

barrel rise in oil prices, that would be half the amount of the last Gulf War, would over a year's time reduce U.S. GDP growth by about half a percent and add nearly 1 percent to inflation.

She goes on to say the economic drag from this oil price shock is being felt most strongly across the transportation sectors, and she also says that most analysts expect that a U.S. attack on Iraq would send the price of oil beyond \$50 a barrel. In other words, more than three times what it was 10 months ago.

So I think that we need to understand that the cost of war is not only in our tax dollars, not only in this horrible cost of the lives of the young men and women we send over there, but also when we combine it with the tax cuts and the large increases in military spending, we are looking at a disaster for our economy. Slower growth, a recession. So we should be very concerned about the economic impact, the immediate impact of this war, and we should be concerned about the long-term economic impact of this war.

This is still about the economy, and remember, all of these debates get swept aside with the war talk. Each time the administration stands up and talks about war, we pay for it at the gas pump.

□ 1915

If we go to war, the prices are going to go up three times what they were 10 months ago. These are the concerns I have.

Mr. Speaker, in the closing few minutes I would like to, with my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), talk about what I am hearing from my constituents in Cleveland. When they ask me what can we do, what can anyone do about this rush towards war, talk about a few things that are possible. I hear from the people in my district; they do not want a war. They expect us to solve this without going to war. They expect that we have the talent and the ability to solve these very difficult problems with other nations, particularly with a nation that used to be a good friend over in the gulf and to whom we sold chemical and biological and nuclear weapons capabilities; and if we could do that a few years ago, why not solve this. Look at the battlefields of World War II. We were at war with Japan and Germany, and they are our good friends now.

We need to work with the international community now. Let us suppose this effort, despite all of our work, just keeps moving along. What can people do, they ask me. Here is what can be done. There needs to be meetings all over this Nation in city councils, town halls, in labor halls and community centers. People need to come together, and they need to talk about how they feel about this. They need to organize.

When I was elected to city council in Cleveland many years ago, I got elected by knocking on doors. I did not have

any money. I just went door to door and talked to people. We need to talk to each other again. We need an up-lifting of our civic consciousness. We need to recreate our civic soul in this country. We need to recreate our national sense of conscience; and we do it by talking to each other, by organizing door to door. Go to your neighbors, create a place for a meeting. Take the information door to door about the meeting. Let people know where they can come to talk about it and then talk about gathering more and more people. Gather by the thousands in your town squares. This is what I tell my constituents.

We need a national revival of this concept of government of the people. Government of the people works because people stay involved. Lincoln's prayer, the prayer that he gave at Gettysburg, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, the way it is realized is when people get involved. So knock on doors. Put a piece of literature in people's hands, I tell my constituents. Tell them how they can come to a meeting. Tell them that they are needed. Bring people together, set an agenda, invite your Member of Congress or other government officials. Invite church leaders to moderate it. We need it talk to each other about this. We can avoid this war. It is not inevitable. We need to connect again with each other.

Each of us is an architect of the world, and our thoughts and words and our deeds are part of that structure of the world. We can recreate the world right now. War is not inevitable. Peace is inevitable if we begin talking to each other and organize at a community level.

There are polling lists available. You can go to a board of elections and find out who the voters are in your precinct, and you can get a list of phone numbers and call people and go back to contacting people, hold those meetings and hold those rallies. I believe, as I tell my constituents about this, that we can turn this around, that we are not stuck with war; but we need to hear from the American people. And my constituents, I tell them, if you talk to your neighbors about it, we can catalyze a change in this country. And I know that the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) works closely with her constituents and tells them how they can make a difference.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, some of the best forums that we have involved a combination of universities, church leaders, community activists, citizens, just inviting ordinary citizens to learn. Many people feel powerless. They feel this is foreign policy, what can I do about that. I think they underestimate their own power.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlewoman is right. Today we have this new structure of the Web. They say I do not know how to use it. I say ask your kids. They have computers. They can get you on a site and you can start to talk to people.

We need to use the available technology that we have; but the best technology in a democracy is the human heart because across this country people can feel in their hearts that this war is wrong. Across this country, people know that America has a higher destiny, that it is not our destiny to be the policeman of the world. It is not our destiny to choose who should be the ruler or leader of another nation. It is our destiny to fulfill the democracy here and to defend freedom when we must.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for participating here and for starting this discussion that war is not inevitable, that Iraq was not connected to 9-11, that there is a chance that we can move forward with our intelligence, that we can some day evolve to a place where what President Franklin Roosevelt called the science of human relationships can be used to resolve our problems, not weapons technology which destroy, but our own capability to evolve in heart and soul, to become more than we are so we fulfill this dream of our founders of a government which is enlightened and a government which has a special connection to its people.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PLATTS). The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to the television audience.

#### IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the House tonight on an issue of importance, I think, to the Nation in terms of what we are facing in the area of domestic policy decision, which I think is an extremely important one for the country. Not surprisingly, I am going to be talking about immigration and immigration reform and a number of related issues this evening.

Mr. Speaker, recently in the Colorado newspapers there have been a series of stories and editorials about an incident that occurred some time ago that was brought to the attention of the public as a result of a story published in the Denver Post maybe a month ago, perhaps a little more than that. The story was one that identified a particular individual in Colorado, actually a particular family in Colorado who were illegal immigrants to the United States.

According to the news reports, even the Denver Post went to the Mexican consul in Denver or the Mexican consul

went to the Post, I am not sure which way it happened, but somehow or other they got together and decided to write a story about a family, the Apodaca family. They decided to highlight a particular individual, a young man that is the oldest son of the family, I believe, who is graduating from a school in Aurora, Colorado, in my district, who has evidently been a model student with very good grades who is now faced with a dilemma. The dilemma is what to do about going to college; how is he going to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, across the country there are several attempts being made to change State laws with regard to illegal immigrants' access to higher education. I believe several States have actually changed their laws that will allow in-state tuition for kids who are themselves illegal or parents of illegal immigrants. This is a major push on the part of the Mexican Government through the Mexican consuls throughout the United States, and it is a major push by immigration advocates all over the country and groups like La Raza and others who want a variety of things, including free K-12 education which they already have, free or taxpayer-subsidized public education, which they do not now have, and driver's licenses and welfare and a number of other things that would add up to citizenship. That is really the point of all of this.

The attempt is being made to erase anything that would be a distinguishment of someone being here illegally. Because after all, if you can come to the United States illegally, put your kids into school, which you can today under Supreme Court rules, have them educated at taxpayer expense, if you can eventually get taxpayers to subsidize their higher education, if you can get taxpayers to subsidize welfare, to pay for welfare for illegal immigrants into the country, if you can get State legislatures to change their laws to provide driver's licenses to people who are here illegally, then what happens, after a while there is nothing that separates you from anyone who is here legally.

If you are present, if you are physically present in the country that we call the United States, you will have all of the benefits of being a citizen, and it does not matter how you got here. This is the desire. This is the hope; this is the plan. To some extent it has been successful, as I say, in several State legislatures. I think California is one, perhaps Utah is another. But the same thing is going on in Colorado.

So there was this plan, if you will, to begin a lobbying process to change our laws in Colorado to allow people who are here, who are in the country and in Colorado in this particular case illegally, to have access to higher education. So the Mexican consul provided the names of a family, the Apodaca family, to the Denver Post. This was a particularly sympathetic case because

apparently these folks came here 7 or 8 years ago, by their own admission illegally, but have so far lived the lives of model citizens. They send their kids to school. They are employed, or at least the husband is employed; and so they now are in this precarious position. They are trying to figure out what to do about the problem they face. How do you send your kids to higher ed, to the University of Colorado?

□ 1930

So about a month ago, as I say, the Denver Post highlighted these people. They in fact put them on the front page of the Denver Post, this family, put in a picture and ran this very, very long story about the family and said, gee, these people, yes, they are here illegally, but they are not concerned about that. They are, as I say, giving their names and locales to the paper and we should in fact now be, of course, cognizant of and sympathetic to their plight.

I read this story as did hundreds of thousands of other people in Colorado and thought, is it not interesting that we are now at the point where people who are here illegally can be so brazen as to make that known publicly without the slightest fear of any sort of negative ramifications? Is it not amazing, I thought, that the Mexican consul would be so audacious as to become involved in domestic politics in the United States? And, more importantly, is it not an affront to every single person who has come to this country legally? Is it not a slap in the face to every single person in this country who has gone through the brain damage and the expense of coming here through the legal process?

Mr. Speaker, I have been able to go up to Commerce City, Colorado, where we have had and where they still have ceremonies to recognize people who are now taking their oath of citizenship to the country. They are becoming new citizens. I have gone there and I have spoken to these groups and I have said, first of all, I want to welcome you to the United States. Secondly, I want to thank you for doing it the right way, for going through the process, for spending the time, the money, for being inconvenienced as I know you are, for trying to learn the language as you are supposed to do. I want to thank you for all of that, because you are acting as good citizens. And every time that we do things like provide amnesty for people who come here illegally, it is a slap in the face to all those who have done it the right way.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my office as I know you do and every Member of this Congress, we have lists of people who have applied for some sort of change in their immigration status and they have asked us to help. And we have. Well over 100 I saw at last count in our office alone. I know that in certain other districts, certain other congressional districts, the numbers are higher; but in mine, a relatively suburban

district, 100, that is quite a few for us. We have actually two people assigned to helping those folks come into the United States or if they are here, to get their status adjusted under the law. That is a resource allocation that I think is unique. I do not believe I have two people among my staff who have a single responsibility or at least have some partial responsibility for a single issue. But that is the load we have, and that is the dedication I have to trying to help.

I thought to myself when I read this story on the front page of the Denver Post that it is amazing that we are so blatant, so fearless about the fact that you do not have to go through that process; that, in fact, you are suckers if you do; that you are being naive if you try to abide by the laws; that you will become celebrities. You will be on the front page of the Denver Post. You will be characterized as heroes because you have lived a good life and you have done what is expected of you in America, you have had a job and you send your kids to school; and therefore because you are an "A" student, we should ignore the fact that you are here illegally and tell everyone in America who is here because they came the right way that they have been suckers.

It also tells everybody in the world who is waiting for the opportunity to come to the United States legally that they should probably simply ignore the bureaucracy, which can be daunting in terms of the obstacles it sets up, and they should simply go to the head of the line. They should simply pass by everybody waiting and enter the gate. That is what amnesty does and that is what we tell people when we showcase them for being here illegally.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know the Apodacas. From everything I have read, they seem to be very fine people who have, as I say, tried to come to the United States for the same reasons that my grandparents, perhaps yours, came here, looking for a better life. I do not blame them for wanting it. But I must admit to you that when the decision was made by the Denver Post and the family and the Mexican consul to showcase these people, they put those folks in jeopardy. Because somebody is going to say, Is this right that you can violate the laws of the Nation with such impunity? Is it right that all those who have attempted to do it the right way should be so insulted? I certainly did not think so when I read the story.

So I waited about 3 weeks or more and finally I called the INS office in Denver and I said, can I please speak to the head of the agency? It was a gentleman by the name of Mr. Comfort. Again, a very nice fellow whom I have met with in the past. I asked him in the beginning of our conversation, I have a hypothetical situation to present to you and that is this: today, Mr. Comfort, you as the head of the regional office for the INS, if you walked

out of the office and were heading over to lunch at a restaurant across the street and somebody came up to you on the street and said, I want to tell you something if you don't mind. I am a person who is a good citizen. I have a job. I have never been in trouble with the law. I send my kids to school. I'm trying to get them an education, but I have this one problem. I am here illegally. What would you do under those circumstances?

He said, Well, of course I would have to take them into custody. Those were his exact words. I would have to take them into custody at that point, and I would have to then put them through the judicial process. They would have a hearing. It would be determined by an immigration law judge as to whether or not they should be deported.

I said, That is interesting to me, because I am wondering what you did about the family that told you that, told not you that, but told the entire State of Colorado that 3 or 4 weeks ago. They said they were here illegally. They were looking for someone to help support their son's higher education goals and expenses.

He said, Yeah, we saw that; we looked into it, but we're not going to do anything about it.

I said, How come? I just asked you what you would do if this happened to you on the street.

He said, It's a resource thing. I don't have the resources to actually go after these people.

I said, I'm not asking you to send in a SWAT team. I'm not asking you to devote any resources to this issue that would jeopardize the major tasks you have in terms of felons who are here illegally and potential terrorists and all that sort of thing. I don't want you to do that. I'm just asking you what you do when somebody tells you this, as these people did and as the Denver Post and as the Mexican consul did.

He said, I really don't know what to say. We don't have the resources. He kept saying, We don't have the resources.

I said, again, What does it take? Would you send a letter? Would you at least send a letter to the folks and ask them to please come in and talk to you about the fact that they have stated publicly that they are here illegally? He said, yes, that they would do that.

Shortly thereafter, I received a call from the Denver Post wanting a follow-up interview to the original story about these folks. I told the Denver Post, it was amazingly coincidental, but I had just talked to the INS and I told them this story. The next day the Denver Post wrote a story, it appeared again on the front page and it was entitled something like "Tancredo Demands the Deportation of this 'A' Student." Forget about the fact that that was an interesting spin that they put on it because I never even mentioned the student in my conversations with the INS. I was talking about the family who had made this statement to the

Post. But, regardless, that was the story. It has been amazing in terms of the reaction to it.

I have had literally thousands of e-mail and telephone calls and letters about this into my office. Overwhelmingly, I should say that the letters and e-mails are supportive. But the Denver Post is very upset about the fact that I did this. I have tried to explain to them that really what I did was what hundreds of other citizens I know have tried to do and that is to talk to the INS, get them to look into the situation, the situation that individuals may feel exists out there in terms of illegals being here and that the INS routinely ignores those inquiries and/or reports from John Q. Citizen. In this case because I was able to get the head of the INS on the phone and speak to him directly, they were perhaps less able to ignore my request to them to look into the issue.

I did not demand, I should say, anyone's deportation, not Jesus Apodaca who was the young man that was identified in this story as being the "A" student who is looking for a college education, or anyone else. I simply said, Would you look into this, would you simply send a letter and ask these people to come in and talk to you? But the press has portrayed this in a way, as you might imagine, to make it appear as though I have taken it upon myself to become the head of the INS and "bully." I think is the word they use most often, and "mean-spirited," another one that they throw in there.

Then yesterday we got a call from the same reporter who had done this story, and he said, we have found out because of good reporting that Congressman TANCREDO has hired people to work in his home, in his home, in this case to finish a basement, and they were illegal, they were here illegally, and they wanted to know whether we had a response. My response was, I in fact did hire a company, a very reputable company to finish my basement and to put in a home theater for a Christmas present to my family. It was truly an expensive one, but it is one that we were able to pay for by refinancing my home, which is what we did. I went to a company in Denver, I purchased the equipment, and I asked if they also installed. They said yes. I said I also need the basement to be finished for this. They said they could do that. A part of their company was also a construction company.

□ 1945

I hired them for this purpose. They were expensive, it is true, but we checked out their references and they were good. And we felt because they had promised me to get it done by Christmas last year, that we would go ahead and pay the extra money that we thought we were paying compared to other estimates to get this job done. So we hired them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, frankly, as you know, we are not home often, espe-

cially if you live as far away from Washington as I do. We are home sometimes on the weekend and during break. But we put a lockbox on our door and we gave the key to the lockbox to the construction company. And they were absolutely efficient and they did a great job, and I can say nothing but good things about the experience. They finished exactly when they said they were going to finish. The job is a great job. I have nothing to complain about whatsoever. Now, I have no idea who they hired, where they came from or anything else.

But, anyway, the Denver Post tomorrow is going to run a story, we are told, they called us tonight to tell us they are going to run a story tomorrow that states what I have just told you, that we have had people working in our home who were in fact illegal immigrants.

Somehow, of course, I know they are going to try and tie this to me, that I either knew, or, I do not know exactly what the point of it is, but I know they are very upset about the fact that we have called them on this issue of highlighting the Apodaca family. So, as a "result of good reporting," they have uncovered some more illegal aliens who are in Colorado, and they are going to publish a story tomorrow about that.

Now, I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have been called a bully, I have been called mean-spirited, because I called the INS and asked them to look into the Apodaca story, which had been printed in the paper serial several weeks before. But, Mr. Speaker, I have to also tell you that I do not seek out people who are here illegally. I do not ask people who may be serving me at a restaurant, who may be doing my lawn work or putting on the roof of my house, or, in this case, the laborers of a company that I hired to put in a home theater system and finish my basement, I do not ask them to show me proof of the fact that the people, I do not say, you know, the waiter that you sent me last night could not speak English very well, or the cab driver that I got when I came over here could not speak English very well, so I would like to see whether or not they are here illegally. I do not do that. I think that would be sort of mean-spirited, frankly, I do not do that.

I only got into this issue, became even acquainted with the Apodaca family, because the Post and Mexican Consul and the family themselves choose to make themselves known to me and to the rest of the people in Colorado, the entire citizenry.

So, I do not know, Mr. Speaker, frankly, I have not the foggiest idea of whether or not the people who were employed by the company that I hired were illegal. I know they were good workers and did a great job. That is all I know. But if the Denver Post continues to press this, if they identify people and companies, then, of course, I would tell the INS the same thing:

"Look, the Denver Post is once again pointing out people who are here illegally. Are you going to do something about it?"

But I want to try to just make people understand the nature of this debate. I know that I suffer the slings and arrows. I know that I am going to be vilified in the paper. Tomorrow I am sure that the article that the Denver Post writes about me will not be complimentary. But, you know, I guess I am really thinking aloud here with you tonight, and that is, who is really the bully? Who is really mean-spirited here?

I hope that we will enforce our immigration laws in this country. I hope that we will stiffen those laws. I hope that we will in fact even put military troops on the border to help enforce immigration laws. But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, quite honestly, that if this Nation decides that it does not wish to enforce immigration laws, that if we do not wish to have a border that requires somebody to get permission to cross, that is okay with me. It is not okay, I would be a no vote on that bill, but let us assume for a moment that this House and the Senate, the other body, I should say, and the President agree that we should abandon this whole concept of border security and immigration policy. If it is the will of the majority, I would live by it.

The idea that we can have a law in place that says you cannot enter the country illegally, but, on the other hand, if you do, and if you are a nice guy and if you have got a kid who is an A student, I do not know, if he is a B student, I am not sure we would cut him this slack, or C or D or F, or maybe if he does not go to school at all, maybe then we should try to deport him. So maybe we should make an immigration policy that depends upon someone's grade point average, or whether or not they have simply been in the country a while and kept a job and stayed out of trouble.

You know, whatever we do, whatever this Congress and the Senate decide to do, the other body decides to do, and the President agrees to, that is the law of the land and I certainly would abide by it. But if we, unfortunately for the Apodacas, have a law that says if you come into the country illegally you are subject to deportation, even if your child is an A student, even if you have lived in the country as model citizens, you do not have the right to citizenship, as long as that is the law of the land, then let me ask you, is it being a bully to ask the INS to enforce the law?

Now, again, Mr. Speaker, I want to say we know there are between 9 million and 13 million people who are here illegally. That is true. I have not the foggiest idea how many people I may have hired in the past as taxi drivers, as waiters, waitresses, home improvement people. I have not the foggiest idea how many of those people may have been here illegally, and it is not

my job to ask them. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is against the law to do so. You could be sued under the Civil Rights Act if you go out and ask people that have been hired by somebody else if they are here illegally or not. I do not do that. I do not inquire.

If you go to the Denver Post or any other newspaper and you say, "I am here illegally and here is the benefits that I want," then, of course, I think it is a different situation, and the Denver Post and the Mexican Consul and this family have to take some responsibility for making the choice to become prominently displayed on the front page of a major newspaper.

Now, I know that this is a very controversial and very emotional issue. I know that, and I do not relish the idea of being here and discussing it. Frankly, there are other things that are also important to me, other issues; the tax policy of the country, the war, the potential war with Iraq, there are a whole bunch of things that weigh on my conscience very heavily and weigh on my mind, as I know they do on yours, Mr. Speaker, and every other Member of this body.

But I must admit to you that what is happening here by attempts in this case by the Mexican Consul and sympathetic news media, the attempts to characterize illegal immigration as benign, that is wrong and it is dangerous. The Apodaca family, certainly from all accounts I have read, anyway, are no danger to the United States. They pose no danger. They seem like good people, people I would be happy to have as neighbors and friends. But it is irrelevant to the issue as to whether or not they have broken the law to come into the country.

What is the most discouraging or disconcerting aspect of this whole thing is that when trying to characterize and personify the illegal immigration issue by using the Apodacas, what you do is ignore another face of illegal immigration that is much, much uglier, much nastier. That is the face of illegal immigration that you confront on the borders of this country, both the Canadian border and the Mexican border. It is the face of murder, it is the face of infiltration into the country of people who are coming to do us great harm, it is the face of drug smuggling. It is the face of rape and robbery, because coyotes who often bring these people, in this case from Mexico, into the United States, they charge them sometimes \$1,000 or \$1,500 to bring them into the United States illegally, and when they get to the borders they rape the women, they steal the money, they force the people into the United States into some of the most inhospitable parts of the country in terms of the desert, and they die out there. This is an ugly thing.

It is the face of murder, where a little over a month and a half ago a young man by the name of Kris Eggle, who was a Park Service employee, he was a Park Ranger in the Organ Pipe

Cactus National Monument in Arizona, and Chris, who was 28 years old, along with a colleague in the Border Patrol, stopped two Mexicans who had come across the border after having murdered four people in Mexico in some sort of drug deal type of thing that went awry, or they were hit men for some cartel, I do not know all of the details. But they came into the United States. They were stopped by this young man, 28 years old, and when he got out of the car, he was killed. They opened up on him with automatic weapons and killed him.

I went to his funeral in Ajo, Arizona, where I saw his mother and his father, I saw all of his colleagues from the Border Patrol, from the Park Service, from the Customs agency, all of them coming to pay their respects. But I saw no one else from the government. I saw no members of the media to talk about that face of illegal immigration into the country.

I have not heard a thing about the fact that a short time ago, maybe less than a week ago, two FBI agents on the border near El Paso, I believe, were abducted, dragged across the line and beaten almost to death. They are both in the hospital in Texas in critical condition. I have seen nothing about that face of illegal immigration.

I have seen nothing about the fact that hundreds and hundreds of thousands of pounds of illegal narcotics are confiscated on our borders with both Canada and Mexico every year, and I have seen nothing about the fact that agents are routinely placed in harm's way, Border Patrol agents, U.S. Forest Service personnel, are placed in harm's way and injured and in fact killed in defense of the Nation's immigration policy, so-called immigration policy.

□ 2000

I have seen nothing about that in the Denver Post.

I have seen nothing about the fact that I received the following message from someone who will remain anonymous, but here is what he says: "Sir: Until about 5 months ago I was a U.S. Border Patrol agent. I was recently informed by a friend who is still with the U.S. Border Patrol of another Ramirez-type incident that Border Patrol agents had been ordered not to talk about and that the Border Patrol is desperately trying to keep away from the media. A Catholic nun was recently raped and murdered in Oregon by a Mexican illegal alien who was apprehended earlier by U.S. Border Patrol agents in Deming, New Mexico. The IDENT/ENFORCE system worked and the system alerted the agent that the alien was a violent criminal. The subject was released back into Mexico where he promptly made his way back into the United States, traveled to Oregon and raped two nuns, one of which was also murdered. The Border Patrol has put the word out to its agents that this information is not to be divulged to anyone outside the U.S. Border Patrol. The patrol agent in charge of the

Deming, New Mexico station has been relieved and temporarily assigned to the sector headquarters in El Paso, Texas. The killing of the nun made the news, but the fact that the killer is an illegal alien recently captured and released by the U.S. Border Patrol did not. Hopefully, you can change that. Keep up the good work."

Well, thank you, sir, for your courage in telling me and telling, therefore, the country about this. Because I can assure my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that this will not be on the front page of the *Denver Post* tomorrow. The fact that I hired a company that purportedly hired illegal aliens to work on my basement, according to what we were told tonight by the *Post*, but this will not, although the story has certainly made news earlier, they said it was news in Oregon, it will not be there, because this is not the face of illegal immigration that the press wants to present to the American public. However, this is the face of illegal immigration on our borders.

Mr. Speaker, I have come to this floor many times. I have no doubt that my concerns about illegal immigration, about the immigration issue have made me a number of very powerful enemies. I have no doubt that they will from this point on hound me, dog me, find out who delivers the milk to my house, who cuts our lawn. I mean, I have no idea to what extent they will go to try and vilify me for bringing the message. I guess, of course, it is an intimidating thing, but I also know that, because I have to ask myself and my own conscience, is this the right thing to do. I have to search my own conscience, Mr. Speaker, about why I do it. Is it out of some sort of animosity or animus that I have? I truly do not believe that is the case. I know that I would be doing essentially the same thing, as millions of others who are seeking a better life in the United States, I would be looking for a way into the country.

I do not necessarily blame the people who come here illegally. I blame our own government for encouraging it on the one hand by refusing to actually secure our borders, and periodically giving amnesty so as to tell people all over the world that the message is, by the way, to come into the United States, and for not cracking down on people who hire illegal aliens. If they knowingly hire somebody who is here illegally, then, of course, there is a price to pay. And I only suggest that if we want to have an immigration policy that establishes what the borders of the United States are and that one must ask permission to come across them, as we must do going to either Canada or Mexico, that the law, and that those borders, ought to be actually upheld.

It is amazing to me and incredibly ironic in a way that the Mexican consul has been so actively involved with trying to change our immigration status. It is amazing to me that the Mexi-

can consul and advocates for immigration policies, for liberal immigration policies continually ignore the laws that are in place in our neighboring countries, Canada and Mexico. I have yet to see in the Mexican press or the Canadian press negative stories about the fact that in these countries if you enter illegally, you can be prosecuted for that. I have yet to see a story in the press about the fact that neither Canada nor Mexico, nor any other country of which I am aware, will allow you to go to school at their expense, at the taxpayers' expense of that country, go on to higher education at the taxpayers' expense of that country, if you are not a citizen of that country.

I have never seen an article written attacking any country for their mean-spirited immigration policy. I have never seen the Mexican consul speak out in the United States, and certainly I would be amazed if they did, of course, against the repressive actions taken by the Mexican Government against Guatemalans who periodically come into the country of Mexico illegally. Often, the Mexican Government will send troops to that southern border, to their southern border and they will also, by the way, round up, and I mean that in the ugliest sense of the words, round up illegal Guatemalans, illegal aliens into Mexico from Guatemala, they will round them up, send them back, they will incarcerate them.

Mr. Speaker, I have actually been in detention facilities in Mexico for people who have entered their country illegally. They are not nice places. I assure my colleagues that the detention facilities that we have in the United States are more like Hilton hotels than in comparison to the detention facility for illegal entrance into Mexico. But there has not been a word of concern about that, has there? Have I missed it? Has any paper in the United States attacked the Mexican Government for their attitude about illegal immigrants into Mexico? Has any media outlet in this country suggested that Mexico should begin educating all children who go to Mexico, regardless of where they are from, at the expense of the Mexican taxpayer? We do that. We do that because the Supreme Court has ruled that if you are here, even if you are illegal, we need to give you a K-12 education.

Now, so far they have not ruled that we have to give you a higher education at taxpayers' expense, but that is what they are seeking. That is what the people that support a liberalized immigration policy, that is what they are seeking. I have never heard anybody else, any other country chastised because they do not do what they are demanding of us. So is it mean-spirited, truly, for me to suggest that if we have an immigration policy, we should uphold it; if we do not wish to do so, we should abandon it?

I assure my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, and I have said this on the floor many times, that I wish there was someone

with the courage to introduce a bill into this House that says we will abandon our borders, there is no need for them, we want the free flow of goods, services, and people. And if it passes, over my "no" vote, if it passes and if it passes the other body, and if it is signed by the President, that is the law of the land, and I walk away from the issue. But if, on the other hand, we pretend that we have borders and that for some reason that is important, which I think it is, then should we not do everything possible to uphold the law about those borders, especially, especially, Mr. Speaker, in times like these, in times that present the United States with the potential for catastrophic terrorist activity, catastrophic events that could be perpetrated by people who have come across our borders illegally? Should we not try to defend those borders? Should we not try?

When we go to the American public, either the administration or the Congress goes to the American public and says, we are trying to do everything we can, we are doing everything we can to protect you, can we be truthful in that, Mr. Speaker? Do we believe that we are doing everything we can to protect America? If that is the case, then why is it still possible for, say, one mile on either side of any port of entry in the country, you can walk across and no one is going to stop you? Is that really doing everything that we can to protect the United States of America? Should we not be as interested in defending our own borders as we are in defending the borders of Korea or Kosovo? Should we not be as concerned about our own safety in this country as we are about perhaps deposing Saddam Hussein and, therefore, removing a threat to the United States, which I happen to agree with? I mean, I agree that he is a threat and that we should depose him. But is it not just as important for us to defend our own country at the closest point of vulnerability, and that point is the northern, the southern, eastern and western borders of the United States? I cannot for the life of me understand why we do not pursue that as aggressively as we do a war with Iraq.

If we go to war with Iraq, does anyone not believe that the danger to the United States increases exponentially, that the danger will not come on the battlefields of Iraq necessarily, although that is certainly a dangerous place, but it will also come as a result of increased infiltration into the United States of fundamentalist Islamic cells designed and with the purpose, I should say, of doing us great harm? Would that not be only logical to assume as a possibility? And should any country not do the rational thing and try to actually defend those borders, even if it means preventing the flow of illegal immigrants into the country who are not coming to harm us?

But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot set up a sieve that distinguishes that. We cannot really expect people on the border to go, I see you coming across here, you look to me to be someone who is just coming across for a job and a better education for your kids, so I am going to let you come by. But you, you look like someone who might be coming across to do us great harm. No, of course, we cannot do that. I mean, even if we tried, the ACLU would go crazy and call it racial profiling or something. So we cannot do that. We either defend our borders or we do not.

□ 2015

Either walk away from this and stop putting our Border Patrol, or Forest Service people, our Park Service employees, our Customs agents, stop putting them in jeopardy of their lives for a principle one is not willing to uphold. One or the other, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, one or the other. Uphold the law or abandon the law, repeal the law. Those are our choices. But this half-baked approach is the worst possible way to deal with it.

And I will suffer the slings and arrows of an angry media and of angry constituents and of angry members of the Hispanic and immigrant communities in the United States, although I must say, Mr. Speaker, that we get many, many supportive e-mails and calls and letters from Hispanic Americans who consider themselves to be Americans only, Americans. No hyphenated part in there, and they are worried about this country's survival, and they are worried about the effects of massive immigration, legal and illegal, and they support this position. It has got nothing to do with ethnicity. I said this a thousand times if I said it once. It has got nothing to do with the countries of origin. We are talking about whether or not we are in fact a sovereign State or whether we are not, and if we choose not to be, if we choose to go the route of the European Union and begin the process of eliminating borders, creating common currency and all that, that is okay as long as it is done as a result of a legal process. It is called this body. We vote on it. We make a decision on behalf of our constituents. That is the way it should be done. It should not be done in a de facto way, just having it happen and then 10 years from now we say, "Gee, how did this occur? Remember when there used to be an actual border between Canada and the United States and Mexico and the United States? Remember when we used to ask people flying in for visas and things like that? I wonder why we do not do that any more. What has happened to the whole American experiment?"

So I guess I will continue to raise my voice in defense of the American experiment, in defense of the people who have come here over the last 250-odd years, who have come here seeking a better life, who have come here legally. I speak in defense of them. I speak in

defense of all those folks who do not have the money to plead their case, I suppose, with the INS, but they are in line, they are following the rules, they are hoping that we will let them in and they will have a shot at the good life. God bless them, I say. God bless them. They are doing it the right way. And every time we slap them in the face, all I can say is I am sorry. It is rude, it is mean-spirited and it is ugly. Again, I tell them thank you for doing it the right way, for coming to the United States legally, welcome to the United States to everyone in this Nation who has come here the right way.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this issue eventually resolves itself so that our Nation is defended and that the idea of sovereignty is upheld and the hopes and dreams of millions of people seeking to come here will be fulfilled, seeking to come here legally.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. FRANK, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. SHOWS, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. FARR of California, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. SANDERS, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. RIVERS, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. BALDWIN, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today and September 19.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 210. An act to authorize the integration and consolidation of alcohol and substance abuse programs and services provided by In-

dian tribal governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources; in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

#### 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. 3880. An act to provide a temporary waiver from certain transportation conformity requirements and metropolitan transportation planning requirements under the Clean Air Act and under other laws for certain areas in New York where the planning offices and resources have been destroyed by acts of terrorism, and for other purposes.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2810. An act to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to extend the deadline for the INTELSAT initial public offering.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 19, 2002, 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:

9206. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Lactic acid, ethyl ester and Lactic acid, n-butyl ester; Exemptions from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2002-0217; FRL-7196-6] received September 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9207. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cypermethrin and an Isomer Zeta-cypermethrin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-2002-0227; FRL-7197-7] received September 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9208. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Daniel J. Petrosky, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9209. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report on the Cost Estimate For Pay-As-You-Go Calculations; to the Committee on the Budget.

9210. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental