

Democrats favor common sense economics and Democrats favor a common sense approach to airport security. Working families are consuming families. Working families, if we put dollars in their hands, they are going to put it back into the economy and turn it over faster than anybody else. All of this is well-known. Japan, now looking back at the way their economy has dragged, regrets that they did not take a more forceful position at first to stimulate the economy by putting more money in the hands of consumers. The consumer is the engine of our economy, and by following the pattern that was laid down in the democratic package today where a great stimulus would be provided via the unemployment route, starting with the unemployment insurance and making sure that people who lose their employment are taken care of, provided with some possibility of re-training, provided with health care, and gotten back into the economy as fast as possible, that would be the stimulus that would surpass any other effort.

To talk about tax cuts means investments in the economy is to put our heads in the sand. If we give tax cuts, if we put more money in the hands of the rich, they are going to invest somewhere in the world, but not in our economy necessarily. I think the oil pipelines in the former Soviet Union are much hotter right now in terms of investment. They have expanded the production and the distribution of oil and there are a number of places in the world where we can get a bigger return on our investment than we can get by putting it into our present economy. We do not necessarily get any kind of stimulus by putting more money in the hands of the rich.

We are all in this battle together, and as I close out, I hope that we understand that to take care of the people on the bottom who are losing their jobs and facing the prospects of not being able to pay their mortgage or put food on the table, to take care of the people on the bottom is part of recognizing that we are all in this together. The working families are going to produce the sons and daughters on the front lines in Afghanistan. Working families are going to live through this difficult period here where we are at home fighting the anxiety of Anthrax; the working families, like the 2 postal workers who died. We are all in this together, and to take the ideological position that we are redistributing the wealth by asking for a decent unemployment package within a stimulus package is to go the route of the ideologues.

Mr. Speaker, ideologues are very dangerous. Ideologues are not the total cause of the collapse of the Soviet Union, it is more complicated than that; but a primary cause of the fall of the Soviet Union was the ideologues were in charge. The ideologues are like witch doctors. They are obsessed. They do not look at reason. They will not ac-

cept any kind of facts. They are locked in. And we are in this great Nation at the mercy of certain people in key positions, especially in this House, who are ideologues and we must fight those ideologues. Common sense must prevail over the ideologues in order for us to go forward, both with airport security and with the stimulus package that will help our economy.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York. I appreciate the fact that we are ending this Special Order as he said, on what is practical. I think that is all we are really saying as Democrats, is that we want practical solutions that are going to pass, be signed by the President, and help the American people. That is why the airline security package that passed the other body, the Senate, should come up here. The Republican leadership should allow us to bring it up because we know it will pass, the President will sign it, and it will become law. The same is true for an economic package. Let us put together a package that helps the little guy, that helps the displaced worker, that provides some tax relief, and that really stimulates the economy that we can all get together with on a bipartisan basis and pass so that it means something to help the economy. That is all we are asking for, practical solutions. As Democrats, we are going to be here every night until these practical solutions are brought up and the Republican leadership essentially faces reality.

AUTHORIZING INTRODUCTION OF JOINT RESOLUTION DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 11 AS UNITED WE STAND REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr. DREIER (during the Special Order of Mr. PALLONE). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 5 of rule XII, Representative FOSSELLA of New York be authorized to introduce a joint resolution to amend title 36, United States Code, to designate September 11 as United We Stand Remembrance Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSBORNE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2001, CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTION DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 11 AS UNITED WE STAND REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr. DREIER (during the Special Order of Mr. PALLONE). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on Thursday, October 25, 2001, without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution introduced by Representative Fossella of New

York pursuant to the previous order of the House (to amend title 36, United States code, to designate September 11 as United We Stand Remembrance Day); that the joint resolution be considered as read for amendment; that the joint resolution be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2001, CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 70, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. DREIER (during the Special Order of Mr. PALLONE). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on October 25, 2001, without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 70) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes; that the joint resolution be considered as read for amendment; that the joint resolution be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE: HEIGHTENED BORDER SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore ((Mr. OSBORNE)). 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, as I have been waiting this evening to address the House, I have, of course, been listening to the comments of my colleagues from the other side with regard to airline security. It will undeniably be an issue that will be brought to the attention of the American public in this fashion as a point of general order and, of course, discussions in the House as we meet daily. It is, of course, a very important issue, there is no 2 ways about it, that people in the general public believe that airline security has to be enhanced. I do not know that there is a single Member of the Congress that does not think that airline security needs to be enhanced. Of course, we will have differences of opinion as to exactly how that should

happen and we, unfortunately, will take advantage of the differences of opinion about this to make partisan points and to be incredibly divisive and to reintroduce the whole issue of partisanship into the debate about airline security. But that is, of course, the nature of the business when we are in. When 2 individuals or, in this case, 2 parties have different opinions about issues like airline security, each side will claim that the other side is being partisan for holding on to their opinion.

It is intriguing certainly, intriguing, to say the least, that a great deal of time is being spent on the discussion of airline security with the thought in mind somehow that a change in who pays the wages of the people who are charged with the responsibility for conducting security, that somehow or other, this fact, this and this alone, will change the whole arena and will change the whole feeling of the general public about security, and will make people feel better about traveling; just simply changing who pays the wages, whether it is the Federal Government paying the wages or a private employer. Somehow or other, people then will become much more intent upon doing their job, much more competent in doing their job.

Well, I must tell my colleagues that I do not believe for a moment that that is what will give us confidence in this country in terms of our general, overall security. I do not believe it is the issue of who is paying the person who is looking through that little screen as our bags go through as to whether or not; and, by the way, people I guess think of that as being some very complex job that only a very highly skilled person, a "Federal employee" is able to do, right? Now, again, I do not know what makes anybody think that a Federal employee is more capable of looking into that little screen and seeing a light go off, because they are not actually trying to identify any individual part of the package going through; they are simply there to see when a light goes off, and the light tells them, search that package, that is it. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is not really a very high-level job. It just means the light went on. Can you tell? If it does, search the bag, right?

Now, somehow or other, the other side would have us believe that if we hire Federal employees, give them all the benefits of Federal employment, of course, more importantly, the security of never being fired for being incompetent, the security for being able to strike, the security of being able to shut the whole Nation down by a work stoppage because they can do that as a Federal employees union and never be held accountable for it, that part never comes up in this discussion about transferring this responsibility.

□ 1945

We are led to believe that if only the Republicans, these ideologues, as my

friends on the other side kept calling us, if only these ideologues will agree to federalizing this entire work force, we will be safer. But never has anybody said why. I ask my friends anywhere in this House to tell me why it would be safer to have a Federal employee looking through that screen to see the light come on, or any other variety of jobs.

If we need better training for the employees who do this work, I am all for it. I am all for it. If we want to federalize anything, federalize the standards that have to be met. I have no qualms about that whatsoever.

But who is the ideologue here in this discussion, in this debate? Is it in fact the people on our side who are suggesting that the safer and better thing to do would be to allow people to be hired and fired if they are incompetent, to be fired if they threaten to strike and shut down the entire Nation's air transport system, and yet be held to high standards of ability in order to assure whatever degree of security we want established at our airports?

Those of us who want that, are we ideologues, or could it be people on the other side who want those people to be Federal employees? Again, nobody has said why that is so necessary. The reason they do not want to say it, Mr. Speaker, is because the reason they want Federal employees is because Federal employees will contribute to the Federal employees' union, which will contribute to the campaign coffers of the people on the other side. That is ideological, in my estimation.

So the real issue here, as far as I am concerned, has nothing to do with airline security; it has everything to do with securing our borders. This is the issue we should be debating tonight, and every single night and every single day.

I have never heard, and I have done this many times; as the staff and maybe the Speaker will attest, I have have done this many times: I have come to the floor on special orders to plead with my colleagues to look at the issue of immigration reform, to look at the issue of defending our border as the first line of defense in defending this Nation.

I have begged for that; and often-times, far too often, I have been the only person here. I am happy to say that I am joined this evening by a colleague to join in this debate who I will recognize in just one second. It is just that never have I heard anyone from the other side of this aisle come to this floor and talk about this issue.

Frankly, from my point of view, I am much more concerned about the fact that we have porous borders through which people can come and do come who wish to do us harm, and we have absolutely no desire to try to stop them there, but we spend enormous amounts of time talking about who should be the guy or the lady looking through the screen to see if the light comes on in the machine. That is what is going to make us feel better?

I do not want them in this Nation to begin with. I do not want them in the airport in the United States, the people who are here to do us harm. I do not want them getting across the border. I do not want them being given a visa in any nation in this world which requires a visa to come to the United States. I do not want them getting it in the first place.

That is where our emphasis should be, because frankly, Mr. Speaker, every single member of the organization that came here on September 11 and hijacked those planes, drove them into the World Trade Center and into the Pentagon, and would have come here, were people who were not citizens of this country. They were here on various visas, some of them illegal because they had overstayed or not done the right thing on their visa, and we did not care. We did not go after them. The INS could not care less. I have tons of information we will get into tonight.

That is where I want our emphasis put. I want it put on stopping them from getting here. I am all for airline security. I am all for making sure that man or woman who is looking through the little scope on that thing, and when the light goes off, I want to make sure that they say, okay, open that bag.

Yes, I am all for it. I am actually for doing a lot more than that with everybody who gets near the airplane. Food service handlers and baggage handlers, let us make them accountable, too. We do not need to make them Federal employees to get there, but that is a secondary issue. The issue is, how do they get into the United States to begin with, and why is it that we continue to be so afraid of paying any attention to this issue, so afraid of discussing the issue of immigration and immigration reform?

Someone who is not afraid of that has joined us tonight, and I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), for his comments.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding to me.

Let us acknowledge what he has said. Yes, it is important to understand what is transpiring in terms of aviation safety. Yes, it is important to have scrutiny to the point that we can ensure airliner safety in many different areas, not only those who would come to get on the plane and have themselves and their hand-carried luggage checked, but also, transcending that, the caterers, the cleaners; a myriad of other people who have access to aircraft. That is very important.

But it seems, to borrow the line from I guess Rogers and Hammerstein, "Let's start at the very beginning, a very good place to start."

It is the unmistakable, undebatable function of the Federal Government to secure our borders and to be in control of those who would come to this Nation. My friend, the gentleman from

Colorado, points out the story of the 19 villainous vermin who came here to do us harm; in fact, who launched this war with acts of terror that were indeed acts of war that cost so many Americans their lives.

When we read the stories that our intelligence gatherers have been able to come across, we understand that, either through miscommunication or an unwillingness and inability to follow up on the status of visas, or special visas that require really no scrutiny, we allowed many of these horrific people to come and stay and perpetrate their acts of terror and war.

We must secure our borders. The challenge in the early 21st century is that there are those who would take an issue of national survival, try to dismiss it as jingoism or xenophobia, or a myriad of attacks of the politically incorrect, when, instead, they are elemental tools that the American people cry out to see activated.

It is not only the border to our south. Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are those who join us, and they see the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Arizona, and they say that it is the United States' border with Mexico that causes the problems.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that some who have perpetrated acts of terror and war against this country came in through our border to the north in Canada. I would point out the unbelievable situation, according to some press accounts, that at least one of the perpetrators voted in our Presidential election in 2000.

Now, there reaches a point in time when enough is enough. With the war we confront and the nature of our enemy, we must take the steps necessary to defend this Nation.

Governor Ridge has taken over as our director of homeland defense. Our first line of defense is securing our borders and taking account of those who have come here. It is very simple. The old saying is, when you have dug a hole for yourself, stop digging. Until we get an accounting of exactly who is here, and quite frankly, who should be escorted beyond these borders, only then can we take control.

One other note. And lest this is confused, Arab Americans have a chance to lead the way in our fight in terms of an understanding of culture and language and their own sense of patriotism. They have a chance to lead the way in this fight.

This is not for a second to impugn the motives or the patriotism of any Arab American. Indeed, I know many personally who are guts-up Americans who have served in the military of this country, who stand ready to defend this land in any way, shape, or form.

But to those who have come illegally and to those who would do us harm, it is time for a change; to harken back to what is absolutely required of us in this constitutional Republic, and that is control of our borders and an accounting of those who are here, and ac-

tions to send home those who are here unlawfully.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

It is not as if we had not been warned more than once. It is not as if all of this happened to us in the United States, the events of September 11, and we thought, Gee, how could this have occurred? Why were we not warned? Why did no one ever come forward?

Well, of course, people have come forward. Many people have come forward, and earlier than the 11th, actually years before. There has been testimony before this House of Representatives, before the Congress of the United States, about the dangers we face as a result of having border that we cannot control.

As early as January 25, 2000, a terrorist expert by the name of Stephen Emerson testified at a U.S. House of Representatives hearing on international terrorism and immigration policy. Rereading Emerson's testimony is chilling, but it is also infuriating, because he laid out chapter and verse how terrorists enter the U.S.

Emerson virtually predicted the attacks. In a 35-page document, Emerson listed the various reasons for the emergence of terrorist groups in the United States:

One, an ability to operate under our political radar system;

Two, an ability to hide under mainstream religious identification;

Three, loopholes in immigration procedures;

Four, ease of penetration of the borders;

Five, limitation on FBI and other agencies performing law enforcement functions, including the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Customs Service;

More sophisticated compartmentalization of terrorist cells around loosely structured terrorist movements;

Exploitation of freedom of religion and speech;

Exploitation of nonprofit fund-raising, and lack of government scrutiny.

Does all this sound somewhat familiar? Every single issue that he brought up of course we now know to be part of the great mosaic that has been presented to us here as the terrorist threat:

Increasing cross-fertilization and mutual support provided by members of different Islamic terrorist groups;

Ease of ability to get student visas from countries harboring or supporting terrorists;

Failure by universities to keep track of foreign students and their spouses;

Protection afforded by specially-created educational programs;

Ease of visa fraud and the intervention of false credentials from passports, driver's licenses, credit cards, and Social Security numbers;

Blowback from the anti-Soviet Mujahedin that the U.S. supported in Afghanistan.

Again, it is almost uncanny, but this was testimony to the United States Congress, and we chose to ignore it. Why? It is because this issue, the issue of immigration and immigration reform, paralyzes so many of us. We are afraid of the kind of epithets that are thrown at us when we enter into this debate.

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

Mr. TANCREDO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, and certainly the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), as well as my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), who is here to speak in just a few minutes.

Concerning a point the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) made as well, and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), let me say today, as a matter of fact, I was in a 1-hour call-in show in Raleigh, North Carolina, the home of NC State, where this gentleman played football years ago, and there came up several times a point you and he made when I first came on the floor.

Certainly those of us in the Congress, whether they be on the Committee on Armed Services, which I am on, or it could be on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and other committees, we have known for a number of years that the possibility of a rogue nation or a terrorist group making an attack on the American people was a matter of probably when it was going to happen. Would we be prepared? That is another question.

The point that was made today by four or five callers is prior to September 11, we have had a problem in this Nation. I know that is what the gentleman has been speaking about, I know that is what he has been speaking about, and I know that there are many people in this Congress, and the gentleman has taken the lead on some type of legislation.

We have done a very poor job as a Nation, as a country, of tracking those who come visit our Nation and what they might be doing, and whether they are extending their length of time in this Nation without permission, so to speak, from the government.

We need, as the gentleman was saying tonight, and the gentleman from Arizona, to do something. The time of debate about what we should have done is past. What are we going to do is the debate of the present and future.

□ 2000

So I want to say that I am glad to be here with this group tonight because the American people, the five callers that I had today on this Raleigh radio station said, yes, we know we have a problem. What are we going to do to reform the problem? What are we going to do to make sure that American people are safe from a security standpoint?

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Just to echo that point and to thank my friend from North Carolina for mentioning my alma mater, although my football experience there may not be quite NFL caliber, but we will not go to that.

But the town halls of the areas, whether it is talk radio WPTF in Raleigh; KFYI in Phoenix, Arizona; a town hall meeting we held on city cable in Scottsdale Friday evening, the people who came there demanded that in this time of war we absolutely control our borders. That is the first step in homeland defense.

It is not for a second to suggest it is the only step, but it is the first step.

Mr. TANCREDO. The gentleman is so correct. We cannot stand here tonight, nor have we ever stated in this debate that unequivocally we know that if we simply control our borders, do everything we can possibly do to make sure that the people who are coming in are identified, that we know what they do when they come in here, that we know when they leave, that if we did all of these things that we could prevent any other kind of event. But not doing those things makes us irresponsible.

At this point in time I will say this, that God forbid, if there is another event of a similar nature as there was on September 11, and it occurs as a result of somebody else waltzing across our borders, somebody that we should have been able to identify as being one of the bad guys, somebody that we recognize or who even comes in under legitimate passport or visa but then does something here for which he should have been deported and we do not do it, if anything like that happens, we are not just being irresponsible, we are actually being culpable at that point. This Congress is culpable if we do not do everything we can do to stop it. It may still happen, but we have a responsibility.

It is like saying they still rob banks even though we have laws against it. What does that mean? Should we pile the money on the desktop in the bank? No. We should still do everything we can do to stop it. And that is what we should be thinking about in this Congress.

Our immigration reform caucus, I see Members joining us here tonight who are members of the caucus; and I sincerely thank them for their participation in that effort because that is the only thing that is going to move legislation through this is getting enough folks to add their voice to those that have been raised in this debate so far.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and my colleagues that are here tonight for having this special order because I think as we talk about this war on terrorism,

if we are not serious about really dealing with some of our immigration problems, then we are not really serious about the war on terrorism. Because if we have enemies from within and we are doing nothing about it, I think the gentleman is exactly right, then we are culpable. Shame on us for not doing more.

The more we learn about this, the more troubling this becomes. I was surprised to learn, and I think most of my constituents, when I talk to my constituents, I ask them, for example, how many people do you think come into this country every year on average on some form of visa? I get numbers like 100,000, 200,000. And when I say to them, it is 31.5 million people, they are taken aback. Then the question I ask is, what happens to those people? Where are they now? And the truth of the matter is we do not know.

One of scariest things if we look back at the events of September 11, two individuals went up to the ticket counter of American Airlines at Dulles Airport just a few miles from here, they used their own names and they purchased tickets on American Airlines to fly. Now, the interesting thing was the INS knew that those two individuals were members of the Egyptian jihad. Now that did not preclude them from coming into the United States. But the interesting thing is the FBI did not know that, and neither did American Airlines.

I was at the Pentagon the other day, and I walked down the hall where they have the pictures of all the people that were killed that day. And I think the saddest picture of all is that picture of that young bride in her wedding dress. Somehow when I think about that, that here the INS knew that these two individuals, using their own names, were members of the Egyptian jihad, and yet that information had not been shared with the FBI or American Airlines.

Shame on us. We have got to do something about this. In fact, the more I have learned about this, and I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) because he has done a great job of shedding the light of day on this issue because we need to know. The American people need to know. For example, in the last year that we have numbers for, 895 people came to the United States on visas from Iraq.

Now, we do not have a whole lot of business dealings with Iraq. We buy a little bit of oil from them. We know that they have been problematic relative to harboring terrorism. How did 895 people get into this country on visas? And, most importantly, where did they go?

Mr. TANCREDO. Let me answer that question, at least a partial answer as to where did they come from? How did they get here? How is it that 895 people from Iraq were given visas?

Something else your constituents should know about, something all of our constituents should know about.

There is another program operated by the government, we passed it not too long ago. It is called diversity visas. Diversity visas are given to countries that we do not think have actually sent us enough people. As bizarre as this sounds, this is the truth. Congress passed it a few years ago. There are 55,000 allotted every single year. They go to countries, as I say, that it has been determined, it is a formula basis; and if a certain country has not sent us enough people, then they go to the head of the line, these diversity visas, 55,000 of them. The bulk of those 55,000 visas go to countries in the Middle East, Egypt, Iraq, Iran. They are put on the top of the list.

So I do not know if the 895 people from Iraq came on that basis. But I am telling you that 55,000 visas are set aside just for those kind of countries. They have not sent us enough people. That is as bizarre as it gets. No, that is not as bizarre as it gets. Believe me, it gets even weirder around here when you start talking about his issue.

Tell your constituents this, that of the 31 million people who come here every single year on visas, something like 40 percent violate their visas. That is 12 million people a year who do something to violate the visa. They overstay it. That is the most common. But they break our laws. That is another very common thing that happens. Of the 12 million who violate these visas, we actually end up with maybe 100,000 of them going into the judicial system, maybe 200,000.

Of the 200,000 of the 12 million who get to the immigration court, about 100,000 actually get deported. No, actually get sentenced to be deported. A judge hears the case. He hears about the person who beat up the old lady, raped the young girl, murdered somebody in the street, robbed the bank, whatever it was, and the judge sentences this person to be deported.

At that point in time, in the system we now have, in the immigration system, that person is turned over to the INS for enforcement procedures. And I had a judge, an immigration judge call my office one day and say I have got to tell you this because I am going crazy. I am so frustrated. I have been here 12 years on this bench. He said, day in and day out I listen to these stories. I adjudicate and I find someone guilty of violating their visa and I order them deported. And day in and day out they turn around and walk out the door, and I know they will never be deported because INS does not go after them. They do not care. That is not their main interest.

He said, I think there are about 225,000 of these people wandering around the United States. So we went on the television and everywhere I would go I talked about it. I said by now it is about a quarter of a million. I thought I was pushing the envelope a little bit. He said the information was about a year old. I thought by now it is probably a quarter million.

Finally, someone from Human Events and a newspaper in California went to the INS and kept pressing them. They finally admitted, yes, it is true that there are a few folks out there who have been ordered to be deported but they are not gone. How many? It was 300,000 per year.

This is what the INS says they have lost. No, the INS says we know they have been deported. We cannot find them. We do not know where they are, and we have not gone after them.

Can you imagine explaining this to anybody, a constituent, and having them say, well, Congressman, what are you going to do about that? And I say, it is very tough because you try to get any immigration reform across here and they would rather talk about the airline security guy who is looking through the screen.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TANCREDO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I will leave in a second; and my good friend and part of our immigration caucus, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE), will be stepping up.

Let me say, this is what I want to leave to my colleagues here tonight from Arizona, Colorado, Minnesota, and Virginia. We need for the American people, we all have been on this floor numerous times with friends, let me say this, that support you, we need for the American people to understand that this is absolutely critical that we reform the immigration laws of this country if we want to protect the national security of the American people. And for that to happen, they need to let their Members of Congress, their Senators, their President know that this is a critical issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) to know that I will do everything I can to help him move forward with this reform because it is critical to the national security of America. I thank the gentleman for that.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman. I must tell the gentleman, I could not be prouder of the people on this floor tonight who are here to support this effort. It is great.

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

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Tancredo) so much for his leadership on the immigration issue and for his work in diligent, hard-working fashion in finding out so many statistics and facts that we need to bolster our argument to end illegal immigration and to curtail legal immigration.

I wanted to share with you an article from the Arizona Republic that talks about the 19 terrorists that were involved in crashing the airlines into the Pentagon, the World Trade Center, and into the field in Pennsylvania. It ap-

pears that over half of those hijackers were illegal. There are no immigration records on six of them. And I will do the best as I can in reading their names. Fayez Rashid Ahmed, Satam M.A. Al Suqami, Hamza Alghamdi, Mohand Alshehri, Saeed Alghamdi and Wail M. Alshehri.

Those six have no immigration records. And the gentleman was talking about the situation of walking in across the Canadian border or walking in across the Mexican border, and any of those six could have taken either of those routes into the United States.

Then we go to four that were here at one time legally, but they were out of status and that means they were also illegal. They entered legally but overstayed the visa was Nawaf Alhazmi, admitted to the United States as a nonimmigrant visitor in January 2000. He appears to have overstayed his visa. Waleed M. Alshehri, admitted in June 2000 as a nonimmigrant; and on the date of the September 11 was in illegal status. Ahmed Alghamdi believed to have been admitted as a nonimmigrant student and appears to have overstayed his visa. The other, Hani Hanjour, admitted as a nonimmigrant student in December 2000. INS officials say they were unable to determine whether Hanjour was legal on September 11.

Another issue in the area of immigration that I feel we need to focus on is H1-B visas. These are the high-tech visas, and we recently in a prior Congress increased the maximum number from 65,000 to 110,000.

In my opinion and I know the gentleman has worked for this and others, we need a moratorium and H1-B visas. That is one thing that could help our economy now because American citizens need these jobs.

I want to just briefly lay out the job layoffs in the fifth district of Virginia.

□ 2015

In my home town of Rocky Mount, 500 jobs were lost at Lane Furniture. In Altavista, Virginia, 500 jobs were lost. In Clarksville, Virginia, I received a call from the Mayor today, 600 jobs at Russell Stover are lost. Last year, in Henry County, Virginia, we saw Tultex Corporation, which was the biggest sweat and fleece wear manufacturer in the country go completely out of business; JPS Converter, in Halifax County, 250 jobs, 2 months ago. And in Lunenburg, Mecklenberg, and Halifax Counties we have seen tobacco workers lose their jobs because of the change in climate in the tobacco industry. And there have been thousands of other textile workers.

We need to be retraining these persons so that they can do the jobs in the high-tech industry instead of bringing in persons from other countries under H-1B visas.

And if the gentleman will just give me a couple more minutes, one issue that is going to be facing us soon is going to involve an extension of 245(i).

Mr. TANCREDO. The gentleman should perhaps explain.

Mr. GOODE. Well, 245(i) is a way for persons in this country illegally, who have been here for some time illegally, to go around the process and immediately get legal status.

This is a real slap in the face to those from other nations that go through the process, that go through the interview process, that talk with the consuls, that talk with the INS people, who get fingerprinted, that wait in line for their turn. These people under 245(i) go around the line and get to the head of the line and they are immediately legal.

We are going to be asked, I feel, on the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill to extend 245(i). The Senate passed it for, I believe, an indefinite extension; and that measure has not made it through the House, so they are going to attach something, I am fearful, on that appropriations bill. And the message would be clear: if you can get in here illegally, if you wait it out, you can get amnesty.

We do not need amnesty at this time. An amendment putting forth 245(i) for an extension, even if it is just for 6 months or a year, would be the wrong message, in the wrong place, at the wrong time, on the wrong bill. And I hope our body will defeat it.

Mr. TANCREDO. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I want to reemphasize something he was talking about in terms of the economic stimulus package that was passed earlier today. It was a very controversial package of legislation, primarily dealing with tax cuts.

I hope that it will do the job. I hope that it will, in fact, provide the stimulus this country needs to put people back to work and to deal with the people in the district of my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, in the district of my colleague from Minnesota, all of whom are looking at us for some way to describe what is happening to them, some explanation of what is going on and perhaps a way to help out.

We can do certain things. We can tinker with the monetary policy, and we can tinker with the fiscal policy, and we can hope that down the road apiece all that will kick in and in maybe 6 months or a year we will see the effects of it. But we could have done something today with an immediate reaction, immediate reaction, and, frankly, I had asked for permission to offer amendments to the bill but was not allowed to. We were not allowed to bring this issue up. But I am going to talk about it, and the gentleman brought it up tonight, and we are going to continue to talk about this because we are going to introduce a bill even in the next couple of days, and I hope my colleagues will join me on this, and that is to repeal the particular provision that the gentleman is talking about that has allowed us to expand the number of people who can come in here on visas and take jobs.

We were told by many people that we needed them; that we could not fill the

jobs with Americans; that no matter how hard they tried, no matter how many ads they put in the paper, and we are talking now about white collar jobs, these are not the folks that are coming in across the border to do some of the more menial tasks. We are talking about white collar jobs that are relatively highly paid, and we have been told for years that we cannot get enough people in here to do it. Well, I think we have people in the United States today, American citizens, who are willing to do the job. But what is happening to us, because of the visas we have allowed, the particular kind my friend refers to, and we raised the cap on that visa, that particular visa, we now have allowed 195,000 a year, and they can stay for 6 years.

Now, figure that out. That is 1.2 million people after that period of time, and that is only from this point on. It does not even count all the ones that have come here up to this year under that visa program. So there is 1.2 million potentially here in a relatively short time. And we could close the door on that and we could improve the opportunity for a lot of people in this country to get jobs again by simply saying that if you are here, and I am sorry, if you are not an American citizen and you are taking a job, you have to leave. Because, frankly, we have our own people that we have to employ.

I am telling the truth here, and I am as altruistic as the next guy, but I want to give the job to the American citizen before I give it to somebody overseas. It is not as if we do not have people who want the job. I have had people in my office, two just last week, both of them displaced because they had people come in here on visas and take their job. It was not because they did not want the job. That was not it at all; but they could be replaced with somebody who would work for less, pure and simple. So they are out of work.

And now, by the way, some of these visa holders have been thrown out of work. And their visa says very, very clearly that they must leave the country if that job ends. But the INS said just the other day, not to worry; to spend a few months, they said, and look for another job; compete with the Americans who have been thrown out of work, they said. This is the INS. This is the group that we charge with responsibility of monitoring our borders, of actually enforcing our immigration policy. But they are not on "our side" here.

I had a debate in Denver, Colorado, not too long ago, with a lady who was the representative of the INS in my region. During the debate the radio announcer, the host, said to her, I do not understand, why does the INS not go after these people who are here illegally and send them home? And she said, without hesitation, this lady said, because that is not our job. She said, our job is to help them find a way to become legal citizens.

I mean, I was flabbergasted. But I do not know why I should be flabbergasted any more about things I have heard with regard to this immigration issue because it is all mind-boggling. In fact, we are compiling in my office, and if anybody has stories out there that can be verified of these, what I call "unbelievable but true stories," they can call our office, 202-226-7882, because we are compiling these stories, and I will bring them to the floor night after night. I am going to list the top 10 most incredible stories. We could be here every single night for the rest of this Congress talking about these incredible but true things like I have just described where an immigration official said that the responsibilities of the INS was not to go after people who were here illegally, but in fact to find a way to get them into the United States and make them legal.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I will be real brief here, but the point the gentleman is really making, and this is what we need to debate and discuss here in Congress and for too long we have been cowed, and I want to come back to that, from having an honest debate about immigration, but Americans are being injured. We talk about what happened September 11, and the list was very, very instructive from my colleague from Virginia, but people are being injured every day by legal, semi-legal, and illegal immigration in America today because no one is minding the store.

They are losing their jobs, people are being injured through crimes, rape. We have had that actually happen in my town of Rochester, where illegal people or people who were here on visas have committed serious crimes, and yet there was no consequence. They are losing their jobs and they are losing their futures because of this immigration, and at the same time the INS is taking this unbelievably bizarre attitude. Worse than that, we in Congress, the people who are elected to set the policy for this country are cowed from debating this, or have been up until the last several months, because we are all sons and daughters and grandsons and granddaughters of immigrants.

We are a Nation of immigrants, and we understand that immigration is part of our culture. And as Ronald Reagan said, we are one of the only countries where people can come here and become Americans. I could go to Germany, and my heritage is of German heritage, but in all likelihood I would never become a German citizen. It is very difficult to get German citizenship. You can go to France, but you will probably never become a French citizen. And that is true of most of the other countries of the world.

We permit every year more people legally to come to the United States and become American citizens than all of the other countries combined in the world. And that is good, because we are

a Nation of immigrants. But we have to have an honest discussion about illegal immigration and what happens when those people who come here on visas and they break our laws, when they take our jobs, when they do not play by the rules. What are we going to do about it?

And the fact of the matter is we have not even had an honest debate about that. But the good news is the American people are waking up on this and they are far ahead of the public policy-makers. When I have my town hall meetings, when I talk on the radio, and when I meet with my constituents, they understand. They get it. And they are way ahead of us. And they are beginning to say, when is Congress going to begin to take some serious action about this issue.

I want to make one more point before I yield back my time, and that is to say, and our colleague from Arizona made this point, that we want to be careful that we do not sound here on the House floor that we are anti-immigrant or, more importantly, that we are anti-Arab or anti-Islamic immigrants. We have a large number, about 300 in my hometown of Rochester, folks who came here who are practicing members of the Islamic faith. And I have never been prouder than last Monday when they had a rally in Rochester, Minnesota, to hear people who could barely speak English shouting and chanting with American flags in their hands saying God bless America.

It reminded me of a country and western singer a couple of weeks ago when he said something so profound and so simple, and it needs to be repeated. He said, "You know, the terrorists just don't get it. They do not realize that we don't just live in America. America lives in us."

We do understand and appreciate the value of a balanced and fair system of immigration. But the system has become so skewed and so unfair. When we have 31 million people coming into this country and we do not keep track of them on visas, when there are 200, perhaps 300,000 people who are in fact subject to deportation and yet there is no real consequence, when there are people breaking our laws and no real consequence, then the system is broken and it really is the responsibility of the United States Congress to begin to fix it.

We want to work with the former Governor of Pennsylvania, Tom Ridge, who has a very, very difficult job, and we all understand and appreciate that. But we need to work with him, we need to work with the administration, we need to work within the confines of the Congress to make certain that we bring some sense of order out of this chaos, because what we have right now in immigration policy is absolute chaos.

When people can walk up and buy an airplane ticket and the INS knows in their computer files that they are members of potential terroristic groups and that information is not shared, we

have a serious problem. When people can take jobs from hardworking, law-abiding American citizens, and there is no recourse for those citizens, there is something wrong with the system.

We have a chance, we have an opportunity, and most importantly I think we have an obligation to fix that system.

□ 2030

We want to work with Governor Ridge. We believe he represents perhaps the best opportunity to begin to get control of all of this and working with the Congress to come up with a new immigration policy that recognizes we want immigrants in our country, we want to be that shining city on the hill that Ronald Reagan talked about, but we also want to have some rules and see to it that those rules are abided by, and that ultimately we do not have a system that literally invites terrorists to come into our country to set up shop, to be able to move freely around our country and never have to be accountable to anybody.

So I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) for participating tonight to help tell that story because I am convinced the more the American people realize what is going on in this country, the more that they are going to demand from their Members of Congress, from this administration, from Governor Ridge and others that the system begin to change in a responsible way.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely appreciate the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) coming to the floor tonight, all of my colleagues, because frankly I could not have said it better and especially the gentleman's last statement in regard to his constituents and others who were recent arrivals to the United States and stood up there with an American flag and saying God bless America and saying God bless them.

Certainly, it is an interesting aspect when the gentleman talks about the idea of dual citizenships, the fact that someone cannot go to other countries and become a citizen, and it is very true that it is very difficult in many countries to become a citizen of that country. It is very easy here.

Another interesting aspect of all of this is that there is another phenomenon we are witnessing with this massive influx of immigrants, both legal and illegal, but the ones that eventually become legalized. There are today as we stand here six million people in the United States that hold dual citizenships, that have either refused to relinquish at one point in time the citizenship of the country from which they came or chose later to accept a second citizenship.

Mexico just recently passed a law a few years ago allowing for this to happen and the numbers exploded. Six million here. I do not know this of course, but I will bet my colleagues that not

one of those people that stood up where the gentleman talked about and waved that flag and were singing God Bless America, I bet none of them have latched on to dual citizenship because you have to ask frankly, whose side am I on. When it really comes down to it, when a person takes the oath of allegiance to become a citizen, that person is supposed to relinquish any allegiance to any foreign potentate or power. That is the old wording of it.

If the person has another citizenship, have they really done that? Why is this happening? Should we allow it to happen?

I do not believe that United States citizenship should be conferred on anyone who has some other loyalty. It is just another part of the picture here that we have to bring forward and wonder about.

It has been a long time that I have been debating this issue, it is true, and it is also true that now some Members of the Congress are joining us. Those of us who have been in this caucus know that now we are getting people coming to us and saying they want to join, and I say that is wonderful. I hate the idea that it may have been the events of September 11 that brought it about. I do not want to win on that basis.

I wish that was not the reason why this whole focus has changed because it is such a horrific event, but we have to deal with reality here, and the reality of the situation is this: That immigration is an important part of this picture and immigration reform is a very important part of the solution. That is undeniable. There is not a Member of this body that can honestly look a constituent in the face or another Member in the face and say forget about immigration, open borders. Even organizations like The Wall Street Journal and others who have been for years on their editorial page pushing the issue of open borders, free trade and all this, and I am a free trader, so that is not the issue at all, but even they now, I have noticed, have some degree of reticence to come forward with those kinds of editorials and I am glad of it. I just wish it had not been anything quite so horrendous to force them into this position.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE).

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, in town meetings and public forums, even before September 11, I saw in my district what the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) was describing in his district, grassroots America is fed up with massive illegal immigration, and they really want to see legal immigration curtailed, and that was that feeling in America before September 11 because these people are at the local level. They are in the counties and cities all across America, and they are seeing the impact in their communities.

The gentleman talked about the INS officials that do not deport. A factor in that is once we deport them, if we send

them north or if we send them south, they can make a U-turn and come right back in. I know the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is the chief sponsor of the resolution focusing on the integrity of our borders, and I would like to see that resolution moved forward and get us tighter security on both the northern border and the southern border.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, perhaps anecdotes are useful and I feel they are useful to sort of portray a much bigger problem.

Every day somebody comes up to me because I have become sort of involved with this issue and people know. So these people will tell me stories about something they have heard something else that just occurred. I will share with my colleagues and the Members here something that happened again a short time ago, and it is one of those things that one says no this cannot be, this is impossible.

Remember here, he was telling the story about, I thought at the time three-quarter of a million people who were running around the country, and I was saying to him, it is better to be a crook as an alien here in the United States than it is to be a citizen crook. A citizen crook goes to our justice system, to a regular justice system. In fact, if the person is found guilty he is going to go to jail. It is a very good chance if the person is found guilty as an alien, there is a very good chance the person will never see the inside of a prison cell.

He said, again, well, listen to this. He said, You think that is something, listen to this. This gentleman had been a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY), a member of the Committee on Government Reform, and if I am not mistaken, chairman of a subcommittee at one point in time, but he was telling me about an immigration magistrate who had called him and said I have had the most amazing thing happen. This is about the third or fourth time.

He said a young man, I think it was 18 or 19 years old, came in, came before me, and he had just mugged an old lady, broke her leg, stole her purse. When the police arrested him, he had no ID, and so the policeman said what is your name, where are you from. He said I am an illegal alien, I am here from Mexico. So they took him to immigration court, and the judge said, well, you have two choices. I will either send you to jail or deport you right away. He said, well, judge, I will be deported. So they put him on a bus from San Diego, sent him back to Mexico.

He goes in as one somebody, the person he said he was, gets into Mexico, calls his mother in the United States. By the way, this young man I am talking about was born in the United States, parents were born in the United States, grandparents were born in the United States. He was a United States

citizen but he had learned the scam. He had learned that it was much better to go before an immigration judge and be turned over to the INS.

So he calls his mom after they deport him, after they send him back on a bus to Mexico, calls his mom and says bring down my ID. She gets in the car, drives 120 miles, hands him his ID. He now enters the country as John Doe, whoever he is, and of course, that record is completely erased of who he was, that he went in and the violation. They do not know anything about him. By the way, this magistrate was telling the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY) this was not the first time this had happened, that they had found this out.

Here is the thing. If the kid on the street, the average thug, a mugger has figured out that it is better to be sentenced by an immigration judge, what does that tell one about how many people are actually taking advantage of the system who are, in fact, aliens? They can with impunity violate our laws and do so and never fear that they will ever be caught.

I see that we are coming to the end of our time. I want to thank the gentlemen very much for joining me tonight, and I just want to end with a little comment here that was on the earlier thing I read.

The U.S. can bomb Afghanistan to dust but terrorism will remain. In some bizarre thought process understood only in Washington, D.C., the possibility of tightening up immigration laws paralyzes most politicians. Absolutely true, but not with the people who have joined me here tonight, and I want to thank my colleagues for their courage.

INCENTIVE TO TRAVEL ACT WILL STIMULATE ECONOMY

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as we look to stimulate the economy, we should help the industries that have been hit the hardest, the airlines and tourism. The airlines are losing billions. They have laid off over 100,000 people. Tourism is New York State and New York City's second largest industry, and it is reeling. 15,000 restaurant workers and over 6,000 hotel workers in New York City have been laid off since September 11.

The Incentive to Travel Act, which has been introduced in a bipartisan way with the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) will help the economy. It will give Americans the incentive to take a vacation at a time when we all deserve one. For 1 year, the bill would provide tax deductions for families of up to \$2,000 nationally, and an additional \$1,000 for New York for travel and entertainment expenses.

It would immediately restore the deduction for business meals and enter-

tainment to 80 percent from 50 percent. The Incentive to Travel Act is an incentive to stimulate the economy, unlike the Republican stimulus package, which is called the "Special-Interest Payback" in USA Today. They say it is time to take a vacation for the special-interest Republican payback.

Mr. Speaker, I request to put this editorial in the RECORD.

[From USA Today, Oct. 23, 2001]

SPECIAL-INTEREST PAYBACK

CRISIS BECOMES EXCUSE TO RAID FEDERAL TILL FOR FAVORED GROUPS

Just about everyone recognizes that the events of Sept. 11 and afterward impose new challenges and responsibilities on the nation and its leaders. But this new reality doesn't seem to have penetrated House Republican leaders. In the latest example, they take up today a special wartime "stimulus" bill that's little more than a good old-fashioned special-interest giveaway.

The case for a stimulus wasn't strong from the beginning. While the economy is clearly suffering, no one yet knows how bad it is or how long it will last. Given that uncertainty, the best bet is for a temporary jolt that eases the current slump without jeopardizing the nation's long-term economic health with a return to deficit spending.

Yet against Bush's advice, and that of experts such as Alan Greenspan and former Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin, the House has decided to repay corporate patrons for their years of campaign support. Among its many deficiencies, the House plan is:

Long-lived: More than a third of the tax cuts take effect in 2003. Even if there's a recession this year, it most certainly will be over long before those cuts kick in.

Unfocused: Rather than target relief at those who need help the most, the House lavishes tax benefits on just about everyone with a lobbyist. Companies get 70% of the tax cuts in 2002, and some of their breaks are permanent. Low-income families get a one-time rebate check.

Fiscally irresponsible: The House version blows through Bush's stimulus goal of \$75 billion. And with many provisions long-lasting, it imposes costs on the country's fiscal health over the next decade. That means less money to pay down debt, higher mortgage rates and slower economic growth.

This is easy to dismiss as politics as usual. But that's the problem. These are times that require everyone, especially political leaders, to put aside petty self-interest and everyday horse trading for the country's good.

The House leaders showed an unwillingness to do that with their adamant refusal to consider federalizing the nation's airport-security system. Now they're at it again with their brazen attempt to use the current crisis to please well-heeled special interests.

Worse, they've weakened the hand of those in the Senate who are trying gamely to provide focused relief to the economy. If Republicans pay off their contributors under the guise of stimulus, what's to prevent Democrats from doing the same? Already, some Democrats have been trying to get a minimum-wage boost included along with money for road and school construction, among other longstanding party priorities.

History shows that Congress rarely gets the timing or the size of stimulus packages right. The Fed, which can act far more quickly and with greater precision, is best suited to manage the ups and downs of the economy. If stimulus is to be provided, it should be targeted at low- and middle-income families most in need of help. That would cost far less than the \$160-billion

House proposal. Ideally, any money used for stimulus should be repaid down the road so that the nation's debt-repayment schedule isn't also sacrificed in the war on terrorism.

If lawmakers can't rise above their traditional narrow focus and produce a stimulus that works, the country would be best served if they gave this idea a long vacation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HILL of Indiana (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. STEARNS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for October 23 on account of a family emergency.

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 Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. EHLLERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREENWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 146. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Great Falls Historic District in Paterson, New Jersey, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 182. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Eightmile River in the State of Connecticut for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1000. An act to adjust the boundary of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site in the State of Ohio, to authorize an exchange of land in connection with the historic site, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1161. An act to authorize the Government of the Czech Republic to establish a memorial to honor Tomas G. Masaryk in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 1668. An act to authorize the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor