would-be terrorist. We should be careful not to do something just to do something, even something harmful.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that some big mistakes could be made in pursuit of our enemies if we do not proceed with great caution, wisdom, and deliberation. Action is necessary. Inaction is unacceptable.

No doubt others recognize the difficulties in targeting such an elusive enemy. This is why the principle behind the marque and reprisal must be given serious consideration. In retaliation, an unintended consequence of a policy of wanton destruction without benefit to our cause could result in the overthrow of moderate Arab nations by the radicals that support bin Laden. This will not serve our interests and will surely exacerbate the threat to all Americans.

As we search for a solution to the mess we are in, it behooves us to look at how John F. Kennedy handled the Cuban crisis in 1962. Personally, that crisis led to a 5-year tour in the U.S. Air Force for me. As horrible and dangerous as the present crisis is, those of us that held our breath during some very tense moments that October realized we were on the brink of a worldwide nuclear holocaust.

That crisis represented the greatest potential danger to the world in all of human history. President Kennedy held firm and stood up to the Soviets as he should have and the confrontation was resolved. What was not known at the time was the reassessment of our foreign policy that placed nuclear missiles in the Soviet's back yard in Turkey. These missiles were quietly removed a few months later, and the world became a safer place in which to live. Eventually we won the Cold War without starting World War III.

Our enemy today, as formidable as he is, cannot compare to the armed might of the Soviet Union in the fall of 1962. Wisdom and caution on Kennedy's part in dealing with the crisis was indeed a profile in courage. But his courage was not only in his standing up to the Soviets, but his willingness to reexamine our nuclear missile presence in Turkey which, if it had been known at the time, would have been condemned as an act of cowardice.

President Bush now has the challenge to do something equally courageous and wise. This is necessary if we expect to avert a catastrophic World War III. When the President asks for patience as he and his advisors deliberate seek a course of action, all Americans should surely heed this request.

Mr. Speaker, I support President Bush and voted for the authority and the money to carry out his responsibilities to defend this country. But the degree of death and destruction and chances of escalation must be carefully taken into consideration.

It is, though, only with sadness that I reflect on the support, the dollars, the troops, the weapons and training provided by U.S. taxpayers that are now being used against us. Logic should tell us that intervening in all the wars of the world has been detrimental to our own self-interest and should be reconsidered.

The efforts of a small minority in Congress to avoid this confrontation by voting for the foreign policy of George Washington, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson and all the 19th century Presidents went unheeded.

The unwise policy of supporting so many militants who later became our armed enemies makes little sense, whether it is bin Laden or Saddam Hussein. A policy designed to protect America is wise and frugal, and hopefully it will once again be considered.

George Washington, as we all know, advised strongly, as he departed his Presidency, that we should avoid all entangling alliances with foreign nations.

The call for a noninterventionist policy over the past year has fallen on deaf ears. My suggestions made here today will probably meet the same fate. Yet, if truth is spoken, ignoring it will not negate it. In that case, something will be lost. But if something is said to be true and it is not and it is ignored, nothing is lost. My goal is to contribute to the truth and to the security of this Nation.

What I have said today is different from what is said and accepted in Washington as conventional wisdom, but it is not in conflict with our history and our Constitution. It is a policy that has, whenever tried, generated more peace and prosperity than any other policy for dealing with foreign affairs. The authors of the Constitution clearly understood this. Since the light of truth shines brightest in the darkness of evil and ignorance, we should all strive to shine that light.

EVERY WEAPON IN ARSENAL NEEDED TO DEFEAT TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, during my comments tonight, I will refer to one phrase that I think is important to place on the minds of the people of this country, and that phrase is this: ''The defense of the Nation starts with the defense of our borders.''

Mr. Speaker, we have begun a massive buildup of forces as a result of the events of September 11. Indeed, the President has issued a call for units of the National Guard to be activated. Troops are being dispatched, planes, ships, all over the world. The President has issued an executive order to restrict the flow of capital so that we will, hopefully, inhibit the ability of terrorists around the world in that particular capacity.

We have done a great deal to try to figure out how to make it more difficult for hijackers to take over planes. We have increased security at all of our airports. Recently, we ordered that even crop dusters would not be allowed to fly for fear that some sort of chemical agent might be introduced into the atmosphere. We have increased security around water facilities and power plants throughout the Nation for fear of some sort of, again, biological or chemical attack that might come in that direction.

We have, indeed, created a brand-new, or will create a brand-new, cabinet level agency for homeland defense that I hope will do what is desperately needed to be done, and that is to coordinate the activities of all of our agencies that are designed to provide some sort of defense for this Nation.

The President and the Secretary of State have been extremely successful up to this point in time in creating some sort of international coalition to help fight terrorism everywhere that it rears its ugly head. We have even talked about trying to tighten up on visas, visas that are given to people who might have backgrounds that are suspicious, have terrorist connections, not allow them to either enter the United States, or if they are here, to be held perhaps even indefinitely.

All of these things are good, and I totally support them. They are all important. We were told today by a general in the Israeli Army at a briefing that was available to any Member, it was not classified, but it was, indeed, a fascinating discussion. We were told about the Israeli experience in dealing with terrorists for now well over 2 or 3 decades.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that this particular general said was that it is imperative that we think about terrorism as a phenomenon, as a system. What he meant by that is it is global in nature. It is not anything like we have ever dealt with before; and, of course, we have heard many, many people, including the President of the United States in his address to the Nation just last week in a very articulate and incredibly compelling address to the Nation say it is a brand-new world in a way, and a brand-new kind of war. The Israeli general that gave the briefing today was talking about the fact that low-intensity warfare, a minimum of power, it is not an appropriate approach.

Terrorism, he said, requires maximum power to be applied against it in order to be successful; and that because it is a systemic problem, you must treat it systematically or holistically, treat it in every way you can. Attack the problem every way you possibly can.

He suggested that we should look at terrorism as a cancer; and that just like any other cancer that invades the body, if it is attacked in a piecemeal way, even though several different kinds of approaches may be tried, it

will eventually gain control and overcome the body, the host body. Therefore, it must be attacked with every single thing in one's arsenal.

Mr. Speaker, the President said from that podium just a few nights ago essentially the same thing. He said, we will use every weapon in our arsenal to defeat terrorism. Every weapon in the arsenal.

□ 2145

I for one was heartened to hear that, because that is exactly what we are going to have to do.

I refer again, however, to the phrase that I opened these comments with, that the defense of the Nation begins with the defense of our borders. It begins with our ability, our desire, the necessity of defending our borders, of making sure that we as a Nation, to the greatest extent possible, are able to determine who comes into the United States and for how long and when they leave, and how many will come into the United States. This is what is referred to as an immigration policy. It is something we do not really have. It is something we have abandoned over the course of the last couple of decades.

And we have abandoned this policy, we have abandoned our borders, we have succumbed to the siren song of open borders, a phrase used so often by organizations like the Wall Street Journal and the Cato Institute and others, libertarians and liberals looking for votes from the massive number of immigrants that would come into the country and perhaps become part of a voting bloc that they could then take advantage of.

For all of these reasons, we have abandoned our borders for all intents and purposes. They do not really exist. No one believes that they are there in reality. They may be there on maps, but they are not there in reality, because if a border is important for determining who comes, how many and how long, then, of course, America is just this place on a map, not distinguishable by lines that separate it from any other country on the globe. That has been the desire of a great many people. Many industrialists, many members of the, quote, elitist establishment in this country, many of the biggest, the Fortune 500 companies, other individuals who employ cheap labor, illegal immigrants, because, of course, they can be hired cheaply, they can work cheaply, and they are frightened to turn their employers in for ill treatment, all of those people have formed a bloc over the course of the last couple of decades to destroy our borders.

And, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that one part of the result that we witnessed that came from this process, of the destruction of our borders, were the events of September 11. Every single person that we now know that was involved in the hijackings, in the suicide bombing, that is, turning the plane into a bomb and crashing it into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and the other attempt that was made outside Pittsburgh, and I am told, I understand that now they believe that there were several other planes, there was a great possibility that the same thing had been planned but they were not, for whatever reason, able to accomplish it, thank God, accomplish their goals, but every one of the people that we know that were on those planes that took them over, that killed the airplane crew, members of the crew, that took over and crashed them, every one of them was here on some sort of visa or were here illegally, and even the ones that were here on visas, we are not really sure exactly what kind.

We have written now, my office and other Members have asked the INS for clarification about the status of each one of these people. They sent me back a list of the names of every single one of them and the status of only two, two, they said, that were here on visas, one with a visa that had expired, essentially illegally.

It is now my understanding that every one of them were here on some sort of visa, but many of them were, in fact, here illegally because they had overstayed their visa or they were not living up to the obligations of the visa. But we did not care. Or we did not know. Or if we knew, we simply paid no attention to that particular problem, because, Mr. Speaker, we do not pay attention to the fact that there are millions, I say millions, of people in the United States who are here illegally. You know it. I know it. Everyone hearing my words knows that there are millions of people in the United States who are here illegally.

Now, I do not for a moment suggest that the vast majority of those people, or even a small percentage factually are involved with terrorist activity or are people that we should be concerned about because of the threat to the Nation. At least not a direct threat to the Nation. But I do suggest to you that it is the philosophy, it is the attitude that we ignore millions of people here illegally, millions coming across the border illegally, that makes it impossible for us to then go back and say, well, but these folks, this particular group, maybe they are Middle Eastern by ethnicity and heritage and, therefore, we should watch them more carefully. Well, that is not going to happen. I mean, that is, of course, profiling. We would not ever want to do a thing like that. You cannot segregate out these particular portions of the population for a different kind of treatment.

If they are here illegally, they should be sent home. I do not care where they are from. It does not matter to me if they are from Mexico, or Egypt, or Lebanon, or Brazil, or Bolivia. It does not matter. It is of no consequence, the place of origination. The fact is they are here illegally and we as a Nation have a duty for the protection of our system of government, and, indeed, for our very lives, we have a duty to secure our borders, because, again, I will say, Mr. Speaker, that the defense of the Nation begins at our borders.

We can do all of the things that I have outlined at the beginning of this presentation, and I agree with every single one of them. You notice that I left to the end any discussion about tightening up on visas, because the only thing I have seen so far as part of the administration's proposal to deal with terrorism that deals specifically with the issue of immigration is this aspect of tightening up on visas.

Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to you that although I completely and totally support that particular provision, the horses are out of the barn at that point in time. The people are already here. The task we have ahead of us, the task we must face, is the one that would prevent them from getting here. It is defending our borders. It is defending the sovereignty of this Nation. That is what we seek.

Mr. Speaker, it has been many, many hours that I have spent almost right here, at various podiums on this floor, cajoling, arguing, using all of the effort that I can muster, any degree of articulation of the issue that I can possibly develop over the past several months, long before this event, by the way, of September 11, I have come to this floor and asked my colleagues to please join me in an attempt to make our borders secure. It has been a relatively lonely fight. I have been assailed by some of my colleagues.

I have certainly been assailed by members of the general public, e-mails and letters and calls and that sort of thing. I have been called a racist, I have been called xenophobic, I have been called a lot of things that I certainly do not want to repeat on the floor of the House. But I persist, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that this is one of the most important, one of the most significant issues with which this body can deal, and, that is, the determination of our own system of government, how long our system will survive. I really believe it has that kind of significance.

There are literally hundreds of reasons that I can bring forward to argue my case for lower immigration, for tightening our borders, for controlling our borders, I should say, for determining who comes in, and they certainly deal with just the simple issues of population growth, the pressure it puts on the infrastructure of the United States, of every community in the country, the costs that are involved, the economic costs involved, the cultural issues that come up when we balkanize America with different languages and different ideas about government and philosophies of life. All of those things we can confront. And I certainly have done so from this floor. But they all pale in comparison to the importance of this issue that was brought home to us all in the most stark of manners, in the most horrendous proof I can possibly offer.

What can I say, Mr. Speaker, what can I possibly say on the floor of this House that could ever compare in terms of encouragement to do something about the control of immigration? What can I say or do that could ever compare with the events of September 11?

Mr. Speaker, if that does not help my colleagues come to some conclusion about the need to do something about immigration, I do not know what else will. And there will still be libertarians who come to the floor as my dear friend did just before me here, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), whom I respect immensely, on almost every issue I have been supportive of what he has tried to do, but I must admit I disagree with him wholeheartedly on the issue of, especially immigration controls and our policy now, the policy we should now adopt vis-a-vis the terrorists that reside in Afghanistan and, indeed, around the world.

But there will still be voices like the gentleman from Texas. There will still be voices like many of my colleagues on the other side tonight who fought against an amendment which, I might add, passed overwhelmingly, and which I was just amazed to see the number. It was an amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) that simply said that the Armed Forces of the United States could be employed, if requested by the Attorney General, could be employed in the protection of our borders.

Now, there were individuals who stood up and argued that, and there were 180, if I remember correctly, 180 some people who voted against it. Even in light of what has happened, 100 and some of our colleagues, I do not recall the exact number now, but well over 100 said, No, I don't think I would use the military on the border to protect our sovereignty, to protect our Nation.

And so you say to yourself, Mr. Speaker, my God, what does it take? What does it take? How many people in this country have to lose their lives before we come to the understanding that the defense of the Nation begins at the defense of our borders? All the other things we talk about are important, but, Mr. Speaker, nothing surpasses the importance of our borders and their integrity. That is why I will continue to raise this issue, as long as I have breath, anyway, and as long as I am a Member of this body, because I can think of nothing more important.

There are hundreds of issues with which I have been involved, I am confronted by them as you are, and every other Member of our body here every single day, important issues, and I say, I have got to do something about that, and we should do something about that. You want to go off in about 20 different directions, but always I am pulled back to this, always I am grounded in this particular issue, because everything begins to come back to it, everything I hope to accomplish for the Nation, everything I hope to add my voice in defense of depends upon our ability as a Nation to control our own destiny. And to control our own destiny, we must control our own borders.

It is a world, Mr. Speaker, that has changed so dramatically in so many ways. There are intellectuals, I think, perhaps I would refer to them as, a famous old reference to them, perhaps pseudo-intellectuals, effete snobs, there were a couple of other things that I can remember, people who pride themselves on talking about a brand new day dawning in the world, that it is really a world that should not be separated by borders, that there is really no purpose for borders anymore. Now, these things we did hear before September 11. I must admit, Mr. Speaker, I have not heard as much of that recently.

□ 2200

But we will begin as soon as things calm down a little bit. I assure you there will be; they will be out in force. They will be saying things like, we really do not need to defend our borders so much, so long as we go out there and we make sure we attack terrorism in other lands, that we root them out, as we have heard often. I am all for doing that, do not get me wrong. Draining the swamp, all those other things, absolutely need to be done. So they will suggest if we can just do that, somehow we do not have to have borders.

I refer back to now the presentation and the little briefing that we had today by this particular Israeli general, who again talked about the systemic approach to this; that you had to use every single thing in your arsenal. That it was not enough just to go out and find them, it had to be done, you will have to go outside of your borders and find the people who are trying to kill you, and you will have to kill them. You will have to disrupt their organization.

You will have to do all of that, Mr. Speaker, but you recognize, and we all recognize, the fact that Israel has another aspect of that core policy, that holistic approach, and that is they defend their borders. They defend their borders in every way they possibly can, using every kind of technology, low-tech and high-tech, barbed wire to electronic surveillance, they use it all to defend their borders.

Now, they have an easier task than we would have, it is true, a smaller land mass, a more homogenous population. All of those things are true. It does not, however, excuse us from the responsibility.

What more are we to do here? What else is more important for us, Mr. Speaker? Is it the Department of Health and Human Services? Is it the Department of Natural Resources? Is it the Department of Transportation? I know I would encourage you to think about that one, Mr. Speaker. Is it the variety of things we do out there, that this Federal Government does, that we spend hundreds of billions of dollars every single year doing? Are all of those things as important as the protection of the life and property of the citizens of this Nation?

No, sir. In my opinion, my humble opinion, they all pale in comparison. I mean from HHS-Labor, which is a thing we are going to be voting on here, and we will dump hundreds of billions of dollars on that thing to get it out the door, and it is more important, yes, even than the Department of Education. I know, there I have said it. The defense of the Nation, the security of the people of the Nation, yes, it is, Mr. Speaker, it is more important than all of the other things we do.

So I am not opposed to efforts to increase, in fact, I heartily support all efforts to increase the appropriations for our military. As I say, it is the most important thing we can do. But how can we ignore in that process, how can we ignore perhaps the most important aspect of that defense system? Where can we be expected to draw the line, so-to-speak, if it is not at our borders?

Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues, a very respected Member of this body, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), he is also the chairman of one of the security committees of this Congress and has been a member of that committee for many years, and I respect his observations. And I have seen him now on television and I have heard him on the radio in the past couple of days, and he has stated unequivocally that it is not a matter of if we are ever going to be confronted by biological or chemical or even nuclear attack by terrorists; it is indeed, he says, a matter of when.

Mr. Speaker, we are well aware of the fact that many countries, several countries anyway, that have already demonstrated their mastery of this particular form of warfare, that is, biological and chemical especially, Iraq, I refer to specifically, as it has used this particular weapon, biological weapons, against its own people, the Kurds, killed many thousands of them a few years ago.

We know that there are governments out there that have perfected these particular weapons. We know that those governments harbor terrorists. We know that those governments provide succor to terrorists, provide support; not just physical support, not just a place to live and some food on the table, but support of every kind and variety.

What makes us think for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that they have not provided them, or at least are not willing to provide them, with these other agents to carry out their dastardly deeds?

Now, I do not know if the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is right or wrong when he says it is a matter of when, not a matter of if we are confronted with this. I can certainly say that the odds are that we will be in

some way, at some time, confronted with that kind of a situation.

I pray to God that it will not happen and that we will do everything in our power to make sure that it does not, and there are things we can do. That is the other side. That is the thing to think about. We should not dwell on the inevitability so much of this particular kind of terror, but we should dwell on our ability to stop it.

There are many things we can do, and certainly finding the terrorists out there, that is number one. But how can we suggest for a moment, even a second, how can it be in anyone's mind in this body, that as part of our defense against that next act of terrorism would not be the closure of our borders to anybody who is not well-known to us, anybody who we can determine is not a threat to this Nation's survival?

How can we not do it? If something were to happen, Mr. Speaker, of this nature, and, again, I pray to God, of course, that it never does, but if it does, and if we have done nothing to increase our ability to protect our borders, then there is culpability here, because this is not, as they say, rocket science.

I do not suggest for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that if we did everything we possibly could, if we put troops on the border, if we reduced immigration dramatically so we could actually get a handle on it for a while, if we tightened up on INS regulations, if we found out where all of the people in the United States who are here illegally are and sent them home, if we did all of that, I am not able, of course, to promise that we would make ourselves immune to or impervious to or unable to be attacked in the way we have suggested. All I know is it is something we have to do.

To those who suggest that there are other options open to us that do not include controlling our own borders, I just say this: perhaps there are others, perhaps in times past there were others who said, look, let us explain to the Vandals in ancient Rome, or the Huns, that there is no reason to be all that upset to us; we will open our borders to them and let them in and just discuss it with them. We will just peacefully deal with it, because, really they are just all members of the human race, you know? The Nazis, the Japanese militarists, you could go on and on and on.

There were people here who said, I am sure, not many, thank heavens, but people who suggested that there probably is some way we could have just negotiated our way out of and around the Second World War, and any other war with which we have been involved, because, after all, they are just people, just like us.

What are their needs? How are they different from us? There are still people who say that, and I suggest that it is almost irrational. People who suggest that we should not care about who comes across our borders are, to a certain extent, maybe to a large extent, irrational. Because I guarantee you this, Mr. Speaker: the American public, they do not feel that way. The vast majority of the American people believe in their heart of hearts in the very common sense idea of controlling our own borders; and they are not heartless, cruel people, who just hate foreigners. No, they all recognize that all of our roots are from someplace else. Even if you call yourself a Native American, your ancestors, how far back, came across a land bridge from Siberia, from Asia.

So all of us are immigrants. That is not the issue. The issue is will we be able to control who comes for how long and how many. Will we be able to do that? And the American people want us to do that.

There is only one way, of course, Mr. Speaker, that this body will ever move in the direction that we are hoping for tonight, even though there was a great sign that things may have changed tonight with that vote on the Traficant amendment to put troops on the borders. However, I am told that has passed before, it has always been taken out in the conference committee. Perhaps it is different tonight. Perhaps September 11 changed all of that. I certainly hope so.

I certainly hope that there were more people in this body who were voting for that amendment without the thought in mind that it would be taken out, and they could easily cast their vote and sort of cover their tracks. They say, well, I voted for it, but knowing in their heart of hearts it will probably be taken out in committee.

I hope there were not many like that in our body. I hope the 250-odd people who voted for it tonight did so because they know what we are saying here tonight, that it is the duty, the responsibility, of every Nation on the face of the Earth, including our own, to defend our borders, and that in our case, because of the geographic problems that we confront, it will require perhaps a far stronger force than we have available to us tonight in the INS, and it may in fact require the positioning of Armed Forces on our borders. That is, of course, what the Armed Forces are for, to defend our borders. It is not an inappropriate use, it is an absolutely logical use of our Armed Forces, because it is very difficult for us to patrol the length of our borders. I understand that.

Mr. Speaker, there was an op-ed that was written by a gentleman by the name of Mark Krikorian who is with an organization called the Center for Immigration Studies. I am going to enter it in the RECORD and read it tonight as my final statement, because I believe that it encapsulates so much of what it is I am trying to say here this evening.

It stays, ''As we consider our response to last week's horrific attacks, we must be careful not to seek scapegoats among foreigners who live among us. But if immigrants in general are not the problem, a broken immigration system almost certainly is partly to blame. While much attention has been focused on the failure of intelligence and airport security, it is also clear that we have failed to properly police our borders, borders being any place where foreign citizens enter the United States. It would be a grave error if we did not ask ourselves the fundamental question: How did these terrorists get in? Despite all the cant about globalization, borders are not irrelevant in today's world, nor are they unenforceable. In fact, the need to secure them is more pressing than ever, given ease of travel, coupled with very real terrorist threats. ''Most Americans understand that our border is not an obstacle to be overcome by travelers and businesses but, instead, a critical tool for protecting America's national interests. Unfortunately, much of America's elite does not get it.

''Most notorious among the cheerleaders for open borders have been libertarians such as the Cato Institute. The Wall Street Journal has frequently called for a 5-word amendment to the Constitution: 'There shall be open borders.' ''

□ 2215

I have not heard that recently from the Wall Street Journal. In fact, as an aside, I had a reporter from the Wall Street Journal call me the other day saying, has there been a change of attitude in Congress about immigration as a result of what has happened? I said, it is funny you should ask that question. I had exactly the same question for you. Has there been a change on the Wall Street Journal editorial board about immigration as a result of what happened on September 11? He just laughed and said, Well, you are not the first person to ask.

Back to Mr. Krikorian's op-ed: ''Even minimal borders to strengthen controls have been stymied. Congress in 1996 directed the Immigration and Naturalization Service to record arrivals and departures of foreigners at border crossings so as to identify people overstaying their visas. Business interests prompted Congress to postpone this requirement several times and ultimately to eliminate it.

''If we take the physical safety of our people seriously, we cannot continue to allow libertarian ideologues, immigration lawyers, cheap-labor business interests, and ethnic pressure groups to hobble our ability to manage our borders. What, then, is to be done?

''The Border Patrol, despite recent increases, remains almost laughably inadequate. At any given time, there are only about 1,700 agents patrolling the southern border, an average of less than 1 agent per mile, and the northern border is even less well defended.

''Establishing a computerized system to track entries and exits from the United States should not even be a subject of debate. There are no technological obstacles, merely a lack of will and funding. What is more, the practice

of requiring permanent residents who are not yet citizens to annually register their whereabouts with government, which was discontinued in the 1970s, should be revived.

''The State Department's visa officers overseas need to be recognized as 'America's other Border Patrol.' Visa officers often have only 2 or 3 minutes to consider an application, and are pressured to approve a high proportion of applicants to avoid offending the host country. The granting of visas should become a freestanding, well-funded function that people sign up for from the start, rather than today's dreaded right of passage for rookie Foreign Service officers.

''The very morning of the September 11 attack, the House was about to resurrect a provision called 245(i), which allows illegal aliens to receive green cards in the United States rather than in their home countries.

''Because personnel abroad are best equipped to screen applicants, 245(i) negates any efforts to keep out those judged to be ineligible.

''Finally, whatever one thinks about the level of immigration, a temporary reduction in legal immigration and the admission of temporary workers and students is essential to allow the overhaul of our immigration infrastructure.''

Did we hear that, Mr. Speaker? ''A temporary reduction in legal immigration,'' and I will say a pause in all immigration; I want a pause. I will soon be introducing a bill to that effect. A pause, at least a 6-month pause, in all immigration into the United States, except for special circumstances, maybe national defense-related issues. But other than that, let us stop it. Because we have an overhaul to do with our entire system. Let us let the Department, let us let our new Secretary for the Department of Homeland Defense determine how best to go back into the field and try to defend our borders. But let us call a pause or a halt to immigration for at least 6 months.

''Only by lightening the INS' load can the agency both process its huge backlog and strengthen border controls.

''Improved border and visa controls may not catch all malefactors, but it will help alert us to conspiracies such as last Tuesday's attacks. If only a dozen of the conspirators had been identified by consular officers during visa processing or border inspectors, it is very possible the entire conspiracy would have been unraveled. We have, of course, seen some home-grown terrorists as well, but there is no reason to neglect border control.

''We should not overreact by eviscerating constitutional rights, including those of Muslim Americans, but an overhaul of our lax border controls is precisely the kind of reasonable reform that would make future attacks less likely and does not represent any threat to the civil liberties of American citizens. Americans are going to have to wait in longer lines at airports, and it is not too much to ask people entering into the country to do the same.

''Moreover, more foreign citizens may be denied visas.''

''The measure of a successful immigration system is not how many people are allowed to enter and how fast, but rather whether the broad national interests of the United States are being served, including the safety of Americans.''

Mr. Krikorian is the executive director, as I say, for the Center for Immigration Studies here in Washington, D.C.; and I certainly commend his reading and his efforts, by the way, which I am sure one can go online and get. In fact, it is on here: http://www.cis.org. One can go on the Net and look into the Center for Immigration Studies and Work. They do great stuff.

And the other thing, of course, everyone must do, Mr. Speaker, is to let their representatives in this body and in the other body know how they feel. Believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, there are still people in this body who are opposed to immigration reform, even after September 11; and there is only one way they are ever going to change their mind. There is only one way they are ever going to see the light and that, of course, is when they feel the heat.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. WATSON of California (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MALONEY of New York) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. KELLY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2603. An act to implement the agreement establishing a United States-Jordan free trade area.

H.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on September 25, 2001 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 2603. To implement the agreement establishing a United States-Jordan free trade area.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 26, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3839. A letter from the Deputy Congressional Liaison, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule—Credit by Brokers and Dealers; List of Foreign Margin Stocks [Regulation T] received August 21, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3840. A letter from the Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Government National Mortgage Association Mortgage-Backed Securities Program-Payments to Securityholders; Book-Entry Procedures [Docket No. FR–4629–F–02] (RIN: 2503–AA16) received August 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3841. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Amendments for Testing and Monitoring Provision Removal of a Provision for Opacity Monitoring [FRL–7039–2] received August 21, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3842. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Idaho: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL–7031–5] received August 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3843. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Finding of Attainment for PM–10; Shoshone County (City of Pinehurst and Pinehurst Expansion Area)[Docket ID–01–003; FRL–7042–5] received August 21, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3844. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental