

[Roll No. 443]

## YEAS—362

Abercrombie Ehlers LaTourette  
Ackerman Emanuel Leach  
Aderholt Emerson Lee  
Akin Engel Levin  
Alexander English (PA) Lewis (CA)  
Allen Eshoo Lewis (GA)  
Baca Etheridge Lewis (KY)  
Baird Evans Linder  
Baker Everett Lipinski  
Baldwin Fattah LoBiondo  
Barrett (SC) Feeney Lowey  
Barrow Ferguson Lynch  
Bartlett (MD) Fitzpatrick (PA) Mack  
Barton (TX) Flake Manzullo  
Bass Foley Marchant  
Bean Forbes Markey  
Beauprez Ford Marshall  
Berkley Fortenberry Matheson  
Berman Fossella Matsui  
Biggert Foss McCarthy  
Billray Frank (MA) McCaul (TX)  
Bilirakis Franks (AZ) McCotter  
Bishop (GA) Frelinghuysen McCreery  
Bishop (NY) Gallegly McGovern  
Bishop (UT) Garrett (NJ) McHenry  
Blackburn Gerlach McIntyre  
Blunt Gibbons McKeon  
Boehler Gillmor McMorris  
Boehner Gingrey Rodgers  
Bonilla Gohmert McNulty  
Bonner Gonzalez Meehan  
Bono Goode Meek (FL)  
Boozman Goodlatte Meeks (NY)  
Boren Gordon Melancon  
Boswell Granger Mica  
Boucher Graves Michaud  
Boustany Green, Al Millender-  
Boyd Green, Gene McDonald  
Bradley (NH) Grijalva Miller (FL)  
Brady (PA) Gutierrez Miller (MI)  
Brady (TX) Hall Miller (NC)  
Brown (OH) Harman Miller, Gary  
Brown (SC) Harris Miller, George  
Brown, Corrine Hart Moore (KS)  
Burgess Hastings (WA) Moran (KS)  
Burton (IN) Hayes Moran (VA)  
Butterfield Hayworth Musgrave  
Buyer Hefley Myrick  
Calvert Herseht Nadler  
Camp (MI) Higgins Napolitano  
Cannon Hinchey Neal (MA)  
Cantor Hinojosa Neugebauer  
Capito Hobson Northup  
Capps Hoekstra Norwood  
Capuano Hooley Nunes  
Cardin Hostettler Nunes  
Carnahan Hoyer Olver  
Carson Hulshof Ortiz  
Carter Hunter Osborne  
Castle Inglis (SC) Otter  
Chandler Inslee Owens  
Chocola Israel Oxley  
Clay Issa Pallone  
Clyburn Istook Pascrell  
Coble Jackson (IL) Pastor  
Cole (OK) Jackson-Lee Paul  
Conaway (TX) Pearce  
Conyers Jefferson Pelosi  
Cooper Jenkins Pence  
Costa Jindal Peterson (MN)  
Costello Johnson (CT) Pickering  
Cramer Johnson (IL) Pitts  
Crenshaw Johnson, E. B. Platts  
Crowley Jones (NC) Pombo  
Cubin Jones (OH) Pomeroy  
Cuellar Kaptur Porter  
Cummings Kelly Price (GA)  
Davis (AL) Kennedy (MN) Price (NC)  
Davis (TN) Kennedy (RI) Pryce (OH)  
Davis, Jo Ann Kildee Putnam  
Davis, Tom Kilpatrick (MI) Radanovich  
Deal (GA) Kind Ramstad  
DeFazio King (IA) Rangel  
Delahunt King (NY) Regula  
DeLauro Kingston Rehberg  
Dent Kirk Reichert  
Diaz-Balart, L. Kline Renzi  
Diaz-Balart, M. Knollenberg Reynolds  
Dicks Kolbe Rogers (AL)  
Dingell Kucinich Rogers (MI)  
Doolittle Kuhl (NY) Rohrabacher  
Doyle Langevin Ros-Lehtinen  
Drake Lantos Rothman  
Dreier Larsen (WA) Roybal-Allard  
Duncan Larson (CT) Royce  
Edwards Latham Ruppertsberger

Ryan (OH) Snyder  
Ryan (WI) Sodrel  
Ryun (KS) Solis  
Salazar Souder  
Sanchez, Linda Spratt  
T. Stearns  
Sanchez, Loretta Stupak  
Sanders Sullivan  
Schiff Sweeney  
Schmidt Tancredo  
Schwartz (PA) Tanner  
Schwarz (MI) Tauscher  
Scott (GA) Taylor (NC)  
Sensenbrenner Terry  
Sessions Thomas  
Shadegg Thompson (CA)  
Shaw Thompson (MS)  
Shays Thornberry  
Sherman Tiahrt  
Shuster Tiberi  
Simmons Tierney  
Simpson Towns  
Skelton Turner  
Slaughter Udall (CO)  
Smith (NJ) Udall (NM)  
Smith (TX) Upton  
Smith (WA) Van Hollen

## NAYS—57

Andrews Herger Payne  
Bachus Holden Peterson (PA)  
Berry Holt Petri  
Blumenauer Honda Poe  
Brown-Waite, Hyde Rahall  
Ginny Kanjorski Reyes  
Campbell (CA) LaHood Rogers (KY)  
Cardoza Lofgren, Zoe Ross  
Chabot Lucas Rush  
Davis (CA) Lungren, Daniel Sabo  
Davis (IL) E. Saxton  
Davis (KY) McCollum (MN) Schakowsky  
DeGette McDermott Scott (VA)  
Doggett McHugh Serrano  
Farr McKinney Sherwood  
Filner Mollohan Shimkus  
Green (WI) Moore (WI) Taylor (MS)  
Gutknecht Murtha Visclosky  
Hastings (FL) Oberstar Wolf  
Hensarling Obey

## NOT VOTING—13

Becerra Gilchrest Ney  
Case Johnson, Sam Stark  
Cleaver Keller Strickland  
Culberson Maloney  
Davis (FL) Murphy

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1334

Mr. FARR and Mr. REYES changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 443, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, on September 14, 2006, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes 442 and 443. Rollcall vote 442 as on the Scott Amendment to H.R. 2965, “The Federal Prison Industries Competition in Contracting Act.” Rollcall vote 443 was on final passage of H.R. 2965, “The Federal Prison Industries Competition in Contracting Act.”

As a lead sponsor of H.R. 2965, had I been present I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote 442 and “aye” on rollcall vote 443.

## SECURE FENCE ACT OF 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1002, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 190, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 444]

## YEAS—224

Aderholt Gilchrest Nussle  
Akin Gillmor Osborne  
Alexander Gingrey Otter  
Bachus Gohmert Oxley  
Baker Goode Paul  
Barrett (SC) Goodlatte Pearce  
Barrow Granger Pence  
Bartlett (MD) Graves Peterson (MN)  
Barton (TX) Green (WI) Peterson (PA)  
Bass Gutknecht Petri  
Beauprez Hall Pitts  
Biggert Harris Platts  
Billray Hart Poe  
Bilirakis Hastings (WA) Pombo  
Bishop (UT) Hayes Porter  
Blackburn Hayworth Price (GA)  
Blunt Hefley Pryce (OH)  
Boehler Hensarling Putnam  
Boehner Herger Radanovich  
Bonilla Hobson Ramstad  
Bonner Hoekstra Regula  
Bono Hostettler Rehberg  
Boozman Hulshof Reichert  
Boustany Hunter Renzi  
Bradley (NH) Hyde Reynolds  
Brady (TX) Inglis (SC) Rogers (AL)  
Brown (SC) Issa Rogers (KY)  
Brown-Waite, Istook Rogers (MI)  
Ginny Jenkins Rohrabacher  
Burgess Jindal Ros-Lehtinen  
Burton (IN) Johnson (CT) Royce  
Buyer Johnson (IL) Ryan (OH)  
Calvert Jones (NC) Ryan (WI)  
Camp (MI) Kelly Ryan (KS)  
Campbell (CA) Kennedy (MN) Saxton  
Cannon King (IA) Schmidt  
Cantor King (NY) Schwarz (MI)  
Capito Kingston Sensenbrenner  
Carter Kirk Sessions  
Castle Kline Shadegg  
Chabot Knollenberg Shaw  
Chocola Kolbe Sherwood  
Coble Kuhl (NY) Shimkus  
Cole (OK) LaHood Shuster  
Conaway Latham Simmons  
Crenshaw LaTourette Simpson  
Cubin Leach Smith (NJ)  
Davis (KY) Lewis (CA) Smith (TX)  
Davis, Jo Ann Lewis (KY) Sodrel  
Davis, Tom Linder  
Deal (GA) LoBiondo Souder  
DeFazio Lucas Stearns  
Dent Lungren, Daniel Sullivan  
Diaz-Balart, L. E. Sweeney  
Doolittle Mack Tancredo  
Drake Manzullo Taylor (NC)  
Dreier Marchant Terry  
Duncan McCaul (TX) Thomas  
Ehlers McCotter Thornberry  
Emerson McCreery Tiahrt  
English (PA) McHenry Tiberi  
Everett McHugh Turner  
Feeney McKeon Upton  
Ferguson McMorris Walden (OR)  
Fitzpatrick (PA) Rodgers Walsh  
Flake Mica Wamp  
Foley Miller (FL) Weldon (PA)  
Fortenberry Miller (MI) Weller  
Fossella Miller, Gary Westmoreland  
Foss Moran (KS) Whitfield  
Franks (AZ) Musgrave Wicker  
Frelinghuysen Myrick Wilson (NM)  
Gallegly Neugebauer Wilson (SC)  
Garrett (NJ) Northup Wolf  
Gerlach Norwood Young (AK)  
Gibbons Nunes Young (FL)

NAYS—190

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Neal (MA)
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Obearstar
Allen	Harman	Obey
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Olver
Baca	Herseeth	Ortiz
Baird	Higgins	Owens
Baldwin	Hinchev	Pallone
Bean	Hinojosa	Pascrell
Berkley	Holden	Pastor
Berman	Holt	Payne
Berry	Honda	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Hooley	Pomeroy
Bishop (NY)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Inslee	Rahall
Boren	Israel	Reyes
Boswell	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Rothman
Boyd	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Jefferson	Ruppersberger
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Sabo
Butterfield	Kanjorski	Salazar
Capps	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Capuano	Kennedy (RI)	T.
Cardin	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Cardoza	Kilpatrick (MI)	Sanders
Carnahan	Kind	Schakowsky
Carson	Kucinich	Schiff
Chandler	Langevin	Schwartz (PA)
Clay	Lantos	Scott (GA)
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cooper	Lee	Shays
Costa	Levin	Sherman
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Cramer	Lipinski	Slaughter
Crowley	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lowey	Snyder
Cummings	Lynch	Solis
Davis (AL)	Markey	Spratt
Davis (CA)	Matheson	Stupak
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Tanner
Davis (TN)	McCarthy	Tauscher
DeGette	McCollum (MN)	Taylor (MS)
Delahunt	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Dicks	McIntyre	Tierney
Dingell	McKinney	Towns
Doggett	McNulty	Udall (CO)
Doyle	Meehan	Udall (NM)
Edwards	Meek (FL)	Van Hollen
Emanuel	Meeks (NY)	Velázquez
Engel	Melancon	Visclosky
Eshoo	Michaud	Wasserman
Etheridge	Millender-	Schultz
Evans	McDonald	Waters
Farr	Miller (NC)	Watson
Fattah	Miller, George	Watt
Filner	Mollohan	Waxman
Ford	Moore (KS)	Weiner
Frank (MA)	Moore (WI)	Wexler
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Woolsey
Gordon	Murtha	Wu
Green, Al	Nadler	Wynn
Green, Gene	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—18

Becerra	Forbes	Ney
Case	Johnson, Sam	Pickering
Cleaver	Keller	Rangel
Culberson	Maloney	Stark
Davis (FL)	Marshall	Strickland
Diaz-Balart, M.	Murphy	Weldon (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1342

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 444 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 444, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 14, 2006, I was unable to cast my floor vote on rollcall Nos. 443 and 444. The votes I missed included final passage of H.R. 2965, the Federal Prison Industries Competition in Contracting Act and a vote on ordering the previous question for providing for the consideration of H.R. 6061, the Secure Fence Act of 2006.

Had I been present for the votes, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall vote 443 and “no” on rollcall vote 444.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1002, I call up the bill (H.R. 6061) to establish operational control over the international land and maritime borders of the United States, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1002, the amendment printed in House Report 109–653 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 6061

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Secure Fence Act of 2006”.

**SEC. 2. ACHIEVING OPERATIONAL CONTROL ON THE BORDER.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall take all actions the Secretary determines necessary and appropriate to achieve and maintain operational control over the entire international land and maritime borders of the United States, to include the following—

- (1) systematic surveillance of the international land and maritime borders of the United States through more effective use of personnel and technology, such as unmanned aerial vehicles, ground-based sensors, satellites, radar coverage, and cameras; and
- (2) physical infrastructure enhancements to prevent unlawful entry by aliens into the United States and facilitate access to the international land and maritime borders by United States Customs and Border Protection, such as additional checkpoints, all weather access roads, and vehicle barriers.

(b) OPERATIONAL CONTROL DEFINED.—In this section, the term “operational control” means the prevention of all unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the progress made toward achieving and maintaining operational control over the entire international land and maritime borders of the United States in accordance with this section.

**SEC. 3. CONSTRUCTION OF FENCING AND SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS IN BORDER AREA FROM PACIFIC OCEAN TO GULF OF MEXICO.**

Section 102(b) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of

1996 (Public Law 104–208; 8 U.S.C. 1103 note) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading by striking “NEAR SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA”; and

(2) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) SECURITY FEATURES.—

“(A) REINFORCED FENCING.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide for least 2 layers of reinforced fencing, the installation of additional physical barriers, roads, lighting, cameras, and sensors—

“(i) extending from 10 miles west of the Tecate, California, port of entry to 10 miles east of the Tecate, California, port of entry;

“(ii) extending from 10 miles west of the Calexico, California, port of entry to 5 miles east of the Douglas, Arizona, port of entry;

“(iii) extending from 5 miles west of the Columbus, New Mexico, port of entry to 10 miles east of El Paso, Texas;

“(iv) extending from 5 miles northwest of the Del Rio, Texas, port of entry to 5 miles southeast of the Eagle Pass, Texas, port of entry; and

“(v) extending 15 miles northwest of the Laredo, Texas, port of entry to the Brownsville, Texas, port of entry.

“(B) PRIORITY AREAS.—With respect to the border described—

“(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), the Secretary shall ensure that an interlocking surveillance camera system is installed along such area by May 30, 2007, and that fence construction is completed by May 30, 2008; and

“(ii) in subparagraph (A)(v), the Secretary shall ensure that fence construction from 15 miles northwest of the Laredo, Texas, port of entry to 15 southeast of the Laredo, Texas, port of entry is completed by December 31, 2008.

“(C) EXCEPTION.—If the topography of a specific area has an elevation grade that exceeds 10 percent, the Secretary may use other means to secure such area, including the use of surveillance and barrier tools.”.

**SEC. 4. NORTHERN BORDER STUDY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall conduct a study on the feasibility of a state-of-the-art barrier system along the northern international land and maritime border of the United States and shall include in the study—

- (1) the necessity of constructing such a system;
- (2) the feasibility of constructing such a system; and
- (3) the economic impact implementing such a system will have along the northern border.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report that contains the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

**SEC. 5. EVALUATION AND REPORT RELATING TO CUSTOMS AUTHORITY TO STOP CERTAIN FLEEING VEHICLES.**

(a) EVALUATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

- (1) evaluate the authority of personnel of United States Customs and Border Protection to stop vehicles that enter the United States illegally and refuse to stop when ordered to do so by such personnel, compare such Customs authority with the authority of the Coast Guard to stop vessels under section 637 of title 14, United States Code, and make an assessment as to whether such Customs authority should be expanded;

(2) review the equipment and technology available to United States Customs and Border Protection personnel to stop vehicles described in paragraph (1) and make an assessment as to whether or not better equipment or technology is available or should be developed; and

(3) evaluate the training provided to United States Customs and Border Protection personnel to stop vehicles described in paragraph (1).

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report that contains the results of the evaluation conducted under subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6061, the Secure Fence Act of 2006.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress return to their districts, as Members of Congress speak with the American people, it is obvious there is no more defining issue in our Nation today than stopping illegal immigration.

□ 1345

This is an issue which is absolutely essential if we are to gain the confidence of the American people, if we are going to show to the American people that we can perform the most basic obligation of any government, and that is to secure the Nation's borders.

Now, we passed very comprehensive legislation in December of last year, H.R. 4437, and I was a strong advocate and cosponsor of that, along with Chairman SENSENBRENNER, but the reality is that legislation is right now bogged down. What we have to do is we have to prove to the American people and also we have to make substantial progress in combating illegal immigration.

One issue in which there appears to be a consensus between the United States Senate and the Congress is on the issue of building a secure fence. So rather than wait, and wait for God knows how long until comprehensive legislation is enacted, there is no reason whatsoever why we should not move forward on targeted legislation which is effective and meaningful. We have to bridge this disconnect between the American people and its government, between the American people and the elite, and we have to show we are responsive.

Now, the legislation today incorporates very much what was already passed by the House with significant Democratic votes back in December. It provides over 700 miles of two-layered reinforced fencing. It also mandates

that the Department of Homeland Security achieve and maintain operational control over the entire border through a virtual fence, deploying cameras, ground sensors, unmanned aerial vehicles, integrated surveillance technology, and it also requires the Department of Homeland Security to provide the necessary authority to border personnel to disable fleeing vehicles, similar to the authority which is already held by the United States Coast Guard for maritime vessels.

We also realize there is concern at the northern border, and I want to especially thank my colleague from New York (Congressman REYNOLDS) for his efforts in homeland security, particularly on the northern border. With his help, we were able to enhance the Secure Fence Act to ensure that appropriate technology and infrastructure are being considered and that border security efforts are implemented in a manner that does not stop or deny commerce.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue where the American people are crying out for help. They are crying out for us to take meaningful action. There is, to me, no reason why, and I am trying to anticipate arguments coming against it, basically saying we need comprehensive legislation, and that is a debate we can have. We passed comprehensive legislation in December. But the fact is just because we cannot do everything today doesn't mean that we should do nothing.

So I am saying let us do something very, very positive. Let us pass this legislation, which will build a secure fence, which will build a virtual fence, and would also give the border personnel the assistance and the power that they need.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today the House continues its efforts to be known as the "do-nothing Congress" by voting on a bill that has already been voted on before. In December, we voted on this fence issue as part of the border legislation offered by Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. KING. Then, the Senate passed a bipartisan comprehensive bill, the McCain-Bush bill, and House Republicans had the opportunity to work with the Senate on a bill that would be voted on and sent to the President to be made into law, but the Republicans decided to do nothing.

Then they decided rather than doing nothing they would waste taxpayers' dollars to hold hearings over the summer, hearings that showed that a lot of their ideas, such as the very fence being discussed today, weren't so good. Rather than listening to the American people and creating laws that actually do something, the Republicans have decided to spend the next 2 weeks voting on things we have already voted on.

Mr. Speaker, voting on a fence today, especially when it is already part of

legislation to be moved, isn't going to solve our border security woes. Indeed, voting on a fence without allocating funds to pay for it is just another example of Republican efforts to sell security on the cheap to the American people.

I have seen estimates that just to build the fence is going to cost us at least \$7 billion. Where is the money coming from to pay for it? I am from rural Mississippi, and I know that when you build a fence you have to maintain it, mend it, and fix it. How much is it going to cost to maintain this 700-mile fence? Who is going to do it? This fence is starting to feel like the bridge to nowhere that Congress once considered.

Mr. Speaker, the British statesman Edmund Burke once said "All that is necessary for the forces of evil to win in the world is for enough good men to do nothing." Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Congress to stop being the "do-nothing Congress." It is time for us to take a real stand against the forces of evil and move forward with existing legislation to secure our borders. Instead of spinning our wheels passing the same bill over and over again, let us move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 6061.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would just make several references, one to my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, who is ranking member and does such an outstanding job on the Homeland Security Committee, that I don't think it is ever a waste of taxpayer dollars to go out and hold hearings and listen to what the American people have to say. Sometimes it is good to get away from just reading editorials in the New York Times and the Washington Post and actually hear what real people have to say.

Secondly, if we are going to show that we are genuinely against doing nothing, then let's do something and pass legislation which we know the overwhelming majority of the American people want, and that is to build this fence.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this legislation, and listened to the assessment offered by my good friend from Mississippi. Yes, it is the political season. Yes, the description is one that is offered almost reflexively, to which we could answer with I believe the fairer characterization of "obstructionism."

And, really, perhaps that is a theme that should be pursued with reference to our borders. The graffiti is strewn on the wall at our international border in Nogales. "Borders are scars upon the earth," it reads. No, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, borders are not scars upon the earth. They are reasonable and necessary lines of political demarcation between nation states to ensure the sovereignty and security of those nation states in the post-9/11 world.

It is absolutely necessary that we move to secure our borders. And as the poet wrote, "good fences make good neighbors." Because, Mr. Speaker, this far exceeds the notion of a fence and mere physical, not to mention debate obstruction. This brings to bear technology necessary to secure the border.

Now, much has been said about process already, and it will no doubt continue. But I think it is the duty of the people's House to time and again take this case to the other body on this Hill and to make clear to the American people, Republicans, Democrats, Independents, Libertarians, and vegetarians, that as Americans we understand this basic truth: When you have got a hole in your roof, the first thing you do is patch the hole.

Let us move forward with an effective fence. Support this legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 6061, entitled the Secure Fence Act. This bill is almost the same bad legislation that was brought before us in the House this summer, but it is even worse because it contains no funding. It ignores real enforcement measures, like hiring more Border Patrol personnel, and instead builds a Berlin Wall on our southern border.

I was born and raised in south Texas on the Texas-Mexico border. We who live and work along the border are acutely aware that the immigration system is broken and that a complete overhaul is required to restore any semblance of order.

So long as employers need workers in this country, and while our immigration systems impede rather than facilitate timely access of willing workers to those opportunities, undocumented immigration will never be controlled. Walls, barriers, and military patrols will only force those immigrants to utilize ever more dangerous routes and increase the number of people who die in search of an opportunity to feed and clothe their families.

The answer to this issue is comprehensive immigration reform. Fix immigration systems and you are assured better border security. Trade is the lifeblood of the Mexico-U.S. border communities and of this Nation. In the Rio Grande Valley, thousands of people cross back and forth across the border daily to shop, to work, to get medical care, and to go to school. Fences will stifle that trade and destroy the eco-

nomie gains border communities have made. The McAllen Chamber of Commerce says, and I quote, "This bill is a 19th century solution to a 21st century problem. It is a waste of taxpayers' dollars."

I participated in the sham hearings in Laredo, Texas, in August of 2006 that only allowed testimony from one side of the issue and are being used to justify this bill. Instead of wasting time with this legislation, this House should be participating in a conference with the Senate on legislation that has already passed.

The McAllen Hispanic Chamber of Commerce stands on the feelings that "we don't need more fencing, we need a real solution. We need a bill that will protect our borders without a fence and consider possible solutions temporarily, legalizing undocumented people who are currently working in the United States, with certain homeland security provisions and allowing future workers to enter legally, reunite families, and provide worker protections."

I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided legislation, H.R. 6061, named the Secure Fence Act.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would just remind my good friend from Texas that just a 14-mile fence in San Diego has brought about a significant decrease in crime. And also one of the reasons why we believe this fence is essential is for the humanitarian reason of not allowing so many people to die in the desert the way they do today because there is no fence.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this effort, and I want to congratulate the chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. KING, for his very hard work on this, and all my colleagues that have been involved.

I hate the idea of our having to put up a fence. The fact of the matter is we have no choice. We have no choice because this week, as we marked the fifth anniversary of September 11, we are in the midst of a global war on terror. We face the threat of someone who would like to do us in coming across our border.

We know that the fence is not the panacea. But the fact of the matter is the fence is essential, and every shred of empirical evidence that we have so far is that it has been helpful in dealing with the challenge that we have.

Chairman KING just mentioned the 14-mile border fence. I have had the privilege of working with our colleague, Mr. HUNTER, and before that our former colleague, Doug Ose, from Sacramento, who worked hard on our effort to complete that 14-mile fence.

□ 1400

The reason we have to have that fence in that area is that the popu-

lations on both sides of the border are very, very heavy, and so it makes it easy for someone to assimilate into society once they get across that border; and having a fence, and a double fence, is one way in these heavily populated areas to focus attention on this.

We have a 1,973-mile border between the United States and Mexico. It extends from the Pacific Ocean all the way to the Gulf of Mexico. No one is advocating that we fence the entire border. We have 21st century technology that is going to allow us to utilize motion detectors, unmanned aerial vehicles, and a host of other things that allow us to deal with areas that don't have heavy concentrations of populated areas, number one; and, number two, areas known to be utilized for smuggling.

This measure is the right thing for us to do. The American people know we can secure our borders. I believe that this effort is a very important one in that quest, and I am proud to be strongly supportive of it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in response to my chairman, I have heard a fence called a lot of things, but hearing it called a "humanitarian gesture" is something very new. I guess you learn something every time you are on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today disappointed that we once again are debating a bill that will not be a real solution to our Nation's border security and to our immigration problem.

This summer the Republican leadership held hearings all around the country under the pretense of learning about what was needed to secure our borders. The various hearings received extensive testimony, but one of the things they told us was that fencing alone is not an adequate solution.

The simple fact is that fences are not the silver-bullet solution that the Republicans are painting them to be. It will not add more Border Patrol agents, who are the ones that do the real work at securing our border. And it will not add more detention space for people who are apprehended. There are no more DAs, no more judges, it won't process these people.

I am also concerned that the bill does nothing to secure the northern border. Just think about it, when you plug one place, people come in through other places: our coasts, our airports, our northern border.

This summer I attended a hearing on the Washington State-Canadian border, and it was very clear that the northern border has major problems, considerable challenges. And what does this bill do to help the northern border? They are going to do a study. I am going to tell you something, the people who were before our committee did not ask for a study. They asked for more Border Patrol agents. They asked for help

from unmanned vehicles. They didn't ask for a study.

The fence proposed today is not cost effective. A low-ball estimate based on an estimate from the Department of Homeland Security says \$9 million per mile. So it would cost almost \$7 billion to build the 730-mile fence. In contrast, with just \$360 million, we could hire, train and equip the 2,000 Border Patrol agents that would make it operational and secure at the borders, the ones that we said we were going to hire in the 9/11 act.

So today we are not discussing a comprehensive bill like the substitute drafted by my colleague, Mr. THOMPSON, the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee, the one that gives technology, personnel, equipment to monitor and secure every mile of the border 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership would not allow an up-or-down vote on that amendment.

I am a strong supporter of border security, and today, today I wish we were voting on a strong border security bill. I want to work with my colleague on the other side of the aisle, but I cannot support this bill. It will cost billions of dollars, take many years to implement, and it still won't solve our border security problem.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my good friend from California, all of us agree no one provision is going to solve illegal immigration, but this is a significant provision going forward.

In addition, this year's appropriation bill provides for 1,200 new Border Patrol agents which will bring us up to 14,580, an increase of over 80 percent since September 11, 2001, and over 1,200 ICE officers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE).

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, I salute the gentleman from New York and his committee for their efforts on the fence bill.

As stated previously, I agree that the fence is not the total solution. In fact, I would like to see more than 700 miles of fence along our southern border, but 700 miles of fence is a start. I would also like to see a firm no-amnesty policy ever for those illegally in the country. That is not part of this bill. But this bill is a substantial and correct step in the right direction.

The invasion into this country is from south of the border primarily. That is why we need the fence along the southern border first, and we will study the situation along the northern border.

Cost: \$7 billion is a small fraction of the cost that illegal immigration imposes upon the taxpayers of the United States and the taxpayers of the various States of this country. It costs in excess of \$70 billion per year.

Let's take this very firm, very positive step and I urge everyone to support the King legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to Mr. GRIJALVA, the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this so-called Secure Fence Act, H.R. 6061. This bill could require the Department of Homeland Security to construct a wall across the entire Arizona border with Mexico. The House has already considered and passed this legislation, but since the majorities of both bodies in Congress have been unable to come to an agreement on immigration reform, the majority here wants to appear that we are accomplishing something as we are nearing election. But this is a sham.

Because of a failure of leadership to comprehensively address immigration in a sensible, humane way, we see before us a bill, to quote a majority member of the other body, that is a 19th century solution to a 20th century problem.

Instead of using our abilities as representatives of the American people who want to see a comprehensive solution to this problem, this is merely an attempt to sweep the serious root causes of immigration under the table and appeal to the lowest common denominator.

Building a wall between us and Mexico will not work. Not only will it not keep people from crossing illegally, it will be a budget-busting endeavor. I note that this bill contains no specific authorization of funds for this wall which will run into the billions.

In the deserts of the Southwest, the fragile and unique national treasures that we have there are bearing the brunt of an immigration policy that has failed. Earlier this year, the Interior Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee held a hearing on immigration's impact on borderlands. Professional land managers testified at this hearing and expressed serious skepticism about the negative impacts to the environment and wildlife that could result from building walls or fences on the border.

It saddens me that instead of working hard to address the border question, the majority continues to push a measure that has little chance of being signed into law. Nowhere in this bill do we see discussion of larger issues at hand that are in dire need of solutions.

The American people will see through this. They know it is nothing more than election year politics. I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 6061.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bill before us because we need to act immediately to seal our borders and protect the American people.

My office is full of bricks, bricks mailed to me by my constituents, and to the offices of many of my colleagues, with urgent pleas to act to secure our borders. These bricks are

more than a strong message from our constituents. They represent the passionate pleas of a country that knows we are losing the battle at our border and the demands of a Nation that understands we will never be secure until we have control over who is entering our country.

The Secure Fence Act will take the necessary steps to give our Border Patrol agents the tools they need to regain control of our borders so they can protect our country.

This legislation authorizes additional fencing as well as state-of-the-art technology and surveillance equipment to help us regain control of our borders.

The Secure Fence Act tells the American people we are serious about getting control of our borders, stopping illegal immigration and securing our country.

It is appropriate legislation. It will help get the job done, and I urge its passage.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to hear some of the folks on the other side of the aisle, especially Members from Arizona and New Mexico, who come here and say this is not a good idea, we shouldn't be moving ahead with it and it won't solve any problems.

It is their States, it is the Governor of the State of Arizona and the Governor of the State of New Mexico who have declared states of emergency in those two States. Something has to be done; that is what they are telling us. These are Democrat Governors in States where they have enormous problems, and they are saying we have an emergency. This is one way to try to address it. It is just one, but it is one way to do so. It is an important step that we take.

In terms of effectiveness, we have a model. On our southern border today, we have a chunk of fence about 14 miles long in the San Diego area, and it has worked. It has worked well. It is hard to find anyone on either side of the border at that location that wants that fence taken down because it has improved life.

This is a good step to take, and I commend my colleagues for bringing it forward.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman and the leadership for their continued astute work on this most important matter.

On December 16 of last year, the House responsibly debated and passed H.R. 4437. Part of that bill was an amendment that I authored that is now

incorporated into section 2 of this bill. It is the accountability portion. It is the oversight portion. And accountability is truly the key.

We are in this position today because of benign neglect from Washington. In 1986, another bill was passed that promised border security. That was not done, and the American people lost trust in Washington on this issue.

In order to restore that trust, we must first gain operational control. Operational control of the border is the imperative, and section 2 is what accomplishes that. It will ensure that the American people will know with certainty that that task has been accomplished.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say a fence is not the only answer, and this bill recognizes that. Look at section 2; it states that Homeland Security shall take all actions necessary and appropriate to achieve and maintain operational control over the entire international land and maritime borders of the United States, including systematic surveillance of the international land and maritime borders and physical infrastructure.

This is not just a fence bill, Mr. Speaker. It is also not just a Republican issue, it is not a Democrat issue; it is an American issue. I encourage and challenge my friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important measure that all of our constituents demand.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In reference to what the last speaker said, that this is not a fence bill, looking at the title, it is the Secure Fence Act of 2006.

□ 1415

Undoubtedly, there is some misunderstanding. The other point I would like to raise, Mr. Speaker, we have already voted on this matter. It is already on the books, been sent to the Senate, and basically it is there. We could be spending significant time doing other items like adding Border Patrol agents to a bill, technology, other equipment that we already know that we need. But this unfunded mandate in terms of this fence is unfortunate, because we are just doing and repeating what we have already done in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time both sides have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from New York has 15½ minutes, and the gentleman from Mississippi has 18.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the real gentleman from Iowa and the real Mr. KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from New York, and I am pleased to be called a real gentleman here on the floor of Congress. I am very

pleased to be standing here to endorse the King bill, and the chairman's work is exemplary.

I also endorse the definition in here of operational control of this border. It is a right-on-the-spot definition that we need to adhere to across this country. Last August 22 I called for a fence, August 22, 2005. The news media lambasted me for a radical idea.

Since that time, this House has voted to pass a fence, and the Senate has voted twice to pass a fence. It has now become bipartisan, and the White House understands the need for a physical barrier on the border. Two thousand miles, and we are spending \$8 billion a mile to watch the border. That is \$4 million a mile, \$8 billion a year; \$4 million a mile, and \$2 billion will build a fence and a wall. Then we can have an effective operational control that meets this definition.

So we need to have a fence and a wall on this border, and we are also watching today as 4 million illegals cross this border a year, that's 11,000 a night. Santa Ana's army was 6,000 strong. Twice that number every night is coming into America. You can't sit on the border in the dark like I have and listen to that infiltration and believe that you can do it with something called virtual. It has got to be a physical barrier.

There are \$65 billion of illegal drugs pushing on that wall. We can shut all of that off and save America drug addicts at the same time.

I support the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. Could I inquire of my friend from Mississippi if he intends to use all his time with more speakers?

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we are waiting for two more speakers.

Mr. KING of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Chairman KING's work on this bill showing that it is a national security issue and not just a problem that we have in the Southwest. Many in this Congress have been following what they believe to be the absurd anti-American prosecution of two Border Patrol agents, Ignacio Ramos and Jose Compean, who were doing their jobs to protect the U.S. border and protect drugs from entering America.

Instead they were improperly put on trial for what the U.S. Attorney who prosecuted this case said was the unlawful pursuit of an illegal invader into this Nation who was bringing 800 pounds of dope into this country.

One part of the bill that I wish to highlight is section 5. This portion directs the Border Patrol to make clear the policy on pursuit and whether the authority should even be expanded.

The Border Patrol lists among its objectives to detect, apprehend and deter drug smugglers. Our Border Patrol agents in the field need a clear, all-inclusive pursuit policy to show that we are serious about defending the border.

This bill will show our Border Patrol agents we are more concerned about them and border security than we are about drug smugglers. Anything less makes our Border Patrol nothing more than highly specialized and trained Wal-Mart greeters.

I urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from New York for his dedication to our Nation's security and border security, which is a huge part of that.

Mr. Speaker, after our Congress on the Road border security hearings, I would have constituents who would say tell me what you learned. What we learned is this, is that every town is a border town and every State is a border State, regardless of where it sits in this Nation. We also learned that what Americans want is to secure the border first.

That is their priority, and they are in hopes that we are going to join them and work with them. We know it has been the House's priority, and we are hoping that the administration and the Senate will join us in this effort.

We have also learned that what America wants to see is some type of border wall or fence or technology that is going to get results and that will end illegal entry into this country, whether it is of drugs, whether it is of individuals. They want the illegal entry to end.

The Secure Fence Act is a result of our hearings. We have heard. We are heeding what we have heard, and we know this is not the be all and end all, but it is one part of this important process. We get it. We hear the American people. We hear the border guards, and we also hear American law enforcement officers at the local and State level.

We are committed to doing the right thing. As I said, I hope that the President and Senate will join us in supporting these endeavors. We welcome bipartisan support on this issue. For those who have sat back and have avoided the issue or refused to take a position, now is the appropriate time for them to basically get off the fence and join us in supporting this. It is responsible, and, indeed, it is an issue of national security.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, we have two speakers en route, one we just talked to, who assures us he will be here shortly.

Mr. Chairman, do you have someone else?

Mr. KING of New York. Actually, we have a pinch hitter. I yield 1½ minutes

to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, Iraqis have been caught trying to infiltrate our southern border. Iranians have been detained trying to cross our southern border, Jordanians and people from countries where al Qaeda recruits.

Border security is national security, and yet the Democrats are now holding hostage border security for their amnesty plan. This is wrong. Mr. Speaker, we have the means to control our border, but do the Democrats have the will?

When they talk about immigration, the question is not yes or no, the question is illegal versus legal. That is the question. We know that a fence does not solve the entirety of the problem, but if you talk to our Border Patrol, as I have, if you have talked to our border sheriffs, as I have, you will note that strategically placed fences and walls, particularly where these human smugglers will gather, is a very important part of a comprehensive strategy to control our border and helping stem the tide of illegal entry.

We know that many people are coming here for the right reasons, but many people are also coming for the wrong reasons. Unbridled, illegal immigration threatens our national security, our border security and the rule of law. We should approve this legislation and take that first bold step in helping secure our borders.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, putting a fence up really doesn't stop people if you don't put the support system around it. So I would encourage my colleagues at some point to look at comprehensive border security and that approach, as well as developing a comprehensive border security plan. Just because somebody happens to be Jordanian or Iranian or what have you does not make them illegal, and I think what we have to do is do it the right way. If you have a fence and don't have staff to support it, you still haven't done much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman greatly.

Mr. Speaker, like Humpty-Dumpty atop a great wall, the Republican leadership's false proposal that we consider today is really on the edge of a great fall.

This is not so much about broken immigration policies, as it is about a House leadership that is desperately trying to cling to power and realizing that it is about to take a great fall. A great fall because, in part, on immigration, as with so many other issues, it has had years to act, and years to respond. Like this Administration, it has failed to secure our borders or find a meaningful way to deal with immigration.

So today, as part of the campaign of fear and hate that it has promoted over the recess with hearings across Amer-

ica, this bill is designed to erect a fence along the entire border of Texas, including all of the area that I represent along the Rio Grande River between Texas and Mexico.

With no funding accompanying the bill, it is really less of a fortification than a fairy tale, and it is also results from public concerns on this issue that arise from the failure of the Administration to fund the 2,000 Border Patrol agents that we proposed in 2004 when it ended up providing only 210.

It is similar in concern to the raid that President Bush and his Administration made on our Texas Border Patrol agents, when it moved them to Arizona, in what even my Republican colleagues condemned as an "outrage." They cannot put Humpty-Dumpty together again because reality does not comport with their rhetoric.

The solution to our problems with immigration will take more than concrete. You cannot build a wall high enough or long enough. You cannot pour in the billions and billions of dollars that they propose over the next decade for this wall, if it were ever funded, to keep people who are hungry from coming to this country.

What we need is a comprehensive approach that includes securing our borders, but at the same time realizes that much of our American industry and agriculture depends on immigrant labor. We need a way to encourage that labor to enter the country in a legal, not illegal fashion. If you do nothing but erect a false barrier and fail to include at the same time a legal way for labor to enter this country to seek a better life and to help us have a better life, one is left with a tremendous false sense of security for a wall that didn't work in Berlin, didn't work around Hong Kong, and hasn't worked in many other areas and is not the kind of comprehensive solution we need.

History and Humpty-Dumpty teach us that great walls are not the answer. What we need today is not a facade like that which is being proposed, we need leadership and real action.

Any high school student who has completed, even at the C level, a civics course at Johnson High School or Crockett or Bowie High School in Austin, Texas, knows that when the House passes one bill and the Senate passes another bill, both Republican bodies, with the President seeming to timidly favor the Senate bill, that the solution isn't to go around and have a round of show hearings and piecemeal a measure. One must cause the two bodies to come together and try to achieve a reasonable consensus.

Instead, House Republicans have done everything that they possibly can to stymie consensus and stymie a comprehensive solution. Instead, they bring us the false hope of a giant and costly wall that will not solve this problem. We need the President and a Congress who support real security and who are willing to stake some of their future on that, not some kind of barbed-wire smokescreen.

The citizens I represent who live on the southern edge of the country live in the very area that this wall would be built. Those who I represent that live hundreds of miles away are recognizing that we shouldn't be punished by posturing politicians high on the prospects of stirring up fear thousands of miles away with people who have never been to our Texas border.

Rather our entire country, all of our families, will be safer if we have a plan for enhancing border security enforcement, as well as for overhauling our immigration system. One of the biggest wrongs committed in this round of hearings, this dog and pony show that House Republicans have taken around the country, is to make an attempt to confuse the violence associated with drug cartels along our border with immigrants coming here seeking a better future, the same kinds of immigrants that came here in previous centuries looking for a better life in America. The two are separate, except to the extent that enforcement policy only drives some seeking a better life to some of the gangs that are also responsible for drug violence.

Similarly, the attempt to confuse our people and make them think that Osama bin Laden is headed north in a sombrero and that we face a great invasion of terrorists across the Rio Grande is also appealing to fear and the unknown rather than appealing to the reality of how we secure our borders.

□ 1430

Many Americans have a legitimate concern for securing our borders. In some areas, it may be that limited use of walls and certainly much broader use of our Border Patrol will provide part of that solution. But without the comprehensive approach that we so desperately need, we will not have solved the problem of immigration, of its contribution to our economy, and of the concerns it raises for some of our border communities.

I salute the gentleman from Mississippi for his leadership on this matter, and I believe that next year, when we have a more responsive Congress that cares about placing a priority on the real problems that affect American families, we may be able to finally move toward a comprehensive immigration approach, and not just a series of campaign speeches by people who want to distort and who want to shift the focus of debate from the failures that they have been responsible for these many years in the House of Representatives.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to listen as carefully as I can to the debate, and the only real argument that I hear that really make any sense is that building a fence is not the only answer. I think all of us on this side agree. But we also believe it is a very

essential part of the answer, a significant step; and the fact that, again I repeat, that we can't do everything, does not mean we should do nothing. That is why it is, I believe, essential to go forward with the legislation today, since there is broad support for it; both here in the House and in the Senate, as well, there is support for it, and also among the American people.

Also, as far as the references made to terrorists coming across the southern border, there is no doubt that there have been captured al Qaeda documents which indicate the desire of al Qaeda to bring people across the southern border.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. Gingrey, a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on December 16, 2005, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 4437, the Border Protection, Antiterrorism and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005, by a vote of 239-182. Included in the final version of that bill was an amendment that was offered by Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. ROYCE and myself to construct a high-tech security fence along the most populated and in-need parts of our border.

This past August, I had the opportunity to visit the border fence in San Diego, California, and I can vouch for its effectiveness. I agree that it may not be cost effective or even necessary to line our whole northern and southern borders with a security fence, but in the most populated areas where there is not much room separating two cities, like Tijuana, Mexico, and San Diego, California, a secure border fence would be a valuable investment because it provides our Border Patrol the time necessary to apprehend smugglers and others crossing the border illegally.

I commend Chairman KING and the House leadership for revisiting this issue, because it is the most basic and effective means for securing our border, in this Congress. Like locking the door to your house before turning on the alarm, it only makes sense to begin enforcement of our borders with physical barriers.

Mr. Speaker, we need to stop the fluidness of our borders before we consider any other immigration idea. In the words of a doctor, we need to stop the bleeding before we can stitch the wound. Constructing barriers on our borders is a critical first step toward curing this patient.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say at this time that there is bipartisan opposition to this bill. I would like to yield 3 minutes to a border State Representative, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from New York for his consideration as well.

Mr. Chairman, here we are again. Nine months ago, we were on this floor passing half measures to deal with the problem. Now we are back to dealing with it in quarter measures. We don't need these kinds of approaches. We know what the problems are. We don't need to have the faux hearings all over the country that we had this summer to tell us what the problems are.

The time has come to reject these kinds of partial measures, more of the same that we have been doing, and get at the root of the problem. And the root of the problem, as we well know, is the job magnet that exists in this country, that pulls migrants in, that makes them willing to do the jobs that most Americans are not willing to do, hard, back-breaking work out in the hot sun.

Fences are not going to stop these people from coming. They are determined to come here. They have been coming against all odds, and they are going to continue to come.

Furthermore, half of all the people who are in this country illegally came here on a legal visa. This doesn't do anything to deal with that, it doesn't do anything to deal with the people who come from other than across our southern border, and it doesn't really deal with that.

We need to have a comprehensive fix to the problem. I know people are tired of hearing that word, "comprehensive," but tell me a better word to describe something that deals with all of the parts of the problem and that that is what we don't have here. Not just fencing, not just sensors, not just UAVs. Those are important. Those are part of the problem. And I have no difficulty with the idea of a fence, but we need to have it as something more than just on its own. By itself, this falls very short.

We have got to have a guest worker program. We have got to have a realistic, honest assessment and solution to the 12 million people who are in this country now in an undocumented status. Unless we do that, we only exacerbate the problem.

Mr. Speaker, there is no evidence that any terrorist has come across our southern border. None. And that was testified to time and again this summer. So if we are really concerned about terrorists, we ought to be much more concerned about our northern border, where there are many more miles of unprotected border without camera sensors, without fencing. And it is also a country where we know there are terrorist cells that exist there. So we know that the problem exists up there.

So what are we really debating here? We are really not debating anything that is of substance. This is a feel-good piece of legislation. We have sent the bill to the Senate. They have sent the bill back to us. This is simply a rerun of what we have done before.

Chairman KING said a moment ago that we can't do everything, we ought

to do something. Well, sometimes the half measures are actually things that make things worse.

What we need to do, and we know that we can get more than this, all we have to do is be willing to walk 100 yards across the Capitol to the other side and negotiate, to start talking with them about a comprehensive solution, something that will secure our borders once and for all.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge that we reject this piecemeal, this rerun bill, and do what is right for the American people. Let's go to conference with the Senate.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Secure Fence Act. House Republicans have been committed to taking action which will strengthen border security now. I have long been committed to this issue. The people of the Fifth District of North Carolina and the people of this country want us to fulfill our constitutional duty to secure our borders.

H.R. 6061, the Secure Fence Act, will address our immediate need to secure our borders. We must address our vulnerability and strengthen our operational controls on our borders through more personnel, greater state-of-the-art technology and surveillance, and additional physical barriers.

We know there is more that needs to be done to deal with the illegal alien issue, but this is definitely the right first step. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the Secure Fence Act.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, every single Member of this House understands that we must secure our Nation's borders. Our Nation is at war, and those who seek to harm our homeland and our people will attempt to exploit our national security vulnerabilities. There is no question, to protect our country, we must know who is in our country.

But rather than work with Democrats to achieve this consensus national security objective, the House Republican majority today is engaging in a cynical charade, I suggest.

This is not a feel-good measure. I agree with most of what my friend from Arizona had to say. This is not a feel-good measure; this is a political measure. This is a political measure, because Americans are rightfully concerned about their borders being secure. They were concerned about that in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and, yes every day up until today. But they know our borders are not secure.

Now, we haven't been in charge of the administration, the Congress or the Senate. Prior to that, if you look at the record, we were more secure at the

borders. If you look at the record, honestly, you will see in terms of the numbers of people coming in, the numbers of people being stopped, the numbers of fines being levied on employers, there was more, not less, in the Clinton administration than there is in the Bush administration.

This is, I suggest to you, to score political points that are going to be, not could be, are going to be demagogued in 30-second ads. I guarantee you they will be used in ads.

The legislation before us solely contains the border fence provisions that were added to the Sensenbrenner immigration reform bill that passed this House last December with overwhelming Republican support.

This is what I call to some degree the "regurgitation process" that we are in so much. We pass a bill, it doesn't go anywhere in the Senate; we pass it again, it doesn't go anywhere in the Senate; we pass it again. Why do we do so? To appeal to the fears and the passions of our people.

Let me just say, building a fence along 700 miles of our southern border is no panacea to our very real national concerns that must be addressed. In my view, it is a political grandstand play that wastes precious time.

Here, in fact, is what the President of the United States, President Bush, said, in May regarding the issue of immigration reform and border security, exactly what the gentleman from Arizona, the Republican chairman of one of our subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. President Bush said, "An immigration reform bill needs to be comprehensive because all elements of this problem must be addressed together or none of them will be solved at all."

We passed a bill. The Senate passed a bill. But we haven't gone to conference. The Republican leadership of the Senate and the House have been stuck in the mud while America knew it had a problem that needed to be solved.

Today, the House Republicans come forward with this rifle-shot bill, this regurgitation of one aspect of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the Republican bill, if it does pass, is going nowhere. It will not be passed. We are wasting our time and the American people's time.

For months now, Republican infighting has prevented this Congress from enacting true immigration reform and protection, and that infighting and unwillingness to compromise on the part of House Republicans is what instigated this narrow bill.

Now, what compels us on this bill? We only have 2½ weeks, 3 weeks to go, the elections are coming, and, very frankly, the Republicans aren't doing too well, and the fear factor is one of their major political plays.

Our Republican friends are desperate for a legislative victory and desperate for political talking points. They recognize that, as Senator SPECTER, the

Republican chairman of the Judiciary Committee, said, "Republicans control both Houses and the White House. If we don't move forward and solve the immigration reform problem and border security, we are not doing our job." Today, we are pretending to do our job.

We are not doing our job. There is a bill in conference, but we are not working on it.

Today, I urge you to support the comprehensive alternative that will be offered by the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee, which deals in a comprehensive way, which is what President Bush suggested we ought to do.

We should be coming together, on a bipartisan basis, on comprehensive legislation that would make us safer by beefing up security along our borders.

That is precisely what the Reyes-Thompson substitute would do—providing the technology, personnel, equipment and infrastructure to monitor and secure every mile of the border every hour of every day.

Instead, House Republicans are engaging in this charade.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Chairman KING also for his hard work on this legislation and for the tremendous efforts of his committee, a committee that this Congress didn't have as a standing committee until a year and a few months ago when he put together, and his colleagues, the first effort congressionally from a permanent committee to look at these important issues.

Our immigration system, Mr. Speaker, is fundamentally flawed. There are millions of workers in the United States who entered the country illegally. Most of those individuals mean no harm to anyone. But any government that cannot account for all those entering and leaving the country, either legally or illegally, must deal seriously and quickly with that problem, especially if the government is at war with an enemy that has publicly stated its efforts to exploit every weakness we have.

As one border sheriff said, standing by me at a news conference earlier this year—a border sheriff, by the way, from the other party, a border sheriff who understood this problem intimately every day. He said, "If you can come across the border for the perfectly understandable reason of a better job, you can come across the border in a way that does much more harm to people than anyone can now anticipate."

□ 1445

As I have been discussing with many of my colleagues in recent days, the House has already had success in securing resources, such as additional Border Patrol agents and vehicles, for immediate border security needs in this

year's current budget, in the supplemental budget, in the budget that we will vote on for next year later this month.

I draw my colleagues' attention to these pictures, pictures of the kind of work that has been going on along the border for months now: Seventy-five miles of fence already completed, 42 miles of fence nearing completion, more Border Control officers, more detention facilities, the return of people who have illegally entered this country to their country for the first time in decades, the assistance of the National Guard. All have led to a more secure border. Today we continue our efforts to undertake emergency measures to ensure that the operational control of the border will continue to improve.

Again, I commend Chairman KING for his leadership. This act, the Secure Fence Act of 2006, will provide over 700 miles of two-layered, reinforced fencing along the border. It will mandate that the Department of Homeland Security maintain operational control over the entire border through a "virtual fence" comprised of electronic surveillance and equipment.

I urge my colleagues to take another step today for greater border security by voting for this act.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding, and I would like to associate myself with the majority whip's comments, as he explained the comprehensive approach that we are arguing for, supporting on the floor of the House.

I raised this earlier, a letter from four governors, two Republicans Governor Schwarzenegger from California and Governor Perry from Texas, the Governor of Arizona and the Governor of New Mexico. They begged this body to enforce a response to immigration by making it a comprehensive response. They begged us to stop holding field hearings that do little but stir up discontent, and they asked this Congress to get to work, and that is what Democrats are saying.

This whole idea of a fence is not a new idea. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that the fence language is in the Senate bill. A simple conference could move a comprehensive response forward, but more importantly, as the Christian Science Monitor said, the fence is only a tactic. It is not a policy. And that is what has happened in this Congress. We failed in the overall policy of addressing the question of immigration. And so we fail our Border Patrol agents, we fail our Customs and Border Protection agents to the extent that they do not have enough resources to have what we call secondary inspections.

So what we are talking about is adding 3,000 new Border Patrol agents, making sure we have 12,000 new agents;

creating 2,000 new Immigration and Customs Enforcement agent positions, having coordination between the northern and southern border. They don't talk to each other. Creating detention beds, having a virtual reality.

Does anybody know what we will do with those individuals that are caught? We are creating 25,000 new detention beds. That is what Democrats are talking about, comprehensive reform.

Then I might suggest that the other aspect of what we are saying is that we must have surveillance. We must have physical infrastructure. We have got to be able to address this question from both sides, not a single one-target issue. This issue before us is dividing and divisive.

We ask that you support the Democratic motion to recommit but, more importantly, that you answer the question, not a tactic, Mr. Speaker, but yet a policy.

And I close by saying read the newspapers. This is a drug fight at the border. Where is the DEA? Where is the FBI? Where is more funding? That is really what we are addressing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6061, the so-called "Secure Fence Act of 2006." I oppose the bill because it neither a serious nor comprehensive measure to secure our nation's borders. It does not provide any specific dollar amounts to build the fence called for in the bill, and nowhere does the bill authorize the additional Border Patrol, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or Customs Inspectors needed to secure the border. In short, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6061 is an election-year gimmick intended to obscure the fact that the majority party has done nothing of consequence in the past 5 years to secure the nation's borders from terrorist attack. It is time to try a new approach; it is time for a new direction. The Democratic Substitute offered by Mr. THOMPSON, the Ranking Member of the Homeland Security Committee, is a large step in the right direction and that is why I find that legislative proposal far superior to H.R. 6061.

Mr. Speaker, building walls and fences is not a panacea and a "one size fits all" approach is a wholly unrealistic and inadequate means of securing the border. Although some communities seem to approve of border fences, many others do not. For instance, Alex Perrone, the Mayor of Calexico, California, is opposed to additional fences. Calexico already has a border crossing as well as a chain-link fence that separates it from its Mexican neighbor. According to Mayor Perrone, the border towns have had a close relationship for more than 100 years, and a massive fence would strain their friendship and symbiotic relationship. Mayor Perrone believes that it would change how our neighbors view us and how we do business.

According to U.S. Customs and Border Protection Commissioner W. Ralph Basham, it does not make sense to construct fences along the border. Stemming the flow of illegal immigration and drug trafficking requires a combination of manpower, technology, and infrastructure, not just barriers.

History shows that even the most substantial walls can be breached. In California, the border fence has been circumvented by tunneling (20 tunnels have been discovered) and

by going around both ends of the fence. This has diverted illegal traffic to more remote areas, but it has not stopped people from crossing. It just makes crossing more dangerous and increases reliance on professional smugglers. The diversion to more desolate areas has exacted a heavy toll in human lives. Moving through the mountains and scorching-hot deserts has resulted in many deaths. The number of persons who have died crossing the border since the fences were constructed is conservatively estimated at 3,600. Mr. Speaker, this is not the way to secure our borders.

#### A NEW DIRECTION ON BORDER SECURITY

What we should do instead is follow the direction charted for us in the Thompson Substitute which, among other things:

1. Establishes Operational Control of All Borders and Ports by requiring the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to develop a comprehensive border security strategy that increases deployment of Border Patrol agents, provides increased surveillance through the use of technology, and ensures the free flow of legitimate travel and trade. It also mandates placement of technology to monitor every mile of the border 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and permits the emergency deployment of up to 1,000 additional U.S. Border Patrol agents for the purpose of patrolling and defending the international border.

2. Provides Significant New Resources Annually to Secure the Border including 3,000 new Border Patrol agents (12,000 total) and a new Border Patrol training facility to expand capacity and an increase in Border Patrol agent and inspector pay from GS-11 to GS-13. There are substantial increases in personnel authorized for Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), U.S. Marshals, U.S. Attorneys, Immigration Judges, Coast Guard, Investigators of Fraudulent Schemes and Documents, Port of entry inspectors, and Canine Enforcement Teams.

3. Provides the Equipment and Resources Needed to Get the Job Done. The Thompson Substitute recognizes the importance of providing the tools needed to secure our borders by authorizing the purchase of additional helicopters, power boats, motor vehicles, portable computers, radio communications, hand-held global positioning system devices, night vision equipment, body armor, and weapons.

4. Ends the "Catch and Release" Practice. To maintain effective control over the border, we must end the Bush Administration's practice of "catch and release." The Substitute makes this possible by authorizing 100,000 additional detentions bed spaces through FY 2010 to assist with the deportation of undocumented individuals. It also increases the number of Detention and Removal Officers by 1,000 through FY 2010 to manage the additional detention facilities and capacity and to enhance the removal process.

5. Promotes International Policies to Deter Illegal Immigration by requiring DHS to report to Congress on the progress of cross-border security agreements signed between Mexico and Canada and the United States, including the Smart Border Accord and the Security Partnership for Prosperity.

6. Orders DHS to Locate Undocumented Immigrants that Have Been Set Free Under the "Catch and Release" program and instructs DHS to locate all 110,000 of those undocumented immigrants and deal with these

cases, deporting those who are deportable or providing other results as required by law.

7. Finally, the Thompson Substitute Directs DHS to:

- Locate and Deport ALL Criminal Aliens;
- Deport ALL Deportable Criminal Aliens Serving Sentences in State or Federal Correctional Facilities;

- Ensure that Local and State Correctional Facilities Cooperate in the Deportation of Criminal Aliens at the End of Criminal Sentences;

- Improve and Strengthen Border and Immigration Enforcement; and

- Return Deported Aliens to Countries that Delay or Deny Return of their Citizens.

Mr. Speaker, were the majority party in this House serious about securing the nation's borders, it would eagerly embrace and adopt the Thompson Substitute. A vote for H.R. 6061 is a vote to continue down the same wrong-headed path that got us into the fix we are in. It is foolish to maintain the status quo and stay the course. It is time for change. It is time for a new direction.

I urge you therefore to vote against H.R. 6061, the "Secure Fence" (but insecure Border) Act.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida, a member of the committee, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Secure Fence Act.

Americans want real border security now.

When I went to the border, the sheriffs along the border, the Border Patrol, they support the House bill, which we have now had to break up.

I heard over the August recess from about 25,000 constituents who almost unanimously opposed the Senate's amnesty bill. They want the border closed before we work on a guest worker program. Yet obviously the Senate refused to consider the whole package that the American public supports. Instead, they decide to play fast and loose with Americans' hard-earned benefits by agreeing to broad amnesty.

Though the Senate put us in a terrible logjam, Chairman KING is showing with this bill that the House is serious about securing our borders.

Listen up, America. We agree that lax border security is a threat. Illegal aliens, criminals, and terrorists alike can too easily cross the gaps too long left unplugged. We are a Nation at war and cannot afford to play Russian roulette with border security.

I obviously urge my colleagues to support the Secure Fence Act, and I would like to briefly quote Robert Frost, who said, "Good fences make good neighbors." And that is really what this is all about.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), who is the author of the original amendment on the wall.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

My colleagues, since 9/11 border enforcement became not an immigration issue primarily but a national security issue primarily. We have to know who is coming across our borders and what they are bringing with them. That requires a fence.

The fence in San Diego works. When we built that fence, we had border gangs robbing, raping, murdering, killing mostly the illegal aliens who came through, preying on those people. We had 300 drug trucks a month ramming across the open border, coming through the sagebrush. We had a border that was out of control. It was the primary smuggling corridor in the world for smuggling of people and narcotics.

We built the double fence. We stopped the drug trucks cold. We stopped the murderers. We stopped the border gangs. And the crime rate in the City of San Diego dropped by more than 50 percent, according to FBI statistics.

The fence works, and moving this fence across the Southwest before the next hot season, before the sun gets to be 110 in the shade, which will happen next summer, getting that first stretch of fence across the hot Arizona desert will save many lives because about 400 people a year die in that desert of dehydration or sunstroke after their smuggler tells them it is just a few miles north to the road and it turns out to be 10 or 20 miles.

The fence works. Let's replicate this fence across the Southwest border so we know who is coming into the country and what they are bringing with them.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, with approximately 12 days left in this legislative 2-year session, we are talking about retreads, an idea that we have already voted on before, an idea that has passed this House but has been rejected by the Senate. That is what we are being left with to tell the people of America what we will do about our broken immigration laws. We are on a path to do nothing once again in this Congress on immigration reform.

This is a bill which says we want to build a fence but provides not a single penny to get the job done on a project that will cost several billion dollars. This is a bill that says we should try to protect our borders but does not one single thing to increase the number of Border Patrol agents, Immigration Enforcement officers, or Customs inspectors that we need to make sure that we protect our borders. This is a bill that says it wants to protect America but does not a single thing about the cargo containers that are coming into this country through all our seaports every day, some 12 million or so cargo con-

tainers per year. We are not doing anything to increase our inspection of them when only one of every 16 of those cargo containers that enter into our country is inspected as we speak.

Mr. Speaker, we are on a path to do nothing. We are in essence moonwalking on the issue of immigration reform once again. Without the Senate's supporting us in the last 12 days of this legislative 2-year session, what can we accomplish? Not a great deal.

There is a bipartisan bill out there that we could vote on today and get this done to the American people's satisfaction, but that is not being proposed today. Instead, we have a prescription to do nothing.

It is time to change. Democrats are ready to sit down with our Republican colleagues and friends and come up with a bipartisan approach that is tough, smart, and comprehensive. Let's get it done.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

At the outset let me commend and thank my friend Mr. THOMPSON from Mississippi both for, I believe, the high quality of debate certainly on his side and hopefully on our side today and also for the cooperation that he has given throughout the time that I have been chairman over the last year as chairman of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. Speaker, there is no issue that is more on the minds of the American people than illegal immigration, and there is one part of the bill that we passed last December which has overwhelming support, and that is the construction of a fence along significant parts of the southern border, operational control of the balance of the border, and also to give Border Patrol agents the authority to stop vehicles, to use force to stop vehicles. But, again, the key part of this is operational control and significant control, including the use of a fence along the southern border.

We can tell the American people we have heard the message. We can tell the American people that we are willing to put aside political correctness and do the right thing.

It is legislation that is humane because it will save lives. It is legislation that will work as it was done in San Diego. It is legislation which would tell the American people that we are serious about combating illegal immigration. And rather than wait for everything, we will do what we can and we will just step up to the plate and get it done.

With that, I urge passage of H.R. 6061.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position on this issue clear. I support the construction of a fence to better secure our border and supported its funding in the Homeland Security Appropriations Act. However, this bill simply doesn't provide for a fence. In a typical example of congressional overreaching and micromanagement, the bill specifies exactly how such a fence will be built

and the precise location of each segment of the fence. We are neither engineers nor construction managers nor do we know the best alignment of such a fence. We should simply direct the experts to construct a fence that accomplishes the objective of preventing illegal immigration and allow it to be built in the most cost-effective manner.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly support H.R. 6061, the Secure Fence Act of 2006. It is critical that we pass this bill to further strengthen our borders.

House Republicans have been forced to pursue this measure separately, because of the earlier opposition by the vast majority of Democrats who opposed that border security bill. Unfortunately, liberals in the Senate weakened the House approved bills so much when they brought it up for consideration in the Senate, that it is more of an amnesty bill than a border security bill. I cannot support any bill that weakens our borders and provides more benefits to illegal aliens, but that is what the Senate bill does.

H.R. 6061 places security first. Border security is national security. According to Customs and Border Patrol, 644 illegal immigrants from countries that sponsor terrorism were apprehended by the Border Patrol in 2005. The fact that these individuals were caught illegally crossing into the U.S. should concern us all. These illegal aliens were from terrorist-sponsoring nations such as Somalia, Iran, Indonesia, and Bangladesh, as well as from other nations, such as Afghanistan, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia, where Islamic militants, such as al-Qaida, operate. We do not know how many succeeded in entering illegally, nor do we know whether they entered with plans to harm Americans.

As further proof that terrorists are attempting to enter our country, the Sheriff of Zapata County, Texas indicated recently that Iranian currency, Arabic military badges, jackets and other clothing are among items that have been discovered along the banks of the Rio Grande River. Some of these attempting to cross the border illegally are from militant Islamic groups that have conducted terrorism on the U.S. A living example is Mahmoud Kourani, the brother of a Lebanese military leader of Hezbollah, an organization clearly identified as a terrorist organization. He was able to come into our country by bribing a Mexican consulate official to obtain a Mexican visa and was smuggled into California. Fortunately, he was later caught.

H.R. 6061 will help shut down the flow of illegal immigration into the United States through utilizing additional physical barriers, fencing, and state-of-the-art technology such as UAVs. It calls for immediate construction of nearly 100 miles of two-layered reinforced fencing along the southwest border. Additionally, it authorizes the Border Patrol to disable vehicles fleeing from Border Patrol agents.

This is a good bill that takes immediate steps to close gaping holes in our border security. Having these fences in place will also enable the Border Patrol to shift agents from those areas to focus on non-fenced areas, better utilizing our agents.

The border fence in San Diego has proven to cut down on illegal entry. It is long overdue that we expand this effective means of securing our border. I am also pleased that the bill requests a study on the necessity and feasibility of constructing a state-of-the-art barrier system along the border with Canada.

I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6061. The consideration of H.R. 6061 is a thinly veiled effort from the Republican Leadership to garner their party's base support in November. H.R. 6061 is a red herring to the real issue that Congress should address: comprehensive immigration reform.

But, as we all know, "Politics . . . (for) all too long, has been concerned with right or left instead of right or wrong." (Richard Armour)

This bill's objectives are not new to this body, in fact, we have already voted on them in the form of H.R. 4377, the very bill which has spurred protests all year long, throughout the country, due to its punitive and unjust nature.

The major initiative in H.R. 6061 is to complete segments of fencing, eventually ensuring 700 miles of it along the southwestern border. One section of this wall would cover practically the whole Arizona-California border.

But Republicans and Democrats know that more fencing along the border is like placing a band-aid on a gaping wound. It will not fix our broken immigration system; it will only serve to move the flow of illegal immigration into more remote and dangerous portions of the country.

In fact, Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff has called fencing "a less efficient way" to address border security than adding more border security officers and yet this Republican led House insists on considering this bill.

Furthermore, building a 2-layer fence through hundreds of miles of public lands and National Parks will have severe ramifications on the delicate ecosystems of the desert. Already in Arizona alone, the Border Patrol estimates that 39 protected or proposed to be protected species are being affected by its operations. This only serves to highlight how this issue has not been viewed through a comprehensive lens.

As people cross our southern border, what kind of image do we want to portray to visitors, our own citizens or their family members? We should not convince ourselves that America is exempt from the images associated with other historic barriers, such as the Berlin Wall, the Maginot Line and the Great Wall of China.

I urge the Republican Leadership of the House of Representatives to address comprehensive reform of the Nation's immigration system so that immigration is legal, safe, orderly, and reflective of the needs of American families, businesses, and national security instead of engaging in this election year political grandstanding.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 6016, the so-called Secure Fence Act.

Once again, we are playing politics instead of debating sound public policy. As we conduct the last legislative business before November's mid-terms, the Republican Leadership has fast-tracked a bill that was introduced just yesterday, in a cynical attempt to mislead the American people, who are demanding real policy, not this political pandering.

Mr. Speaker, we have had plenty of time to have an actual debate on immigration. This rhetoric is simply a way to make it look like Republicans are doing something, when they have squandered opportunities to pass amendments offered by Democrats to help ad-

dress immigration and border security. Over the past four and a half years, Republicans have voted against Democratic amendments that would have added an additional 6,600 Border Patrol agents, 14,000 more beds to detain undocumented people, and 2,700 more ICS agents.

However, these Band-Aid bills that the Republicans keep bringing to the floor do not address the overall wound—our immigration system needs an overhaul from the top down. Arming troops to intimidate the defenseless and building up costly fences will not address the issues of immigration backlogs and more effective border patrol and customs management.

Mr. Speaker, let's address the real issues when it comes to immigration. Let's talk about the work these people are literally dying to come over here to do. Let's talk about why our neighbors would risk their lives and well-being, and that of their children and loved ones, to get across the border for low-paying jobs, in often less-than-desirable work environments—picking from pesticide sprayed crops, or teetering 40 stories high in the air to make the high rises they probably also helped build, look clean.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you—when does the Republican Leadership stop playing politics here, and start working on actual policy; Policy to address the real issues important to Americans—like real immigration reform, like healthcare, education, rebuilding of our Gulf Coast, and ending the bloodshed in Iraq.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation and appreciate Chairman KING's leadership on this issue.

There is perhaps no more important issue than national security. And border security is national security.

So I am pleased that the House Leadership has chosen to bring this bill to a vote. And because our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol say they want to secure the borders, I am hopeful this bill will soon be signed by the President.

The bill requires the Department of Homeland Security to prevent illegal entry into the United States within 18 months of enactment by using technological and physical infrastructures. Many of us have been calling for this for years.

In fact, another provision of H.R. 6061 builds on a concept included in the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act, which I authored as Chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee. In that bill we required fencing to be built near San Diego, California, because of the large number of illegal border crossings.

That fencing was built and it was effective—the number of illegal immigrants crossing in that area fell drastically.

And now illegal immigrants cross the border in places with no barriers or that have only vehicle barriers that are easy to climb.

Over one million people were apprehended crossing the border illegally last year; millions of others crossed illegally but were not apprehended. It is clear that Congress and the Administration need to do everything possible to secure the border.

Anything less leaves our country more vulnerable to terrorist attack and leaves our citizens and legal immigrants paying the welfare, education, healthcare and other costs associated with illegal immigration.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, as a nation founded and built by immigrants, the United States has a proud history of reaching out to foreigners and offering refuge and opportunity to those who seek it. We must, however, find better ways of ensuring that people who wish to enter our country to study, to work, to reunite with family, or to seek refuge—do so legally and maintain their legal status so they can be integrated properly and fully into American society.

The current immigration system is broken and requires comprehensive reform that strengthens border security; bolsters enforcement of immigration laws; recognizes the importance of the immigrant workforce to the U.S. economy; and provides a realistic and practical solution for the twelve million undocumented immigrants residing within our borders. Thus it is not sufficient to focus entirely on border security.

The bill before us today, however, addresses only one aspect of the immigration problem. Studies have shown that a large portion of people living illegally in this country entered through legal, work-based immigration channels, but then failed to renew their status. This shows that a bill focusing primarily on border enforcement will not prevent the increase of immigrants living in this country illegally.

Therefore, while immediate measures need to be taken to address the status of immigrants residing both within and outside our borders, we must work to ensure a responsible measure is produced that secures our border and enforces current law, does not penalize American businesses, and addresses the undocumented workers already living and working in our country.

While I will vote for H.R. 6061 today as a step forward in securing our borders, I continue to hope that this Congress will enact a more thoughtful and long-lasting solution to this most pressing issue.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Border Fence bill. It is yet another instance when the leaders in this Congress chose to ignore the real issues facing Americans and consider legislation this Congress has already passed. I opposed the legislation for the border fence when it was before the House earlier this year and I will oppose it again this time.

There is an awful practice this House has consistently gotten into . . . passing bills with great fanfare, then not funding them. That is what we have done with the 9–11 report . . . the Majority was guilty to pass into law the reforms the 9/11 Commission told us would prevent us from another attack. Then we never funded it.

This border fence is a profoundly bad policy because it won't work. Yet it is already included in 2 bills passed by the House this year. This is election year politics at its worst. The \$2.2 billion it is estimated this bill would cost could fund almost 2,500 new Border Patrol agents for five years, a 22% increase in the force.

This is not about security. You want security? Then you want comprehensive immigration reform. This President and this Congress brought us to this place . . . where our Border Patrol agents routinely release OTMs (Other than Mexicans) into the U.S. population because we have no room to hold them.

It is in the national security interest of this nation to know who is living inside our borders, and we cannot do that without offering them a path to citizenship so they can come out of the shadows and be part of this economy. That's how you secure this country—not with a fence.

As the founder and co-chair of the Congressional Border Caucus, I have been advocating for adequate border security funding before it was a political issue this year. In particular I have been concerned with the lack of detention space, the need for adequate technology for our United States Border Patrol, the need for more immigration judges, prosecutors and customs agents, and the importance of sanctions on employers illegally employing immigrants.

None of those issues are addressed in the bill before us today. Rather, this bill simply authorizes 700 miles of fencing—again—along the 2,000 mile U.S.-Mexico Border.

The Southern part of my district rests along the U.S.-Mexico border and my constituents want real solutions. We have 8–10 million people living in this country that we have absolutely no information on. This is a national security issue. In a post September 11th world, we must comprehensively address immigration and border security. When Congress last addressed immigration reform it was in the late 1980s and they did not do it together—that was a mistake and this Congress is going down that same wrong path.

Border security and immigration enforcement are very serious issues which deserve solemn debate and discussion in Congress. They are not getting them with this controversial political ploy.

Here's a real solution: provide a virtual fence to substantially improve border security and immigration enforcement, as the Reyes-Thompson substitute proposes. Their motion includes provisions to provide the technology, personnel, and equipment needed to monitor and secure every mile of the border 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

I urge the members to vote "no" on the border fence, and to support the Reyes-Thompson substitute.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 6061, the Secure Fence Act. I ask my colleagues: If you were considering illegally immigrating to a country, which would be more likely to keep you out: a fence, or knowing that it would be impossible to get a job in that country?

The answer is obvious. You can't tunnel around unemployment.

So why won't my Republican colleagues support comprehensive immigration reform that would provide a stable, legal workforce and harshly punish employers who hire illegal immigrants? Maybe they don't want to admit that we need some immigrant labor to make this country run. Maybe they don't want to offend their corporate backers who want to continue exploiting illegal immigrants by paying them low wages without benefits. Maybe they think the image of a fence will play well to their base in the upcoming election. Maybe they think it will distract voters from the fact that they haven't done anything to fix our dysfunctional immigration system.

Whatever the ploy, I refuse to go along. This is the United States of America—not the former East Germany. We don't solve problems by building fences. We can be smarter

and we can do better. I urge my colleagues to reject this embarrassing bill.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed today that the House is once again refusing to take up substantive, comprehensive border security and immigration reform legislation which could actually be enacted into law before we adjourn for the year.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely critical that Congress pass meaningful and effective border security and immigration reform. Since the 9/11 terrorist attacks, Congress has taken significant steps to secure our border and prevent another terrorist attack on our soil. Congress created the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and a strong Director of National Intelligence, which constituted the largest reorganization of our law enforcement and intelligence services since World War II.

As a former member of the House Homeland Security Committee, I know that the United States must move rapidly to: establish operational control of all borders and ports; end our "catch and release" practice of aliens apprehended crossing the border illegally; effectively organize the border security agencies within the Department of Homeland Security; and promote international policies to deter illegal immigration.

I support the Motion to Recommit this legislation, which would: create 3,000 new U.S. Border Patrol agent positions; create 2,000 new Immigration and Customs Enforcement agent positions; improve recruitment and retention of border security personnel; create 25,000 new detention beds annually, for a total of 100,000 new detention beds; and develop a comprehensive border surveillance system.

I agree with the former 9/11 Commissioners, who recently issued a report which concluded that Congress and the Administration have much more work to do to make America safer, and gave our government fair to poor grades for our current level of border security. This legislation does nothing to provide the significant new resources called for by the 9/11 Commission report.

I am disappointed, therefore, that the leadership of the House of Representatives has failed to allow the House to take up a comprehensive homeland security and immigration reform bill that addresses the pressing vulnerabilities in our border security. The House has already passed legislation in December which authorizes the creation of new fencing, and the Senate has passed a much broader border security and immigration reform measure. The House leadership should immediately proceed to a conference with the Senate to reconcile these differences. Border security is too important and should be included in legislation that can be quickly enacted into law.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today's house bill H.R. 6061 signals a complete abrogation of responsibility on the part of the House Republican leadership. If they were serious about solving the problems of immigration they would not just introduce another bill that will go nowhere in the Senate. They should instead convene a conference committee. The House passed an immigration bill on December 16th, 2005, and the Senate passed its own version 112 days ago. Instead of moving forward to have a serious discussion to resolve policy differences, they have ground the legislative process to a halt and engaged in acts of political theater.

The most notable of these acts was the series of well-publicized pretend hearings around the country, which were designed to score media points and not resolve differences to move the legislation forward. The introduction and passage of this border security legislation is the latest in a line of political acts. Rather than continue this game, the majority leadership should be willing to move forward in an honest effort to resolve differences and pass a real bill.

Questions of border security and immigration reform should be dealt with in a very serious manner. By choosing to play politics with an important and sensitive issue we are just breeding more cynicism on the part of the American public and making scapegoats out of both undocumented immigrants as well as the many who are here legally and are feeling increasingly uncomfortable because of this polarization.

Fortunately, the American public will have a say in November and have a chance to vote for new leadership and bring an end to the charade surrounding immigration and border security reform.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 6061, the Secure Fences Act of 2006. We need a comprehensive solution for our immigration policy. This measure irresponsibly attempts to gloss over the problem of securing our nation's borders rather than working to finalize negotiations on an all-encompassing solution. It is a transparent political attempt by the majority to coerce voters into believing something is being done, when in fact this measure does not even outline a funding mechanism to put these provisions into action.

According to the Department of Homeland Security, we need a varied approach to the border security problem combining personnel, equipment, technology, and infrastructure improvements. For the estimated cost of the fence proposed in H.R. 6061, we could instead spend \$2 billion to purchase the 35,000 detention beds authorized in the 9/11 Act of 2004 and end the "catch and release" practice. For \$360 million we could hire, train, and equip 2,000 new border control agents also outlined in the 9/11 Act. For \$400 million we could hire 250 port-of-entry inspectors or acquire 1,000 radiation monitors to screen 100 percent of the cargo entering U.S. ports for nuclear material. Spending what will likely be over \$7 billion to build a fence instead of providing the enhanced manpower and technology the Department of Homeland Security has identified as necessary is a misuse of taxpayers' money.

American citizens deserve real solutions. The problem of securing our Nation's borders is not one exclusive to the southern border. The lack of adequate border control enforcement at the northern border presents a serious threat to our national security, particularly in respect to the war on terror. A border security measure calling for nothing more than a study on the northern border is grossly underestimating the threat an unsecured northern border presents to our national security.

My colleague, Representative BENNIE THOMPSON, ranking member on the Homeland Security Committee, presented a responsible alternative to this measure with realistic and possible solutions. His substitute amendment would have provided the funding authorization for the personnel and technology

needed to realistically secure the entire border, not just the Mexican border. Unfortunately, the majority did not allow the substitute bill to be considered and receive an up or down vote on the House floor.

It is for these reasons I strongly encourage my colleagues to reject this measure and devote our time and effort to developing a responsible, comprehensive solution to secure our borders.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman KING and Majority Leader BOEHNER for their leadership in bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor. It cannot be overstated how crucial the need is for America to have secure borders, and this bill is a step in that direction.

For too long we have seen the effects of a porous border. An estimated eight to twelve million undocumented aliens are here illegally in the United States. Last year alone, over a million illegal aliens were apprehended at the border, but the Border Patrol estimates that many more have crossed undetected. In addition, there is evidence to support that Al Qaeda would like to exploit our South West Border. We cannot let this happen.

I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation which is vital to the security of our borders and our Nation.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.R. 6061, the Secure Fence Act. Although I voted to pass this bill to demonstrate my support of strong border enforcement, it is yet another example of the House Republican leadership's piecemeal approach to immigration reform.

America's immigration system is broken, but instead of implementing comprehensive, commonsense solutions such as increasing the number of border agents, funding more detention beds and enforcing current immigration law, House Republicans have chosen to manipulate this issue for partisan political purposes.

In December of 2004 I voted in favor of H.R. 10, the 9/11 Commission Recommendations Implementation Act. This bill, which passed the House on a vote of 282-134 and which the President signed into law on December 17 of that year, authorized Customs and Border Patrol to hire 10,000 new border agents over the next 5 years as well as add 35,000 detention beds to hold illegal immigrants while they are being processed for deportation.

Although the bill passed overwhelmingly, House Republicans refused to back up this important legislation with the necessary funds to implement the provisions. The President, who signed the bill into law, only provided funds for 210 border agents in his fiscal year 2006 budget request.

The United States cannot secure its borders with only physical barriers. We can only achieve effective immigration reform and border security through a combination of consistent enforcement of current immigration law, the addition of the thousands of additional border security personnel that Congress has already authorized, and the implementation of a fair, balanced immigration plan that encourages lawfulness, rewards hard work and safeguards families.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6061, the Secure Fence Act of 2006.

I commend the distinguished majority leader, Mr. BOEHNER and the chairman of the

Committee on Homeland Security, Mr. KING of New York, for moving this bill and for their strong leadership on border security issues.

The last two years, I have toured parts of our nation's southwest border with Mexico. Only after seeing the vastness of the landscape and the nearly invisible line that separates our country from Mexico, did I come to fully appreciate the border security crisis our nation faces today.

I support this bill because it provides for the use of personnel and technology—such as cameras and sensors, satellites and unmanned aerial vehicles—to gain operational control of our borders. These are vital tools for our Border Patrol agents who are the tip of the spear in protecting our country.

Beginning in June of last year, the Homeland Security Subcommittee that I chair began a series of hearings to closely examine the Department's existing border technology program, know as ISIS—the Integrated Surveillance Intelligence System. Unfortunately, our reviews uncovered waste and mismanagement of precious funds provided for border technology.

Last November, the Department of Homeland Security announced the launch of the Secure Border Initiative—the Department's multi-billion dollar effort to integrate technology, infrastructure, and personnel to secure our borders.

While I support the Department's efforts, my subcommittee has already begun to closely monitor this program and we will hold an oversight hearing this fall on the new SBI contract.

In closing, I would like to reiterate my support for this important bill and hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle support this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1002, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. In its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Thompson moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 6061, to the Committee on Homeland Security with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. MONITORING AND SECURING THE UNITED STATES BORDER.**

(a) OPERATIONAL CONTROL OF THE BORDER.—Not later than September 30, 2007, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall obtain operational control over the entire international land and maritime border of the United States.

(b) WORKFORCE ENHANCEMENTS.—In obtaining operational control over the border under subsection (a), the Secretary shall:

(1) Increase—

(A) by not less than 3,000 in each of fiscal years 2007 through 2010 the number of positions for full-time active duty Border Patrol agents; and

(B) by not less than 2,000 in each of fiscal years 2007 through 2010 the number of positions for full-time active duty immigration enforcement agents for work at the border.

(2) Establish northern and southern border coordinators to oversee the security of the border in their respective geographic areas.

(3) Establish a plan to improve the recruitment and retention of border security personnel.

(c) SECURITY ENHANCEMENTS.—In obtaining operational control over the border under subsection (a), the Secretary shall:

(1) Increase by not less than 25,000 in each of fiscal years 2007 through 2010 the number of detention bed spaces.

(2) Establish a plan to reduce the use of fraudulent immigration documents to gain admission to the United States.

(d) SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM.—In obtaining operational control over the border under subsection (a), the Secretary shall:

(1) Develop a surveillance system of the international land and maritime borders of the United States that, when combined with the personnel authorized in subsection (b), and otherwise authorized under law, ensures continuous monitoring of every mile of the United States border on a 24-hour basis, 7 days a week, and is fully interoperable with existing surveillance systems used by the Department of Homeland Security.

(2) Not later than March 1, 2007, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a plan for surveillance over the United States border to the appropriate congressional committees (as defined in section 2 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101)). The plan shall set forth—

(A) an assessment of existing technologies to determine if one technology is better than another, or whether there is a way to combine the capabilities of various detection devices into a single system;

(B) an assessment of how the United States Border Patrol is working, or will work, with the Directorate of Science and Technology to analyze high altitude monitoring technologies (such as unmanned aerial vehicles and tethered aerostat radar systems) for use with land-based monitoring technologies;

(C) a description of how radiation portal monitors will be deployed to ports of entry;

(D) a description of the use of K-9 detection units along the United States border;

(E) a list of any obstacles that may impede full implementation of the deployment plan; and

(F) a detailed estimate of all costs associated with the implementation of the deployment plan.

(d) PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE ENHANCEMENTS.—In obtaining operational control over the United States border under subsection (a), the Secretary shall make physical infrastructure enhancements to prevent unlawful entry by aliens into the United States and facilitate access to the international land and maritime borders by the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, including but not limited to additional checkpoints, all weather access roads, and vehicle barriers, while maintaining the speed of commerce through such points of entry.

(e) OPERATIONAL CONTROL DEFINED.—In this section, the term "operational control" means the prevention of all unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to

carry out this section \$5,290,000,000 for fiscal year 2007, and such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding fiscal year.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today we have heard over and over again from Republicans that good fences make good neighbors. Ironically, that tag line comes from a Robert Frost poem entitled "Mending Wall" that seemingly questions whether a wall in need of repair is worth the effort. Even more ironic in this is the fact that this poem is about mending a fence, something that this bill does not pay for. In fact, H.R. 6061 does not even pay for the fence to be built. If border security is so important, why do my colleagues across the aisle refuse to do it right?

Mr. REYES and I are offering this motion to recommit to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security has the resources and capabilities to address our border security problems. This motion to recommit would secure our borders and protect the American people.

That is not to say there is not more to be done. Congress still must face the issues of comprehensive immigration reform, which Republicans refuse to bring to the floor and have used parliamentary procedure to keep it from discussion today. But if Republicans insist on voting yet again on border security, let's do it right.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the former Border Patrol chief from El Paso, Texas, my colleague SILVESTRE REYES.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This debate today is about whether or not this Congress can afford to micromanage what the United States Customs and Border Protection does on our border. This bill calls for a fence from Calexico to Douglas, from Laredo to Brownsville, from Columbus to El Paso, from Del Rio to Eagle Pass, and a fence in the Tecate area as well.

Our position in this motion to recommit is, instead of micromanaging, let us give the Customs and Border Protection the resources that they need. Let us give them real meaningful legislative support.

Under our bill we give them additional Border Patrol agents.

□ 1500

Under our bill we give them security enhancements, we give them surveillance enhancements, we give them practical infrastructure enhancements.

In other words, what we do is, we provide them the support and ask them, what is it that you need; tell us how you are going to enhance the ability to better monitor the border.

We think that makes sense. We can do much better than micromanage from here. We wouldn't micromanage and tell generals in Iraq or Afghanistan how to fight that war. Why should we do that when we are trying to defend our homeland? We can do much better.

This bill, from my perspective, and from my 26½ years of experience with the Border Patrol, as I walked in, I listened to my colleague from California, Congressman HUNTER. He was talking about a fence that was effective. There are limited areas where fencing is effective, but to put a fence from Columbus to El Paso, a stretch of 88 miles, is ridiculous. It is not only expensive, but the maintenance and the effectiveness is going to be expensive and questionable.

Part of this process has to include common sense.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REYES. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would my colleague answer one question for me.

In the measure that is before us today, is there any money in this measure to build any kind of fence?

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, there is none. There is no money provided in this bill. This is purely a political ploy. This again, unfortunately, proves that the leadership of this House is putting politics ahead of good policy.

We can do better, we must do better, we must work together. Let's vote "no" on the bill itself, vote "yes" on this motion to recommit.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this Democratic motion to recommit solves the problem. We hope we can get support from the majority of the body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, let me just state at the outset, again, the great regard I have for Mr. THOMPSON and also for Mr. REYES. But in that context, I must say that I strongly disagree with their motion to recommit, primarily because even though this is the Secure Fence Act of 2006, the motion to recommit nowhere even mentions the word "fence." And it is significant that they seem unwilling to address this fundamental issue.

We believe on our side and a solid majority of the House of Representatives believed last December, and indeed a majority of the United States Senate believed, that a fence is essential, that a fence is important. And

that is why it was passed last December, that is why the overwhelming majority of the American people support it today, and that is why we are bringing it forward now.

The reality is that comprehensive legislation is not going to be moving. But, again, the American people are crying out; they are demanding that we take action. This is an issue which goes right to the heart of America today, whether you live on the border or whether you live in the north, the Northeast, Northwest, Midwest, it is an issue. As Members went back to their districts this summer, last spring, the one issue that resonated completely was the issue of stopping illegal immigration. One proven way is to build a fence and to get operational control over the entire border.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. REYES. Our motion to recommit includes physical infrastructure enhancements; fencing is part of that. There is fencing in there, there are access roads, there are buildings in there. All of that is included in there.

Mr. KING of New York. If I could reclaim my time, I do believe that it is significant that in a fence act, even though fencing was mentioned in December legislation passed in the House, even though fencing was mentioned in the Senate bill, there is no reference to it, which to me is bowing to political correctness. We are up front about what we are asking for.

Also, I don't believe we should abdicate responsibility to the Department of Homeland Security. We should make it clear what we want, tell them what we want. If they want some variations within there, fine. But we feel so strongly about this, the American people feel so strongly about it, I believe it is essential that we make it loud and clear what we do want.

Now, having said that, on the issue, for instance, of Border Patrol agents, the appropriations bill for fiscal year 2007 will include 1,200 new Border Patrol agents. That will get us up to 14,580, an increase of almost 50 percent over the last several years. There are 1,012 new ICE officers, which will get us up to 11,500. This appears to be about as many as the system can absorb as we train new officers, and we are going forward with that. If more are needed, I pledge to the ranking member we will work to bring that about as we go into the next session.

But it is essential that we do this today to tell the American people that we have gotten the message, that we are willing to take the action that is needed, we are willing to go on the line this is needed, this is essential; and we are calling for it, we are demanding it, we are voting for it. The easiest way to say that we are going to do the right thing on illegal immigration, to stop illegal immigration, and also to be humane and stop the deaths in the desert.

I was at the desert with Speaker HASTERT and Congressman RUSH and Congresswoman MILLER this past July, went to Yuma and Nogales in Arizona, we helicoptered across the desert. To me, a fence is absolutely essential in certain parts of that border. That is what this is about. Let's put aside political correctness, let's have the guts to do the right thing.

I urge defeat of the Democratic motion to recommit and passage of the underlying bill, H.R. 6061.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 6061, if ordered, and the motion to instruct on H.R. 2864.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 193, nays 224, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 445]  
YEAS—193

Abercrombie	Dingell	Larsen (WA)
Ackerman	Doggett	Larson (CT)
Allen	Doyle	Lee
Andrews	Edwards	Levin
Baca	Emanuel	Lewis (GA)
Baird	Engel	Lipinski
Baldwin	Eshoo	Lofgren, Zoe
Becerra	Etheridge	Lowey
Berkley	Farr	Lynch
Berman	Fattah	Maloney
Berry	Filner	Markey
Bishop (GA)	Ford	Matsui
Bishop (NY)	Frank (MA)	McCarthy
Blumenauer	Gonzalez	McCollum (MN)
Boren	Gordon	McDermott
Boucher	Green, Al	McGovern
Boyd	Green, Gene	McIntyre
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	McKinney
Brown (OH)	Harman	McNulty
Brown, Corrine	Hastings (FL)	Meehan
Butterfield	Herseth	Meek (FL)
Capps	Higgins	Meeks (NY)
Capuano	Hinchey	Melancon
Cardin	Hinojosa	Michaud
Cardoza	Holden	Millender-
Carnahan	Holt	McDonald
Carson	Honda	Miller (NC)
Chandler	Hooley	Miller, George
Clay	Hoyer	Mollohan
Clyburn	Inslee	Moore (KS)
Conyers	Israel	Moore (WI)
Cooper	Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)
Costa	Jackson-Lee	Murtha
Costello	(TX)	Nadler
Cramer	Jefferson	Napolitano
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Neal (MA)
Cuellar	Jones (OH)	Oberstar
Cummings	Kanjorski	Obey
Davis (AL)	Kaptur	Olver
Davis (CA)	Kennedy (RI)	Ortiz
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Owens
Davis (TN)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pallone
DeFazio	Kind	Pascarell
DeGette	Kolbe	Pastor
Delahunt	Kucinich	Payne
DeLauro	Langevin	Pelosi
Dicks	Lantos	Peterson (MN)

Pomeroy	Schwartz (PA)
Price (NC)	Scott (GA)
Rahall	Scott (VA)
Rangel	Serrano
Reyes	Shays
Ross	Sherman
Rothman	Skelton
Roybal-Allard	Slaughter
Ruppersberger	Smith (WA)
Rush	Snyder
Ryan (OH)	Solís
Sabo	Spratt
Salazar	Stark
Sánchez, Linda	Stupak
T.	Tanner
Sanchez, Loretta	Tauscher
Sanders	Taylor (MS)
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)
Schiff	Thompson (MS)

NAYS—224

Aderholt	Gibbons
Akin	Gilchrest
Alexander	Gillmor
Bachus	Gingrey
Baker	Gohmert
Barrett (SC)	Goode
Barrow	Goodlatte
Bartlett (MD)	Granger
Barton (TX)	Graves
Bass	Green (WI)
Bean	Gutierrez
Beauprez	Gutknecht
Biggert	Hall
Bilbray	Harris
Bilirakis	Hart
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)
Blackburn	Hayes
Blunt	Hayworth
Boehlert	Hefley
Boehner	Hensarling
Bonilla	Herger
Bonner	Hobson
Bono	Hoekstra
Boozman	Hostettler
Boswell	Hulshof
Boustany	Hunter
Bradley (NH)	Hyde
Brady (TX)	Inglis (SC)
Brown (SC)	Issa
Brown-Waite,	Istook
Ginny	Jindal
Burgess	Johnson (CT)
Burton (IN)	Johnson (IL)
Buyer	Jones (NC)
Calvert	Kelly
Camp (MI)	Kennedy (MN)
Campbell (CA)	King (IA)
Cannon	King (NY)
Cantor	Kingston
Capito	Kirk
Carter	Kline
Castle	Knollenberg
Chabot	Kuhl (NY)
Chocola	LaHood
Coble	Latham
Cole (OK)	LaTourette
Conaway	Leach
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)
Cubin	Lewis (KY)
Davis (KY)	Linder
Davis, Jo Ann	LoBiondo
Davis, Tom	Lucas
Deal (GA)	Lungren, Daniel
Dent	E.
Diaz-Balart, L.	Mack
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo
Doolittle	Marchant
Drake	Marshall
Dreier	Matheson
Duncan	McCaul (TX)
Ehlers	McCotter
Emerson	McCrery
English (PA)	McHenry
Everett	McHugh
Feeney	McKeon
Ferguson	McMorris
Flake	Rodgers
Foley	Mica
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)
Fossella	Miller (MI)
Fox	Miller, Gary
Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)
Frelinghuysen	Murphy
Gallely	Musgrave
Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Gerlach	Neugebauer

Tierney	Towns
Udall (CO)	Udall (NM)
Van Hollen	Velázquez
Viscosky	Wasserman
Waters	Schultz
Watson	Watt
Waxman	Weiner
Wexler	Woolsey
Wu	Wynn

NOT VOTING—15

Case	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Ney
Cleaver	Forbes	Reynolds
Culberson	Jenkins	Ryan (KS)
Davis (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Strickland
Evans	Keller	Westmoreland

□ 1531

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. SODREL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.” +

Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. CONYERS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 283, noes 138, answered “present” 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 446]  
AYES—283

Aderholt	Carter	Goodlatte
Akin	Castle	Gordon
Alexander	Chabot	Granger
Andrews	Chandler	Graves
Bachus	Chocola	Green (WI)
Baird	Coble	Gutknecht
Baker	Cole (OK)	Hall
Barrett (SC)	Cooper	Harris
Barrow	Costa	Hart
Bartlett (MD)	Costello	Hastings (WA)
Barton (TX)	Cramer	Hayes
Bass	Crenshaw	Hayworth
Bean	Cubin	Hefley
Beauprez	Davis (AL)	Hensarling
Berkley	Davis (KY)	Herger
Berry	Davis (TN)	Herseth
Biggert	Davis, Jo Ann	Hobson
Bilbray	Davis, Tom	Hoekstra
Bilirakis	Deal (GA)	Holden
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Hooley
Bishop (NY)	Delahunt	Hostettler
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Hulshof
Blackburn	Doolittle	Hunter
Blunt	Drake	Hyde
Boehlert	Dreier	Inglis (SC)
Boehner	Duncan	Israel
Bonilla	Edwards	Issa
Bonner	Ehlers	Istook
Bono	Emerson	Jenkins
Boozman	English (PA)	Jindal
Boren	Etheridge	Johnson (CT)
Boswell	Everett	Johnson (IL)
Boucher	Feeney	Jones (NC)
Boustany	Ferguson	Kanjorski
Boyd	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Kelly
Bradley (NH)	Flake	Kennedy (MN)
Brady (TX)	Foley	Kildee
Brown (OH)	Ford	Kind
Brown (SC)	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Brown, Corrine	Fossella	King (NY)
Brown-Waite,	Fox	Kingston
Ginny	Frank (MA)	Kirk
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Kline
Burton (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Knollenberg
Buyer	Gallely	Kuhl (NY)
Calvert	Garrett (NJ)	LaHood
Camp (MI)	Gerlach	Latham
Campbell (CA)	Gibbons	LaTourette
Cannon	Gilchrest	Leach
Cantor	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Caputo	Gingrey	Lewis (KY)
Capuano	Gohmert	Linder
Cardoza	Goode	Lipinski

LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marshall  
Matheson  
McCarthy  
McCaul (TX)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Melancon  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Osborne  
Otter  
Oxley  
Pascrell

NOES—138

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Becerra  
Berman  
Blumenauer  
Brady (PA)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Cardin  
Carnahan  
Carson  
Clay  
Clyburn  
Conaway  
Conyers  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummins  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Higgins  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Holt

Honda  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (OH)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kilpatrick (MI)  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
T.  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCullum (MN)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Michaud  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller, George  
Moore (WI)  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pastor

Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skelton  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Sodrel  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberti  
Turner  
Upton  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Young (FL)

Payne  
Pelosi  
Price (NC)  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz (PA)  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Slaughter  
Snyder  
Solis  
Stark  
Tauscher  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—10  
Evans  
Forbes  
Johnson, Sam  
Keller  
Ney  
Strickland

□ 1541

Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. EMANUEL changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. RAHALL changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated For:

Mr. FORBES, Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present at the vote for H.R. 6061, the Secure Fence Act of 2006. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on final passage.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2864, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2005

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. MELANCON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 2864 offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MELANCON) on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 340, nays 79, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 447]  
YEAS—340

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bass  
Bean  
Beauprez  
Berry  
Berman  
Berkley  
Bishop  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis (TN)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Boyd  
Bradley (NH)  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown, Corrine

Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Herseth  
Higgins  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hyde  
Inslee  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
Jindal  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kelly  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick (MI)  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kirk  
Kline  
Knollenberg  
Kucinich  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson

NAYS—79

Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Billray  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Bonilla  
Bonner  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (SC)  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Coble  
Conaway  
Cubin  
Deal (GA)  
Dreier  
Flake  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Harris  
Hart  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hensarling  
Hobson  
Hostettler  
Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Istook  
King (IA)  
Kingston  
Linder

Sabo  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz (PA)  
Schwarz (MI)  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Simmons  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Sodrel  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Kaptur