

"We're going to play for Paul," a tearful Lauren Einecker, 12, said after the practice, her ponytail tied with a sweat band. "He's going to be in our hearts every time we step out on the court," said Shannon Gilmartin, 12, a slip of a point guard.

Off to the side, John Dini, now the team's head coach, was fighting back tears. "They call it terrorism," he said. "But to me, it feels like my heart's been broken."

Not all the people of Middletown are comforted by talk of war. Many have children in the military, who may soon be in harm's way. And several who lost family members in the Sept. 11 attack are horrified to hear Americans calling for people of other countries to die en masse to avenge their loved ones.

"You don't want a bomb to drop anywhere; You don't want anyone to go through this," said John Pietruni, whose brother Nicholas, 38, was a back office worker at Cantor Fitzgerald. "I turned on the TV and saw that big banner, 'Operation Infinite Justice,' and it was as if they were talking about a movie. I expected them to say, 'Coming soon.' . . . The way people are talking about retaliation is a disrespect to my brother and to everyone who died there."

All around Middletown are reminders of the simple things that used to define life here, most of all, the lure of the water. It is written in the names of streets: Oceanview Avenue, Seaview Avenue, Bayview Terrace. Nobody has yet gotten used to the new meaning of the water. Anthony Bottone, owner of Bottone Realty Group Inc., showed a residential lot to developers last weekend and found himself saying, "You could build a \$500,000 house here and see the New York skyline from the second floor."

"You should have seen the looks I got," he said.

The ferries resumed regular service last Monday, but now they carry more than commuters. Among the travelers are rescue workers, ironworkers, electricians and contractors, all involved in excavating the rubble. There are psychologists and social workers, too, in case passengers need emotional support. Some of last week's commuters were on the 7:55 a.m. ferry from New Jersey on Sept. 11, which reached Wall Street just as the first plane struck. Others had lost up to a dozen friends.

Social worker Aurore Maren rode the ferries all week, and was struck by the commuters' distress. "They're helpless in their sense of loss and they're helpless in their sense there's nothing they can do to stop this from spinning even more wildly out of control," she said.

Maren was struck, also, by something else. As the ferry passed under the Verrazzano Narrows Bridge, opening up that amazing, wide-angle view of the Statue of Liberty and the New York skyline, the commuters did something she'd never seen before. They all turned around in their seats. They couldn't bear to look.

IMMIGRATION AND OPEN BORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Michigan). 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, it is once again my opportunity to address this body about an issue of great concern to me. It is an issue, of course, that I have been dealing with for quite some time. It is an issue that has taken on much more significance after the events of September 11; but it is an

issue, nonetheless, that held and should have held our attention before that time. I am talking about the issue of immigration and the fact that this Nation for now at least for decades has embarked upon and embraced a concept that we have referred to often as "open borders."

Amazing as that is to many of our countrymen, there is still a philosophy, it is still a general sort of pattern of discussion in this body and around the country, think tanks, entities like The Wall Street Journal and others, to continually press this concept of "open borders," even in light of all that has happened to us since September 11. It is a dangerous concept. It was dangerous before September 11, and it is dangerous today.

My colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), addresses the issue of workers that have been laid off, workers that have been denied jobs; and now, as a result of these horrible events of September 11 have lost their jobs. But let me point out that before September 11, even before the September 11 terrorist attacks, U.S. job cuts announced in 2001 exceeded the 1 million mark.

In this article, they give us a partial list. It goes on for four pages of the companies that had laid off employees, again, even before the attacks on our country on September 11. Lucent Technologies headed the list on this one with 40,000. Since then, I understand, they have announced that another 20,000 people would be laid off. Nortel Networks, 30,000; Motorola, 28,000; Selectron, 20,850; and it goes on to over 1 million Americans having been laid off before September 11.

Now, of course, everyone knows what has happened in America and especially to the airline industry since September 11. Hundreds of thousands of Americans more have been laid off. It is not just of course the men and women who have been laid off in the airline industry directly, it is the thousands, maybe hundreds of thousands that we may be approaching here very soon that have been laid off as a result of the fact that the airline industry is down.

I do not know at this point in time, as of today, as of this moment, what our unemployment rate is; but I will hazard a guess that when it is announced by the Labor Department, the most recent figures will show a significant jump. And I do not think that is much of a task to predict something like that.

□ 1930

I say to my colleagues in this body and I say to the administration, when we are presented with the administration's plans for an economic stimulus package, when presented with the plans to deal with the unemployed, I know I have heard already of plans in the works to extend unemployment compensation to all of these people who have been laid off, and I have

heard various other kinds of comments. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) talked about doing something with health insurance. All of that is admirable, but why will we not deal with one very basic problem, and that is we have had for almost 4 decades essentially porous borders, borders that really do not exist.

We have faced a flood of immigration that has never before in this Nation's history been paralleled. Nothing we have seen in the Nation's history, not even in the, quote, heyday of immigration in the early part of the 20th century, not even then did we see the kind of numbers that we have seen in the last 3 or 4 decades.

Right now we admit legally into this country about 1 million people a year, and we add to that another quarter of a million that come in under refugee status. But, of course, that is just the legal immigration, which is four times higher on an annual basis than it ever was during the heyday of immigration into this Nation in the early 20th century, the early 1900s. Four times greater. We are looking at four times the number of people coming into the country legally, and who knows how many are coming across our borders illegally; but I would suggest that it is at least that many every single year.

The net gain in population of this Nation as a result of illegal immigration is at least a million. I have seen estimates far higher, of 3 million, 4 million. The INS does not really know and does not really care. The INS is a coconspirator in this immigration flood we have had. The INS considers itself not to be an agency that protects the border, that keeps people out who are not supposed to come here, that finds people who are here illegally and deports them, that finds people who are here even legally and have violated the law under their visa status and deports them. The INS does not consider itself to be an agency designed to do that job I have just described.

Mr. Speaker, the INS considers itself to be, and I quote from an INS official I was debating on the radio in Denver a couple of months ago, and during the question period by the moderator who said to her why does the INS not essentially round up people. She said because that is not our job. She said, Our job is to find ways to legalize these people. Astounding as that might sound to the majority of Americans who are listening, to the people in the INS, that is the culture.

Mr. Speaker, to suggest to them that their responsibility, an equal responsibility at least, is to keep people out of the United States who have not been granted a visa, who are not legally coming here under any sort of immigration status, to suggest to them that that is their role and that they should perhaps do something about the number of people who have come in illegally, we should find them, send them back to their country of origin, we should find an employer who employed

them knowing that they are here illegally. Instead of thinking that is their job, they say their job is to essentially help these people find a way into the United States, and once they get here, find a way to make them legal.

This is incredible, Mr. Speaker. It is almost beyond imagination that this is the perception and this is the culture inside the INS.

Almost every single day I am confronted by another horror story that makes this one pale in comparison in terms of the corruption inside the INS, in terms of the culture that exists inside that agency, and of course with the acquiescence of the Congress. I do not for a moment suggest that we have not played a role in this corruption.

We have essentially allowed the INS to do what they do, to abandon their responsibility, to thwart the law. We have allowed them to do so because in this body there has been, I am not so sure it is as prevalent as before September 11, there is a philosophy of open borders. There are a lot of reasons why we have found ourselves in this particular situation.

Some of those reasons are quite political in nature. It is very possible that if we encourage massive immigration from certain areas of the world these people will eventually become citizens of the United States. Certainly their offspring who are conceived and born here in this country, I guess I should just say born in this country, will become citizens of the United States via the way we grant citizenship here, and therefore able to vote.

There is a perception if we can get millions and millions of these people here, keep them here long enough to establish families, they will all become part of one particular party. That is, frankly, why we saw in the last administration a push, if Members remember correctly, to get as many people legalized and citizens awarded so they could vote in the election for the past President.

Well, that is one reason why we have such massive fraud in this whole area of immigration. Another reason is because again it is the culture inside of the INS, and it is abetted by another aspect of our society and that is, of course, businesses, large businesses and small, that employ immigrant workers, some legally here, some illegally here.

Before I go into the numbers that I came across today as a result of having a very interesting and disturbing meeting with two people, American citizens both who have been laid off of their jobs and replaced by foreign workers, H-1B visa recipients, specifically, before I get into that story I want to relate to this body an actual conversation I had last night with someone who chooses to keep his name secret but is involved in the judicial process with regard to immigration.

This person has had a lengthy period of time working in his particular capacity dealing with immigration. He is part of our legal system. He called me

to tell me of his great and incomprehensible frustration, the frustration that he feels every single day, recognizing the fact that although our judicial system is set up to address the issue of people who are here illegally or people who violate their status while they are here, and orders are entered to send them back, that it does not happen. These people are not sent back.

Now, could it possibly be true, Mr. Speaker, what this gentleman told me? He said that there are presently almost a quarter of a million people in the United States who have gone through the system. There has been an adjudication, there has been a determination by a court of law that these people have violated their status. They have violated the law of the land. Either they have overstayed their status under the visa, or they were here doing something that the visa did not allow, or in fact they committed crimes against this country, crimes that had nothing to do with immigration, regular old run-of-the-mill crimes like felonies, like robberies, like murder, like muggings, and that when they go into immigration court, because they are here as an immigrant, because they are here under a visa status, they do not face the same system of justice that an American citizen would face. Mr. Speaker, could this be true?

Mr. Speaker, let me say that the person who told me this should know. I am going to establish that as a fact tonight. I am at least going to make that challenge. I am going to challenge anyone who disagrees with what I have just said, that there are almost a quarter of a million people here in the United States who have been found guilty of a crime.

They are here as guests of the United States under a visa process, a quarter of a million who are wandering around who have never been returned to their country of origin; and the reason is because that duty, that job, that responsibility, is one that we turn over not to the Department of Justice, in a way it is the Department of Justice because its a subset of it, but it is not to the police department, it is not to the regular court system.

They do not come before a Federal, district, or county court. They come before an immigration court. The immigration court can and almost always does when they violate the law say you are going to be deported. We repeal the immigrant's status here. The immigrant's legal status, we withdraw it.

Guess what happens, Mr. Speaker? Again I challenge any of my colleagues here on this floor or in this body to prove me wrong. A quarter of a million of these people have simply been ignored by the INS. They have chosen to simply ignore the situation.

In fact, I am told that many times attorneys for the INS who are supposed to be on our side in these proceedings, they are supposed to come in and give the Government's position, they end up becoming a defense attorney for the

plaintiff. Either that, or I am told they are so incompetent, so incapable of actually mounting a prosecution that the whole thing is a farce.

Now I do not think that most people in America understand or know this. I do not think that most of my colleagues in this body know what I am saying tonight. But some do. Some know that it is absolutely true because I was talking to a colleague tonight earlier and I was relating this story. I was saying is this possible. This colleague happens to be a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and more specifically a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims.

As is often the case when I get into a discussion like this, I find that I am always being one-upped. When I start telling somebody a story like this, they say, well, listen to this.

This gentleman told me about a conversation he had had with a magistrate in the immigration court because I had indicated if what I said was true and if people could come to the United States, commit crimes and essentially walk away without any kind of punishment because they are in this never-never land of immigration court, it is far better to commit a crime in the United States as an illegal alien than as a citizen of the country.

□ 1945

As a citizen, you will face a judicial process that has some integrity, at least we can hope, and if you violate the law and if you are found guilty and if the judge chooses and a jury agrees, you can go to jail.

In an immigration court, that is not at all the case. In an immigration court, you are oftentimes told, well, you will be deported for this act. But, of course, unless the INS actually takes some part of this, comes in afterwards and says, okay, this person is to be deported, we will see that he or she is deported and we will watch to make sure they do not come back. Unless that happens, you are free to wander the land and do what you want to do. And a quarter of a million people today in this country are in that status, having been adjudicated, having been found guilty of violating their status and are simply walking around the country, free to do what they want to do, because the INS chooses not to deal with it.

I was in the process of telling you about a conversation I had with another Member who said, that is nothing. Listen to this. I heard from a magistrate that something had been happening in his court. When people recognize what I have just described, this scam, and the charade that we call immigration courts, it does not take too long for people to figure out how to work the system. He said that a magistrate told him that before him had come somebody who had been born in the United States, his parents had been born in the United States, his grandparents had been born in the United

States. This fellow was a citizen of the United States. He had robbed an old lady, beaten her up, stolen her purse. He was arrested. Evidently not his first offense, by the way.

When he was arrested, he had no identification on him. He said to the arresting officer when asked why he had no identification, he said, "Because I am here illegally. I am not a citizen of this country." They, of course, the arresting officers, took him to a Federal court, to immigration court, at which point the magistrate said, I will give you a choice of either serving time here or returning to your country of origin, which he said was Mexico. Naturally the defendant said, "All right, Judge, I'll go back home. I'll take your severe punishment. I'll go back home."

They put him on a bus, which is, by the way, more than happens most of the time. At least putting this guy on the bus was a step up, because most of the time they turn around and walk away, without any action. But they put him on the bus, they took him to the border and they said, okay, good-bye. His slate was at that point wiped clean. He then went to a phone, called his mother in the United States and said, Mom, bring me down my ID. She dutifully got in the car, drove across the border, brought him his ID. He then, of course, came across the border as the American citizen he was, showed them the material, he came in now under a different name, his own name but as an American citizen. No problem. The slate has been wiped clean. And another travesty occurs.

I am told by the gentleman today that this judge who told him the story said this has happened many times in his courtroom, because, of course, people have found a way to scam the system. It really does not take, quote, the proverbial rocket scientist to figure this out. If it is better to be an illegal alien in this country when you commit a crime, then why not pretend you are an illegal alien to escape justice? Or why not just be an illegal alien and commit the crime? You will not do the time. The gentleman that called me last night went on at great length about the corrupt nature of the system, the fact that time and time again, even when bond is posted by these people.

By the way, he talked about the fact that drug dealers, I mean big-time drug dealers who bring these people in to transport drugs for them, when they get arrested, the drug dealer puts up the bond, it is just a cost of doing business. The individual bonded out never shows up again for the hearing and is never ever looked for by the INS. I say never. In very few cases. The INS will always tell you, well, it is a matter of resources, we have returned this many, but the reality is this, Mr. Speaker, they do not care for the most part.

There are, of course, many people, and I have had them in my office, I have had INS agents come into my of-

fice and say, "Look, I'm afraid of telling this story publicly, but, Mr. TANCREDO, you are absolutely right in talking about this and describing the nature of this system. It is corrupt." There are many, many people who serve in the capacity of enforcement agents who are trying to do their best on the borders, but what they are doing, Mr. Speaker, is trying to hold back the ocean with a sieve. We could not get much attention paid to these kinds of problems up to this point in time. It has been very, very difficult to get anybody to care.

I have talked about it at length on many occasions at this microphone and in the conference and at every opportunity I have had. Up to this point in time, certainly prior to September 11, the response I got was almost uniformly one of, "Well, we really can't get into that issue, we really can't deal with immigration reform because, you know, Congressman, if we do, we're going to be called racists. If we try to stop the flood of immigrants into this country, you've got a whole huge constituency here in the United States that would turn against us."

I say, who here legally supports illegal immigration? And if they do, I do not even want their vote. For the most part, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the vast majority of people in this country, of citizens of this country who came here through the regular process, who are legal citizens of the United States, be they Hispanic or Asian or whatever, they agree with us, that we must do something to stop the flood of illegal immigration into this country. But we have this fear, a fear which has paralyzed this Congress, and we are not over it yet, even after the September 11 events.

Before I get to that, I want to stay focused on this issue of H1B visas, people coming into this country under a visa program called H1B and the incredible fraud that exists there.

I told you that I met earlier today in my office with two people, two people who had been employed, they are part of the statistics in this article. They are just two of the four pages of numbers I have here of people who have been laid off prior to September 11 because of the downturn in the economy. But they were not just laid off because of the downturn in the economy. They were laid off because they were replaced by cheaper labor to do their very same job. They were replaced by people who came here legally under the H1B visa program.

Now, for those people who do not know what we are talking about, Members of the House, perhaps, that do not know what an H1B visa program is, I will explain it simply, it is a visa that allows you to come and work in the United States. Usually it is a white collar job under an H1B. There are various kinds of visas that allow you to come in and take other kinds of jobs, more menial in nature, less skilled jobs, but this one, in particular, I am

going to talk about for a few moments is called the H1B visa program.

Recently, the Congress of the United States raised it. In 1998, the Congress of the United States raised the level, the number of H1B visas that we could grant, from 65,000 a year to 115,000 every single year. At that time, Mr. Speaker, industry representatives told Congress that there were not enough Americans with the necessary skills to fill the jobs that were available. Yet government studies, most notably the Department of Labor, rejected the industry's claims of a worker shortage. After months of negotiation, Congress adopted a temporary increase until 2002 when the annual level would supposedly return to 65,000. The 1998 H1B law also provided some protections against wage depression and job loss for American workers. However, they have not taken effect since the government has yet to issue the regulations to implement the safeguards.

Today, despite continuing evidence that there is no high tech labor shortage and with the exception of possible spot shortages, the demand for foreign workers by American technology companies has prompted this body, this Congress, to propose raising substantially annual H1B limits. We were pressured to do so, Mr. Speaker, by businesses and industries which, in turn, came in just recently with these figures.

They told us that they did not have enough American workers to fill the jobs, and that is why we had to go ahead and increase the visas in H1B. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether they actually lied, but I will say this, that they misrepresented the situation dramatically. Because over and over again, we have seen cases where people were laid off of their job and were being paid X number of dollars and were replaced by H1B visa recipients paid less money. It was not a matter of not being able to fill the job, Mr. Speaker. It was an unwillingness to pay the price. And so they, of course, recognizing how the market works in these situations, supply and demand works, they increased the supply and, therefore, the wage rates went down precipitously.

Now, this has become this massive, massive fraud that is lining the pockets of many millions of people around the world, but not the workers in the United States. One of the perpetrators of this fraud, an organization that I believe could be charged with aiding and abetting the fraud, is the American Immigration Lawyers Association. It has perfected the art of exploiting loopholes and technicalities in the law.

They work with what are called body shops that are set up all over the world, India and Pakistan especially, Malaysia. Body shops by the way, Mr. Speaker, that phrase does not relate to any sort of auto work or any other sort of, I guess, any other kind of business. A body shop in this case refers to these organizations like employment agencies. They are set up all over. They

bring people in. They give them some sort of fraudulent package of résumés. They construct fraudulent résumés for the people they bring in in India and Pakistan, saying that they have had years of experience in a particular field, which is required under the H1B visa program, to have at least 2 years' experience in the field. So they construct a fraudulent résumé. They put these people through a brief, maybe 6-week course sometimes, and award them diplomas and degrees and whatever, and then put them into the H1B program and they charge these people exorbitant fees. There are interesting articles again here to prove that.

□ 2000

They charge these people exorbitant fees and then promise them jobs in the United States. Some of them get here, of course, are put into the pipeline, sometimes laid off immediately and end up in jobs that have nothing to do with the kind of work they were supposed to be here, that their visa had cleared them for. There are many articles about that, people coming into the United States to be computer technicians, ending up, of course, as menial laborers in many cases. But many, many thousands, in fact hundreds of thousands of other cases of people coming into the United States under H-1B and taking jobs that Americans had, because they will work for less. There is massive, incredible fraud in this entire program.

The fraud in this program, as I say, is rampant. It is widely understood within that community, within the H-1B community, even within the INS itself, that once you get here by an H-1B visa, you will never have to leave. It is sort of the colloquialism in the immigrant community deal with this whole issue of just getting here under H-1B, that you never have to leave. Even if you get laid off, even if you are not working in the kind of job you were originally assigned to, that does not matter, no one is coming after you. Again, it is because the American Immigration Lawyers Association has aided and abetted in this fraud.

Mr. Speaker, we have now accumulated literally millions of people here in the United States who should not be here because they have overstayed their visa or in some other way caused an infraction of the visa. They are not working in the field.

Mr. Speaker, another part of this, of course, is people who come here under an education visa and are supposedly attending school here. I think we have heard about one or more of these particular kinds of individuals came here to learn how to fly. Some of them attended classes; some did not. When we look into that whole arrangement between the schools that were providing this kind of experience and education and the whole issue of visa fraud, I think we are going to be very interestingly surprised.

But the fact is that there are 30 million visas that are allotted annually, 30

million people every year are told they can come into the United States for a certain period of time. These primarily are tourist visas. But then a huge number are in the categories I talked about, work-related or education-related visas.

It is my understanding, and once again I am going to state it as a question. Could this be true? A question posed to me by the individual I talked to last night on the phone, who is actually part of the immigration judicial process, if such a thing actually exists? He told me, and could this be true, Mr. Speaker? He told me that of the 30 million visas awarded annually, about 40 percent are violated annually; 12 million people violate their visa status every year, according to this gentleman.

I pose this as a question. I do not have information in front of me to substantiate it. But I will tell you once again that the individual that talked to me was an individual who should and in fact I believe with all my heart does know. It was not someone at the lower level of the immigration service or judicial process.

Millions of people are here, I think, who have overstayed their visas. I just talked, remember, about the quarter of a million that have already been adjudicated; the 225,000, actually, not quite a quarter million, but that was 1997, so I am sure it is up to a quarter million now, people who have actually gone through the process, been found guilty and not sent back. I am not talking about the millions who are probably here who have never been brought to any sort of court, never found themselves in front of a judge because they overstayed their visa. They just simply stay, and they take jobs.

My friends, especially my friends on the other side of the aisle, talk about the need to do something for the unemployed in the United States. Well, I can tell you what to do, Mr. Speaker. You can cut off illegal immigration. You can eliminate or reduce dramatically H-1B and all of the other visa types that come in here. You can put troops on the border and make sure that people do not come across this border illegally. You can overfly the border. You can use sensors and detectors to protect this Nation, not just from those people who are coming without malicious intent, who are coming simply to improve their lives, of which there are millions, and I certainly understand and empathize, but protect yourself also against the people who come here with evil, malicious, or malicious intent. And there are, unfortunately, far too many of them.

Today in this body, Mr. Speaker, many Members are still reluctant to deal with the issue of immigration reform. Many Members have told me personally that they agree entirely with everything that I say about this issue, but, after all, dealing with it is another thing entirely. It is not politically correct, and it may be politically volatile.

Well, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that although there are people in this body who do not get it, who do not understand the nature of this problem or the depth of it, who think they can get by; that we can all get by with ignoring this massive fraud that is perpetrated on this Nation; ignore the incredible problems that come as a result of massive immigration, both legal and illegal; ignore the fact that the crimes that were perpetrated on the 11th were perpetrated by people who came here on visas, who were not American citizens, some of whom, as far as we know right now, were not living up to their visa application guidelines, some, as I understand, who may have overstayed. Who cares? Overstayed your visa? Who cares?

The fact is that all of these people, and the Members of this body, many of them feel that it is too controversial and we cannot deal with it. But let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the American public knows the truth of this issue. At least they know the problem with illegal immigration.

Some of what I have said tonight, certainly I was not aware of it even until just recently, from discussions as I say I have had with people who called or other Members of the House. I had no idea how deeply rooted the corruption in the process, in the whole INS structure and immigration system, really is.

But most people know there is something wrong. Although my colleagues in this body may not feel the heat right now, I guarantee you that they will. And they should, because that is the only way change will occur.

In a recent Zogby poll, actually September 27, Zogby International poll, it is a survey of likely voters that shows virtually all segments of American society overwhelmingly feel the country is not doing enough. By wide margins, it says, the public also feels that this lack of control in immigration makes it easier for terrorists to enter the country. And, of course, they are absolutely right.

Moreover, Americans think that a dramatic increase in border control and greater efforts to enforce immigration laws would help reduce the chance of future attacks. They are absolutely right. It would not necessarily guarantee it, it is true. It does not guarantee the fact. If we were able to seal the border tomorrow, it would not guarantee the fact that we would not be subject to another attack, but it would lessen the chance.

To suggest that people can get in even if we try to enforce our immigration laws and therefore we should not enforce immigration laws is like saying, you know, I know there are laws on the books against robbing banks, but people do it, so why do we bother putting the money in the vault? Why not put it on the counter? After all, they are going to rob us anyway. That is about as ludicrous as to suggest we should not try to deal with our borders

and close the sieve, because right now people get through.

When asked whether the government was doing enough to control the borders and screen those allowed into the country, 76 percent said the country was not doing enough, and only 19 percent said the government was doing enough. Those 19 percent were probably people who are here illegally and just told the person calling them up on the phone that they were going to be voting.

While identified conservatives were the most likely to think that not enough was being done, by 83 percent, get this, Mr. Speaker, 74 percent of the liberals and 75 percent of the moderates indicated that enforcement was insufficient. In addition, by a margin of more than two to one, blacks and whites and Hispanics all thought government efforts at border control and the vetting of immigrants were inadequate.

So although this body may not think there is a problem or that dealing with it is politically volatile, Americans do not think there is a problem with dealing with it. They think there is a problem with not dealing with it. They believe and they know, and they are right, Mr. Speaker, that there is a huge problem that we confront as a Nation because of our unwillingness to deal with this concept of immigration control.

Again I stress the fact that it goes across political philosophies. It goes across racial lines. It does not matter if you are black, Hispanic, or Asian or white. They feel the same way about this issue, because they are Americans, just like anybody else; and they are worried, just like anybody else, about their own safety.

And is that not our responsibility, Mr. Speaker? Are we not the ones charged with the responsibility in this body to develop, among other things, plans and proposals and programs to ensure domestic tranquility and provide for the common defense? Is that not our job? And are we not uniquely charged with the responsibility of determining immigration policies?

No State can do it, Mr. Speaker. No matter how inundated that State may be, no matter how difficult it may be for them to deal with it, they cannot establish immigration policy. Only this Federal Government can; and, after it is once established, only the Federal Government can enforce it.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we ignore this any longer and another event, God forbid, another event of a similar nature as those on September 11 occurs, and occurs as a result of our inability or unwillingness to protect ourselves from people who come here to do us evil, then we are culpable in that event.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, choose to do everything I can and speak as often as I can and as loudly as I can about the need to control our own borders.

We talk about the defense of the Nation, the defense of the homeland. An

agency has been created for that purpose. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the defense of the Nation begins with the defense of our borders. I reiterate and repeat, the defense of this Nation begins with the defense of our borders. It is not illogical, it is not immoral, it is not even politically unpopular, as many of my colleagues would think. It is the right thing to do. Americans know it.

What is it going to take, Mr. Speaker, I wonder, for the rest of my colleagues to come to this conclusion?

We have written a bill to deal with terrorism. It got marked up today in the Committee on the Judiciary. As I understand it, although I have not seen the specifics, I am told that every provision we had about immigration control got watered down.

□ 2015

That all attempts on our part to deal with the possibility of terrorism, terrorists coming into the Nation, identifying them, detaining them, deporting them, all of those proposals by the administration got watered down so that we could have a nonpartisan or a bipartisan bill come to the floor. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I will not be allowed to offer an amendment to that bill. I believe that it will come to this floor with a rule that will prevent me or anyone else from offering some of the amendments to tighten up the borders. I am sickened by this possibility, but I think that that is where we are headed, because no one wants to rock these boats.

Mr. Speaker, I am willing to do so because I cannot imagine doing anything else. It is my job, it is my responsibility to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the American people, to the extent that I am humanly capable of doing so, the dangerous situation we face as a result of our unwillingness to deal with the concept of immigration control. Tell me how we will face our children. Tell me how we will face the future, Mr. Speaker, if another event occurs as a result of our unwillingness to address the issue of immigration control because we fear the political ramifications thereof.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the only way we will ever change our policies is if the American people rise up in one accord and confront their elected representatives with this issue. Do not be placated by platitudes and do not be assuaged by those people who tell us that we are doing something because we may allow for 7 days of detention of potential terrorists, and that is the whole immigration reform package. Do not listen to it, I say to my colleagues. Demand more.

What are the possibilities? I do not want to think of the possibilities of not acting. Think of the seriousness of our deliberations and of the potential consequences of inaction on this issue. They are more than I wish to deal with. I cannot imagine that we will shrink from this responsibility, but

that is what appears to be in the wind, Mr. Speaker. All I can do is come here and beg Members to listen to these arguments and to act on behalf of the people of this country who look to us to keep them secure, to ensure domestic tranquility, and to provide for the common defense.

THE EFFECTS OF TERRORISM ON EDUCATION POLICY IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRUCCI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about three important items which definitely overlap: education, reparations and terrorism. As a member of the House and Senate Conference Committee on H.R. 1, the Leave No Child Behind Act, a major initiative of President Bush that probably will come to the floor in the next 10 to 15 days, I would like to emphasize the fact that this legislation focusing on education, which will probably set a tone and establish some basic principles and concepts and procedures and movements for the next 10 years, is very important legislation. It is still important today, despite the pressures that we feel as a result of the tragedy of September 11. In fact, after September 11, education becomes even more important in general; and specifically, as we move toward creating recovery and construction programs, education must play a major role in this process of creating recovery and restructuring and construction programs.

September 11 presented us with a tragic and compelling landmark event. It said to us that terrorism will be a scourge on civilization for a long time. Modern societies are amazingly vulnerable to terrorism. The domino impact of the destruction of the World Trade Center towers overwhelms the mind. How can one event have so many repercussions? How can one event, one destructive, heinous event lead to the collapse of so many life elements of our economy and of our way of looking at certain civil liberties, and a number of other major tenets of our society? One event.

During World War II when targets were picked to cripple the industrial might of Germany, they bombed the oil fields in Romania and they bombed the industrial complex in Hamburg and a number of different targets, they had definitely aimed at crippling the industrial might of Hitler, not any one target ever had that kind of an impact. But in our present society we have constructed, it is so fragile in one sense that a strike at one point can lead to the tremendous repercussions which impact not just my City of New York or the State of New York, but the entire Nation and the economy of the entire world. So I want to highlight the fact that this event let us know that