

didn't want to push him. I wanted his first hunting season to be something he'd anticipate and remember.

So I started asking experienced hunting and shooting friends about how they would solve my problem. What amazed me was how wide-ranging the answers were. Some said to get him some sort of "oh-my-gosh" magnum and let him learn to shoot and pack it. Others advised that a well-placed head shot on elk with a .223 would always take it down. And I heard everything in between.

I finally decided to narrow the field by choosing what I determined was the minimum, fully elk-capable caliber. Admitting a bias for .30-caliber cartridges, I finally chose the .308 Win. for Ty. I found that if I looked hard enough I could find a Remington 700 in a short-stocked, short-barreled youth configuration, and with a synthetic stock. I had a local dealer order it for me and it arrived a few days before Christmas, in just enough time to slap a 6X Weaver scope on it. It did look nice under the tree, and the look on Ty's face when he opened it promised a great hunting season.

Still, there was a lot of work to be done. I belong to the school that believes a person should put a lot of ammo through the gun they'll hunt with before they go hunting. I had hopes of Ty being able to put several hundred rounds through his new rifle before hunting season, but because recoil had been one of my original concerns, and since this youth model was lightweight, there was no way I was going to subject Ty to several hundred rounds of full-house 308.

I ended up handloading some light "plinker" rounds that Ty liked shooting immediately. We practiced until he could place five-round groups of this ammo into a two-inch circle at 100 yards. Spring came around and Ty passed the Montana Hunter Education class, even becoming a junior instructor—quite proud to be the only 11 year-old with that status. A prairie dog shoot later in June allowed him lots of shooting, the two of us going through several gun changes and some 2,000 rounds of ammo in one afternoon alone.

Between the prairie dog shoot and other practice at the Deer Creek Range near Missoula, Ty consumed almost 400 rounds of his light practice ammo over the summer. The next project was selecting the right ammo for his elk hunt. I tested several kinds, but the bullet I finally selected as the best compromise of weight, shape, cost, and performance was the Hornady 165-grain soft-point boat-tail. Backed by Varget powder in Lake City brass, the bullet would run out of Ty's barrel at about 2800 fps and group five shots into about 1¼ inches at 100 yards. I should say that this ammo makes Ty's light rifle kick pretty good—he has never fired a round of it. He's carrying it elk hunting now, and I've promised him that when he shoots at an elk, he won't notice the kick at all.

Ty is 12 now, and though it is currently the second week of elk season in Montana, school has limited the youngster to only two days afield so far. And though we haven't seen any elk, there's lots of good hunting within a two-hour drive of where we live. Soon, we hope to be able to put to the final test, a kid's first elk rifle.

TRACKING FOREIGN VISITORS AND STUDENTS IS A PROTECTION FOR ALL

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 2001

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member wishes to commend to his colleagues the October 1, 2001, and the October 2, 2001, editorials from the Omaha World-Herald entitled "Loosey-Goosey Borders" and "Loosey-Goosey Borders: II." For many years, this Member has argued that it is critical to U.S. security interests to have our government energetically reform and effectively implement visa control for foreign nationals and to screen those foreign nationals who are seeking to be accepted as legitimate refugees or immigrants. As the October 1st editorial notes, "U.S. law enforcement agencies should know who is entering the country and where they are supposed to be." Sadly, it took the horrific terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, for the American public to fully understand why that is the case.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Oct. 1, 2001]

LOOSEY-GOOSEY BORDERS

One of the greatest challenges facing the United States now is how to maintain an open, free society while protecting the country from terrorists who exploit that freedom. A key element of the question is the millions of foreigners who enter the United States each year, some of whom have had terror, not touring, on their mind.

In 1998, about 30 million people entered the country on visitors' visas, a form that is relatively easy to obtain, sometimes after only a few routine questions. Then this is what happens: nothing. Once these visitors arrive, the U.S. government washes its hands of them. They are never checked on unless they commit a felony of some kind. In practice, they are free to go home or disappear into American life, as they wish.

Many of them never leave. One estimate suggests that half of the 7 million illegal aliens in this country didn't enter illegally but simply overstayed their visas. And the Immigration and Naturalization Service has no idea who they are, where they could be or what they might be up to. Officials say that 16 of the 19 hijacker-terrorists entered the United States on temporary visas as students, workers or tourists.

U.S. borders aren't simply porous, said Mark Krikorian, director of the Center for Immigration studies in Washington; they are, to all intents and purposes, wide open. That is crazy. An open border is an open invitation to terrorism.

First, the painfully obvious. The INS should keep track of all who visit the United States, where they are and when they are required to leave. The act of not leaving should trigger a reaction from INS enforcement officers—perhaps a letter of inquiry, perhaps arrest, depending on the potential threat.

Keeping track of visitors will take a computer system, a reform mandated by Congress in 1996 but abandoned when border states objected to the delays and loss of business. It will mean time lost and, in all likelihood, traffic jams, particularly at busy U.S.-Mexican and U.S.-Canadian borders. But it is vital to check foreign visitors both in and out. Not to do so invites what has happened.

Protecting the United States may require that the embassy and consulate staffs where visas are issued be better trained or enlarged. They are the first line of defense

against attack, and they should act positively, checking backgrounds and criminal records of would-be tourists, particularly if the applicant is from a problematic country such as Iran.

The changes needed might also involve modifications in the visa waiver program, by which nationals in 29 friendly countries such as Great Britain and Norway are admitted to this country without the formality of a visa. At the very least, these visitors, too, should be checked in and out via computer. Because the criminal world so highly values stolen or forged passports from waiver countries, more stringent security provisions might be needed.

Foreign visitors shouldn't look at increased scrutiny or security as an accusation or violation of rights. They are, after all, guests, here on sufferance and required to obey the law. Few other countries have been as wide open as the United States in the past, and even fewer are likely to be in the future.

U.S. law enforcement agencies should know who is entering the country and where they are supposed to be. These organizations can then judge potential risks and problems and handle them as the law allows. When the INS keeps closer track of visitors, it isn't intended to harass but to identify, not to accuse but to protect. It's not xenophobia. It's self-defense.

And self-defense, within the context of freedom, has suddenly become of vital importance.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Oct. 2, 2001]

LOOSEY-GOOSEY BORDERS: II

As the United States moves to take control of its borders and keep track of foreign nationals entering the country, it is important to change the way student visas are handled, too.

About half a million foreign students enter the country every year, some headed for colleges or universities, some for vocational or language schools. The vast majority of them actually attend school.

Some, however, do not, and disappear into the population. In that category was one Hani Hanjour, who was supposed to study English at Holy Names College in Oakland, Calif. Ten months after he skipped out on his student visa, he and companions hijacked the jet that crashed into the Pentagon.

Hard as it might be to understand, schools are not required to notify the Immigration and Naturalization Service if foreign students fail to appear or drop out. Five years ago, Congress ordered the INS to begin tracking foreign visitors. That was to include students starting in 2003. But in August, a bill was introduced to end the system before it began.

The system would have issued cards with magnetic strips to students. The strips, containing personal information, would have to be swiped through a reader when the student entered the country and the cards would have to be shown to school authorities when they arrived on campus.

Then, campus officials would be required to report changes of address and other information concerning international students.

More than a hundred schools spoke out against the INS plan, as did NAFSA/Association of International Educators, a lobbying group. Many university officials worried that any identification system would discourage international students.

Perhaps it would, but it shouldn't. It is not unreasonable and it should not be intimidating to require foreign students not only to be what they claim—students—but to allow the immigration service to keep track of their whereabouts.

The education lobbying group has seen the light and changed its position. Last month, after the attacks on New York City and Washington, D.C., its spokesman said, "The time for debate on this matter is over, and the time to devise a considered response to terrorism has arrived."

That is a commendable turn-around, one that college and university leaders would do well to emulate. The idea is not to punish foreign students or inconvenience their schools but to protect Americans from terrorists who might enter the country under false pretenses.

The system needs to be put in place yesterday.

CHAIRMAN OF CITIGROUP, SANDY WEILL, GIVES A HELPING HAND

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 2001

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the insightful article from the October 1 edition of USA Today that reflects the philanthropic efforts of corporate America to assist the victims of September 11.

The article illustrates the scope of the corporate philanthropy taking place to help my constituents and all those affected by the attacks. Leading the charge is Citigroup which has set up a \$15 million education fund for all the victim's children. CEO and Chairman of Citigroup, Sandy Weill described the mindset of America's corporations, as he talked about the company's employees "not just giving their money but their time and talents" to help the victims.

As we struggle with the grief and new realities before us, I ask that we also look to the compassionate efforts of the individuals and corporate America as a symbol of what makes America great. The efforts of Citigroup and others are not going unnoticed in Washington or across the country and I would ask you all to join me in thanking those who have helped during this time of great need.

[From USA Today, Oct. 1, 2001]

CORPORATIONS SETTING UP OWN CHARITABLE FOUNDATIONS

(By Julie Appleby)

Restaurateur Waldy Malouf never thought he'd be running a charity. But he has joined a growing number of executives who are doing just that.

In coming weeks, he'll be helping decide how to dole out millions of dollars to fami-

lies devastated by the attack on the World Trade Center.

And he's not alone.

Some big-name corporations, and a few trade associations, have created their own multimillion-dollar relief funds, determining how, where and to whom to give the money.

As the events of the past weeks have been unprecedented, so, too, are these efforts: Corporations don't generally give direct financial aid to victims.

"We had to take care of our own," says Malouf, co-owner of Beacon Restaurants, which lost 76 employees in the Windows of the World of the World Restaurant in Tower One at the World Trade Center.

He and his business partners spent a whirlwind week creating the Windows of Hope Family Relief Fund, aimed at helping the families of food-service workers killed in the collapse of the towers. Without such a fund, Malouf feared that bus boys and waitresses would be overlooked in the outpouring of support for other victims.

Such efforts are generally being overseen by top business executives, many of whom have served on the boards of charitable organizations.

Philanthropy experts caution that this planning to give direct aid—rather than funneling money through private foundations or established relief groups—face challenges.

"The danger is that companies may be amateurs in running effective relief funds," says Kirk Hanson, who has studied philanthropy for 20 years and heads an ethics center at Santa Clara University in California. "They will need to look to experts in relief to ensure the money is spent wisely."

Who, for example, will oversee the funds and provide an accounting of the monies spent? (Funds that obtain charity tax status will report itemized details to the IRS, but not all are seeking that status.)

Which victims will get money and how much? Will the money go only to families of those who died, or could the definition grow to include the injured or the unemployed?

Publicly traded companies may face opposition from shareholders about how money is distributed.

"This is one of the thorniest problems of disaster relief," Hanson says. "Any charity engaged in direct aid has to struggle with the definition of who is needy."

Which is what Malouf and other firms wrestled with last week.

"There are a lot of legal and moral and ethical issues that come up that you have to grapple with," says Malouf.

One example: Three carpenters were working in the Windows on the World Restaurant when the attacks occurred. All three died.

The relief fund, however, is designed to help restaurant workers. Would the carpenters' families be eligible?

"In that case, we know the families, and we probably will help. They might not have been washing dishes, but they were working on the restaurant," Malouf says.

Malouf and other executives say they are either hiring administrators to run the funds or relying on to executives, many of whom have served charitable organizations.

"It's more difficult (to run a fund), but we've always had a philosophy that we have talented executives who can be helpful in working on a lot of things other than business, giving not just of their money, but of their time and talents," says Sandy Weill, chairman and CEO of Citigroup.

His company, which already supports charities and student programs through its foundation, plans to run its own \$15 million scholarship fund to help children who lost parents in any of the attacks, including the one on the Pentagon.

"We'll sit down with the appropriate people and come up with (eligibility) criteria that will be simple, that people can understand," Weill says. "I don't think it's rocket science."

Many of the companies that have established funds have earmarked them for specific purposes.

Morgan Stanley has set aside \$10 million to aid the families of its own employees who were injured, missing or killed in the World Trade Center, along with families of missing rescue workers.

The National Association of Realtors has raised \$2.5 million to help the families of victims from any of the attacks make rent or mortgage payments.

"The money is targeted for families who have lost a breadwinner as a result of the tragedy and might be in jeopardy of missing housing payments, spokesman Steve Cook says.

Money will be given out on a first-come, first-served basis in Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia and Washington, D.C.

At DaimlerChrysler, executives are pondering whether they want to turn over their \$10 million children support fund to an outside organization to manage.

"You need people who have expertise in the endeavor," spokesman Dennis Fitzgibbons says.

At Alcoa, where a \$2 million relief fund has been set up, executives won't rush to fund anything immediately, preferring to wait to see where the greatest needs are, spokesman Bob Slagle says.

"We believe we are capable of sorting through some of these difficult issues and really making a difference," Slagle says.