

Department, the State Department, the Agriculture Department, the Centers for Disease Control, State public health programs and directors, and city-based domestic preparedness programs. This is a job for the new Director of Homeland Security.

Second, we must make a systematic effort to incorporate hospitals into the planning process. As of today, I think it is accurate to say that there are few, if any, U.S. hospitals that are prepared to deal with community-wide disasters such as a bioterrorist attack for a whole host of financial, legal, and staffing reasons.

There will be significant costs for expanded staff and staff training to respond to the abrupt changes in demand for care, for outfitting decontamination facilities and rooms to isolate infectious patients. Think about the cost of respirators and emergency drugs.

The first serious efforts to implement a civilian program to counter bioterrorism emerged in the spring of 1998, when Congress appropriated \$175 million in support of activities to combat bioterrorism through the Department of Health, but, Mr. Speaker, we must do much more to integrate Federal, State, and city agencies.

First, we must educate family doctors and public health staff about the clinical findings of agents;

Second, we need to further develop surveillance systems for early detection of cases;

Third, we need individual hospital and regional plans for caring for mass casualties;

Fourth, we need laboratory networks capable of rapid diagnosis, and we need to accelerate the stockpiling and dispersal of large quantities of vaccines and drugs.

And these are just a few of the things we need to do. The Public Health Threats and Emergency Act of 2000 provides for increased funding to combat threats to public health, and we should provide that increased funding this year.

□ 2115

I recently visited Broadlawns Hospital in Des Moines. Public hospitals like Broadlawns and public health agencies have not been adequately funded for years. They need to be bolstered in order to cope with a biologic attack. Even if a catastrophic biologic attack does not occur, and we pray that it does not, the investment will still pay dividends in many ways.

Finally, let me return to the question of understanding the causes of Muslim fundamentalists' hatred of the United States.

President Bush asked in his September 20 address to Congress right here on the floor, why do they hate us? Those of us here on the floor and those at home listening to the President, still stunned by the magnitude of that attack, wondered what degree of poverty or political resentment or religious convictions could lead anyone to

revel in the deaths of so many innocent people.

Shortly after the attack, I was asked by the Des Moines Register editorial board why I thought there was so much hatred of us in the Middle East. In April I had visited Israel, Jordan, and Egypt. Our congressional delegation met with the leaders of these countries and the Palestinians, but we also met with people from these countries who were not in government.

I told those editorialists that there was much envy of our wealth and dislike of our Western culture, particularly the role of women as equals. I also said it was clear that our support of Israel was significant.

I think that is an incomplete answer, and I do think we need to reflect for a moment on what we hear when, for example, we hear the translation of Osama bin Laden's screed. In the end, coping with Islamic anti-Americanism has to be a component of our war on terrorism.

As someone who has traveled rather extensively in Third World countries on surgical trips, let me say that not everyone regards the United States as a greedy giant. Even critics in other countries of America's foreign policy still often praise United States values of freedom and democracy, but extremism thrives in poverty.

Cairo is now a city of 18 million people. In the center of the old city is a huge cemetery called the City of the Dead. Years ago, the authorities gave up evicting people from living in those crypts. Today, it is the home for over a million people.

Population explosion in these countries is unbelievable. The breakdown of services as simple as garbage collection is something that few Americans can comprehend.

Since the early 1970s, the populations of Egypt and Iraq have nearly tripled. As a result, per capita income in Arab states has grown at an annual rate of 0.3 percent. The labor force in these countries is growing even faster than any other region in the world, and that leads to large pools of restless young men with no jobs and nothing to do.

Globalization has accelerated the pace of economic and social change and that creates insecurity. Most Islamic states do not have democratic governments to mediate those conflicts. Generals, kings, leaders for life, parliaments with no power, all these lead to frustrated people. When people feel powerless and extremely deprived, either economically, politically or psychologically, the ground is fertile for terrorism.

This sense of deprivation is part of the public backlash in those countries against globalization, modernization, and secularism. And the United States, regardless of its relationship with Israel, is the country most benefiting from globalization. It is the most modern Nation and it is the most secular Nation on Earth.

Two-thirds of Egyptians and four-fifths of Jordanians consider a "cul-

tural invasion" by the West to be very dangerous, according to a survey from a couple of years ago. So what can we do?

First, let me say, as Tony Blair said, there is no compromise with people that celebrate killing 5,000 people and who would celebrate even more if they killed 50,000. We will hunt down and destroy those assassins of our brothers and sisters and mothers and fathers and our children.

We must also understand the region better. We do need to help those countries tackle their underlying economic woes. We had to fight a Second World War because of the failure of the treaty of Versailles after the First, but the Marshall Plan helped us secure a safe Europe after World War II. President Bush has already started in this direction with Pakistan. The Jordanian Free Trade Agreement is also an important step, especially symbolically.

Education in the region is a real problem. Secondary school education is low. Illiteracy is high and fundamentalist Islamic sects have filled the void. Those fundamentalists sects educate, feed and clothe the poor, and they win converts to their hatred of the West.

In Egypt and Jordan, the State forbids the teaching of Jihad in those schools. As a condition of U.S. foreign aid to Pakistan, I think the Pakistan government should do the same. Many of the members of the Taliban are products of those schools that teach hatred of us.

The United States could do more to promote democracy in the Middle East. This means promoting free and fair elections, judicial and legislative reform and rule of law. An investment in these countries will be well worth the cost. Consider that the Wall Street Journal today estimated that the World Trade Center attack will cost the American economy over \$100 billion.

This war that we are in is a fight for freedom and justice. Whether it is our military, our intelligence agencies, our resolve to make airports more secure and our public health system better, I see around this country the will and resolve to win this war.

Our parents fought World War II. Each generation is called on to sacrifice, and I see today the valor of our fellow countrymen and its soldiers, its firefighters, its policemen, its nurses, and ordinary Americans, who, in 45 minutes, become heroes.

This is our generation's challenge. It is our turn to fight for freedom and justice. We will do our duty.

IMMIGRATION: THE POROUS NATURE OF OUR BORDERS AND THE DEVASTATING EFFECT THAT HAS ON OUR ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, I am here tonight to speak about a couple of topics, in particular, of course, the issue that is always of interest to me and I believe should be to our colleagues and to the American people, and that is, the issue of immigration, the porous nature of our borders and the very devastating effect that has had on the United States literally and figuratively.

I want to preface my remarks this evening Mr. Speaker with some observations that I had while I was waiting to address the House.

One of the previous hours was taken by the members of the Hispanic Caucus, and they spent their hour dutifully recounting the notable achievements of Hispanic Americans in the United States, both in the military and in other areas; and as I say, dutifully, and it is appropriate that those observations were made and those accomplishments were lauded.

As I listened to them, it struck me just how peculiar it is to have such a thing in this Congress. Certainly I think it is not unique here. There are probably State legislatures around the country that probably have a similar entity as a Hispanic caucus. That is a unique thing here, of course, and interesting from a variety of different standpoints. But it brings to mind the problem we are having in this country with trying to integrate into our society all peoples of various ethnic origins.

There is to some extent a desire on the part of many people to integrate into our society and do so as quickly as possible as they get here, newly arrived individuals, new immigrants to the American scene, and that is as it has been since the inception of the country. Most people coming into the United States are coming here for reasons that help them adjust to the American scene by disassociating themselves with their past and integrating themselves into the American mosaic.

I think to a large extent, although it is understandable, as I say, for individuals to form themselves up into organizations to reflect relatively narrow points of view and attitudes, it is peculiar, I think, to have organizations like that in this body and in other legislative groups around the country, and this all came home to me recently in Denver, when I was asked to speak to a group called the Hispanic Human Resources Association.

These are individuals who work in companies throughout the State of Colorado in the capacity as human resource development people. It was kind of intriguing to me when I first got their offer that there was such an organization, first of all, Hispanic human resource administrators. I mean, I think to myself, well, why Hispanic human resource administrators? Why not Greek human resource, whatever, and of course, I wanted to go and speak to them.

They wanted to talk to me about my position on immigration, a position, of course, which is very, very unpopular among a number of Hispanic organizations, not so unpopular among many Hispanic individuals who live here in the United States, who themselves see the problems that are created as a result of massive immigration, legal and illegal, but many organizations, of course LARASA and others, who attack my position quite vehemently.

They and this group to a large extent reflected that point of view, but I wanted to go and I wanted to debate that point in front of them, and I was there with a representative of another Member of this body, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE). And although she could not be there that night, she sent a representative, and he and I were the focal point of the evening discussion.

At the conclusion of our discussions, a gentleman in the back of the room stood up and he was Hispanic. He said to me that he was concerned about the fact that, as he pointed up to the dais where we were sitting, that he and the other Hispanics in the audience were not represented by the people at the dais.

□ 2130

In other words, not by me or by the representative from the office of the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE). And he was very annoyed by that. And he indicated that that was really his problem; that that was a major problem that he has generally with American society, with his particular situation in living in Denver, as I assume he did.

And I was extremely interested in that observation because it goes to what I am talking about here tonight in terms of this Hispanic Caucus that exists in the body. I said to him, I am really intrigued by what you say, because what you have suggested is that because I am not Hispanic nor is my colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), I cannot represent you and neither can she for only that reason; not because we may not see eye to eye on the issue of taxation or Social Security reform or the degree of support for the military or any of the wide variety of issues that confront us all on this floor day after day after day. No, not for any of those reasons did he feel that he is not represented and could not be represented by either my colleague or myself. He felt that he could not be represented because neither of us, neither my colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado, nor I, is Hispanic.

That was really a fascinating thing in a way, because this is really a problem in our society, Mr. Speaker, I believe, this balkanization of America, this assumption that in order for us to be truly "represented" in any body, any legislative body, it can only be someone of our ethnic background. So I said to him, do you know what that

means, sir? That means if you are telling me I cannot represent your interests, and I may very well not represent your point of view on a wide variety of issues, because I assume you are a very liberal, sort of maybe a Democrat-leaning individual and I am a conservative Republican, so you are probably right that I do not represent your political point of view, I will give you that. But it is not because I am Italian; it is because I simply do not agree with your issues. But you are also suggesting that my colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), does not represent your point of view, even though I will bet you anything that on every single one of your issues, everything that you can talk about, everything that you can possibly come up with as a public policy issue, I will bet you that she agrees with you. But you do not think that is good enough; that she agrees with you on every single public policy issue. You say she has to be Hispanic to represent you. Well, of course, what that means is that you cannot represent me. You could never represent me; not because you do not believe what I believe, but because you are Hispanic and I am Italian.

I mean does that make sense to anybody here? Do we really believe that that is the way we ought to determine who gets elected to office, based solely on their ethnic background? And yet that is what this is all about. We draw lines. We are in the process now around the country of redrawing district lines for the Congress of the United States. And, interestingly, we continue to think about and courts continue to adjudicate lines drawn to protect specific minority groups so that minority groups, black and Hispanic, can have their representation here. But, of course, that begs the question, does the color of our skin make us incapable of responding to the needs and desires and wishes and attitudes of our constituency, if it is not the same color as the majority of the people who live there in that particular district?

This is a very dangerous thing, Mr. Speaker. And I do not blame my colleagues for getting up here tonight and extolling the virtues of Hispanic Americans. They are wonderful people, and I certainly join them in their praise of the accomplishments of many people. But in a way it almost makes you wonder why we have to say it in that way. Why do we have to say these are the accomplishments of Hispanic Americans? Is it not just the fact these people did marvelous things and they are Americans? Is that not what we should really be giving them credit for, in order to not create and continue this divide that simply, I think, personally, makes it very difficult for America to succeed in its goal of a united States of America, of a united people of America?

I see banners and signs all over. I am sure my colleagues have seen them, too, Mr. Speaker. I saw them on U.S. 66 coming from the airport, great big

hand-painted banners people had hung over the overpass and they said "United We Stand." Let us be united. That was kind of the underlying theme of all of these banners I saw; that we were united as a people against the threat of international terrorism. That is exactly what we have to be. There is no two ways about it. We must be united in order to confront this threat and to be successful in that confrontation.

It does not help us, I think, in our quest to be united to constantly be reminded of our differences, again be they ethnic or religious or anything else. It is problematic from that standpoint; it is detrimental to American interests. And I worry about the degree to which this affects our culture, and I worry about the fact that it has an impact certainly on this body and it has an impact throughout the country. Again, what an odd thing, in a way.

I wonder what the founders would say, Mr. Speaker. I would be fascinated to know what the founders of the Nation would have said if during their deliberations on the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence someone were to have suggested to them that it would be important to add a provision in the Constitution that assured that every ethnic group that one could possibly identify in the United States should have a special area in the country where they are highly populated, have that special area cut out and have a representative of that ethnic group especially for them. I wonder what they would have said about that. I wonder if they would have suggested that that was "a good idea" for American democracy. I do not think so.

As I say, I mentioned to that gentleman that night that it was wrong, I believe. And by the way he responded and he said, are you telling me you really think we should not have separate groups to represent our points? I said, you are right, if what you are telling me is that your point of view needs to be represented by someone of a particular ethnic background. Then I am telling you I am opposed to that. I am totally opposed to that. I am Italian American, 100 percent Italian American; but I will tell you this, I would no more cast my vote for another Italian American simply because he or she was Italian than I would cast a vote blindly. Because it depends on what they think, what they believe, who they are politically. That is how I would vote.

I know people in the State of Colorado for whom I have voted, Lilly Nunez, who is a lady I have known for 25 years, and who I nominated for national committee woman from Colorado; Bob Martinez, who I supported for national committee man. I did so not because either one of those two people are Hispanic, but because they were Republicans and they were the kind of Republicans that I wanted to see in power, in place. They were con-

servatives. And that is the only thing that really matters to me. It is not their ethnic background.

But if I were to live by the dictates of the folks who come in here and form these caucuses and develop these groups and keep trying to divide America into these various balkanized States, then I would say, no, I could not possibly, even though I know Joe and Lilly Nunez very well, and I believe that they are solid Republicans, I could not vote for them because, gee whiz, they are Hispanic and they could not really represent my interests. That is idiotic. But that is the point of view that these organizations want us to proceed upon, and they go into court throughout the Nation and try to get courts to adjudicate this redistricting issue on their behalf so that they will cut up districts in order to have representation of a specific ethnic group. And I think that is abhorrent.

I was struck by that, as I say, as I was listening to the debate tonight. Once again, please do not misunderstand me or misconstrue what I am stating here tonight. I absolutely agree with and lend my voice to the adulation for all of the accomplishments of the Hispanic individuals they mentioned. The Americans they mentioned. The Americans. No hyphen. The Americans. They did extraordinary things, the 38 members they identified; winning the congressional medal of honor. I say God bless every single one of them. The Nobel prize, and the various other things they were talking about. God bless every single one of those people for what they did for America as Americans. And that is the way they should be remembered.

Now, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we are confronted by an incredible dilemma this evening on the floor of this House and as a Congress of the United States, and that is how to construct the most powerful alliance that we can possibly think of in order to confront the terrorists who have perpetrated such heinous acts on the United States on September 11. The spawn of evil is the way I identify these people.

It seems to me that there are some interesting things that we confront in that particular endeavor; and one is, as I say, trying to build a coalition of countries who will help us in a variety of ways: Contributing armed forces, contributing financial support, agreeing to do something within their own financial systems to stop money from being transferred among and between these organizations, share with us intelligence information, help us maintain some sort of integrity on our borders. All of these things are the signs of what a friend would do.

It is interesting to me, and I think it elucidates the problem that we are having around the world when we talk about one particular "friend" of the United States and what they are doing for us, and that "friend," and I put that in quotes again, is Mexico. Mr.

Speaker, after September 11, literally scores of nations immediately rushed to our support, promised various degrees of help and support. But one was conspicuous by its absence, one of our friends. One of our neighbors was conspicuous by its absence in support for our endeavors, and that, of course, was the country of Mexico.

□ 2145

Now, if my friends in the Hispanic Caucus here tonight really want to do something for the United States, then let me make a suggestion to them because they have chosen again to form themselves up into this specific sort of ethnic group. Let me suggest to them that this is a very positive role that group can play. Instead of trying to divide America, separate America, it seems to me that they could make a plea to the Mexican Government and to Vicente Fox.

On behalf of the Hispanic Caucus in the Congress of the United States, it would have been heartwarming to hear them say, President Fox, please give the United States the support we need in order to defend ourselves against these terrorists. Please do not hold back any more. Please try to overcome the objections within your own government, which have been noted in the paper here several times, and be forthcoming and bold in your willingness to help the United States.

This is an article which appeared in the Washington Post on September 26. Mexico City, September 26, President Vicente Fox fighting charges that he has been lukewarm in reacting to terrorist attacks in New York and Washington. He came to the United States and sort of wanted to do some damage control. Fox's comments in the speech Tuesday followed a period of uncharacteristic quiet from the usually loquacious Mexican leader who had made friendly relations with Washington a trademark of his 10-month old administration. After calling President Bush and offering public condolences after the attacks, Fox seemed to focus on domestic Mexican issues, at least in public. And despite months of globe trotting and talking about how Mexico wants a greater role in foreign affairs, the article goes on to say, there was no trip to the rubble of the World Trade Center, no photo op of the dos amigos at the White House.

In response, some Mexicans called Bush and Fox distant friends. An editorial in London's Economist magazine asked whether Fox was a "fair-weather friend."

Since the attacks, it says, Fox has been in an uncomfortable spot. Voices from the Mexican Congress, intellectuals and the public have long made it difficult for the Mexican Government to be seen as too supportive of the United States. Mexico has a tradition of avoiding getting swept in the U.S. policies and refusing to intervene in foreign conflicts. Nationalism often has been defined as anti-Americanism,

anti-Americanism from our neighbor to the south. Refusal to provide the support that we should expect from our neighbors and friends. Refusal to provide the support that one would expect from a country for which the word trust was used over and over and over again during President Fox's visit here to the United States. He must have used that 10 times during his speech to this body. We need to trust one another he said, over and over again.

Well, President Fox, if the Hispanic Caucus will not bring this to your attention, then let me. If you want to develop that trust that you ask for, there are things we can do. You can help us first of all by securing our border, our mutual border, our common border. Help us in defending that border against incursions. Help us in stopping the traffic of illegal aliens across that border, whatever nationality, wherever they come from.

Mr. Fox, you recognize the problem, I would say to him, Mr. Speaker. You recognize the problem in your own country, where you have not too long ago ordered the military, the Mexican military, to go down and defend the border between Mexico and Guatemala from incursions of Guatemalan immigrants whom you identified as people that had to be kept out because of the problem they caused in Mexico.

Now, in doing that, President Fox, I would say, I do not challenge you. You make the decisions that are necessary for the well-being of your country. So then help us, I would ask him, help us in doing exactly the same thing on your northern border. Of course, he is constrained from doing that, Mr. Speaker, because the politics inside Mexico are such that he could probably never get away with such a statement.

The article in the Post goes on to say, Carlos Fuentes, Mexico's best known novelist, also weighed in noting his concern that the declared U.S. war against "an enemy without a face," could bring civilian casualties. Fuentes reminded Mexico of its independence from its powerful neighbor, saying in widely published comments, quote, "we are partners of the United States, not their hangers-on."

The newspaper Reforma drew a scorecard. This is fascinating, Mr. Speaker; and I really hope our colleagues pay close attention to this. This is a Mexican newspaper called Reforma. It drew a scorecard of how supportive 15 countries have been for Bush. Mexico came in second from last, tied with China, slightly above Iraq and Cuba. The rankings were based on 10 signs of solidarity such as holding a national moment of silence, visiting Bush, granting permission for the use of military bases or air space.

We have refused so far to make a public issue of this lack of response on the part of our southern neighbors because I think we do not want to embarrass them or ourselves. I think the President has not asked President Fox for overt shows of support, signs of sup-

port, because he knows he cannot get it from President Fox. He knows that the Mexican people do not support it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would very much have appreciated hearing tonight from the Hispanic Caucus on the floor of this Congress how they were going to deal with this issue, again, since they choose to form themselves up in that kind of an organization, it is fair for me to ask. Why will they not talk to the President of Mexico and your colleagues down in the Mexican Congress and ask them to provide the same sort of support to the United States that Canada, Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay have provided?

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, that the countries I have just noted were listed in the paper today. As I was flying in, there was a map of the world and they were listing the countries of the Americas that had helped the United States. Canada, of course, add to that list. And the ones I just mentioned, those were identified as being, to the best of my recollection, those were identified as being the countries in the Americas that had come forth and helped us in our time of need. One was, again, conspicuous by its absence, Mr. Speaker. Where was Mexico? Where is Mexico in this dispute?

Here are excerpts from Mexican newspapers. Many Mexican newspapers reacted to the first strikes by the United States and England against Afghanistan by criticizing U.S. President George Bush and questioning Mexico's governmental support. Daily La Jornada printed an editorial saying that the attack was "not about justice or international law. It was a unilateral and arbitrary act of revenge."

An editorial called the act "Bush's holy war" and said it is the start of a war in which Mexico has no moral, political, or military reason to participate. I want to repeat that, Mr. Speaker. This is the editorial in La Jornada, a daily in Mexico. It is the start of a war in which Mexico has no moral, political or military reason to participate.

The murder of 6,000 innocent people in the Trade Towers and the planes that were used as missiles does not create a moral dilemma for Mexico according to this. Well, what in the name of God would if that does not do it?

The newspaper Excelsior said, "Mexico should not distance itself from its political tradition of rejecting war to resolve even the most difficult international controversies." The Daily added that Vicente Fox's government "voiced its support of the actions of the U.S. and Great Britain." Hopefully, it said, "that was not an effort to appease the Bush Government." The Bush Government.

La Cronica de Hoy printed in its editorial page, quote, "They will start two wars. One of the U.S. against the Taliban and one based on threats. In the first missiles are launched at targets that fail to feel the power and courage of the most powerful Nation."

An editorial in that La Jornada was the strongest yet, saying it is not necessary to go back decades to see the moral similarity between the U.S. Government and its current enemy at the moment, covert acts of censorship and lies.

This paper in Mexico compares the United States with its current enemy. We, I guess according to this paper, are similar to the Taliban, similar to the bin Laden organization, al-Qaeda.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on here with these quotes from Mexican newspapers. Suffice it to say that our friend in the south is not showing us that degree of trust that was called for by its President when he was here. Nor, Mr. Speaker, should we extend any trust under these conditions.

Street vendors, I am told, in Mexico are selling T-shirts that say essentially in Spanish, "Go Taliban." I am told that the sales are brisk.

For night after night I have come on this floor, Mr. Speaker, and I have talked about my concerns with massive immigration; and I continue to raise those concerns tonight because I believe that this is a significant problem for the United States, that a country to our south that contributes the greatest bulk of the immigration to the number of immigrants to the United States with this kind of attitude, this is not really all that healthy for the United States. We find ourselves in a difficult position if these are the attitudes that these people bring with them. I do not know that they are.

My concern is that they may be. And I am also concerned about simply the numbers. It is the massive numbers coming from any country. In this case it is Mexico. But the massive numbers make it very difficult for integration to occur. It only exacerbates the problem of the divisive nature of these debates. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, let us go ahead and talk about the political reality of massive immigration.

One reason we have it, one reason we cannot stop it, one reason why it is so hard to get people to address it is because there are political ramifications to it. One party enjoys a great benefit as a result of massive immigration. People become citizens in the United States, or even if they do not, many of them still vote illegally.

We have cases of that popping up all over. Just recently one of the groups of terrorists or it is one in the group of terrorists had actually voted in United States elections twice and was not a citizen, needless to say. So it is not hard for voter fraud to occur. We do not know the extent to which it occurs, but I think it is significant.

At any rate, people come here and are attracted to one particular party who promises, more than anything else, government largess; and that is one reason why we cannot stop immigration, legal or illegal.

□ 2200

I hate to say it, Mr. Speaker, but I believe with all my heart that we have

a serious problem as a result of porous borders and our unwillingness or inability or a lack of desire to actually create borders with integrity.

I have said this before, and I will say it again. If, God forbid, another event were to occur in this country of the nature of the September 11 events and if those events were perpetrated by people who came across our borders illegally, snuck into the United States, or were here on visas that were extended, overextended, or were here on visas that were violated because they were not doing what they were supposed to do or were here because we let them in because even though they have been associated with terrorist organizations, right now, Mr. Speaker, that by law, by a law we have, that is not enough to keep them out. If they put down on a piece of paper, yes, I am a member of al Qaeda, that does not mean we could keep them out right now. We asked for the ability to do that. The administration sent a bill to the Committee on the Judiciary to ask for the ability to do just that, and it was turned down, it was watered down in order to get bipartisan support.

So we have this problem. We have open borders, essentially. We have right now almost a quarter of a million people living in the United States who have gone through the system and been found guilty of violating their visa, or guilty of some law, the violation of an American law, and they were ordered to be deported, Mr. Speaker, but they are still here. A quarter of a million people have been ordered deported but are simply roaming the country because the INS chooses not to go after them. I will say this again, that if anything else happens and it is the same sort of situation, somebody else coming into this country and doing that and we choose to do nothing about securing our borders, not only are we irresponsible in this body but we are culpable.

We look to do everything we can. We go to country after country asking for support. We look to cut off their money supply. We look to destroy their infrastructure. We look to every single way there is to try and stop terrorists from perpetrating heinous acts, their acts of hatred on this country, but we are afraid to do one thing. We are afraid to actually begin to control our own borders, because there is a political problem here, a political issue. I think that is despicable. No one should care about how these people will eventually vote. No one should care about whose party would be more benefited by the massive numbers of people coming across our borders. What we should care about is the safety of the Americans here of every race, religion, creed, color. We should be concerned about every single Hispanic American here, citizen, every single black American, every Hindu, Muslim, whatever, I do not care what.

That is our main concern, Mr. Speaker. It is not some political need to keep these borders open that we should be

concerned about. And if that concern overrides our major responsibility as a country, as a Federal Government, then I say shame on us, because our responsibility is here clear. The Federal Government has one responsibility, primary responsibility. It is more important than health and human services, it is more important than the Department of Education, the Department of Interior, the Department of Transportation. It is more important than all of that. It is to protect the lives and property of the people in this country. That is it. That is our main goal. Everything else pales in comparison. If we refuse to take that one step that would help in that direction, and I am not suggesting for a moment that even if we seal our borders, we would be absolutely able to be sure, positively, undeniably we will never have another attack of this nature, certainly I cannot say that, but I can say this, we will lessen the chance. And I will dare anyone, I challenge anyone to stand up and explain to me how we can possibly keep open borders under these circumstances. I just simply do not understand it. But we will do it, Mr. Speaker, unless the people of this Nation rise up in a loud voice and let their representatives know that they are concerned, more concerned even than the political problem of closing down the border, the political ramifications of such a thing.

Again I ask my friends in the Hispanic Caucus, please send a message to our friends, if they are friends, in Mexico. We need their help. It is not just our Nation we are trying to protect. It is civilization. It is not just our morality that we are trying to defend, it is the morality of civilized men and women all over the world. And we need their help. The sign of a friend would be to say, we put aside all these regional differences now, we know that there is something bigger, more dangerous that affects us all, and we will help you secure your border, America, and we will do something else: If the Arab nations that control OPEC, if they attempt to blackmail the United States again by raising the cost of oil, we will sell you oil from our state-owned oil company at lower prices, and we will look to see everything we can do in terms of intelligence gathering to help you in your efforts to quash al Qaeda and any of the other organizations that are designed for the purpose of bringing death and destruction to the United States and the Western hemisphere and civilization.

Uruguay, Argentina, Brazil. Can their efforts be any more in common with ours than Mexico? But they understood that there is a moral dimension to this that extends all the way through and across their borders. How could we not expect the same from our, quote, trusted neighbor in the South? It is not just our safety that I plead for their support on, it is their own. It is civilization itself that is threatened, make no bones about this. This is not

just a war between the United States and Osama bin Laden, or al Qaeda or any of the other various individual terrorist groups. This is a war about whether civilization as we know it, where free thought and individual freedom reign, will be overtaken by the darkness of a barbaric time.

So it is in your interest, Mexico, not just ours, to help in this endeavor. Until that happens, I do not believe we can call you a trusted friend.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1992, INTERNET EQUITY AND EDUCATION ACT OF 2001

Mr. LINDER (during the Special Order of Mr. TANCREDO), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-232) on the resolution (H. Res. 256) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1992) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to expand the opportunities for higher education via telecommunications, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1992, INTERNET EQUITY AND EDUCATION ACT OF 2001

OCTOBER 9, 2001.—REFERRED TO THE HOUSE CALENDAR AND ORDERED TO BE PRINTED

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules submitted the following report to accompany H. Res. 256.

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 256, by a non-record vote, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution be adopted.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF THE RESOLUTION

The resolution provides for consideration of H.R. 1992, the Internet Equity and Education Act of 2001, under a modified closed rule. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. The rule provides that the amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

The rule provides for consideration of an amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in this report, if offered by Representative MINK or a designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENT MADE IN ORDER UNDER THE RULE

(SUMMARY DERIVED FROM INFORMATION PROVIDED BY SPONSOR)

Mink amendment in the nature of a substitute. Allows institutions of higher education that meet a high standard of financial responsibility by having default rates lower than 10% to be exempt from the 50% provisions which restrict the number of courses offered through distance education and the number of students who may enroll in distance education courses.