pressures are there. Why it is because the numbers are here at such a level as to force a change in the structure of society.

There are ramifications to massive immigration. It behooves us, it is our responsibility as the organization established, the entity established to, in fact, determine who comes into the country and who will not be allowed to come in. It is our responsibility to set an immigration policy that is good for the immigrants who we allow in and good for the United States on the receiving end.

An amnesty program for millions of people who came here illegally, that is not a good proposal. That is not a plan, Mr. Speaker. That is surrender. It may be, it has been suggested, as a matter of fact, that this plan was proposed with the thought in mind that it would attract a certain number of voters from various ethnic communities, that they would support our efforts and the efforts of the party in the White House, my party.

Well, I do not know, Mr. Speaker. If that is true or not, but I will tell my colleagues this. Even if it were true that we would find a huge number of Hispanics in this country changing their attitude about the Republican Party and, therefore, voting for us in massive numbers, I do not know whether that is true or not but it does not matter. We should not make laws in this country for specific groups in order to entice them to support us, our party or our candidacy.

We should make laws that benefit all members of our society.
to millions of people who snuck into the country, who did not fight in any way, had no greater claim to come into this Nation than people who came here legally, that they wanted the benefits of this life, of this society. What do we say to people like that? How can we look them in the face and tell them that they live in a just society?

Mr. Speaker, there are literally hundreds of millions of people like this gentleman who would give anything to come to the United States and who have in fact applied for entrance into this country. But we have a quota for people from certain areas and we establish how many can come in, supposedly. If you are going to do it legally, you wait. That is exactly the way it should be. You do it by the rules. It is a travesty to offer amnesty to people who violate the law. Again, I am not blaming them individually, but I am also saying that it has not been in our interest to reward them for that action.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that massive immigration into this Nation in the numbers we are talking about is one of the most serious domestic policy issues we face. It is extremely difficult to get many of my colleagues to stand up here and talk about this because there is a fear that if you do so, you will be branded as a racist, a xenophile, a variety of relatively unpleasant things that no one likes to be called. Certainly I do not consider myself to be any of those things. I believe that I am pro-immigrant, having come from an immigrant family. I believe that the United States has been made richer in many, many ways by the contributions of immigrant families from the time our Nation was founded. I am not against immigration. We can handle a certain number of people in here every year. But we cannot handle the millions and millions of people who are streaming into this Nation and who are waiting to stream into the Nation.

What if we really did eliminate the border? What if we really said, “Well, if you want to come, come. Come on ahead.” Does anybody wonder about what would happen? How many hundreds of millions of people would stream into the country? Could we really handle this? Could we really provide for them and for ourselves and for our children the kind of quality of life that we have come to build and expect in this country? I do not think so. I do not believe anybody believes that.

So I ask to be rational in our approach to immigration. I believe that most of the immigrants who have recently arrived in the United States legally would agree with me, that that is the way it should be done. I believe that we should not reward those who would say that the people coming in should not be rewarded for that kind of behavior, when they themselves, the people who came here legally, had to go through all of the hoops and did it right. So I do not think we are unique in calling for a complete reversal of this policy. I believe that we should proffer amnesty. I hope that we will once again regain control of our borders. I hope that we will establish guest worker programs that will satisfy the needs of business and industry in the United States, those that tell us day after day—they tell me, anyway—that they would go out of business if they did not have the opportunity to use guest workers, but in reality all of that can be handled through a guest worker program.

We do not have to rely on illegals in order to serve us, because the illegals themselves and not just by these employers. They are paid less, they are ill-used, they are ill-treated, because they know that if you are here illegally, you are afraid to turn anybody in. This is not a good deal.

Illegal immigration is not a good deal for the immigrant, it is not a good deal for the United States, and it should not be rewarded by amnesty.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for July 23 on account of a death in the family.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for July 23 on account of the funeral of a close family friend.

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. ENGEL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. TANCREDO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. COBLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, July 25.

Mr. TRANDAHL, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker: