

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM;
IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of South Carolina). 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, I rise tonight to talk on a subject that often brings me to the floor of the House, and that is immigration and immigration reform.

Before I do that, I have had the opportunity to sit here and listen to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle discuss the upcoming legislation referred to as campaign finance reform or the Shays-Meehan bill which we will be discussing tomorrow.

It strikes me that some other viewpoints may need to be made this evening. First of all, it is intriguing in the way that we can actually identify a piece of legislation to fit our personal desires, as the Members that have introduced it have done. Certainly I have done it. I introduced the Sudan Peace Act. I hope if it passes, eventually we will have peace; but I have no hope that it will happen immediately, or the day after.

Nonetheless, it is interesting how we characterize pieces of legislation here with terms and titles and phrases that we want to put it in a certain light, and we call this thing that we will be discussing tomorrow campaign finance reform.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is anything but that, as many of us know. I have often had the opportunity to discuss this issue and to refer to a game that I am aware of. When I was much younger, I used to work at an amusement park in Denver, Colorado, called Elitch Gardens. I started there as a sweeper when I was 16 years old, and stayed every summer. Pretty soon I was the rides manager of the park and then the summer manager of the park. It put me through college. It was a great place to work.

One of the things that we had in that amusement park was a game, and it was called Whack a Mole. It is a game which at that time the player put in a quarter and took a little hammer out, and the game started. Little mole heads would start popping up. The player would hit the mole here, and it went down, and then the player would hit it over here. And then it started moving faster and faster and faster, and the player tried to keep up with it. And pretty soon the player realized they probably were not going to win. The player probably could not win because it would keep popping up faster. You never could actually beat it.

Mr. Speaker, every time I hear a debate on campaign finance reform, I think of that game because really that is what we are talking about here. We are talking about trying to stop the flow of money into the process of politics. Living in a free society, living in

a society governed by the rule of law and the Constitution, in this case the Constitution of the United States which equates and has said over and over again, in politics money is speech; and, therefore, we have a right to free speech, we will never, ever, ever, stop the flow of money into politics.

Now, let us recognize that at the beginning of this discussion. It is never going to happen. If there is anyone out there who thinks it is, and anyone who thinks that it happens anywhere else in the world under any system, let me disabuse that Member of that idea. Money does flow into politics. Is it all because there are people who want to work their way with the Congress of the United States? Undoubtedly some people contribute for that purpose. But the fact is for this country's history, far more, millions more people contribute to the political process with their money not because they want to get something special, not because they want to buy off the politician that they are giving the money to, but because they are supporting people who feel as they feel about issues. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker, in my last campaign I was trying to recollect what we raised, and it was over a million dollars, I know that. I cannot remember the exact amount right now. But I also know when we averaged out the contributions to the campaign, it came to something like \$55 per person.

□ 2045

I assure you that the literally thousands of people that contributed to my campaign in amounts of \$1, \$2, \$3, \$5, \$10, \$25, I do not think any of them really believed they were buying my vote on any particular thing. As a matter of fact, I do not believe that most of the people who gave me \$1,000 believed they were buying my vote and that if they gave me \$1,000, which is the maximum, that somehow I would change who I am, what I believe and what I think and vote for them, for their way, for their attitude and idea.

Mr. Speaker, what really and truly I have to say to the people in this body, to the people listening this evening: if there is a single Member of this body who in their whole career on this floor or in this House has ever cast a vote against their conscience and because a large donor wanted that vote, then they should vote for Shays-Meehan. Because, Mr. Speaker, they need that kind of rationalization, they need to save their conscience maybe. They need to somehow get out from this feeling that they are being bought. I have heard colleagues stand up here, and in the other body, and say, "The system is corrupt, we're all bought, we're all paid for," and that sort of thing. Maybe they are. Maybe they are. But I must tell you, Mr. Speaker, they do not speak for me.

There are issues on which I feel very strongly. I express them here on the floor. I express them in my vote. In the

conference I try to convince my colleagues to see things as I see them, to vote my way. Yes, I came here because I believe in issues. I love the debate. But I should tell you, Mr. Speaker, that people support me, I think, not because they are hoping to change my opinion but because they like my opinion. They want that opinion expressed.

As an example, I am known in, certainly Colorado, for being a very strong critic of the public school system, especially the monopoly system that runs the public schools, not for the teachers themselves, not for the people who work so hard trying to accomplish a task, but the teachers union. I attack it all the time because I think they are an obstacle to education reform. The teachers union, the NEA, the National Education Association, has never given me a dime, not a penny. Nor should they. And I am positive that this thought has never crossed their mind, that maybe if we give Tom Tancredo \$1,000 or \$5,000 from their PAC, he will start voting on our side on this issue. They know that is not true. They do not give me money. No matter how much money they gave me, I would not vote on that side of the issue. And they know it. That is the way, I am sure, that most of my colleagues are.

We came here with a set of principles, a set of ideas that we want to advance and we tell our constituents what we are and who we are and what we believe in. And they elect us or they do not. And if they elect us, then they expect us to come here and be as forceful as we can, to advocate those positions. And because some people give me money for my campaign who happen to also believe what I believe, would I not be doing them a disservice if I did not try my best to advance those issues?

But I again say, if you are afraid of this, if somehow or other you feel you have been bought and that you cannot withstand the pressure of a large donor that is maybe wanting you to vote for something you do not believe in your conscience, vote for Shays-Meehan. Maybe somehow that will get you off the hook. But I assure you, Mr. Speaker, it will not really change the process. We will once again hit the mole on the head, and it will go down; but it will pop up here and there and everywhere. As you know, Mr. Speaker, when they talk about soft money and hard money, for the most part I think most Americans have not the foggiest idea what we are talking about here. But they maybe like the sound of it: "We're going to stop soft money from coming into the Congress." "Oh, right, good, great. That's exactly what I hope they do."

The reality is, of course, even in this bill that is being brought forward, and it will be brought forward tomorrow afternoon, we do not stop soft money. We do not stop even really the contribution of hard money. We will still have millions of dollars flowing into the system. They will find other ways

to come up. The mole's head will come up in a variety of other holes, and it will come into the system.

I say, look, who cares? Eliminate this charade that we are playing here. Forget about it. I really wish we would remove all restrictions and just say we report every dime. Mr. Speaker, on my campaigns, I report every single penny that comes in, as long as we can identify it. If somebody sends \$5 without a name, I guess we cannot. But if someone tells me who they are and they contribute to my campaign, we post it, even though we are not required by law to do that; I think it is anything less than \$200. But I post it all, every single penny. Then people can make their own decisions. They can look and say, gee whiz, look, he got all this money from Enron, which I did not get any money from Enron; but from any of these organizations or people, let them make their own conclusions as to whether or not that influenced my vote. Does that change who I am because they gave this to me?

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is a charade. That is what is so discouraging. Many of my colleagues stood up in the previous hour and they talked about how cynical people are about the system, that the American public, I think that is the word they used over and over again, that they are cynical. I can understand that. I can understand that. Because if you listened to what was said tonight, you may come away, if you are not really perhaps well aware of the way the process works, you may come away from the debate, you may have come away from our colleagues and said, you know, I think if we pass this bill, there will be no more, quote, "soft money," and that we will have reformed the system, no one here will come to this body influenced by contributions. If they think that, and if we pass this piece of legislation and then a year from now, two years from now we will read accounts of millions of dollars being spent, hundreds of thousands, we will say, "Gee whiz, I thought they took care of that. Wasn't that called Shays-Meehan campaign finance reform? Wasn't that supposed to have taken care of it?" Lo and behold, it did not.

If you want to make people cynical, Mr. Speaker, then pretend that we are going to be doing something incredibly significant here tomorrow, eliminating the influence of money in this body. You and I, and I think even Members of the other side, well, both sides who support this certainly know in their heart of hearts that really things are not going to change that much except they can claim some sort of rationalization later on and say, "Well, we voted for Shays-Meehan."

In a couple of years, Common Cause, other organizations, whatever, other Members of the body will be up here saying we have to stop this hole that this mole's head is coming out of; and there will be a great hue and cry, there will be a big battle between both sides

and the press will get into this because, remember, in any way, shape or form could we ever stop them. Of course the press is all in favor of reducing our ability or the ability of other people to have an influence and have their say in government; but you never hear them talking about reducing their own freedoms. And I do not want to. There is the first amendment which, of course, is going to make most of Shays-Meehan unconstitutional, anyway. But the reality is this, that we should not be so focused, we should not get carried away, we should not place more emphasis on all this than it warrants, and it warrants very little, because it really, really and truly will not change much except it very well may do exactly what the proponents suggest is the problem today, it may exacerbate that and make people even more cynical about this process.

But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I will be a "no" vote on that bill, as I was the last time around. Maybe I should not be, because as an incumbent, maybe we should support this kind of legislation, because it does put more of a burden on somebody else to raise money. After all, I have got the advantage of incumbency, I have got the advantage of name recognition and all the things that come with it; and so maybe I should just vote for this bill because it puts us in a better situation, vis-a-vis some opponent who comes and tries to get elected without the benefit of personal money. Because if you are not personally wealthy, it may be harder for you to get your name out, to get known, to get people to understand your position on issues under this kind of legislation. That is true.

If you are wealthy enough, of course, you cannot be stopped. There is a provision in this that says something like if you put more than a certain amount of your own money in, the other limits are raised or whatever; but the reality is, Mr. Speaker, that the Supreme Court has ruled over and over again, you cannot limit someone's ability to put their own money into their own campaign. It is impossible.

There are Senators who, of course, as we know put 30 million or more dollars in; but there are other people who put in millions of dollars and lost. I am not personally a wealthy person. I could never fund my own campaigns out of my pocket. No way. Impossible. I cannot do it. So I have to rely on contributions from other people. Every time I have run, I have run against someone far more wealthy than I, and God bless them for it. That is not a crime. I wish I were in that situation. But I am not. And so I have to rely on the contributions of others to help me level that playing field. That is never going to change. If you want to turn this place into a body of the wealthiest of us, who have the ability to fund their own campaigns, who are not the slightest bit concerned about corporate or political or any other kind of PAC, then fine, Shays-Meehan helps you accomplish

that goal. But it does not improve this process, and it does not improve the body as a whole. I worry, because I do think people become cynical. Undeniedly, they become cynical.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that was not the original purpose of my requesting this hour, but as often happens while I sit here and wait for my turn at the plate, I do have the desire to respond to some of the things that I have heard. I am sure there will be others tomorrow who will be more articulate in their observations, in expressing their observations about this bill; but this is the opportunity I have selected for tonight.

Let me get on for a few more minutes and discuss another topic. Here we are 5 months and 1 day from the tragic events of September 11, 5 months and 1 day in which an enormous amount of activity has occurred. The Nation has gone through a gut-wrenching experience. We have responded in ways and as a result of the leadership of our President; we have really risen to the challenge in many respects. In a little over 5 months, we have deployed American forces halfway around the world, we have stopped and defeated a terrorist regime in Afghanistan, we have probably identified terrorists and stopped actions that would have been taken up to this point in time.

We are on the way to the next series of steps in that particular war, although I hesitate to call it war. We have not actually declared war. I wish we had done that. But the fact is that we have done an enormous number of things and to our credit, to the credit of this Nation, to the people of this Nation, to the President of the United States, to the men and women in our Armed Forces, God bless them all. I am proud of them, I am sure, as almost every American is in their heart of hearts. They are proud of what we have been able to accomplish in a relatively short time, with such little bloodshed, especially on our part, on the part of American servicemen and women, but even, quite frankly, on the part of the aggressors in Afghanistan. The reality is that far fewer of them were injured or killed than would have been the case in almost any other conflict of this nature, because our technology and our will is such that we are able to confine the damage to a relatively small area and identify our targets carefully and that sort of thing.

So again, I am proud, I am happy that we have accomplished what we have accomplished. But, Mr. Speaker, we could in fact bomb Afghanistan into dust, into rubble. We could do the same thing in a variety of other countries. We can use our military might and that of our allies to help stop aggression, to help stop terrorism in other countries around the world, and I expect that we may be doing that.

□ 2100

It is covertly now, overtly in some time to come, and I am completely

supportive of those efforts. But one thing we have failed to do, one horrible, terrible failure, is that we have failed as of this point in time, 5 months and 1 day, we have failed to secure our own borders.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said on this floor so many times, the defense of this Nation begins at the defense of our borders. We can do everything we are doing all around the world to try and protect American citizens from the threat of terrorism, but, in reality, we must deal with the issue of the defense of our borders, securing our borders, because everything we do externally, everything we do around the world, will never actually work to stop that one ultimate threat, and that is of somebody coming across our borders for the purpose of doing us harm; coming across our borders without us knowing it, without us knowing exactly who they are, what they are intent on doing here, how long they are going to stay here, what they do or are doing while they are here. We have done nothing really to change that. It is amazing.

We have, even in this House, attempted to pass one piece of legislation to address this issue specifically, and that is a bill called the Feinstein-Kyl bill, a Senate bill we passed on the House side, which has been bottled up in the Senate by one Member from West Virginia, one Member of the Senate over there.

They have these strange rules in the other body, as you know, Mr. Speaker, that allows this person to work his or her will over that of the majority, and because this one Member of the Senate has chosen to put a hold on that bill, we have not even been able to pass a piece of legislation that deals with the issue of student visas and tightening up the regulations and requirements on student visas. For heaven's sake, that one thing has not been able to pass.

Needless to say, we have not been able to do an even more important thing. We have not been able to reform the Immigration and Naturalization Service, referred to as the INS. This is the body in which we entrust the responsibility of protecting our borders and determining who is, in fact, here illegally and removing them from this Nation. We have not done that.

We have entrusted that body, but, unfortunately, that organization, the INS, is absolutely incompetent, incapable of doing what we ask of them in the area of enforcement of immigration law. They are both incapable and unwilling, and that is a problem that is very difficult to deal with, because if they had the heart for it, then we could address the issue with resources. If they wanted to do it, then it would be up to us to say, let us see what can we do in this body to make sure you can get the job done. How many dollars will it take? How many field agents will you need? How many people will you need? Tell us, and we will try to address the issue.

But, unfortunately, that is not the real problem. Money is not the problem. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the INS budget from 1993 to the year 2002 went from \$1.5 billion to \$5.6 billion. It almost quadrupled. The President's budget for 2003 has another \$1.2 billion increase, to a total of \$6.8 billion.

In all that time and with all that amount of resources available to it, the INS has been incapable and unwilling to defend our borders and to secure internally in the United States our system and our people against the activities of people who come here, terrorists who come here illegally, and also they have not been able to do even the minimum, and that is to actually stop the flow of illegal immigrants across the borders, both north and south, and that is a shame. That is not just a shame, it is a travesty, because, of course, we gave them the money. They chose to use it someplace else.

Now, there are two sides to INS. It is divided into two parts. One is what I call the immigration social worker side, and this is the side that is supposed to help people get their green cards; help people come here and immigrate into the country legally and make sure that they are provided with benefits and that sort of thing and show them how the system works and help them get through it. They do not do that very well either. That is where their heart is and where almost all of their resources go.

The other thing they are supposed to be involved with is enforcement, the actual enforcement of immigration law. But, of course, we know that they turn a blind eye to people coming across this border illegally, so much so that to this point in time we now believe there are at least 11 million, I think it is even higher than that, but at least 11 million people here in this country illegally. They did not come through the process, we do not know who they are, we do not know what they are doing here, and we certainly do not know if they ever go back to wherever they came from. We do not know anything about it.

In fact, when we ask the INS, that is the answer we get for almost every single question; when we pose a question to them, they say, "I am not sure."

I have suggested on more than one occasion a new logo for the INS, on their Web site, printed on all their stationary, a new logo, just a person going like this, Mr. Speaker, a shrug of the shoulders. "I do not know." Because that is all you get from them. "I am not sure." "I do not know." "How many people? We are not positive." "Where are they? We do not know." Let me ask you, do you know how many people are here in the United States who have overstayed their visa? "Oh, a lot. Millions." "I am not sure."

After a while you just realize there is not really any purpose to ask, because this the answer you get: "I do not know." "I am not sure." "I have no idea."

We think so little of this agency, and it really and truly has been sort of one of those stepchildren that you just go, you know, let us not really pay a lot of attention to it, to the point where we have actually appointed someone as the new Director.

Now, this is a time when, as I say, we are facing an enormous, enormous challenge, not just from the possibility of terrorists coming across the border that we do not know about and we do not know who they are and that sort of thing, coming in here illegally, but we are, of course, in the middle of a flood of illegal immigrants, and that has incredible implications for our society. Infrastructure costs, political, economic, you name it, there are going to be massive implications as a result of the huge numbers of people coming into the United States, both legally and illegally. Yet the INS we know to be incapable of dealing with it, and we have known for some time.

In many ways there are many people in this body who really and truly do not care. They want to kind of cast a blind eye to it, to say, "Oh, well, that is true. Millions are coming across, but we need the help, we need the labor, we need the people to work in certain areas." Plus, of course, there are political issues on the Democratic side of the aisle. They recognize that massive immigration eventually translates into votes for them. On our side of the aisle we believe that massive numbers of low-wage earners and low-skill workers will, of course, keep wages down, supply employers with a large pool of potential workers.

So everybody wants to turn a blind eye, and everybody wants the vote. They want the vote of these people coming in. And so we are afraid. We are very, very uptight about this. It makes us very skittish to talk about immigration reform, about reducing the numbers of illegal immigrants. To talk about trying to do something about illegal immigration makes people skittish, let alone reduce the number of legal immigrants, which I believe firmly we should do.

But, nonetheless, we have chosen to ignore it, to pretend it does not exist, to look the other way for political reasons, and so, therefore, we have not paid much attention to the INS, and we really do not care that they are as incompetent as they are and unwilling to do their job, and we keep giving them money, and they keep, of course, misusing it or transferring it to activities that have nothing to do with enforcement.

We have even gotten to the point, Mr. Speaker, if you can believe this, but we just appointed a new Director, a new Director of the INS. This agency, of course, oversees a budget of \$6.8 billion. Thousands of people work for it. It has the responsibility of one of the most serious activities of the Federal Government, one of the few responsibilities that is uniquely Federal Government. We debate education issues

here and welfare issues here, none of which is truly a Federal responsibility, but this area of immigration, that is uniquely Federal.

We take an organization like that, an organization to which we give \$6.8 billion, and we appointed an individual as head of it whose only experience in this particular arena in terms of identifying who is coming and going across borders and that sort of thing is who is coming and going in the door of the other body, because it was the Sergeant at Arms for a lot of years. A nice guy, I am sure. He is the head of the INS.

Maybe we should not be too surprised when people in the INS say things like Fred Alexander, Deputy Director for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, publicly told a group of "undocumented day laborers," this is the Deputy Director for INS, talking to a group of illegal aliens, right, who he should, of course, have had arrested, but, no, he is speaking to them, like at a rally. But, of course, they had nothing to worry about. They were, I am sure, all applauding and having a great time, because he said to them, Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, this is on the list we have on our Web site, we have a list called unbelievable but true immigration stories, and some of them I will go through, because they are astounding. Fred Alexander publicly told a group of "undocumented day laborers" that "it is not a crime to be in the U.S. illegally." It is not a crime to be in the U.S. illegally. "It is a violation," he says, "of civil law."

Oh, heck. Well, gee, you know, I do not know why I was so confused by the words "law" and "legal" and stuff like that. Here he is, "Hey, do not worry. It is not against the law. Come on in." This is the Deputy Director of the INS.

I mean, this would be a joke. It would be a Saturday Night Live skit. It would be great, wonderful. There are lots of them, believe me. If the producers of Saturday Night Live are looking for any sort of material, just go to our Web site, the immigration reform Web site on our Tancredo Web site, and you will see we have, what have I got here, 54 little vignettes so far, and, believe me, they keep coming in every single day, things just as bizarre as that.

The INS spent \$31.2 million on a computer system to track down whether visa holders overstayed their visa. The system does not work. They say they need an additional \$57 million for the system. Believe me, if we gave them \$570 million, or \$5 billion, they could not make it work. It is not the hardware that is the problem here.

So I guess again it would not be surprising that we take the Sergeant at Arms from the other body and make him the head of the INS. Who cares, he is a nice guy, a friend of a lot of people in the other body, and, why not? He probably wanted to be appointed to something. Why not the INS? Certainly we do not care. It is no big issue, no big deal.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a big deal. It is a very big deal. And it is incredible

almost to me that we treat it with such, I do not know, disdain is not the word, I treat it with disdain because it deserves it, but we treat it in a way that it does not reflect its importance to the Nation.

It should be completely reformed. When I say reformed, Mr. Speaker, I do not mean just some cosmetic attempt to pretend like we have actually separated the two sides out, and now we will have one guy that is just the head of enforcement and one guy the head of the social services.

□ 2115

No, we need something far more than that. Right now, Mr. Speaker, we have to actually reform the INS in a way that means abolishing that part of the INS that does any work in immigration enforcement. We have to take its responsibility away from INS; we have to take the responsibility away from the Coast Guard, from Agriculture, from DEA, from all of the other agencies that presently have some role to play.

By the way, I have been on the border, and I have witnessed firsthand the work that our border folks do, that the Border Patrol does; and to them I give all the credit in the world. They work as hard as they can. It is not their fault. Please do not get me wrong in that there are people listening tonight, Mr. Speaker, that have friends, relatives or are themselves employed by the INS. For the most part, they are doing everything they can. We hear from them every day. People call my office every day. INS, people who are agents and have been agents for 30 years, some of them want to speak without going on the record, some of them are willing to become whistleblowers; but almost to a person, they talk about their frustration in trying to do a job that they are incapable of doing as a result of an incompetent administration, as a result of a whole bunch of stupid rules that this Congress has passed.

Come to think of it, and I am sure it is on here in our list of "Amazing But True," and it goes to show you it is not all entirely the INS that is goofball in this area, as I have described, but other groups play a role. On the INS Web site, one can go to it today, tonight, and one can pull up a temporary visa application form. About the third or fourth question that one has to fill out if one is trying to come into the country is one that says, and I am paraphrasing because I do not have it in front of me, it says, are you a terrorist? Have you ever belonged to an organization that has expressed a desire to commit acts of terror in the United States? Are you a member of the Nazi Party? Did you ever do anything in the concentration camps? Answer yes or no. There is this little box that one checks. And one thinks to themselves, well, okay, goofy as that sounds, maybe we are using that if somebody checked no, but then comes in and does something wrong, we can

say, we caught you because you lied on your form. We can make the case that is necessary.

But get this: as a result of a member of the other body, a gentleman from Massachusetts who has been around a long time, and he happens to be also the chairman of the immigration committee in the Senate today, he added a provision in 1990 to this that said, by the way, if you check "yes" up here to that question, do not worry, because that is not a reason to keep you out of the United States.

So, as I say, they are confronted with a lot of very, very difficult, the INS, even the people who are trying to do their job, are confronted with a variety of mixed messages. Strange, but true, as I say. Incredible, but true. Please believe me, there are so many stories like that, I do not even know where to begin. But they are all metaphors, in a way. I use them as a metaphor for the whole problem, the whole situation we face.

That one form, that front page of that temporary visitor visa; and here is another one, Mr. Speaker. We were down on the border in El Paso about a month and a half ago, I guess; and we were watching people come through, and we have now set up, and we have paid a lot of money to have a card given to all of the people coming through, especially for just day trips or something like that, and we paid a lot of money for these machines so that the border agent can swipe the card through the machine, and on the screen it will come up and say who this person is, whether or not we know something about them that we do not like. It gives some information and background. Logical. Good idea.

Well, of course, there are so many people coming across, the line goes up over the bridge and into Mexico, and there are literally thousands; I cannot even imagine how many thousands of people were waiting to come across. There are like four or five stations with a Border Patrol agent there. But the crush of humanity is so great that they simply do not swipe the card. The person coming in holds the card up next to their face and walks by, and the agent is like this saying, I am sure that face goes with that card, oh, yes, absolutely. Of course, it is a joke. It is ridiculous. But again, that is a metaphor for the whole system. I am not even saying that this is a bad idea; I am just saying it is another one of those kind of amazing but true things.

But they showed us a door frame. Now, that is all it was, Mr. Speaker, a door frame on wheels. And periodically they would wheel this thing out, and on it in Spanish it is written "drug-sniffing door frame." And they wheel this thing out, and they wait to see if anybody sort of balks at going through it. Excuse me, but the picture always does make me laugh; it is sort of humorous. In a way, listen, they are trying anything. If it works, it works, okay. But it is a metaphor for this

whole system. It is completely and totally shot. This thing does not work, Mr. Speaker. It does not work. The best thing we got going for us is a door frame that says "automatic drug-sniffing door frame." Oh, my goodness.

But the people do try. They are overwhelmed. They are overwhelmed. One of the things they told us while we were down there, the people were really working as hard as they could. They knew that the task ahead of them was incredible. They said, you know, the only thing we ask is please do not do something up there that is going to make this job even more difficult. I said, well, like what? And they said, well, for instance, every time you guys start talking about amnesty for all of the people who are here illegally, they said. Do you know what that does here? I mean, the numbers swell. We are trying to hold back a flood; and if you give amnesty again like we did in 1986, telling everybody who came here illegally, oh, that is all right, all is forgiven, of course the flood turns into a tidal wave. Why would we think anything else? Why would we imagine that that would not be the case? That is exactly what would happen. Yet, we still talk about it here.

The night before we adjourned in the last session, we almost passed an amendment to that visa bill I mentioned earlier, the Feinstein-Kyle bill, that would have been an extension of 245(i), which is legalese for amnesty. We almost did it. Thanks to an outcry by literally thousands of people across this country who e-mailed their Congressman or Congresswoman and told them that they really and truly were not excited about that possibility, thanks to doing that, it was pulled; and we did not, in fact, pass an extension of 245(i).

But, Mr. Speaker, I will tell my colleagues what that is. It is another game. I assure my colleagues that it is going to come up again. I assure my colleagues that there are people here in this body, certainly even in the administration, who are trying to figure out a way, along with the President of Mexico and the Government of Mexico, they are trying to figure out a way to bring back 245(i) extension.

This is wrongheaded for a wide variety of reasons, of course, not the least of which is the fact that we could not possibly in a million years, the agency we presently have that we call the INS, could not begin to handle the flood of applications that they would get almost immediately from people that they will not be able to tell; now, the applications will come in and it will say, yes, I have been here a long time and here are some receipts from my rent and whatever, but of course they could be fake; and we will never know exactly who these people are, because we will not have time to do any background checks.

Just like the last time around, we let so many people in and then the last administration, the Clinton administra-

tion, pushed to get as many as they could made citizens as quickly as they could; and we ended up making thousands, if memory serves me right, it was something like 60,000 people became citizens of the United States under that process who were felons, because we did not know about it. We could not find out. We did not have time.

So that is one problem, saying, for instance, that within the next 4 months, everybody who is here illegally, come in, get some paperwork in and we will verify it, quote, "verify it," and if we do, you will be given amnesty and on the road to becoming a citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that citizenship in this country is more important and it means more than simply stepping over a line that separates two countries. There is much more to it than that. We should be much more concerned about who we let in, how many we let in, and what they are coming here for. Like every other country on the planet who understands that it is their sovereign right to actually determine who comes into the country and when, how many, and what for. We have abandoned that for a variety of reasons, some political, some idealistic in terms of what people think the world should look like, a place without borders.

But I can assure my colleagues that the consequences of a borderless society are significant and dramatic. Some of them can be characterized by the kind of events we experienced on September 11. But that is, nonetheless, the elimination of the borders, that is exactly where many people want to go; people here in this body, some people in the administration, certainly people in the administrations of other countries for their own reasons and for their own purposes.

Mr. Speaker, there are many, there are legitimate reasons, there are legitimate debates that can be held about whether or not borders should be eliminated; and I have many times suggested that that be the basis of any debate on the issue of immigration; that everyone, everyone should ask themselves, everyone here, everyone in the United States should ask themselves this question, and try to answer it as honestly as they possibly can: Do you believe that borders are necessary in the Nation? Is there a reason for it? Now, some may say, oh, well, that is silly, of course. No, no, listen. Believe me, there are people who would suggest that borders are not necessary, that they are anachronisms, that they prohibit the free flow of trade, of money, and of people, and therefore should simply be eliminated, as is happening. Frankly, the European Union is based on this model that will essentially eliminate borders and all the things that separate countries, establish a common currency, a new governmental system, a European Parliament, and who knows how far that will go; but that is the new world order. And again,

it is a legitimate debate topic, but I just want to have the debate.

I want us in this body to actually enter into a debate on that one very basic idea: Do we need borders or not? If Members come down on the side of wanting borders, needing borders, believing that they are necessary, then, of course, we must decide what that means. If we have a border between a country, what do we do about that? Do we actually defend it? Do we actually try to stop people from coming across without permission? Do we provide resources to make sure that the border is meaningful or not? Because if we do not, then of course we should simply side with the group that says eliminate them. After all, we are spending \$6.8 billion in just the INS, let alone all the other agencies that have some responsibility for border enforcement. Let us stop this wasteful expenditure. Let us go ahead and say we do not need borders, we do not want them, we just want people to come and go as they please and not spend the money on borders.

Now, I happen to be totally opposed to that concept, but there are people in this body who believe in it. The people at the Cato Institute, a very influential think tank here in this town, who believe in it.

There are, as I said before, there are members of the administration, there are people we have spoken in other countries, specifically Mexico, who absolutely believe in it. One member of the Mexican Government, a gentleman by the name of Juan Hernandez, he is appointed to the newest agency, just been created, and it is a cabinet level agency in Mexico, and his title translates into something like Minister in Charge of Mexicans Living Outside of Mexico.

□ 2130

Interesting job. Interesting job title.

Mr. Hernandez happens to be, by the way, an American citizen and also a Mexican citizen. He lives part of the time in Texas and part of the time in Mexico City. He was a teacher at a college in Mexico and a very, very interesting gentleman. Very pleasant individual to speak to, very intelligent. He has a great command of the language. He is a good representative of his particular point of view.

In our discussions when we were in Mexico, several Members and I were meeting with him, and he kept using the word "migration" to describe this process of people coming across the border. By the way, that is typical. Many, many people today have chosen to use the word "migration" to explain the phenomena of people coming across the border into the United States at their will. And so I always stop people when they are doing that, and I stopped this gentleman at the time and I said, you are like many people who talk about this, but you are really incorrectly using the word "migration." It is not migration. Migration is when

people move through a country, but when they reach the border of that country and cross it, it is called immigration, and when they do so without the permission of the host country to which they are coming, it is called illegal immigration.

Mr. Hernandez turned to me and the other two Members that were with me and said, Congressman, we are really not talking about two countries here. It is just a region. It is just a region. That was a very, very interesting statement, and a very candid one on his part. And that is what I appreciate about Mr. Hernandez. He was up front with us the whole time. He essentially agreed with the proposition that the United States public policy is. He understands it is made as a result of voting blocs. He wants public policy in the United States to change vis-a-vis Mexico. How do you do that?

Well, you have millions of people here in the United States who have cultural and linguistic ties to Mexico and who will vote for a policy shift in the United States. I mean, he was absolutely clear about it. This is not just some sort of, I do not know, hypothetical that he was talking about. It is not a conspiracy with deep, dark secrets. He was explaining exactly. It is a very logical political strategy if you think about it.

There was a time especially in Mexico that people leaving Mexico were thought of in derogatory and spoken of derogatorily as people who were abandoning their homes, but that has changed. But now they are encouraged, in fact, to do so, but remain connected somehow linguistically, politically to Mexico.

These are interesting facets of the problem we face, and they are part of what should be the debate that goes on in this body and throughout the country over whether or not we should eliminate borders. But if we are going to maintain borders, or at least the facade of a border, then it behooves us, I think, Mr. Speaker, to try and do everything we can to provide integrity to the process.

The first thing we need to do is abolish the INS or that portion of it that deals with enforcement. The first thing we need to do is create a brand new, a brand new agency. We can call it a lot of things. I would suggest that it would be something that would be attached to Governor Ridge's Office of Homeland Security. But whatever we do, we need a brand new structure, one that has a clear line of authority, that has a singleness of purpose, that is given the resources necessary.

We should take away the responsibility from Customs and from the Agricultural Department and all the other agencies that now get in each other's way essentially at the border trying to do their job which sometimes conflicts with the other agencies' jobs and makes it easier for people to come across the border here.

Here is another one of those amazing but true things I was telling you about

earlier, Mr. Speaker, another interesting point. Because we have so many different agencies handling our border security, they are assigned each one of stations that people are coming through in their cars. One may be run by Customs. One may be run by Agriculture. One may be run by INS, but each of them have different responsibilities, and different ways of dealing with the issue, and different questions they ask and different things they are looking for.

So people actually will sit on the hills observing this situation down on the border, people coming through; and they will watch through binoculars to see which line is being managed by which agencies. And if you are smuggling people in, you will want to come in through this line. And if you are smuggling drugs through, you will want to come through that line because they have a different sort of emphasis. Amazing, but true.

We have to stop that. We have to combine the agencies, take the responsibilities away and create a brand new one. That is not easy to do here. As you know, Mr. Speaker, this body and the government is not set up to allow tough issues to advance very far. Everybody gets very jealous, very, very guarded about their little kingdom, their little piece of the action here. So when recently Governor Ridge and his staff developed a white paper on border security, and it said that we needed to do exactly what I have just described, it said we must take all of these responsibilities away from the other agencies, we must create one new agency with a singleness of purpose, a clear line of authority and all the rest of it, it set off a firestorm of protest. I think that is the way the article characterized it, a firestorm of protests within the administration, within all the agencies that would be affected.

So we called over there. My office called the Office of Homeland Security; and we said, we were reading an article in the New York Times about this white paper. They said, we do not know what you are talking about. They are taking on the INS logo. I do not know. I am not sure. And we do not know. We said we are reading, we have a white paper that talks about how we should create the new border control agency. They said, no, no, it is all theoretical. Nothing is on paper. Of course, that is not true.

As a matter of fact, maybe I am breaking the news here to the Office of Homeland Security, but the paper is out. The media has it. The one you say does not exist exists. So you might as well 'fess up to it and let us get on with it. Let us try to do it regardless of whether or not the INS gets mad, regardless of whether or not the Department of Agriculture gets mad, regardless of whether or not Treasury gets upset because some sort of their little bailiwick will be affected. Who cares? Who cares?

The job of this body is not to protect any particular agency. The job of this

body is to protect the United States of America. And it is impossible to do in this way on the particular system we have created and it is being maintained.

So now we are seeing one or two bills that will come to the floor, and we will try to tinker with it and pretend the rest of it is not a problem. And if we separate the agency into the two parts, enforcement and social services, everything will be okay. But it will not, Mr. Speaker. It will not be okay at all.

The problems will remain, and what we will have done here so many times is create an illusion, created an illusion. We have fixed the problem with INS, we will say. It will not be fixed. People will still stream across the border illegally. Thousands upon thousands of people will be here. Right now there are at least 300,000 people who are here in this country who have been ordered deported. They have actually somehow gotten arrested.

Now, be sure and understand, Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about people who overstayed their visa and we somehow found out about it. I mean, the INS was out there doing their job and said, you know what? I think so-and-so may have overstayed their visa. Let us go find them. No. No. That is not what happened, of course.

What happened was so-and-so violated a law, broke a law, broke some other law. They violated one law because they overstayed their visa, but then many times they also robbed somebody, they raped somebody, they murdered somebody, whatever, but they have been found. They have been brought to trial.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to once again consider the importance of this issue of immigration reform and treat it with the respect that it deserves and do not just create another illusion.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2207

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR) at 10 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2356, CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 344, I hereby announce my intention that the following amendments be offered by the following designees: Amendment No. 10 to