

character born of his commitment to his family as a devoted husband, father, and son, and his commitment to his many friends and to our country.

We owe Technical Sergeant John Chapman our sincere appreciation for his 17 years of committed service to our Nation. His determination, devotion, and dedication to freedom should serve as an example for us all. It is important that we not only remember John as an excellent and dedicated airman and family man but also as the American hero that he is.

May God bless him and his family and those who have served with him. May God bless our great country. We indeed are a better Nation because of John Chapman and those who serve with him in our Nation's Armed Forces.

### IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. TANCREDI. Mr. Speaker, recently a study was conducted by the GAO, the General Accounting Office. It was to look into the degree of fraud in the immigration benefits program. I have oftentimes, Mr. Speaker, taken the microphone for the purpose of identifying what I believe to be our serious concerns in this particular agency. There are, of course, many people who work in this agency, many people who are assigned especially on the border, assigned with the task of trying to defend our borders, trying to actually make sure that people do not come into the country illegally.

This is an overwhelming task. I commend those people for doing everything they can to uphold the laws of the United States. But it is something I have likened to trying to keep back a flood with a sieve because of the variety of conflicting laws that have been passed by this Congress, because of the culture within the INS which has absolutely no support for upholding the laws, the immigration laws of this land, and because they are just overwhelmed by the numbers. I have often brought those things to the attention of the Congress. I have personally been to the border. Several Members and I took a CODEL down there just a month and a half ago or so. We observed firsthand the problems that are confronted by our people there on the border. I know and I sympathize and I understand their problems. They not only face the daunting task of trying to deal with the hundreds of thousands of people a day that come into the United States and determine whether or not they are coming here legally, for what purpose, for how long and that sort of thing, and they not only face the, as I say, conflicting laws that have been passed by Congress, some designed to enhance border security, others de-

signed to degrade it, but they are also, it is apparent now, working within a system that is broken beyond the ability for us to fix it. In their own system, they realize that they cannot look to anyone higher up on the ladder, those people that are there today who, as I say, are in the trenches, either on the borders or the people who work in customs, all of them recognize that the system in which they are operating is broken.

Recently, I returned from overseas. As my wife and I were going through customs at JFK in New York, the lady looked up and she said, "I think I recognize you. I actually watch C-SPAN. I think I recognize you. Aren't you on?" I said, "Yes, I have been on often talking about immigration-related issues."

She just hung her head the minute I said it, she said, "Oh, yeah, that's right, it is such a mess. Don't get me started on this. I don't know where to start. It is a mess." Her brief response to the word immigration, immigration policy, is I think probably the best analogy I can give you to the whole system. It is a mess. That is the best example I can give you, the best definition of the system I can give you. It is a mess. This recent report of the GAO is just the most recent example of the problem.

We have actually had over the course of the last 10 years several reports done by a variety of different agencies all on the INS talking about the inefficiency in the organization, their inability to get the job done, even referencing their lack of a true desire to get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, the INS, as you know, is divided into two parts at the present time. They have two different functions within the same organization. Maybe that is part of the problem, because these responsibilities conflict with one another. One part of the INS, Immigration and Naturalization Service, is designed to be what I call the immigration social work side, that is, to find benefits for people coming to the United States, hopefully legally, help them get their green card, help them get visas, all the things that are attendant to people coming into the United States legally and then being able to function when they get here. All of that stuff is part of their responsibility.

Then on the other side, of course, is the enforcement arm. The INS is supposed to be the agency to which we go when we say, look, we are concerned about the number of people coming across the border illegally; we are concerned about not knowing who is here, when they are here and what they are doing here and we are supposed to rely on them to do something about it.

But, as you know, as most of the Members of this body know, the INS is completely incapable and to some extent it is not really desirous of taking on that role. There are literally scores of examples to show that. The fact that 19 of these hijackers on September 11

came here on visas, some of them, of course, then expired, some people were here illegally at the time that it happened and the inability of the INS to control that process is a dramatic example, one dramatic event that happened as a result of their inability to actually know who is in the United States, know for what purpose they are here and know when they have overstayed their visa, for instance, so that they can in fact be deported. But the INS pays little, if any, attention; and they will tell you when you call them and ask them, do you actually go out and look for people who are here illegally. Their answer is, Well, of course not. That's not our job.

I was on the radio not too long ago with a lady who is the spokesperson for the INS in the Denver area and she said, really, that is not what they do anymore. They do not go out on sites and look for people who are here illegally. Really, our job is just to explain to them why they are here illegally and then help them get benefits. That was her statement. It was almost incredible, but that was what she said. That is what they think, that it is not their job. They will say, well, we do not have the resources, we do not have the time; but what they actually should add to it is, we do not have the inclination. It is really not in our makeup. It is not what we want to do. We want to be the social work side of it. That is what we can do well. We do not really do this very well, this sort of becoming a policeman. We do not like that idea. So they shy away from it.

We have had calls in my office from incredibly frustrated INS inspectors, from INS agents, sometimes who have been on board for 30 years. The caucus that I head, the Immigration Reform Caucus, has actually held hearings bringing these people in so they can talk and vent some of their frustration. It is incredible the stories they tell. They have every reason to be frustrated, because they work for an agency that is dysfunctional; and they are trying to do a job that is not supported by the agency itself. It would drive you nuts. I can certainly understand it.

We have had calls from judges who will tell us that they are immigration law judges, and they are also frustrated by the fact that day after day after day they see people in front of them who have committed crimes in the United States besides, by the way, being here, probably many of them, illegally but they have committed crimes and they are aliens and so they are ordered to be deported by a judge. But because they turn that function over to the INS right after the gavel falls and the person is ordered to be deported, they turn that function over to the INS and the INS simply looks the other way.

So at this point in time, we have at least, and I underline at least, because when you ask the INS for specific information, they come back with the same response. In fact, it is the logo that I have designed for the INS. It

should be on their letterhead. It should be on their Web site. When you click on INS, a little figure should pop up that looks like this, a guy shrugging his shoulders going, "I don't know, I'm not sure. Maybe. Could be." Because when you ask them anything, that is exactly what happens. They respond with, "I don't know. I'm not sure. Could be." When you ask them how many people have actually been ordered to be deported but have not in fact left the country, you get this: "I'm not sure. I don't know." Probably around 300,000, they will say, 300,000 people.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about people who are just here illegally. As we know, that is probably 10 or 11 million people here illegally. We are not talking about people who have just overstayed their visas. Certainly they number in the millions, also. We are talking about people who have violated the law. They have robbed a bank, they stole money from somebody on the street, they shot somebody, they raped somebody and then they got arrested. And because of their violation of an American law, they were ordered to be deported. But they do not get deported. They walk away. No one has the slightest idea where they are, 300,000 of them. But the INS says, well, that is not really my thing, that is not really what I am too interested in. We are really on the immigration social work side of things. That is where we concentrate our efforts and that is certainly where we concentrate all of our resources. We have quadrupled the budget for the INS over the last several years. Quadrupled. It has gone almost entirely to the social work side. Very little has gone into defending our borders.

Time and time again we have seen that the INS has absolutely no concern about the people who are here illegally. If you call right now, if a local policeman, for instance, picks somebody up on the street, it may be a traffic violation, it may be disturbance of the peace, whatever, and they find that that person is here illegally, they could, although hardly anyone does anymore because they know it is futile, they could call the INS and they could say, look, I have someone here who has done X, Y and Z and they are here illegally. What do you want me to do? The INS would say, well, go ahead, let them go. Get their name, and we will try to get back to them. Sometimes even people that have gone through this process and are ordered to be deported or who are coming up for their deportation will get a letter, it is actually called a "run letter" in the lexicon because it means the minute you get it, it says something like, look, we know you have violated the law so please report here in 2½ months for deportation.

Yes, right, thank you, of course I will be there with my bags all packed. I do not think many people show up. It is called a run letter for a purpose, because when they get it they run. It is idiotic. Why should we even waste the

stamp? The local law enforcement agency calls up and says, these people are here illegally and they tell them, let them go. We have had in Colorado instances where people have been picked up on the highway for violating some traffic law, the van opens, there are 15 people inside, they are all illegal. That is when they are lucky, that is when they have not run off the road and had the van get into an accident. We have had, of course, many people killed on the highways. It ended up that they were being transported through the State of Colorado. It is a big transportation hub, I am told, for illegal immigration.

But, of course, we call the INS and nothing happens. They tell them, we really have not got the time, we have not got the people, so just forget about it. So at this time very few people actually even do anything; very few law enforcement agencies do anything like, say, call the INS because they have got somebody. They know it is futile. They know there is absolutely no reason to do it. And even after September 11, even after that, we find very little happening inside the INS that would lead us to believe there is a change of heart, a change of the culture, an emphasis on trying to actually keep people out of the country who are here illegally.

It is incredible that we can say that after the most horrific event this country has ever experienced in terms of an act of terror, and, I pray to God, the most horrific event it will ever experience. But, of course, you and I know, Mr. Speaker, we have been told over and over and over again by our Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence here in the House, by members of that committee, we have been told by members of the Armed Forces, we hear it from the Secretary of Defense almost nightly that, in fact, we probably will be experiencing other acts of violence of this nature, of terrorism.

Once again I pray to God that none of them would ever reach the level of damage as that that occurred on the 11th of September, but we do not know. We know, we believe, something will happen. We hear that all the time. There are alerts that are being offered, issued all the time. Yet even with all of that, we have not been able to get the INS, and this Congress, as a matter of fact, we have not been able to get anything out of this Congress that would force the INS to do a better job.

□ 1330

Amazing. We have responded to the President's call by increasing the budget for the armed services and for the homeland defense, and I am totally in favor of it. I vote in favor of very few budget increases on this floor, but I certainly do vote for increases in the area of defense for one reason: It is our single responsibility. It is the most important thing we do here.

I know it is hard to believe, but I certainly think the Constitution would back me up when I say it is more im-

portant; the defense of this Nation is more important than health and human services. It is more important than the education budget. It is more important than transportation. It is more important than anything else we do. So I am more than willing to increase the budget for those agencies through my vote.

But what is amazing is that we have taken very specific and very direct action in beefing up the military, and thank God we have. They will, as the President said so eloquently when he addressed the Nation, they will always make us proud, and they do. They are fighting overseas today as we speak. American blood is being shed in foreign lands in defense of this Nation, and it is the right and proper thing to do.

Who knows? We may soon be in other countries besides Afghanistan. I would agree with the proposal that we need to do something wherever terrorism raises its head or shows its tentacle, whether it is in Iran, Iraq, Georgia, or the Philippines. Wherever it is, I am willing to say we should try and go there and stamp it out.

But why is it, Mr. Speaker, that we are so willing and able as a body to do that, while we are just as unwilling to do anything significant to improve our own defenses here in this country? How is it that we can ignore the fact that we still have people coming across the borders illegally? We still have thousands of people coming across the border every single day illegally. We have not really paid much attention to that. We have paid mostly lip service to it.

It is, for one thing, a fact of political life that we are concerned about raising the issue of immigration reform for fear of the political fallout in the United States. But from whom, I ask, Mr. Speaker. From whom should we be expecting opposition?

Yes, certainly from the Democratic Party, because they recognize that massive immigration will eventually lead to what they believe will lead to more voters for the Democrat candidate. So they will do anything they can, and have done everything they can, to stop any sort of immigration reform, and they want them essentially to come in, legally or illegally, it does not matter. Eventually, they believe it will accrue to their political benefit.

On our side, we, of course, hear from people who are business owners, who say to us, I have to have these people because no one else will do the job. So turn a blind eye to illegal immigration. Let them come in. We need them.

We certainly do not want to be seen as a party that is anti-immigration, or anti-ethnic group; and certainly, I guarantee my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I am not either of those two things. I am not anti-immigration. I certainly have nothing against any ethnic group coming into this country.

The issue is, how much, how many, for what purpose, and will we be able to control it? That is the issue. Do we want open borders? Do we want the elimination of our borders?

There are people who, in fact, do. President Vicente Fox has stated very publicly that he expects in the next 20 years to not have a border between the United States and Mexico. I have talked with members of his cabinet who share that exact same vision: The head of a newly created agency in Mexico that would translate into the Ministry for Mexicans Living Outside of Mexico, an interesting cabinet level position, I would certainly say.

I have talked to Mr. Hernandez, the newly appointed minister in this particular cabinet level department, and he has stated clearly to me that he does not believe that there are two countries. He says they are just a region. That is all. It is not two countries, he says.

Well, now, this may be a very legitimate debate topic. There may very well be people on the floor of the House and in the administration in the United States, and certainly we know in Mexico, who believe that we should not have borders, that we should meld ourselves into sort of a United States of the North American continent and beyond, perhaps. South America, too. A European Union model. I know all of these things are actually in the sights of many people. That is what they think we are going to do.

Well, okay, let us debate that issue, right here, a bill on the floor. I would like a bill to go the committee of reference to eliminate the borders and to join hands with all of the people on the North American continent in some sort of confederation, with common currency, all of the stuff that the European Union is doing.

I will vote no, I will tell my colleagues. I will vote no. But that is okay. That is just my vote. If a majority of the Members of this body and the President agree, that is the way it will be.

But what I do not like happening, Mr. Speaker, is that that is exactly where we are heading, only without any sort of legal justification, without an actual law being passed, without a decision being made by this Congress or by this President. We will look at some point in time in the future back and say, gee, how did all of this happen? We sort of eliminated the borders. They do not really exist anymore.

Well, that may be true; and, as I say, it may be a good thing. I do not think so, but let us debate. Let us at least have this issue come to the floor. Let us not pretend that we are not just expanding immigration for all of these altruistic reasons.

There are political reasons, both in the United States and in Mexico, for massive immigration. It is the hope of a number of people in Mexico, of the government of Mexico that enough people will be here to eventually influence the policy of the United States vis-à-vis Mexico. It is the hope of people in the United States that we can somehow attract these people and get them involved. It is the hope of the labor

unions that they can get all of the newly arrived immigrants, whether they are legal or illegal, into labor unions, so all of a sudden we have labor in support of massive immigration.

And then there are certainly altruistic reasons why even the President of the United States will support it.

I believe that the President is a man who does speak from his heart. I believe that. I go to bed every single night thanking God that George Bush is the President of the United States. Let me get that clear and out here on the table. And especially not the alternative that we had in the last election. So that is not an issue. I am a 100 percent solid supporter. No, I am not 100 percent, because this issue is one with which I disagree with the President. But I believe it comes from his heart when he is saying that he wants to expand immigration. I just think he is wrong.

I have a responsibility here to vote my conscience, and I certainly will do that, and I will speak out against it. It is not being disloyal to the President. It is simply an issue with which I disagree that he brings up, his point of view.

I believe that there are massive implications for immigration in the United States, especially in the numbers that we are talking about today. It is something we are going to have to deal with politically, economically, culturally. There are a whole raft of fascinating topics that can be brought up when we begin to debate on immigration. But as long as we are going to have borders, however, as long as there are still lines on a map that actually divide the United States from other places in the world, from other countries, then, of course, they should be meaningful.

What is the purpose of a border, we should ask ourselves, and what is our responsibility as a national government to defend them?

It is again a unique position we find ourselves in at the Federal level, establishing immigration policy. States cannot do it. States have to deal with our decisions. With our decisions to abandon the border comes a host of problems that confront every State in the Nation, some more dramatically than others.

California, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Florida and other States that face massive immigration, legal and illegal, are faced with building schools as fast as they can, building highways, building hospitals, their social service budgets are busting at the seams, all because they are being inundated by people coming here, as they have come for many years, to seek a better life.

There is one unique kind of situation that is developing, however, Mr. Speaker, in that we are witnessing an interesting phenomenon with the recent arrivals into the United States. Undeniably, they are coming here because they want a better life, because they see job opportunities that are not

available to them in their homeland. That is exactly why most of our relatives, most of our grandparents or great grandparents or whatever, this is why they came. That is not different.

But, in the past, the vast majority of people coming into the United States were seeking not only economic opportunity but they were seeking a new life, a new experience, a new country that they could become a part of, and they were anxious to cut the ties that bound them to the country of their origin. They were willing to speak the language for a while but very, very intent upon moving to the English language as quickly as possible, because they recognized that it was the way they could move up the economic ladder in this country. And it was also because, as my grandparents used to say to each other, they would say "speak America," not English, but "speak America." They were the immigrants of the late 1800s, early 1900s.

They would get into arguments. I remember Sunday drives, and they would get in an argument in the back seat and my grandmother would yell at my grandfather, "speak America," because it meant more to her. She knew that the word was "English," but what she was conveying was something else. She was intent, as was my grandfather, on making themselves and their children and their grandchildren American in every way that they could.

Mr. Speaker, I am a relatively new immigrant, in a way. That is to say, I was born here, but my family is only third generation. I am only third generation. My grandparents came here, as I said, in the late 1800s; and it is intriguing to me that in my life, the second generation after that, there was absolutely no attachment to the country of my grandparents' birth, other than I knew where it was. We had the cuisine that represented Italian ancestry, and that was it, really. That was it. There was certainly no political allegiance that my or my grandparents or my parents held to the country from which they came.

Today, however, we are witnessing something quite different. We are witnessing a flood of people into the United States who do not wish to cut those ties. They wish to retain the political, cultural, and linguistic ties of the country of their origin, and we encourage it in the United States. Believe me, our own policies here, this radical, what I would call radical, multiculturalism certainly encourages that kind of separate status, the Balkanization of America.

I can tell my colleagues that this is the case. We can actually show empirical evidence. This is not just theory. It is a different sort of situation today because I think that has always been brought up whenever immigration issues are discussed that, well, it is different today than it was before. Well, it is different today. Today, there are 6 million people here in the United States, at least; this is our best estimate so far, at least 6 million people in

the United States who claim dual citizenship. Now, this is an interesting thing. It has never been this high.

Well, for the longest time one could not do that in the United States, and one is not really supposed to now. You cannot really become a citizen. You are supposed to swear allegiance to the United States and no allegiance to any foreign dictator or potentate, I think the word is. But, in fact, people do retain their citizenship, as a result of Mexico allowing their citizens to retain their citizenship just a few years ago, and the numbers shot up to 6 million people.

□ 1345

Now, I am stating, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe that we would have had this same phenomenon, not even the same percentage of immigrants coming to the United States in the early 1900s, late 1800s. I do not believe we would have had the same percentage of people seeking to retain their citizenship of the country of origin. Because they came for a different purpose.

Now, I am not suggesting that this is a nefarious thing, that these are not people coming here with the intent to do us harm for the most part. That is certainly true. But it does, in fact, bode ill for the United States. It really puts the emphasis on pluribus and not on unum. Out of many, one. It puts the emphasis on many, and we really do not get to the one. And that is happening to us, and most people I think understand it. I know that most Americans understand it.

Poll after poll after poll indicates a desire on the part of the American people and, by the way, even recent immigrants to reduce the number of people coming, to take a break, take a breather here, to not let people come in illegally, and to not do something like give amnesty for those people who are here illegally.

I will get to that in just a moment because, I am afraid to say it, but I am disappointed that I have to say it, but the fact is we will probably be once again facing this proposal. I know the White House is pushing it. I understand the leadership of the Congress, at least the House anyway, has agreed to bring it up, maybe even as soon as next week.

But let me go back for a moment to the INS and talk about my concerns there.

I have already discussed the incredible degree of dysfunctionality, if you will, in that particular agency, especially on the enforcement side. They are incapable or nondesirous of actually doing anything for enforcement. I think that is blatantly clear. I cannot imagine anybody here, no matter how supportive they are of immigration, I cannot imagine anybody actually defending the INS and their ability to actually accomplish anything.

And we must not think very much of it, Mr. Speaker. We must not think very much of the agency itself, because

we just appointed a guy to the head of it, a good friend of the minority leader in the other body, a good friend of a number of Members in the other body. This is a gentleman that we appointed to head the INS. A nice man. I have met him.

Let me tell what you his qualifications are for the job. He was the Sergeant at Arms of the other body. That is it. That is it. He had been a staffer, I think, some many years back. He had been the Sergeant of Arms for years. Of course, he knew many Members over there; and, lo and behold, he is the new head of the INS. So we must not think very much of the agency, I suppose. It is sort of a toss or a throwaway.

We should think more about it because it is charged with an incredibly important function. It just does not carry it out, and it really cannot because not only, as I say, is the problem with the enforcement side but now comes that GAO report that I mentioned earlier on. February 15 the report was issued, titled "GAO Report Finds 'Pervasive and Serious Problems With Immigration Benefit Fraud'".

Now, remember, Mr. Speaker, this is the other side of what they do. This is what they are supposed to do well. This is the social work side, and this is what they tout. This is what they will state that they are really all about.

The lady that I debated who was the spokesperson for the INS in Denver, this is what she said they do. They help people. They are there to get people their benefits. That is what she said.

Well, here is what the GAO report just found. "Immigration benefit fraud is a significant problem that threatens the integrity of the legal immigration system. Aliens apply to the Immigration and Naturalization Service for such benefits as naturalization, work authorization and adjustment of status. Immigrants benefit fraud involves attempts by aliens to obtain such benefits through illegal means."

Oh, my goodness. Could that be happening? Ask the INS, how much fraud is there, and they give you the low go. I am not sure. Probably a lot.

"The report also details the Immigration and Naturalization Service failure to root out fraud in the immigration benefits application process." In other words, they know there is fraud. They do not care.

The Chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), stated, and I quote, "This report raises a whole host of troubling homeland security threats posed by an immigration benefits process wrought with fraud. In fact, the GAO study finds the INS does not know the extent of the problem."

There we go again. Hey, who knows? Probably a lot.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) continues, "Based on this report I am not confident that the INS is not giving green cards to al Qaeda operatives. We have a complete failure by the INS to take the steps

necessary to protect the people of the United States and the immigration system itself from criminals manipulating the benefits process. These findings support the urgent need for a comprehensive legislative restructuring of the INS."

Is that not the truth? Underline comprehensive, by the way. Underline comprehensive.

We know what will happen in this body, Mr. Speaker. I am sure you are aware as much as anyone else how difficult it is to actually reform an agency of the Federal government and do so quite significantly, comprehensively, very difficult. We will take a stab at it. We will introduce something. It will get watered down in both Houses, and we will end up thinking, was this really what we were trying to do? Is this really reform? Maybe we have changed a few names.

I am worried about it, but, nonetheless, we have got to try to do something, again, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) says, "comprehensively."

Here are some of the findings from the GAO report. Now, please understand that the GAO is not an agency with a given bias here. These people, if anything, we would expect them to be more on the side of the agency itself that they are investigating. But get this, Mr. Speaker. A 90 percent fraud rate. A 90 percent fraud rate was found in one review of a targeted group of 5,000 petitions. A follow-up analysis of about 1,500 petitions found only one was not fraudulent.

Please let me repeat that. I just do not know if you got that. A 90 percent fraud rate was found in the review of the targeted group of 5,000 petitions. Follow-up analysis of about 1,500 found only that one was not fraudulent.

This is what they are supposed to do well, remember. "Benefit fraud is a comparatively low priority within the INS," it went on to say. "Without improvement in its benefit fraud investigations the INS's inability to detect the number of ineligible aliens improperly applying for benefits will be hampered."

Next, "A senior INS official has testified to Congress that criminal aliens and terrorists manipulate the benefit application process to facilitate expansion of their illegal activities, such as crimes of violence, narcotic trafficking, terrorism and entitlement fraud. GAO was told by an INS official that fraud is probably involved in about 20 to 30 percent of all applications filed." They wish it was that low.

"The INS approach to addressing benefit fraud is fragmented and unfocused. There is no assurance that INS reviews are adequate for detecting non-compliance or abuse during application processing."

These are all findings of the GAO study. This is not my analysis. This is the GAO policy of the part of the activity of the INS that they are supposed to do well.

"Some adjudication officers had to sneak over to the operations unit to discuss fraud-related issues because adjudication officers are discouraged from taking the time to discuss questionable cases with investigators.

"INS officials said that fraud is rampant across the country and out of control." That is the part they are probably sure of. I know there is a lot of it, they would say. "INS officials indicate that the immigration benefit fraud problem will increase as smugglers and other criminal enterprises use fraud as other means of bringing illegal aliens, including criminal aliens, into the country."

By the way, please understand we are not talking about Mexico here for these types of problems. We are talking about Russia. We are talking about China. We are talking about countries all over the world who are perpetrating this fraud in order to advance certain illegal activities.

"The INS fails to balance its responsibility to provide immigration benefits with its duty to detect fraud in the immigration process. The GAO concluded that emphasis has been placed on timely processing of applications, allowing quality to suffer. This has contributed to the increase in benefit fraud."

Now, this is the GAO report; and it probably, as most reports of this nature, only skims the surface. This is probably just the tip of the iceberg. But even if it is the whole thing, for heaven's sake, why would we not say we have a massive problem here?

Mr. Speaker, with this in mind, with this picture I have tried to paint of an agency, dysfunctional in nature, incompetent, inefficiently run, headed by a gentleman, again, nice enough fellow but who was the Sergeant of Arms at the Senate, that is it. That is it. This is the agency to which we entrust the sanctity of our border, maintaining that, creating it, because that certainly is not a place with which you can apply that term today.

This is to whom we turn in a time when terrorism poses enormous threats to our very survival. This is the agency that we turn to.

Now, when we were on the border, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned to you not too long ago, several Members and I went down on a congressional delegation. We talked to literally scores of people who were working on the border at the time. We talked to our immigration officials. We talked to people in the embassy, people who were important for visa processing. We talked to people right on the border, border control agents; and to a person they recognized that they were facing unbelievable challenges and that they were not really doing all that well.

But what they said to us is, please do not do anything to make the job worse. And we said, well, like what? They said, like this amnesty issue. Do not do that again. Every time you start talking about amnesty up there, meaning

here, the flood turns into a tidal wave. Because, of course, what do we think would happen?

Is it illogical to assume that if we allow everybody who is here legally or even a large portion of them if they are here illegally, if we allow them amnesty, would that not simply encourage a lot of people to come across the border in hopes of obtaining exactly the same thing in a short time and not going through the regular process, not doing what millions of other people have to do, fill out the paperwork, go through the process of immigration, wait in line and wait your turn? Why would not they just simply come across?

Well, they do. Of course they do. And they said, please do not do that again.

I got back here that night to find that, in fact, we were preparing an amendment to do exactly that. The President had asked for it. The leadership was preparing it. We had quite a little tussle in our conference about that, and a decision was made shortly thereafter to not pursue it. A wise decision, I think.

But because the President is going to Mexico in just a few weeks, just a couple of weeks, there is strong desire on the part of the administration to allow him to take with him this issue, an amnesty. So I am told in a relatively short time, maybe next week, the House will be once again debating whether or not we are going to give amnesty to people here illegally.

Now, again, it is almost incredible that we have to say that this is a bad idea. Again, I support the President in almost every single one of his efforts, domestic and foreign policy combined. But on this he is wrong.

We should not reward people for breaking our laws. And whether we call it a fine or just a revenue enhancement thing, having them pay a little extra money to get in here, I am told that maybe the thinking is having them pay \$1,000 and that would be the fine for having broken our laws. What does that mean to the whole world? Come up with a grand and come on in.

□ 1400

That is all it means. It means do not go through the system. Do not be a fool. Why would you actually go through the system? Why would you wait in line? Why would you do it legally? There is an easier way. Come across the border, get into the United States through a visa, by any way you can, by ship, by plane, just get here, stay here, overstay your visa, meld into the populace at large and forget about it. Because pretty soon somebody will say "Olly, Olly, Ox In Free," and we will let them in.

This is a bad idea. It may be done for political reasons; it may be done out of all truism. I do not know. It does not matter. It is a bad idea. There is a security issue we must deal with.

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

Mr. TANCREDO. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to congratulate the gentleman on his brilliant articulation of the topic.

Mr. TANCREDO. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that we will see how brilliant it is once we get a vote on this issue and whether or not we are able to convince anybody, but I thank the gentleman for those kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is an agreement of political muscle being applied on this. The Speaker of the House is going to bring it, the President of the United States wants it, but most people in this country do not. Even yesterday, Mr. Speaker, something very interesting happened. I was told about this, I did not witness it myself; but I understand the President was speaking to the National Hispanic Chamber of Commerce and he was getting applause in all the right places for everything he said and everything he was doing in talking about the troops, talking about our war against terrorism; and then he said, and by the way, I am going to push for 245(i) extension. There was not, as I am told, there was not a single person in the audience who put their hands together in applause.

This is not something that most people who came here legally want. They understand the problem. They do not want to encourage illegal immigration. They came here legally. They know that that is the right way to do it. We should not be pandering to any other groups or organizations, to the immigration lobbyists. We should not be doing that. We are not going to benefit from it politically. Nothing we will ever do will ever satisfy groups like La Raza and others, these immigration advocacy groups. Nothing will ever satisfy them until the complete elimination of the borders actually occurs.

It is not a good idea. Every time I go to Mexico and I talk to them in Mexico, I ask them, what is it they are looking for? They always talk to me about the circularity. They want people coming to the United States, said the foreign minister, we want people coming to the United States, we want them working, we want them sending money back to Mexico, and then, as President Vicente Fox said, I want them coming home to retire in Mexico. Well, I would say that I am all for the circularity issue, but I would narrow the time frame quite dramatically to something we call a "guest worker program."

People need a job, and people need workers. Great. We establish a guest worker program, one that really and truly is viable. People come in, they take the jobs that are available for them, and we protect their rights as workers. We do not let them be abused by employers who may want to take advantage of them because they would be here illegally under other circumstances. So we can protect their

rights and also protect our own rights as a Nation by determining who comes and how many and how long they stay by establishing a good guest worker program.

But they do not want that. They simply want us to abandon the border. They do not want people just coming to the United States working and then going home; they want them just coming to the United States. And, as I say, there are political reasons for that in Mexico; there are political reasons for that here in the United States. But we should at least speak out on it. We should at least speak out against it.

For one thing, Mr. Speaker, we would be giving the task of determining who is eligible for this amnesty to the Department of Justice and, more specifically, to the, guess what, to the INS. Now, Mr. Speaker, what more do I have to say about this organization that could possibly convince the people here that this is not the right organization to give such a responsibility to?

I cannot imagine that anybody thinks that fraud would not be rampant in all of the applications, or at least a huge majority that would be approved by this organization. Because, after a while, they just get the stamp out. As the clock winds out, they just get the stamp out. I would go back to this last comment that was made about the INS, about their only real intent is to move the paperwork quickly and efficiently. That is all they care about.

So they get the stamp out, they will let people in, and they will not have gone through a background check that is the same kind of background check they would have in the country from which they originated. And, therefore, we become even more vulnerable to the kind of terrorist activity that we have seen and that we anticipate.

Mr. Speaker, there are many, many battles that we will fight with regard to this immigration issue, some very, very broad in nature, some very specific. This is a specific one. Extension of 245(i). People listening to this might hear that, but that is simply a euphemism for the word "amnesty." This is not a good thing for us to do. It is not good public policy. Most people in the United States agree with that statement.

Why are we doing it? What is the reason we are in such a rush to get this in front of us? Why is there so much pressure being placed on us to do something most people in the country are absolutely opposed to, and in their heart of hearts, I think most Members are absolutely opposed to it? How they will vote, I am not sure, because there is, of course, this element of having the administration backing it. But I assure my colleagues that whether this administration or any other supports this kind of proposal, it is the wrong thing to do. And I for one will speak out against it as loudly as I can, as vociferously as I can, and as often as I can.

I recognize fully well that there are only two things I have in this body,

and that is my voice and my vote; and I will use both of them as effectively as I possibly can to stop what I believe to be a tragedy in the making, and that is the disuniting of America, as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., puts it in his brilliant essay, "The Disuniting of America."

That is really what the issue is about here, whether this Nation will actually sustain itself. And, therefore, it is my responsibility to speak out against it regardless of who is pushing it, the President or Speaker.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1983

Mr. SIMMONS (during special order of Mr. TANCREDI). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1983.

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

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON H.R. 2646, FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the Chair appoints additional conferees on the bill (H.R. 2646) to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011, as follows:

From the Committee on the Budget, for consideration of section 197 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. NUSSLE, SUNUNU, and SPRATT.

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of sections 453-5, 457-9, 460-1, and 464 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. CASTLE, OSBORNE, and KILDEE.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of sections 213, 605, 627, 648, 652, 902, 1041, and 1079E of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. TAUZIN, BARTON of Texas and DINGELL.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of sections 335 and 601 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. OXLEY, BACHUS, and LAFALCE.

From the Committee on International Relations, for consideration of title III of the House bill and title III of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. HYDE, SMITH of New Jersey, and LANTOS.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 940-1 of the House bill and sections 602, 1028-9, 1033-5, 1046, 1049, 1052-3, 1058, 1068-9, 1070-1, 1098 and 1098A of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin and Ms. BALDWIN.

From the Committee on Resources, for consideration of sections 201, 203, 211, 213, 215-7, 262, 721, 786, 806, 810, 817-8, 1069, 1070, and 1076 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. HANSEN, YOUNG of Alaska, and KIND.

From the Committee on Science, for consideration of sections 808, 811, 902-3, and 1079 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. BOEHLERT, BALLENGER, and HALL of Texas.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of sections 127 and 146 of the House bill and sections 144, 1024, 1038 and 1070 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. THOMAS, HERGER and RANGEL.

There was no objection.

#### MIKE PARKER FORCED TO RESIGN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, when I was a kid, and when a guy named Mike Parker was a kid, it was fairly common for schoolteachers to talk about a story. We do not know if it is true or not, but they certainly told kids about a young man who, as a child, had a hatchet, and he took that hatchet to his father's favorite cherry tree and chopped it down. And when his father confronted him very angrily over whether or not he had done that, he said, Sir, I cannot tell a lie, I chopped down that cherry tree.

We do not know whether or not that is true, but it certainly is an important lesson. The important lesson is that the person who is said to have told the truth went on to become the father of our country, and this town is named after him. I regret to say that that sort of reward seems missing in this town right now.

I know of another person who in this town just last week told the truth and for that he was asked to resign. That person is my fellow Mississippian, Mike Parker, a former member of this body who served in both the Democrat and Republican Parties.

Mike appeared before the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations last week. As the head of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Under Secretary of the Army for that job, Mike told the Members of that committee that he did not feel that the budget was enough. He went on to say that he felt like the Office of Management and Budget had intentionally underestimated the amount of money that would be needed to run the Corps of Engineers.