

Dr. Einstein lived. She said no as she was skipping the rope. He finally asked about the guy with the big fuzzy white hair, and she directed him to the correct door. He went in with two other physicists and together with Albert Einstein they wrote the letter to FDR that changed the world. Edward Teller was a great scientist. He was also a great American.

CALIFORNIA RECALL DECISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased with the decision made yesterday by the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals that declared the use of older voting machines would again lead to the disenfranchisement of minority voters. I applaud the court for deciding to assure voters that the basic fundamental requirements of equal treatment and fairness are carried out. Underlying this, I quote from Justice Kennedy who wrote: "Voting is one of the most fundamental and cherished liberties in our democratic system of government." To me, the California decision highlights a painful lesson our country learned from the 2000 elections, that it is not possible to hold a fair democratic election if voters are not guaranteed their votes will be fairly counted.

I read in the paper and have heard on the news a lot of talk about hanging chads and other technical problems that led to the Supreme Court selecting George W. Bush as the President in the 2000 Presidential election; but let me tell Members that in my district, Florida's third, 27,000 votes were thrown out and never counted. Let me repeat, 27,000 votes from precincts 7, 8, 9 and 10 tossed out, never counted from minority neighborhoods that vote 98 percent Democratic.

In California, the voting machines that 44 percent of the voters were going to use in the October 7 recall election were so questionable that California's Secretary of State, a Republican, was not planning to allow this equipment to be used in future elections. And take note, the comparison he drew for the dire situation was that California should not wait for a Florida-style election problem before going ahead to replace their out-of-date voting machines.

In the court decision, the 9th Circuit stated that 40,000 citizens of California would have their votes uncounted because of old machines they were planning to use. I repeat, 40,000 votes. In addition, a quarter of the State polling places are not yet functioning because election officials did not have enough time to prepare for the recall. To me, the situation in California clearly shows that we still have quite a ways to go in reforming our voting system. And to make matters worse, even though just last year we passed an

election reform bill, the Republicans have blocked full funding. Up to this moment, we still need another \$2 billion before the end of the year to ensure that we do not repeat the 2000 election. Yet if we fail to provide the States with this badly needed funding, we may be headed right down the same path, to face this terrible situation that we were in just 3 years ago.

Here we are, 3 years later, the leader of the free world and at the same time the laughingstock of the free world telling other nations that we do not support them or we are going to sanction them because we consider their elections to be unfair; yet here at home we cannot get our own elections right.

I completely support the circuit court's decision and hope to see the election postponed until they get better equipment in place. We must never, ever repeat what happened in Florida. We certainly do not want to witness a repeat of the 2000 Presidential election. In closing, I think the recount in Florida, the redistricting problem in Texas, and the recall of California's Governor is part of a right wing conspiracy to politically enslave the American people.

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

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REMEMBERING ROBERT LLOYD KELLEY

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in honor and remembrance of Robert Lloyd Kelley, who tragically passed away on March 15, 2003, at the age of 57. Robert Kelley, known as Bobby, was not only an outstanding father and beloved husband, he was also a great community leader and mentor who gave freely of his time and energy.

Those who knew Bobby knew that he loved life, especially his family, his church, the Texas Aggies, his job, and his community. He was devoted to his aging parents and took care of their physical and emotional needs. Bobby was kind and generous to many in the community, but his rewards are now being reaped in the splendor of heaven.

Bobby was born on February 4, 1946, in San Antonio, Texas, to Dr. E. Lloyd Kelley and the late Mary Yvonne McGarry Kelley. He is preceded in death by his mother as well as his son, Timothy Lloyd Kelley.

Bobby played an active role in his community of Hondo, Texas, serving both on the board of directors and as president of the Hondo Area Chamber of Commerce, as well as president of the Hondo Owl Band Booster Club.

During his life, he received numerous service awards and recognitions, including Volunteer of the Year for the Hondo Volunteer Fire Department, 1986; Community EMS Service Award, 1986 to 1990; Medina County Peace Officers Association Citizen of the Year; Hondo Area Chamber of Commerce Citizen of the Year; Outstanding Band Booster Service Award; and special recognition from the San Antonio Area Chapter of the Red Cross, as well as the Boy Scouts. He was an active member of the Hondo Church of Christ. He was the chief of the Medina County Juvenile Probation Department where he worked with the troubled youth of the area, a job which he found most rewarding, and through his department he helped a faith-based program called Angels Crossing.

□ 2045

Bobby was always willing to volunteer and work on any project that was "for the kids." He always said, "If you can't do something for kids, what's the point? Kids are our future."

He also served as a Texas Department of Criminal Justice religious volunteer for approximately 8 years. He loved to sing and served as a song leader at church services held at the Joe Ney Unit in Medina County. Through his work at the Joe Ney Unit he was able to secure funds to have a chapel built, and now with his passing, a formal request has been made that the chapel to be constructed as the unit be named the R.L. Kelley Chapel. It will be dedicated to helping men find God and change their life just as he dedicated his life to helping people.

I extend my deepest condolences to Bobby's wife of 35 years, Jill, who is a seventh grade Texas history teacher at McDowell Middle School in Hondo, and his daughter, Lisa, who works for me on the House Agriculture Committee. Although he will be deeply missed, Bobby's spirit will live on in the hearts and memories of everyone he loved and inspired, especially his family and closest friends, today and for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honor and remembrance of Robert L. Kelley. Medina County, Texas, was indeed fortunate to have such a dynamic and dedicated community leader who willingly and unselfishly gave his time and talents to make his community a better place in which to live, to work, to call home and to raise a family.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, earlier this evening while we were voting on the House floor on a number of issues and as conversations develop among colleagues here, I had an interesting

conversation that I would like to recount. A colleague of mine as we were walking across the street from our office building over here, the Longworth Office Building, said to me, you know, I know that you have had a lot of involvement with immigration-related issues and therefore I just wanted to talk to you a minute or two about some of the concerns I have. This particular individual happens to be a chairman of a committee that has oversight in a particularly important area of concern for us all and has some responsibilities that I would say overlap into the immigration area. He asked me what I thought we needed to do because he recognized the particular problem we were in, the peculiar problem we were in, I guess, in that we have a huge number of Americans who are concerned about this issue, about immigration, immigration reform, and we have a great deal of pressure developing, political pressure, I guess we could say, to do something about our porous borders and do something about the problems that exist as a result of the fact that today unfortunately even 2 years after 9/11, the event that transformed America in many ways and changed the world in many ways, we have still not been able to come to grips with one aspect of this problem and the fact is that we all know this, people in this body know this, and yet we seem paralyzed to do anything about it.

I said, well, okay, I have some ideas about this. Of course we went on to talk in-depth about what we thought should be done. Underline the word "should" be done. There was general agreement between the two of us, I guess, that much stronger action needed to be taken, that our borders are porous and that something had to be done in order to control the number of people coming across our borders, north and south, into the United States without our permission, for reasons sometimes benign, sometimes not so benign. We talked about the things that should be in place. Once again I emphasize the word "should" be in place. Some of the protections that any country would take, some of the undertakings that we as Americans should simply say we should look at as being the most basic kinds of precautions, that any government would undertake in order to protect their own citizens. We talked about the need for internal security. We talked about the need for Americans to devote more resources to trying to identify those people who are in this country, illegally for the most part, and who are here for purposes of doing us great harm. And we went through the number of problems that we have because, of course, there are many interests that are involved here, many political interests that develop that complicate the issue of simply securing our own borders.

It became apparent after a short time, after we talked about the amount of drugs that are being brought into

this country, illegal drugs that are being brought into the country as a result of the fact that cartels, especially in Mexico, have realized that their ability to transport illegal drugs into this country is great and the profits are enormous and that the harm that is being done as a result of that kind of activity is well documented. And we talked about the fact that there are national security problems involved with porous borders and that terrorists, potential terrorists, are able to come into the United States, able to work within the United States because, of course, there are so many millions of people who are living here illegally, that they can blend into the society, they blend into that community, it makes it incredibly difficult for us, the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, to identify, to monitor and to interdict these people. And then we talked about, of course, just the abuse of our own laws, the fact that we recognize that our immigration policies are being constructed by States and by localities, by cities and counties throughout the United States that are developing policies and laws that actually aid and abet the criminal activity we call illegal immigration.

And all of this devolved into one common theme. Our borders are porous and we need to do something about that. As amazing as that sounds, it is still a difficult concept for many people in this body and in the administration, apparently, to get. But our borders are porous and there are consequences as a result of this situation.

I tell you about this and I relate this conversation because of the way it ended. There was, as I say, agreement between the two of us as to what the problem actually is. There was also an agreement between the two of us as to why we cannot solve that problem and that is what is amazing to me and I guess why I want to start off my discussion this evening with telling you about this conversation, because at one point this gentleman said to me, you know, we do not have the political will to secure our own borders. That is, of course, something I have said many times on this floor. It is something I have said in speeches I have given all over this Nation. But hearing this from another Member, a Member who is, I might say, not identified as being part of our Immigration Reform Caucus or someone who is very high profile but nonetheless a very respected Member of this body. As I say, a committee chairman. He said, and I want to say it again, we do not have the political will to secure the border. What a statement. And in an absolutely truthful statement, a statement we all know in our heart of hearts is accurate but a statement that we do not want exploited, a statement that we do not want to be made public. But it is public knowledge, Mr. Speaker. We may think we are the only ones here that know this dirty little secret, but I assure you that Americans know and understand

that there is this problem. Many millions of Americans understand that there is a problem but perhaps they do not know why and they ask me all of the time. I get I do not know how many letters and e-mails and calls to my office. Over and over again the question is, why can't we do something about this? Day after day, week after week, month after month, year after year we talk about the problem. There are countless news reports about the fact that we cannot control our own borders, about the fact that people are coming across and that we choose to do little if anything about it. People say to me, why is this happening, Congressman? I can only tell them what my colleague said to me. We do not have the political will to secure our borders. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, we have the technical ability to do so. We have the resources. We have the technological attributes necessary, combined with human resources to secure our borders. We can do it. It is a fallacy, it is a canard to stand up in front of any group and say it is impossible, we must figure out a different way to defend America rather than defending our borders. When people say that, Mr. Speaker, what they are saying is this: I choose not to defend and secure our border, because there are political ramifications that I fear. This is what we should read into any statement given by any politician, whether they be Members of this body or the other body or running for any position, elected position in the State, in any State of the Nation, because this issue has reached that point where it is now a State and local issue, because we have States in the Nation that are trying to develop their own immigration policy, sometimes because they are attempting to fill the vacuum created by the lack of involvement by the Federal Government and sometimes because they are trying to pander to political constituencies that they believe will help them retain or obtain power, political power.

Recently we have seen something happen that points this up in a way I guess I could never have thought of. The old issue about truth being stranger than fiction, it really works here, because what if I had come to this floor, say, 3 or 4 years ago and said, Mr. Speaker and Members, I can envision a time when States will actually be doing things like giving driver's licenses which in many respects, and many times referred to as the keys to the kingdom in America, a driver's license, what if I had said, I think there are going to be States in this Nation that actually are going to give illegal aliens driver's licenses?

Of course there would have been derision, there would have been a response we all can identify with, those of us who are concerned about this issue, because we have faced that kind of reaction by the press and by even our colleagues in the past. They would have said, you are such a radical on this issue, you are so off base, you are anti-

immigrant, you are racist, all of those epithets that they throw out every time we talk about immigration and immigration policy. Never could this happen that any State in the Nation would give illegal immigrants the keys to the kingdom. Yet, of course, that is exactly what is happening. Several States in this Nation have, and now the most recent, the State of California.

□ 2100

A Governor so desperate to try to retain power that he signs a bill that he had twice vetoed and vetoed with a message that said something like this: It is crazy to give people who are here illegally a driver's license because we do not know anything about them. We cannot determine their background. We do not know who they are. We do not know anything about them, and when we give a driver's license like to somebody like that, they can use it for nefarious purposes. But he forgot all of those veto messages because he is in the process of being recalled by the people of the State of California. And he says, oh, this is a great idea. Why did I not think of it before? It is absolutely necessary for us to give illegal immigrants into this country the "keys to the kingdom."

There is only one reason he did that, of course, and that was to gain the votes he hopes he will obtain in order to be retained in office. This is amazing to all of us. I mean, most Americans look at this and understand it for exactly what it is: political pandering in its worst form, and yet it has happened. And I hope that we can look at this little visual example of the problem: A California driver's license for a gentleman named Osama bin Laden, 525 Main Street, Los Angeles, California; date of issuance: 9-11. This is a dramatic, perhaps some would say overly dramatic, statement we are trying to make here, but this is what it takes perhaps to bring some people to their senses. Can we keep this from happening?

Illegal immigration poses a threat to the United States in many, many ways, certainly in a national security sense. In a recent article by Steve Brown and Chris Coon, they say, "Governor Gray Davis has opened a significant breach in the Nation's homeland security by signing a bill allowing illegal immigrants to obtain driver's licenses that bear the official seal and full governmental authority of the State of California." These driver's licenses allow people to open bank accounts, make certain purchases, and obtain jobs. "Driver's licenses also serve as the sole ID needed to travel abroad to Mexico, Canada, and some Caribbean countries. They allow easy access to air travel and car rentals. It is a requirement for obtaining a firearm. Through the convenience of the Motor/Voter Act, obtaining a driver's license even grants the right to vote, a fundamental right for which generations of American blood has been shed and the one sac-

rosanct facet of citizenship. But increasingly, even in the post-9/11 atmosphere of heightened security, States are giving away the keys to our country to those who aren't even citizens and are, in fact, here illegally.

"A recent Federation for American Immigration Reform report highlights how States are undermining immigration enforcement and throwing the door open wide to terrorist infiltration. Along with Sanctuary policies mandating noncooperation between local and Federal enforcement, Federation for American Immigration Reform cites the issuance of driver's licenses to illegals as one of the key breakdowns in homeland security, a conclusion shared by both the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security.

"All 19 of the 9/11 terrorists possessed one or more of State driver's licenses, which they used to blend in, rent apartments, open bank accounts, and, ultimately, to board the airplanes they intended to crash," the report notes. "The decision by 13 State legislatures and Governors to give driver's licenses to people in this country" who are here "illegally, people about whom we know nothing, directly hinders Federal efforts to address the homeland security threat."

"Gun Owners of America Communications Director Erich Pratt told" this magazine "that obtaining a driver's license would 'absolutely' make it easier for illegal aliens to purchase firearms throughout the country. 'The background check only bounces names against real bad guys . . . so yes, if they have what would seem to be proof that they are a legal resident,' " the driver's license, "obviously, there would be nothing on the driver's license to indicate that" they were here illegally. "Then this really greases the skids of being able to purchase firearms from gun stores," Pratt explained."

I am a Representative of the State of Colorado, specifically the 6th Congressional District. An incident occurred in my district that is often referred to as just the "Columbine incident." Columbine High School is in my district, not more than a mile or so from my own home, and we all know the tragic consequences of those children who took guns into a school and killed 13 students and died at their own hands, the two perpetrators. And there was an outcry throughout this Nation, and there was a concern raised about the availability of guns to these two individuals who committed this heinous act. We had to work through that in this body, and we had to work through it as a Nation, and time and again I have heard people come to this floor to protest against the availability of firearms. Here we have a situation now in several States where we have made it enormously easy for someone who is here illegally to obtain a firearm. What does that mean? It means that we have nothing against which to bounce off this information, as the statement here I read a minute ago indicates.

Someone presents a driver's license. They may have a criminal record in other countries. They may have obtained that driver's license illegally. They may have used a false identification to obtain the driver's license. They may have gone to the Mexican Consulate, let us say, and obtained a matricula consular. This is a document that is handed out by the Mexican Government to those Mexican nationals living in the United States illegally. In California, as a result of the bill that was signed by Governor Gray Davis, a person who has obtained one of these matricula consular, that is the name of the card, can then go and get a driver's license. So even if one is, in fact, a citizen of the United States but a felon who has a long, long history of transgressions, they can obtain this matricula consular in a different name and become a different person just like that. And then they take their card to the motor vehicle division in California, and they get their driver's license, and then they go buy a gun, and there is nothing, there is no record, of course, of who they are, who they really are, and therefore, they can obtain this weapon. Why have we not heard from the antigun lobby? Why have we not heard from all those people who raised such hell when we talk about the possession of firearms in America, and they even try to restrict the possession of firearms to law-abiding citizens? But they do not say a word about the fact that we have just opened the door to millions of people who are here illegally and to potentially millions of people who would do harm to the Nation and to others if they were able to obtain a firearm because they are now able to get a driver's license in one of several States, the most important of which, of course, is California.

Not too long ago, last week, as a matter of fact, I held a press conference here, and I had with me several family members of people who were killed in the terrorist attacks on our country on 9/11. "Families for a Secure America" convened on Washington, D.C., to air their grievances over the continued lax immigration policies supported by lawmakers concerned only about their careers and lobbyists with specious ulterior motives.

"It is clear," they say, "that the lawyers, lobbyists, ethnic power brokers, ideologues, business profiteers, and misguided do-gooders who don't care about the security of their fellow Americans will never stop working to keep America's borders open. Beyond any doubt, since the murder of . . . 3,000 innocent people on 9/11, these people have shown by their actions that they will never sacrifice their power, profits, and ideology for the safety of the American people as a whole."

This was a quote by Tom Meehan at this press conference that we held. And he went on to say: "And we 9/11 families have learned since the murder of our loved ones that this President and most Members of Congress will not do

the right thing unless they are forced to do so by the 70 to 90 percent of Americans that polls show want drastic and immediate immigration reform."

Lynn Faulkner, who lost his wife in the World Trade Center, pointed to politicians "both liberal and conservative, Republican and Democrat" that continue to push for open borders and loose immigration standards.

"Though the specifics of the 9/11 attacks may have been unknown to the politicians listed above," and prior to this he listed the Members that he was concerned about, "and Bill Clinton and President Bush, they had to know that additional attacks would follow and that the only way to keep terrorists . . . out of our country was to screen the people who seek to enter," Faulkner said. "Therefore, we say without any reservation that the Members of Congress, the current President, and his two predecessors contributed to the murder of our family members and the thousands of other victims of September 11."

In a callous attempt to save his political career from recall, Democrat, California Governor Gray Davis, recently signed legislation allowing approximately two million illegals to obtain driver's licenses, legislation he has twice vetoed, as I said earlier.

With the stroke of his pen, while blatantly pandering to the Latino vote, Davis quashed his State's border with Mexico. Far from a single-handed act, he was aided and abetted by the Democrat-dominated California legislature, particularly by bill author, Senator Gil Cedillo. Cedillo has been pushing this legislation for years under the thin premise that new licenses will have increased incentive to obtain auto insurance coverage, in turn improving highway safety. An ardent member of the taxpayer funded MEChA, which is a "racist Latino student movement demanding annexation of all southwestern States," and MEChA, by the way, is as close to a Hispanic KKK as I can possibly imagine and something, by the way, that the aspiring Governor in California Mr. Bustamante belongs to. Cedillo once said, illegals have a right to stay because "they were here first." Illegal aliens, he says, have a right to stay because they were here first. Given the illegal constituency's interests, there is little doubt who they will pull the lever for in the upcoming elections at both the State and national level.

"I'd like to thank Governor Davis because up until last week, how many people in this country knew that illegal immigrants were getting driver's licenses?" the Families of Survivors member Grace Gottschalk, whose son was murdered in the World Trade Center, asked.

□ 2115

"Here and there you would see something in the press occasionally, but when Governor Davis used this as a po-

litical tool, passing a bill that he had turned down many times because he is now in jeopardy, it shows you how political this is and how immigrants are being used."

This move has not gone unnoticed by those tasked with securing our Nation from the threat of terrorism at home. Asa Hutchinson, Under Secretary of Border and Transportation Security, recently said, "Certainly we have to review our policy among inspectors on the border and their reliance upon driver's licenses. If you do not have integrity in the driver's licenses that are issued, the integrity of those documents, the securities of those documents, then it really undermines the whole premise of allowing U.S. citizens to travel abroad and come back with limited proof of U.S. citizenship without a passport. More than 160,000 people cross the border in San Diego daily here simply flashing a State license allows them to be waved through. It promises to be a focal issue in the upcoming California gubernatorial recall election."

Republican State Senator Tom McClintock, a recall candidate, said the only reason for issuing state-approved identification to illegals is "to undermine our immigration laws."

"What Gray Davis has done by signing this bill is put politics before the people of the State of California," Assemblyman Tony Strickland said.

"The California legislature failed the people of California. Governor Gray Davis has failed the people of California when he signed the bill into law. He said he didn't care about California, but he cares about his job in Sacramento. It is about a last-ditch effort to save his career," said Assemblyman Dennis Mountjoy.

The California Republican Assembly has issued a call for the referendum to stop the new driver's license ordinance. They hope to obtain 373,816 signatures of registered voters within the next 90 days to make the March 2004 ballot.

California Republican Assembly President Mike Spence commented, "To lower the standard for getting a driver's license in this era of al Qaeda and the era of identity theft is an attack on every citizen of California."

The California Republican Assembly has started a Web site to support the petition drive.

Mr. Speaker, it is, again, incredible for us today to think that this is happening in California and it is happening in other States. It is incredible to think about the fact that many States now give all kinds of opportunities and benefits to people who are living here illegally, those benefits that have heretofore been given only to people who we call citizens, or at least legal residents, of the United States, the benefit of citizenship, like having the State taxpayers pay to subsidize your child's education, both in K-12 and higher education. Now many States say let us do that for illegal immigrants, the benefits of social services, the benefits of

health care, and, yes, even the benefits of voting.

What is left? What is left to define the idea or the concept of citizenship? What does it mean? Has it any value whatsoever? If everyone in this country, regardless of their legal status, can obtain all of the benefits afforded to those people who are here legally, then what does it mean to be a citizen of this country?

The distinction is erased, and that is the hope and desire of many of the people who actually push these kinds of issues. It is to eventually come to a place where borders are eliminated, where people who are here can obtain all of the benefits of citizenship by simply being a resident.

There are cities in this Nation that provide people who are here illegally with the benefit of voting. College Park, Maryland, comes to mind immediately, not too far from here. They call themselves sanctuary cities, and you can vote if you can prove you are a resident of the city. The Mayor of the District of Columbia not too long ago proposed such a thing for residents of the District of Columbia; and of course Gray Davis has done exactly the same thing by giving residents of the State of California a driver's license, because under motor-voter, they now can vote.

So, what does it matter then when we use the word "citizenship"? There is a recent flap that has developed over the fact that the Bureau of Immigration Enforcement has come up with a new oath of citizenship. I think they recalled it because there was such a response on the part of many people. They were re-writing the oath of citizenship.

But let me suggest to you that the concern about the actual words that are used in that oath, that concern is misplaced, I think, because, of course, the oath will eventually mean nothing, because citizenship, the concept of it, the reality of it, will mean nothing.

When we talk about immigration and immigration reform, many people think that we are just talking in terms of jobs, the loss of jobs, which, of course, is a real concern. Many people are just talking about the fear that we have as a result of our Nation being balkanized, being divided up into all kinds of sub-groups, of victimized groups, that refuse to become part of the American mainstream, that do not even wish to integrate into our society.

But this debate about illegal immigration is even broader than that. I believe with all of my heart, Mr. Speaker, that massive immigration into the country, both legal and illegal, combined with this cult of multiculturalism that permeates our society and tells people that they should not immigrate into the American mainstream and they should keep their own language and their own political relationship and political affiliation to country of origin, this is a dagger pointed at the heart of America.

It is as dangerous as al Qaeda; it is as dangerous as any terrorist out there

who is plotting to do something terrible to this country. Because, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you now that if we do not know who we are as a Nation, if we are divided up into all these camps, into these groups, victimized sub-groups in America, then we will have no strong desire to save our civilization and our way of life, because we do not know what it is, we do not know who we are, we do not know what holds us together, we do not know what binds us together as a Nation.

We can all revel in and enjoy the differences that we have in this country, the cultural distinctions that give us such a rich texture as a Nation. We can enjoy it. I certainly do. But that is a far cry from disassociating oneself from this country and actually seeking only the economic benefits that it can provide, while simultaneously trying to connect oneself, or, I should say, retain one's connections to countries of origin, which, if they were so great, if those countries of origin are so wonderful, one wonders why millions of people have sought to leave them.

In a recent Los Angeles Times article, September 15, 2 days ago, by Claire Luna, she states that "painted on the cheeks of children waiving grandly from a balcony and planted in women's hairdos, Mexican flags were on display everywhere Sunday in Santa Ana as tens of thousands of people showed pride for their home country."

Showed pride for their home country. What does that mean? What is their home country? Do they not live here? Do they not obtain the benefits of living in this land? Do they not call themselves Americans? Do they not think of themselves as Americans?

Mr. Speaker, if I asked you what is your home country, if I asked anybody in this body what is their home country, if I asked any American citizen out there, what is their home country, how many would answer to me some country other than the United States of America?

Now, I am only a third-generation American. My grandparents came here from Italy. But never, ever, ever, I thought of myself as anything but an American. Never have I thought of my home country as anything but America.

"The Fiesta de las Americas parade commemorating Mexican Independence Day drew the largest crowd in its 15-year history," police said. For 2 hours, spectators cheered for their home states," home states, "in Mexico, as girls in traditional dress pranced among marching bands, government dignitaries and mariachi floats. It is so important that all Mexican remember how their liberty was won."

Their liberty, if they are living here, was won by people who sacrificed their lives in the fight against Great Britain. That is how their liberty was won.

"The parade helps reaffirm our pride in our love of Mexico."

Well, Mexico is a wonderful country. I do not dispute that, and I do not sug-

gest for a moment that anyone should, if they are from Mexico, should forget about it or not understand that they have that heritage. But there is something happening here, Mr. Speaker, that deserves our attention, because this is what I am talking about, about a country being divided into all of these sub-groups, being balkanized.

This article goes on to say that, "Corona, the vending machine stocker, was watching the parade with his brother-in-law Roberto Mundo, 38, and Mundo's two children. To shield his eyes from the sun, Corona shoved a piece of cardboard over his head and was reduced to wordless glee when passing Orange County Sheriff Mike Carona gave his headgear a thumbs-up. His power of speech returned when a dozen folks and women passed by on a Budweiser beer float. 'You are beautiful,' he screamed happily in Spanish, and when they threw him a poster. 'People used to be too scared of being deported to come to something as public as this,' Mundo said, 'but times have changed. Now people aren't scared to show their pride.'"

So what he is saying here is, of course, that many, many of the people who were on the street were here illegally, but they do not care anymore about the fact that they are here illegally. They are not afraid, they are not concerned, because they know that this government does not have the will to enforce our own immigration policy.

There is a book, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that I would certainly suggest should be mandatory reading for every American citizen. It is called "Mexifornia: A State of Becoming," by Victor Davis Hanson. I will just read something from the cover:

"Cutting through the lies of race-hacks, multi-cult commissars and their guilty white enablers, fifth generation Californian Victor Davis Hanson tells the brutal truth about Mexican immigration to California. Combining social-science fact with the personal experience of living in the San Joaquin Valley, immigration's ground zero, Hanson shows that discarding the old paradigm of immigrant assimilation in favor of the fantasies of identity politics victimhood has seriously compromised the process of turning into Americans the millions of hard-working Mexicans who desperately want the freedom and prosperity underwritten by the very values that the multi-cult industry disparages. No one concerned with immigration and its impact on America can afford to miss this tough and brilliant book."

And I certainly agree. "Mexifornia: A State of Becoming."

California is a State I guess that represents what we are all, every State in the Nation, in some stage of becoming, somewhat transformed. To some, even in this body, that is a good idea. That is something to which they look forward, a Nation that no longer understands its roots, a Nation that is divided, a Nation that is balkanized, a

Nation that is just a place of residents and not of citizens.

□ 2130

Mr. Speaker, that is where we are going. That is where we are headed. And most Americans know it. And they ask their representatives in this government to do something about it. And yet I have to tell them when they ask me why we cannot and why we ignore this, I have to tell them that there is no political will to secure our own borders.

It is a shameful fact, Mr. Speaker. It is one I wish I did not have to express and did not have to state. But it is the truth. I hope it will soon change.

THE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin on something we can all agree on and that is what President Bush said in August at an August fundraiser. He said, "I ran for office to solve problems, not to pass them on to future Presidents and future generations."

We can all agree on that, but, unfortunately, the reality is that instead of paying off the public debt by 2011, as we had projected in 2001, this administration will leave the future generations with a debt of almost \$7 trillion as of 2011.

Now, rather than get into rhetoric and everything, let us just use a chart so we know exactly what numbers we are talking about. This shows the deficit year by year from the Johnson administration, Nixon, Ford, Carter, the deficits that were run up in the Reagan and Bush years, and also shows the surplus that was generated by the time President Clinton left office.

Mr. Speaker, in 1993 we passed a budget without any Republican votes. The Republicans, after those votes were cast, campaigned against that budget that was passed, and picked up 50 seats in the House and control of the Senate as a result.

In 1995 after the 1994 election, the Republicans, with control of Congress, passed a budget with trillions of dollars in tax cuts. President Clinton vetoed that budget. They threatened to close down the government. He vetoed the next budget. They closed down the government, and he vetoed the budget again.

Because he vetoed those budgets, this trend went up until we had a surplus of almost \$100 billion projected for 2001. And that is on budget. That is without touching the Social Security or Medicare surplus.

As soon as President Bush came in, he signed the trillion dollar tax cuts. And, wait a minute, this has \$500 billion in deficits. This is the February