

We need to remember, too, that in addition to the commitments of those folks at home for jobs and opportunity, bridging the gap for the problems we face now, we also have that commitment to our seniors, that greatest generation the gentleman talked about, that paid in their Social Security dollars, and some others are paying in, that we were going to maintain that promise and commitment to them.

There is not an endless supply of resources. This money will come out of those dollars. If we make it permanent, we will permanently impede our ability to meet the commitment to that greatest generation and others when they reach retirement age. That is bad public policy, it is wrong, and we have absolutely violated our commitment to them and to the commitments we made, as I said, last year and the year before that that we were not going to get into that money.

We are in a crisis now, and people know we have to deal with immediate things. But these kinds of public policies are not in the best interests of this country, they are not in the best interests of our people, and they certainly are not in the best interests of the future, when we want to have economic activity at the levels we have seen before for our children and our grandchildren.

I thank the gentleman because I think he is absolutely right. We can make good public policy. We can have a stimulus package that truly helps those who have a need and gets us back on the track to employment opportunities for the people who really need them.

□ 2245

Mr. ALLEN. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) makes an important point and it is worth elaborating on.

If we write a check to IBM for \$1.4 billion, that money comes out of the Federal Treasury. That is where it comes from. It is not available, for example, to acquire vaccines and antibiotics and we are going to have to do this. The President has said we have to do this. It is clear we have to do this. How much we have to do is the subject of debate, but we know we have to have more vaccines and antibiotics developed and acquired and stored and available.

Now, if this \$1.4 billion that is just simply given back to IBM is not available, the money for acquiring vaccines and antibiotics will be coming out of the general revenues of the Federal Government, but we are already well into the Social Security surplus. So what does that mean? That means that this \$1.4 billion is coming out of the Social Security surplus.

Who pays into the Social Security fund and how much do they pay? Well, 7.5 percent from the employees, 7.5 percent from the employer up to about \$80,000. And there we have to it, and that is where that money is coming

from. Essentially, it is all coming, it is all coming from salaries of \$80,000 and below.

Now, there will be some people who earn more than \$80,000 but they are only paying their Social Security taxes on that first \$80,000 or 82- or 83-, whatever the limit is now. So what we are doing is, we are getting to a place where we are funding with general revenues of the United States. We are actually starting to have a flat tax that hits the people at the lower end of the income scale much harder than the people at the upper end of the income scale, who are better able to afford it.

We developed a progressive tax system in this country because we believed it was fair. And now as we slide back into deficits and as we do these handouts for the largest corporations in the country, the effect is to lean even harder on the ordinary people of this country, who are just getting up every day, trying to keep their jobs, support their families, somehow pay for their health care; and these are the people who we are asking to sacrifice, even as we write a check to IBM, according to the Republican House proposal, for \$1.4 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, let me compliment again the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for the fine job he has done. I think many Americans can recall the great voice from outside this chamber, when writing about the Harvest of Shame, was Edward R. Murrow. And he talked eloquently and was able to visually bring home to so many Americans problems associated with poverty, of just a small element of society. And yet it was very powerful and resounding. It is my belief that we are going to need the same kind of voices beyond this Chamber as well to demonstrate to the American public in a resounding manner, a public that is tired of promises and platitudes, and not fulfilling the commitment to the people that we are sworn to serve here in this Chamber.

I believe that it is going to take voices beyond this Chamber to bring these issues home. But I commend the very strong voice, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) who has so tirelessly and eloquently stated the plight of the elderly with regard to prescription drugs, and this evening has laid out in very specific fashion, albeit a very narrow tax in terms of the repeal of the alternative minimum tax. But just that tax alone, when contrasted to what could be provided to the American public, it has got to make people very disturbed and upset when they see the tax cut juxtaposed against what could be homeland security relief for so many of our front line responders in municipalities and cities all across this Nation. I commend the gentleman again.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I appreciate his being with me tonight during this special order.

In 1854 Abraham Lincoln wrote, "The role of governments is to do those things that a community of individuals cannot do or cannot do so well alone."

What he was talking about is, our governments are there to do things that we, of necessity, do together. And so many of the things that relate to homeland security are just that. We cannot have an individual Coast Guard. We cannot protect our borders individual by individual. We cannot deal with the threat of terrorism. We cannot provide vaccines. We cannot deal with all of these threats to our existence, these national security threats, as individuals. We can only do it through our government, our governments really at all levels.

It is a tragedy that in the aftermath of September 11, when we think about the way people in this country have responded, this is, in my opinion, the greatest sense of common purpose, the most resolve, the greatest unity that we have had in my lifetime. And to squander that unity, that resolve, by returning to an old agenda of giving corporate tax breaks in the \$25 billion range for this one tax cut alone, at a time when the country as a whole needs attention, not just aviation security, not just threats of bioterrorism but trying to deal with health care and education needs in this country, it is a tragedy that we would be so divided this way.

It is my hope that there will be a reconsideration of this issue, and that in the other body and in whatever conference emerges, that we will find a new way to express our common purpose, our common goals, the things we have to do together to deal with the threats that we are faced with today.

If we do that, I think that the sense of unity, the kind of resolve, the determination that we have, the sense that we are all in this together as the people of New York feel, as the people of Maine feel, and the people of Connecticut, and the people all across this country, if we do that, then I think this sense of common purpose can be preserved for a long time to come.

But if we degenerate into the same old tax breaks for the wealthiest individuals and the largest corporations in this country, if we degenerate into that, we will have lost an opportunity to pull ourselves together and lead this country over the next 10 years to a place we have not been before. That is our challenge. We have choices and we need to make better choices than we made 2 weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for being with me.

ANTI-AMERICAN SENTIMENT

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, as we face the calamity and the calamitous

events of September 11 and recognize what our Nation now needs to do in response to that, we also recognize that there are literally hundreds, thousands, perhaps, hundreds of thousands of incidents of incredible patriotism that have been expressed by the average American citizen. We have seen the many pictures on TV and the representations of the flag being held aloft, and it is truly inspiring. And it is indeed necessary for our country to survive, to have that kind of united agreement upon our principles about who we are and what we are trying to accomplish in this conflict.

But recently it has come to my attention, and I am sure to the attention of many of my colleagues, that we are also reaping what the seeds of political correctness that have been sown in this Nation over the last several years are producing for us.

For years we have, I should not say we perhaps, because it is predominantly liberal political thought that has initiated a hatred for everything American, for everything with expressions of what might be called patriotic. Textbooks all over our land for the last 20 years or more have been purged of anything resembling an appreciation of those who fought and died for our freedom.

We make fun of the people who constructed the most brilliant political document ever to be conceived of by the mind of men on this planet. And we taught our children to ignore or even deride these people and our heritage. We look down upon any act of patriotism. It was not perceived to be politically correct.

Our media, of course, aided and abetted this anti-American spirit under the guise of an intellectual superiority and political correctness. Our courts on far too many occasion have encouraged this anti-American sentiment by interpreting the Constitution in a way that would have had Madison and Adams spinning in their graves.

All of these things, in fact, comprise old news. No one is really surprised about that. We have talked about it certainly on this floor. I know many, many individuals have expressed their concern over the past years about the way in which American children were being taught in terms of our heritage and appreciation of those values that we call American.

By and large, as I say, Americans have reacted to the events of September 11 with great courage and great patriotism. But amazingly, amazingly there were many places in America where expressions of anti-American sentiment are still prevalent. Often times, of course, they are college campuses where this goes on.

As recently as September 22, a gentleman by the name of Zewdalem Kebede, he is a recent American immigrant, he is from Ethiopia, he was studying in the campus library at San Diego State University, when he overheard a group of Saudi students dis-

cussing the suicide bombings of the Pentagon and the World Trade Center. They started talking about September 11, he said, and with the action that they were deeply pleased. They were happy.

The anti-American group, speaking in Arabic, thought that no one would be able to hear what they were saying. Kebede, who speaks fluent Arabic, surprised the anti-American students by interrupting their conversation in their native tongue. Guys, what are you talking about? And you are being unfair, he said. How do you feel happy when those 5,000 to 6,000 people are buried in two or three buildings. He said, You are proud of these terrorists. You should feel shame.

Kebede claims he addressed his fellow students in Arabic because he did not want to embarrass them in front of others. A Saudi student sitting at a nearby table then angrily confronted Kebede in English. The ensuing conversation grew heated. Thirty minutes later the police came for Kebede.

They informed him that a complaint had been issued against him. Soon the University Center for Student Rights ordered him to attend a disciplinary meeting because it was alleged he had been verbally abusive to other students. He received a letter ordering him not to respond to his accusers or he would face sanctions.

This is all from a story written by Daniel Flynn in Human Events the week of October 29, 2001.

□ 2300

The university, after a lot of outrage was expressed by some Members of the alumni especially, concluded the matter with an October 9 letter threatening disciplinary action against the political science senior: "You are admonished to conduct yourself as a responsible member of the campus community in the future," San Diego's missive warned. Of course, I and many others would say that is exactly what Mr. Kebede was doing on September 22. He was conducting himself in a completely responsible manner, and yet he is the one attacked by the institution, by some of his fellow students.

Unfortunately, what happened to Mr. Kebede at San Diego is not an isolated incident. At Marquette University, undergraduates were blocked from holding a moment of silence around the American flag on September 11. The gesture, the school's president and advisers felt, might be "offensive" to foreign students. The administration felt that it showed too much nationalism or patriotism and respect to foreign students.

At Lehigh University, the vice provost for student affairs initially reacted to the tragedy of September 11 by banning the display of the American flag. Lehigh spokesman explained, "The idea was to keep from offending some of our students, and maybe the result was much to the contrary."

When officials at Arizona State removed the American flag from a school

cafeteria out of fear that it might offend international students, Syrian immigrant Oubai Shahbandar introduced a bill in the student senate, paving the way for its return. Shahbandar's bill was defeated, but the ensuing bad publicity he generated against the school forced the administration's hand. The alumni threatened to pull their funding for the school. Money talked and the flag was returned.

Professor Robert Jensen of the University of Houston pronounced that, "My primary anger is directed at the leaders of this country." That is his response to September 11. "The attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center are," he said, "no more despicable than the massive acts of terrorism, the deliberate killing of civilians for political purposes that the U.S. Government has committed in my lifetime. We are just as guilty," he concluded.

University of New Mexico Professor Richard Berthold bluntly declared, "Anyone who would blow up the Pentagon would get my vote."

Undergraduates writing in campus newspapers echoed this hatred against the United States, and I cannot imagine that we would be too surprised at that. Is that not just exactly the results that these professors would want? Is that not exactly what these students had been taught for years, that it is always our fault; that there is nothing in this country worth dying for; that there is nothing special, nothing of uniqueness that would give us the right to defend our way of life? That is what they have been taught.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, it was years ago now, but it was a demonstration against the war in Vietnam, and there was a young man at my college, and he was carrying a banner, a poster; and it said there is nothing worth dying for, and I remember thinking to myself even at the time here is a fellow who is tan, just coming back from spring break, somewhere probably in the Bahamas. That is where a lot of the folks went in those days at spring break. He was certainly well dressed. He was well fed, well taken care of. It was apparent that he was not at all in need of any physical help or he was certainly well off and certainly a representation of the average American student on a college campus; and here he was carrying a sign saying that there was nothing worth dying for, not home, not heart, not kith, not kin, nothing worth dying for.

We had hoped that that sentiment would be squelched by life's reality, frankly. It is understandable that idealistic students would seek this alternative way of expressing themselves or this way of expressing themselves, perhaps, because it is a part of growing up and being disruptive and that sort of thing, but it goes deeper than that I believe, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that it infects our institutions, and it will infect our society to our great detriment. These students,

who I started to mention, who wrote in various campus publications about America's involvement in Afghanistan, one of them said, "We are kidding ourselves in thinking we have been wronged."

This is Lisa Mann of Wake Forest University. She added, "Sometimes it's our fault."

"We sponsor dictators who maim. We defend corporations that enslave, and then we have the arrogance to pretend we are safe and untouchable," said a West Virginia University student, Joshua Green.

In light of the current destructive nationalism that calls for a war, a Duke student opined, the sight of the flag burning would be preferable to its display.

Mr. Kebede found out the hard way that if one loves America they are going to get in trouble, especially if they are on a campus and especially if they express that opinion. He was harassed by the university simply for disagreeing with people who welcomed the killing of thousands of Americans on September 11.

All that he is guilty of, Kebede insists, is loving his adoptive country. Is that a crime, he asks? At San Diego State, unfortunately, some people think it should be.

Public colleges that force patriotic students to remove American flags because they are potentially offensive and threaten to expel students who scold terrorists, cheering foreign students should immediately lose their government funding. This is something I agree with entirely. These examples that I have given and others that I will add to it are so disconcerting that I think it deserves our attention in this body.

I am going to go on and add a few more. At Central Michigan University, a school administrator told several students to remove a patriotic poster and an American flag from their dormitory. A residential adviser said that pro-American items were offensive.

At Pennsylvania State University, a professor was told that his Web site, which advocated military action against terrorists, was insensitive and perhaps even intimidating. Under Penn State speech codes, intimidating language is grounds for dismissal.

At Florida Gulf Coast University, Dean of Library Services Kathleen Hoeth demanded that employees remove "proud to be an American" stickers from their work areas on the grounds that they might offend international students.

At the University of North Carolina in Wilmington, a professor is under an investigation for harassment after he told a female student that he supported U.S. military action in Afghanistan. The student said that the position made her feel uncomfortable.

These things are incredible; and they are, as I say, worthy of our note.

Recently, and this one is, I suppose, striking closer to home as one that

really got me thinking about the issue to a greater extent, a few weeks ago Marcelee Gralapp, the Boulder, Colorado, Boulder Public Library's art director, recently turned down employee requests to hang a large flag from the glass entrance of the main branch. She said, "It would compromise our objectivity and we do have many flags outside," she said. "The idea is to make the environment of the library politically neutral to every one of the two to 3,000 Boulder residents that walk in each day," she said. "We have people of every faith and culture work walking into this building and we want everybody to feel welcome." "Library employees," she said, "can wear flag pins and ribbons," but she urges them to do it thoughtfully, whatever that means.

Now this has caused quite a stir in the Colorado papers because the same time that this particular library/art director had turned down a request to hang a large flag in front of the library, she approved a bizarre sort of artistic representation, I do not even know how graphically I can describe what was in the library. Suffice it to say that it offended the sensibilities of many members of the community, one to the point where the gentleman actually took down the display.

□ 2310

As I say, it is very graphic, and I will not go into it here. It is a comparison of attitude. That is something that is very, very difficult. If I can describe it here, it would be very difficult to describe this particular display as artistic in any shape or form, and yet it was approved to put up, and an American flag was not approved to put up because it might offend somebody.

That is where we are, Mr. Speaker.

I cannot imagine, frankly, that an American flag flying can offend anyone in the United States of America. I know we offend people or it is offensive to people like bin Laden and his supporters. We see them burning it every day on the news. We see other terrorists throughout the world who do take offense at the American flag, and that is dutifully carried by all of the media throughout the world, whatever they do to the flag. There is little that we can do about that except to stand in revulsion of it.

But here in the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, here, where that flag has draped the coffin of so many men and women who have given everything, their lives, their limbs, their health, for us to enjoy the freedom that we every day experience here. To be offended by that symbol is incredible, of course, to most of us. I would assume everyone in this Chamber would agree that it is incomprehensible.

I would add, Mr. Speaker, as dramatic as this statement may seem, or I guess some would say bombastic, the reality is if one enjoys the freedoms provided by this country, if one enjoys the economic benefit provided by our

system, by a free enterprise, capitalistic system, if one has sought that and come across our borders, oftentimes illegally, and has gained access to that freedom and economic opportunity, if you are offended, if you indeed take offense at the sight of an American flag flying from any building, from any porch, from any car antenna, if you take umbrage at that and if you are offended by that sight, then I say, get the hell out of the United States of America.

I do not believe there are millions of people who respond that way, but I believe there are some, undeniably, who do, who do take offense, and that is what these incredibly ultra-politically-correct librarians and school superintendents and principals are trying to reflect, because they themselves to a large extent take offense at the sight of the American flag, at the sight of its depiction. I say to them the same thing. How can you take advantage of everything this country has to offer and be offended by its symbol? It is truly incredible to me.

I will be attacked, of course, for being closed-mind and chauvinistic and all the rest of those things, I recognize that; but perhaps someone can explain to me in the midst of the attacks that I know will come as soon as I get back to the office, the phones have a tendency to light up when this subject is discussed, but perhaps someone can take the time to explain to me why I should not be offended personally at someone who says that they take offense at the flying of the flag.

Mr. Speaker, to that end, I have introduced H.R. 3201 which prohibits any department or agency of the United States from transferring any funds to any individual or entity that prohibits the display of the flag in the United States of America. That is it. It is one sentence.

I recognize full well that these people may have the absolute right to hate the United States as much as they do, to hate everything that we stand for. They have that right, but they do not have the right to command the tax dollars from hard-working Americans who do love this country, they do not have the right to take that money and then so callously disregard the system and the people who have created this wonderful experiment in freedom we call America.

Mr. Speaker, I would just go on now to one other topic, and that is the topic of immigration and immigration reform. To a certain extent my previous remarks did reflect my concerns about massive immigration, legal and illegal into this country. Immigration that has had incredibly detrimental effects, massive immigration that has had massive detrimental effects.

I want to go on with a series of discussions I have been having on the floor of the House over the last several weeks in which I have indicated that there are innumerable stories which have been brought to my attention

with regard to the issue of immigration and the problems inherent in the system that we presently operate, or perhaps I should say the lack of a system that we presently operate.

We are just building a file of incredible, but true and let me get something here, Mr. Speaker. This is an e-mail address that we have, Tom.Tancredo@mail.house.gov, and the fax number is (202) 226-4623. We use this for people to communicate with us. There is no way to do that through the regular mail, and yet we have had lots of people, actually several thousand people, try to communicate with us about this issue, about immigration reform, expressing their concerns and opinions and their willingness to try to do something about it, and also bringing to my attention and to the attention of the body some of the incidents which I call unbelievable but true.

Here is one more for this evening. This comes from an article originally published in the New Times Broward Palm Beach on November 8, 2001.

"The INS' Mary Schneider warned of the terrorist threat, but no one listened to her. More than 2 years before the September 11 attack, a seasoned Federal immigration officer named Mary Schneider vehemently complained that Islamic visitors who were possibly terrorists were moving into the Orlando area. She told INS officials that hundreds of aliens, some of whom she suspected were tied to Osama bin Laden, were illegally gaining residence. She further alleged that several INS supervisors had accepted bribes in return for allowing those aliens to remain in the country.

"Rather than investigate Ms. Schneider's complaints thoroughly, the INS began a campaign of retaliation against the 21-year immigration employee that nearly led to her termination."

□ 2320

Ms. Schneider has information from five informants on long-running, extensive, felony bribery conspiracies engaged in by Orlando INS and staff at former congressional offices, unnamed. The bribery ring involved over 50 Islamic Muslim Moroccans, an unknown number of whom had ties to Ihab Ali, an Egyptian who lived in Orlando before he was imprisoned in 1999 in New York City for ties to Osama bin Laden and East Africa embassy bombings.

INS officials stole cash and jewelry from illegal aliens who had been detained, she claims.

Records of more than 200 felony immigration fraud cases were secretly removed from her office.

Whatever the merit of her allegations, Ms. Schneider's warnings certainly proved prophetic. Numerous Orlando ties to the suicide bombings and bin Laden have been uncovered both before and after the attacks, so many that the Orlando Sentinel recently suggested that Central Florida should be dubbed "Terroristland."

Ms. Schneider has retained the services of an attorney. Her one-time attorney, Mr. Ross, said that the INS and the FBI both dropped the ball in a big way. "I was shocked that the Justice Department never investigated this. I don't think INS officials thought that what happened on September 11 would ever happen. Now people are actually going to look at this. Had the government followed Schneider's philosophy, we probably would have stopped some very bad people."

Schneider would say, "We are in danger. They are sending these terrorists into this country and I can't understand why more isn't being done. They are going to commit acts of terrorism in this country. She happened to hit the nail right on the head."

This is just one individual. We have had literally scores of communications of a similar nature, many of them from INS officials, who today have told us that they are willing to provide testimony. One of them is actually going to provide testimony to this body. Mr. Speaker, I am the chairman of the Immigration Reform Caucus here and our caucus will hold a hearing on Thursday, this week, at which one of these individuals, a 30-year INS employee, perhaps we will have two but we know right now of one for sure who we were able to obtain whistleblower status for and eventually the INS agreed to allow him to testify when they recognized they really could not stop it although they threatened to fire him shortly after his decision to speak to various congressmen was made known. But he is going to be here.

As I say, we have had all kinds of information like this, from INS agents who are good, solid Americans wanting to do their job and who recognize that the organization for which they work is incredibly corrupt and incompetent. Those are strong words, I recognize, Mr. Speaker; but they are the only ones that accurately portray the system itself. Corrupt and incompetent.

She alleges, as I said, INS officials stealing cash and jewelry from illegal aliens who had been detained. She suggests that a bribery ring was involved and that many officials, even staff at a former, quote, unnamed congressional office was involved. These things have got to be dealt with. The INS refused to deal with it. Even the Justice Department refused to deal with it.

Mohammed Atta, a name all too well known to everyone in the United States now as the ringleader of the group of 19 terrorists who hijacked the planes on September 11, Mohammed Atta here on a visa, left the country and did so illegally. He was to fill out a particular form, he did not do that, saying that I am going to leave the country, I will be returning on a certain day. He did not do it. He left; he came back. He came back through Miami in January of this year. He should have been stopped at that point in time. The INS actually recognized that he had not in fact informed them,

he had breached his contract, if you will, which is what a visa really is; and they could have at that time denied him entrance into the United States.

Mohammed Atta could have been stopped from coming back into the United States, at least in January. But the INS overlooked it, chose not to pay the slightest bit of attention to it. The INS time and time and time again, far too numerous to lay out in any 1-hour Special Order, but so many times that it is beyond imagination. It is unfathomable that this agency could be in charge of our security, our border security. They have put almost all of their resources into what I call immigration social work. When I was on a talk radio show in Denver not too long ago, shortly after I was on the radio the person running the show called the INS and had a spokesman for the INS come on. They said something like, isn't it your job to go after these people who are here illegally and get rid of them? And she said, well, kind of in a way. But really, she said, our main focus is to explain to these people why they are here illegally and then help them get benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I may be just confused about what I thought the INS was all about; but I think that that statement, that paraphrase in a nutshell describes the problem and the problem with which we must deal, and we must deal with it before leaving here this year. We have spent countless hours in the discussion of the degree to which we can make our airports more secure by improving the quality of the people that actually do the baggage screening. I have yet to hear any discussion of the literally hundreds of thousands of other people who have access to planes every single day, whether they be baggage handlers, whether they be food service workers, whether they be the people who repair the airplanes.

None of them fall under the scrutiny of this particular piece of legislation that we are spending an inordinate amount of time debating and was brought up many times by our friends on the other side here just a little bit ago. Is it not the least bit peculiar, is it not the least bit odd that we spend this amount of time focusing on one small part of the entire airport security problem, one tiny part, frankly, the baggage screening people, a very small number relatively speaking, but the sound and fury coming from this body and the other body about this would make you think that if we just solved this problem, we will all be okay, we can rest easy at night if we just simply make baggage screeners Federal employees, as if somehow magically by changing who their employer is, we will make these people much more competent. It is idiotic.

I personally, of course, support our efforts to try to improve airline security. I certainly support the House's bill which does so in a fashion far more definitive, far greater than the other body. As a person who flies twice a

week, as most of the Members of this body do, I have a very personal stake in this thing of airline security. And contrary to the allegations made by our friends on the other side of massive payments and massive influence-peddling by these corporations who want to maintain it, I have never heard from any of them; and I want to know what Member of this body would vote for a piece of legislation that he or she thought did not enhance the security to the greatest extent possible, because he or she flies a lot and my family flies a lot and my grandchildren get on planes all the time. I am not going to do anything that is going to minimize or even jeopardize their safety if I possibly can.

I have voted for and I believe the House bill is better. But all that said, Mr. Speaker, it begs the question, is that all there is to security in this country? The baggage screeners and bombing Afghanistan, that is what we have done so far. We have not even accomplished the former. I totally, totally support the President's actions in Afghanistan. I, of course, wish he had declared war; I wish he would have come to this body and asked for a declaration of war, because that is the constitutional way to handle this particular issue and crisis. Nonetheless, we are where we are. We have accomplished great things. The courage, the fortitude of our fighting men and women have persevered again. As the President said from that very podium the night he addressed the Nation, I know you will again make us proud, and they have.

□ 2330

And they have. But while we are fighting this struggle, again, I hesitate to call it a war, it actually is not, we have not declared war, but while we are fighting, involved in this struggle in Afghanistan, risking the lives of men and women in the uniform of the United States, we have paid literally no attention whatsoever to the most basic issue of security, of national security. It is not just bombing the terrorists in caves in Afghanistan; it is trying to stop those terrorists and their colleagues from coming across the borders of the United States.

If they get in here, I will worry about how they can get through a security checkpoint at an airport. We will do everything we can to stop them. But why would we not try to stop them at the border is the question that is begged by this discussion. Why would we not? Why have we not chosen to move as dramatically, as quickly, as expeditiously toward improving the security of our own borders as we have at enhancing the security of the people who look at the baggage going through the mechanism at the airport?

There are plenty of reasons, of course. It is, again, politically incorrect, going back to a discussion of the first part of my remarks. It is politically incorrect for us to talk about bor-

der security, because we are talking about then inhibiting the ability of people to come into the United States. And since most of the people coming into the United States, both legally and illegally, are coming from south of our border, it is an assumption that if you talk about immigration reform you are naturally talking about and expressing sort of a anti-Hispanic sentiment.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, could not care less about the ethnicity of the people that are coming. It is the fact that our borders are insecure, and it is the fact that too many are coming, that I believe we must address. It does not matter from where. I am not talking about whether they are from Mexico, or Belgium. The issue is, who should control the boarders of a Nation? Should we actually? Is it the right of the United States to say who gets into the country and who does not? And if we say some do not, then should we not also say that it is our responsibility to try to prevent them from doing so illegally?

What part of this discussion is so hard for us in this body to comprehend? Why have we chosen not to deal with this? Many bills have been introduced. They have not seen the light of day. Even the administration has been reluctant to deal with the issue of immigration reform and border security, except in the most cursory ways, except talking about certain visa changes, changes in certain visa requirements.

Now, I am for strengthening visa requirements, Mr. Speaker, do not get me wrong. I am especially amazed at some of the more bizarre examples. This is another one of those incredible but true stories we could tell about immigration.

Up until just a short while ago, until we passed the anti-terrorism bill in this Congress and it was signed by the President just a short time ago, it was absolutely legal for anyone, well, put it this way: It was okay for someone to come to a consulate anywhere around the world, fill out a visa application and say on it I am a Member of al Qaeda, the terrorist network that is committed to the overthrow of your government, and I hate America, and I agree with all of the things al Qaeda has stated about the United States.

You could do that, and under our laws, that alone was not a reason to keep you out of the United States, because of something the other body and the leadership of the gentleman of Massachusetts sometime ago passed a law saying that just because someone has these political affiliations, they should not be kept out of the United States.

Incredible. Incredible, but true. Now, we reversed that when we passed the anti-terrorism bill. We added that one clause that says yes, they could be kept out. That is great. I am happy. But, Mr. Speaker, let us be serious about this. Does anybody think for a

moment that a terrorist, potential or real, is going to be even remotely intimidated by the fact that they cannot now attest to their allegiance to a terrorist network when they fill out their visa form, and so therefore they are going to say gee, you know, Mr. bin Laden, I wanted to go into the United States and wreak some havoc upon their people and kill as many as I possibly could, but, you know, I could not get my visa, so I just went home.

Who thinks that? Who thinks that is going to stop them? Why would they not do exactly what millions of other people do every single year, walk across the border, north or south of the United States? Walk into the country, as perhaps at least six of the 19 hijackers did?

When we asked the INS for information about these people, they said, oh, we are not sure. We will let you know. So they sent us eventually a document that indicated that ten of the people were here illegally because they had either overstayed their visas or were not doing what their visa was approved for. But, unfortunately, six of the 19, they said, we have no idea. This is the sort of, I call it the logo, if you will, of the INS. It is a shrugging the shoulders. I do not know. I have no idea. I do not know where these people came from. I have no idea what they were doing here. I do not know how. Maybe they snuck in. Could have been. We do not know.

Where are the hundreds thousands of people, you could ask the INS, that have been ordered deported by immigration law judges across this country? Three hundred thousand people, Mr. Speaker, even the INS now agrees with this, we forced them into telling the truth about the numbers. Three hundred thousand, they say, so therefore I believe that is a very significant underestimate. But let us assume they are right, 300,000 people have been deported.

No, they have not been deported, they have only been ordered deported. They have been brought up for trial, for rape, murder, robbery, fraud, for you name it. Not just, by the way, for overstaying their visa. That never gets you in front of a court.

There are literally millions of people in the United States here illegally. It is estimated that 700,000 to 800,000 enter illegally through the visa process, who end up staying as permanent residents of the United States every single year. So we asked the INS about that. They go, oh, I am not sure. I do not know. I am not positive. I cannot tell you about that.

Where are the 300,000? I do not know. They say we cannot go look for these people. They were ordered deported, but we just do not have the resources. We have got other things to do. We have to show them how to get benefits.

That is the mentality of the INS, to show them how to get benefits. As I say, there are hundreds of people who are dedicated workers. I do not want to

say thousands. I do not know if there are thousands in INS, but at least hundreds, I am sure, who are dedicated to the cause, dedicated to doing a good job, and they are thwarted by an agency that is completely and totally out of control. It is corrupt and it is incompetent. I repeat that allegation, and I want someone to prove me wrong, because, unfortunately, we today give them the responsibility of keeping our borders safe and secure.

Does anybody feel good about that? The people who have e-mailed us at this e-mail address or faxed us at that number, most of them, I would say 90 percent of them, do not feel comfortable with that, Mr. Speaker. They do not like the fact that the INS ignores the responsibility for protecting the border, for not just the protection of the border, but then for internal investigations; what to do about the people who got here, who are here illegally. To ignore them completely is something that is akin to a death wish for the country.

Now, I know that most of the people who come into the United States illegally do not do so to do us harm. They do so mostly for personal benefit. Naturally. That is probably why most of our ancestors came.

□ 2340

But we cannot be that unconcerned. We do not know. It is not in our ability to be able to stand at the border and say, I know you are coming across the border illegally, but you appear to have no ill intent. You appear to be just coming across to get a job, send some money back home, improve your own life, maybe go back, maybe not. And we cannot determine that from the person who is coming across with the purpose of killing as many Americans as he or she can possibly kill. We cannot really decide that at the borders. So we have to do the next best thing. We have to secure the border from all illegal immigration. We have to call up the National Guard in each of the States that border Mexico or Canada and ask them to please use their resources, the National Guard, in defense of our borders. If that is not good enough, then we should put our own active duty troops on the border. We should use all the technology available to us, the sensing devices. We should use air flight.

Mr. Speaker, we should do everything we possibly can to make sure that no one comes across that border that we do not know about. Hard? Absolutely. Foolproof? Absolutely not. No matter how hard we try, someone probably will get through. No matter how hard we try, someone with the intent to kill or commit acts of atrocity in the United States may get through. But that does not excuse us from trying.

We have laws on the books, Mr. Speaker, against any one of thousands of various kinds of human behaviors, and those laws are violated pretty regularly and yet, no one suggests that we

should simply ignore them because they are violated. We should do everything we can to protect our borders, everything we can. We should do everything we can to find the people who are here in the United States illegally and deport them. If we need workers, if we need workers in particular industries, fine. Establish a guest worker program that allows people to come in, allows their rights to be protected, and allows them to return home at the end of a contractual period of time, and an enforcement mechanism that makes sure that they do so, like a bond established for part of their wages or that the employer has to put up, part of the wages, that they can only be claimed once they return home. If we can convince this Congress, Mr. Speaker, that we need 10 million of these people every year, okay, that is fine, but bring them in here legally. Their lives are improved, their rights, they are not exploited by unscrupulous employers. That is fine with me. Then we determine how many people should be coming through just legally. Is it 1 million as it is today? I do not think so. It should be far fewer.

But regardless of what we determine to be the legal process whereby anybody gets into this country, we should do everything in our power to make sure that the illegal process that is used is slammed shut, at least to the best extent possible, to the greatest extent possible. Because as I have said oftentimes here on the floor of the House, and as I will repeat tonight, if, God forbid, another event of the nature of those that occurred on September 11, another event like that occurs, or like those occur and it is perpetrated by someone who comes across this border and is either here illegally at the time or enters illegally to do it, and we have not done everything in our power in this Congress to prevent that; I am not saying that it is foolproof, I emphasize that, it may still happen, but if we had not done everything in our power, then we are not just irresponsible, we are culpable. We have to live with that.

Mr. Speaker, I choose not to. I choose to know that I will do everything I could possibly do to bring to the attention of my colleagues and to the American people the seriousness of this debate on immigration reform. It is a matter now of life and death.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Mr. MASCARA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. WATSON of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. TRANDAHL, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H.R. 2620. An act making appropriation for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, November 14, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4567. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Wisconsin [WI107-01-7337a; FRL-7064-4] received November 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4568. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Oxides of Nitrogen Regulations [IN 131b; FRL-7077-7] received November 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4569. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled the, "Managerial Flexibility Act of 2001"; jointly to the Committees on Government Reform, Armed Services, International Relations, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Energy and Commerce, the Budget, Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, Science, the Judiciary, and House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk