

have this preemptive strike. Well, there is a traitor in the White House. They are unpatriotic, and I do not want to hear them utter the word one more time about who is patriotic and who is not.

As a matter of fact, as we look at how we have been misled, we need to remind the American public over and over again that we support our soldiers. We are upset that they have not had the equipment to keep them safe and secure and all that we thought they had. Each day we are finding out more and more about that which they have not had and ways that they have been suffering.

We have been misled by Donald Rumsfeld. Donald Rumsfeld comes up to this House and gives us so-called classified briefings. We do not learn any more from him than we learn on CNN; and Members have been too intimidated to ask him the tough questions, to push him up against the wall and tell him when they think that he has been misleading us, but just take a look in the ways that we have been misled.

□ 1930

First of all, we must say over and over again, remember, they said they were going to do this preemptive strike because Saddam Hussein was harboring weapons of mass destruction. They have found none. There are none. I do not think they will ever find them.

But, of course, Mr. Wolfowitz said, we just told them that. He had the arrogance and the audacity to say, well, we thought that would be the best way to get support for the war. So they misled us, told us a lie, basically, that there were weapons of mass destruction.

And then they told us that they had drones. And these drones that were normally used for surveillance were equipped to deploy biological and chemical warfare. Another lie. The uranium lie.

I will close by saying we have been misled; we have been lied to. The American public should not feel mispatriotic. Do not support this war. Tell your Congresspeople not to spend \$87 billion on this war.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent Resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate.

IMMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss an issue that often I bring to the attention of this body, and that is of course immigration and immigration reform, an issue that I think we spend far too little time discussing here.

I was compelled to come tonight to share an e-mail message I received just a couple of days ago. It is from a lady by the name of Rhonda Rose. And Ms. Rose speaks, I think, compellingly about a problem, a set of problems, that she perceives in her area. And I think she is not unique in this. I think she speaks for many Americans, in fact, millions of Americans. So I thought I would start tonight by sharing this particular e-mail message to me with my colleagues.

It says, "My story: I live in a world where I do not count. I'm not a minority. I'm poor. I don't have coalitions rallying for what I feel is important. I don't have news reporters writing about 'poor me,' but I have views. I vote, I pay taxes, and I know there are millions of people in America just like me.

"I live next to a shelter built by politicians who are afraid to have an opinion about closing the border. Daily, 1,500 illegals come and visit that shelter. It was supposed to keep these 'poor people' from urinating and defecating on the streets. It didn't. My home and my vehicles have been broken into 22 times in 5 years.

"I stopped calling the police each time now that this happens because they do not come any more. Instead, we bought a gun. We scared off the last person trying to steal our truck. The only English he knew was enough to say 'sorry' as we pointed at him. Three months later we still have a towel over the smashed driver's-side window.

"Last week, I was ordered to pay an \$85 fine for a false alarm. Police showed up for that hearing. The police couldn't find any criminal at my home when my home alarm sounded. I'm curious how long police think bad guys 'hang around' after an alarm has been triggered.

"I was involved in an accident in my car. The policeman said I would have to wait while he called for backup. My baby was screaming. The police had no film in the camera. The backup police had no fingerprinting ink or film. The person who ran into me was here illegally. He had a fake ID, but the police said there was nothing that they could do about it; the illegal alien would just get another fake ID and would never show up for court. He didn't have insurance. The illegal alien who hit me said sorry as he was walking away. He was free to go. I was free to pay the deductible on my car and the chiropractor bills for my children and myself. If I drove without insurance and hurt someone or their possessions, I would be forced to pay for the damages or lose everything I had.

"My husband works 6 days a week as a framing contractor. He pays FICA,

Social Security, State taxes, Federal taxes, general liability insurance, workman's comp. insurance, and probably others that I don't remember. His workman's comp just skyrocketed from \$5,000 per year to \$28,000 per year. Now, I ask you, where are we going to come up with the extra \$23,000? We had no claims. Should I take it out of my food budget? We often go weeks without meat. Should it come from our clothing budget? We buy our clothes at thrift sales and savers. How about our entertainment account? Does seeing a movie every month qualify?

"My home insurance costs me \$100 more yearly because I live in a border State. How long before Kansas becomes a border State? I have had no medical insurance for years and years. I can't afford it. At 33, I got cancer. My doctor told me to go to ACCHS. I don't remember how to spell the State's medical system, since they declined me.

"My husband's company had no profit in 6 months due to theft and lack of laws at the time to force general contractors to pay. Without studying my receipts, I was declined. Interesting that hundreds of illegal aliens in this country standing in line were being given food stamps and medical care. They did not have Social Security numbers; they did not speak English. If you don't believe me," she says, "look at the application DES."

I am sorry, Madam Speaker, but I do not know what that stands for.

"Spend 5 minutes at DES and remind yourself why you pay taxes. You won't be smiling.

"Taxes. Well, we fell behind one year. I contacted the IRS and told them we wanted to make arrangements to pay. We now show the IRS everything we buy, from the female items to chewing gum, they see the receipt. For the next year we will be scrutinized. For the next 5 years we will be audited. Maybe I should never have done the right thing and told them.

"My son cries nightly because his legs and arms hurt. He has cried for almost 7 years. My husband often walks on one leg because his back and leg pain is almost unbearable. Monthly I have many strokes. During those times I lose the ability to speak well, and I have had seizures until I lose consciousness. We really don't know what is wrong with any of us. We may never know. We can't afford a doctor. God forbid we need emergency services. Thirty percent of the time hospitals are on divert status because there is no room. Illegal aliens have taken their kids to the ER for colds and sore throats. I would only go if I lost a limb or if my heart gave out.

"Two years ago, I announced to my family there would be no turkey for Thanksgiving. We would eat pasta and be thankful we were a family. My Catholic friend made arrangements for me to get a food box from her church. I went, reluctantly. I drove up in my broken old van and saw a lot of full new, stickers attached, Suburbans. My

van was the worst vehicle there and it hit me that I really was poor.

"I stood in line for 20 minutes amazed at the number of illegals taking box lunches and boxes of food. When it was my turn, I had to show an ID. I was told to leave. There wasn't enough food for me to take a box. I looked around. There were boxes of food everywhere. For a minute I forgot that I was not in a minority and in their eyes not deserving.

"At church, our pastor reminds us to stay hopeful. I struggle to make sense of a system that has taken from me and given to those who have more than I do. Who will be my voice? Where is my coalition? I thought it was the leaders of America. I was wrong. They have sold me out and millions like me. And what is worse, I do not know why. Rhonda Rose."

Now, Madam Speaker, I think that Ms. Rose's situation is dire, but I think in many ways she says what many people feel. They feel, in a sense, disenfranchised. They feel that they are losing their own country. They feel that they cannot look to their own government for support or for help.

Night after night I come on this floor and I bring to the attention of the body stories of people who live on the border in Arizona, Texas, and California. I talk about the fact that these people are in many ways homeland heroes because their stories were not all that dissimilar from Ms. Rose's. Their lives have been essentially destroyed. Their businesses, homes, ranches have been overtaken by illegal aliens coming through by the hundreds of thousands destroying property, vandalizing, threatening, attacking; and they do not know why.

They are asking why this is happening now, when we have lived here for generations. Our family has been on this property for generations. We have always had people coming through here, sometimes illegally, or many times illegally, but only a few of them. And we would give them food and we would give them water and they would move on. But now it is by the thousands that they are coming through. And these people turn to the government for help and our government turns a blind eye to them. And so they get frustrated, as you would, Madam Speaker, and as I would.

So they write to their Congressman, and they talk to their neighbors, and they see no change. And they wonder why they do it. They wonder what is happening when they read polls that show that 70 percent of Americans are essentially on their side. And, Madam Speaker, I have to say to Rhonda that 70 percent of this country looks at this, listens to your story and is empathetic and believes that some change should be made, but maybe 25 percent of this Congress feels the same way. And I do not know who in the administration feels this way. But not enough people here feel this way, I will tell you.

And so we end up with a system that is unresponsive to the people; and

anger grows, and resentment grows, and frustration grows. Because every day people see things like this. They pick up the paper and they read that another State has just decided to give illegal aliens driver's licenses. They see that foreign governments can distribute cards to those people living here illegally. These are referred to as the matricula consular card, and that States and cities are agreeing to accept these cards for a variety of services. Illegals can open bank accounts with these cards, they can obtain social services, they can even get driver's licenses.

In California, the most recent State to allow illegal immigrants to obtain driver's licenses, you can use a matricula consular to obtain your driver's license. How do you get one of these? You get them from a consulate here. Usually, the Mexican consulate. They are the ones that hand out the most. And what do you have to give them? You have to give them some documentation that says you are a Mexican citizen. Not that you are here illegally; but, of course, everyone who needs one of these cards is here illegally.

□ 1945

Madam Speaker, I want to repeat that. Every single person here in the United States who needs a matricula consular is here illegally because if you are here legally, you have a document that we have given you. You have a visa. You have a green card, you have a stamp on your passport at least. So an illegal alien in this country can obtain this particular card and with it can obtain all of the other documents they need to become essentially citizens, really, in a way.

It is a stealth amnesty program. American citizens recognize that. When they read it in the newspaper, they know something is wrong. They know something is wrong when a body agrees to give illegal aliens in-State tuition for which they have to pay. They know something is wrong when they hear that their jails are being filled by people who are here illegally and that the costs attributable to that particular phenomenon are enormous. They know something is wrong. They know that when they hear reports about people coming across the border by the hundreds, by the thousands without our permission, we do not know who they are, we do not know why they are coming, surely most of them are coming for relatively benign reasons, to get a better job, seek a better life, that is the reason that compels most people to come to this country, the same reason my grandparents came and perhaps yours, but among them are people who are coming to do very bad things to the United States and we allow this to happen, and they ask me, Why? They ask me all the time. I get all kinds of e-mails and letters and calls into my office and they say, Why, Congressman? Why is this happening?

Why is it my Government has so little respect for my citizenship and for the fact I try my best to do things the right way?

This is another letter I received from a lady by the name of Linda Hendricks. She lives in my district. She says, Page 2 of this fax I am sending you is a copy of a Medicaid eligibility form. I want to draw your attention to question number 8. I turn to question number 8 on this form. Is anyone in your household a legal alien, yes or no? Is anyone in your household undocumented? Of course, what that means is are they here illegally, yes or no.

Next question: If yes to either, we will need the following information: If you are undocumented, no paperwork is necessary, and we will not report you to the INS. If you are documented in any way, please provide copies only of the front and back of your card and other INS papers.

Now, this is a form distributed by the Federal Government for a service that is supposed to be for American citizens: Medicaid. This is supposed to be the program that we have constructed to provide medical services to people who are financially unable to provide it for themselves.

She goes on to say, "Hello, something is really wrong here. Illegals are not being reported and yet receive free medical benefits. There have been many stories in the Denver Post lately about people with serious medical needs that are losing their benefits due to cutbacks. These people are U.S. citizens. As a citizen myself, I believe citizens should have the benefit of medical care before those who do not belong here. I have a revolutionary idea," she says, "quit giving free medical service to people who are here illegally and keep it for U.S. citizens and those who are here legally.

"I recently heard about a man here to work from South Africa who paid \$3,000 for his green card, and yet when he got here, he found out that Mexicans are paying \$100 for a fake green card. And with those fake green cards come all the benefits.

"No wonder our country no longer has any sovereignty, we are willingly giving it away."

Madam Speaker, I just cannot fathom, I cannot imagine how these things are not taking a toll on the way people look at their Government. Believe me, these are not unique in any way, these two letters. These are representative of the thousands of letters that I receive almost weekly, and calls and e-mails and that sort of thing. It is happening everywhere. Looking at this makes me think there is a form that you can go to the Web site and find out from the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and it is called a temporary visitor visa, and you can go onto the Web site and pull it up and fill it out yourself if you want to come into the United States.

One question on that visa is are you a terrorist? Do you belong to any terrorist organizations? Have you committed any terrorist acts, yes or no. I do not know who answers yes, but evidently some people do because the next thing underneath it is a little asterisk, and it says do not worry, if you answer yes to this question, it does not mean that you will be denied entrance into the United States.

How can that be true? Well, it happened because a Member of the other body, Mr. KENNEDY, decided that because he had acquaintances that were members of the IRA, Irish Republican Army, and they might be on our terrorist list and they might want to come into the United States, that just being a member of a terrorist organization should not prevent you from coming to the United States, and so that is why we added that.

Well, as they say, people know this, people see this, people understand this, and people are frustrated by it. They are frustrated by the fact that their own Government will look the other way when people come into this country illegally, obtain this matricula consular, open up a bank account, let us say, and when the Treasury Department of the Federal Government promulgates rules saying that banks should be allowed to accept the matricula consular for the purpose of identification, and people look at this and think this is odd, that when you look at the fact that these rules were promulgated under the PATRIOT Act and designed to be rules to tighten up on banking regulations, so that identity theft and money-laundering activities would be minimized. When you realize that was the reason that those regulations were promulgated, they are asking how can it be that you are saying that you can do this? You can use this card given to you by a foreign government for the purpose of opening a bank account? People look at that and think what is going on with my Government.

They may know, I am not sure if many people know this, but they may even have heard that in the Committee on the Judiciary, the Subcommittee on Immigration in testimony there not too long ago, the Justice Department, the FBI, testified that using the matricula consular was absolutely a bad idea, and that people would, in fact, take advantage of it, that we cannot begin to guarantee the validity of the document. The FBI, Homeland Security, testified that we should not accept the matricula consular, that no agency of the Federal Government should accept it, and you have got the Department of the Treasury promulgating rules telling banks it is okay to accept it. People can get confused by that.

I believe it is simply a matter of pure politics, and the mother's milk of politics, of course, campaign contributions from large corporation through their executive officers who package up their

contributions, and through banks and other big contributors to both parties, we find it difficult to do the things necessary to protect our own country.

We also, of course, fear the political ramifications of doing something to stop illegal immigration or even minimize illegal immigration. We find that this is a politically embarrassing thing. Even to bring this up on the floor of the House makes people uncomfortable. They would prefer if we did not address this issue because of the political implications.

When we recognize on one side of the aisle here, the Democratic party sees massive immigration, both illegal and legal, as a source of political support, future voters; on our side of the aisle, we see the same thing as a source of cheap labor; the administration sees the same thing as a potential source of voters for them, a wedge issue that they can use in the next campaign, and Members can see why it is difficult to actually get anything done.

That is what we have to tell people when constituents call and ask how can it be that this country has essentially decided to abandon its borders, surrender its sovereignty and attack the concept of citizenship because that is truly what is happening to us. All of the things that I have mentioned here, all of these things that are happening in States and cities and here at the Federal level, cities that are declaring themselves to be sanctuary cities, cities which pass regulations telling the police department not to provide information to the Bureau of Immigration Control and Enforcement or to accept information from them, cities that say they will accept the matricula consular for the provision of services, States that declare that they will give illegal aliens driver's licenses, States that declare that they will provide higher education benefits to people who are here illegally, all of these things combined are an attack on the concept of citizenship because if we have all of these benefits and are here illegally, and if you get a driver's license, you have the keys to the kingdom including the ability to vote under Motor Voter. So you have all of the benefits, including the ability to vote, but you are not a legal resident. What distinguishes you as an illegal resident of the country? What is it, absolutely nothing.

Today Members of this body were confronted by people that came here on a Freedom Ride. I understand buses and this trek started in States all over the Nation. People gathered all over and descended upon the Nation's capital to declare their concern for the plight of illegal immigrants in this country, and they wanted to associate themselves with the freedom marches of the 1960s, the precivil rights days of the United States.

□ 2000

They wanted to associate themselves with the plight of the African American who had suffered, who certainly

his heritage was a heritage of slavery and who suffered degradations that certainly could never be countenanced; and so they called themselves the Freedom Ride. Remember, we are talking about slavery, an institution that brought people here against their will, and even after they were freed institutionally by law kept them from being able to achieve certain things and do certain things that citizens of this country were allowed to do, voting, for instance, and going to a restaurant and being served in the same place with a white person and going to the same school as a white person. All these things were being denied to these people who were here legally, whose parents had been here and whose family had been here for generations.

This was a travesty. This is a blight on America. This is a dark part of our history. Yet the people who came here today suggest that they have a common problem.

Today we have been visited, many offices in this body, in the House of Representatives, many Members have been visited by people who were here on what they call a Freedom Ride. They were here to put forward their concerns with regard to what they call the plight of those people who are here as immigrants, but what they really mean is here as illegal immigrants. Because if you are here as an immigrant, a legal immigrant into this country, you have all the protections available to you that any other citizen has. But if you are here illegally, you are oftentimes ill-treated and you are oftentimes taken advantage of by unscrupulous employers. Undeniably true.

So their solution to this problem was to give everybody who is here legal status, to simply give amnesty to all those people who have come here, make them legal residents of the country and then, of course, they have all the protection.

Yes, that is one way to handle it. But I suggest to you that it is the worst way to handle it. And I suggest that the idea, the public policy of giving anyone who has broken the law here a benefit for doing so is bad public policy, that no one should be rewarded for violating the law, and that no matter how compelling your story is about how long you have been here taking advantage of this country and this country's benefits, how long you have worked, that those are not reasons to simply ignore the law.

If we do not like this law, then it is up to us in this body to change it, to repeal it. If we do not believe in borders, then erase them. If we do not believe that people should come into this country with our permission, then stop trying to give it. But as long as that is the law, then we cannot simply ignore the fact that it is the law and give amnesty to everybody who ignores the law.

What sense does that make? The people of this country are asking the question. What sense does that make? And

they are asking us, why is it that my family had to go through years of applications, sometimes thousands and thousands of dollars in expenses to make the trek to this country legally, to wait in a long line, to do everything that is expected of us to come into this country as legal citizens, while at the same time you are considering telling everybody who came here illegally that they have all of the same benefits and all will be forgiven? What message does that send to the millions of people who are waiting to come into this country legally?

It tells them all they are suckers. That is what it says. And that they should, in fact, simply jump to the head of the line, come across the border, sneak into this country, get a visa, come in, overstay your visa, which actually accounts for about 45 or 50 percent of all those people living here illegally. They did not just come across the border from Mexico or from Canada. They actually flew into this country or came here somehow legally on a visa, then simply stayed.

All of those people, it says, did the right thing. They were the smart people. They avoided all the hassle, all the expense and all the respect for the law that we expect from the people who do come here legally.

What sense does this make, they ask, Americans ask? Can you answer this? Can anyone answer this? I cannot. It makes no sense.

Yet there are Members here who are going to produce a bill, who have introduced a bill already, that is, quote, getting legs, as it says around here, the saying goes, it is getting steam up, to give at least 500,000 agricultural workers amnesty under the guise of creating a guest worker program. What they do create is essentially an indentured servitude status for 4 or 5 years before they give them amnesty. This is great. This is wonderful, according to the sponsors of the bill.

And Americans ask, why? What can you be thinking of? How can you possibly be talking about giving amnesty to anybody who has come in? How can you talk about giving jobs to people who are essentially taking jobs from American workers?

Madam Speaker, all we hear of is, well, these are people who are doing jobs Americans won't take. That is, of course, only part of the statement. It is doing jobs Americans will not take for the price we are willing to pay. That is true in many circumstances. But we are also, of course, exporting jobs and bringing in foreign workers under visa categories, H1B and L1.

People ask me why? How come it is that when American high-tech workers are out of work by the millions, which they are, how come we are still bringing in hundreds of thousands of people in the H1B category to take those jobs? How come we are allowing other people, other companies, to bring them in under the L1 category visa and replace American workers with less expensive

foreign workers? How come, they say? How come when these people come here many of them are actually trained by the person they are replacing? And in order to get severance pay the person they are replacing is told, you must train this person in your job or else we won't give you severance pay. How come, they ask, is this happening?

Madam Speaker, I cannot explain it. I do not know. I have a guess. My guess is that the high-tech industry contributes an awful lot of money to both parties and to the President and, therefore, we choose a cheap labor policy. That is my guess. Maybe I am wrong, and somebody could certainly dispute it. I am hoping someone will. But in order to dispute my claim, we have to at least have a debate on this issue. But we will not have a debate, because debating this issue makes people uncomfortable.

We are dividing this country up, Madam Speaker, into a lot of camps, victimized groups, groups that continue to hyphenate their own definition, groups that see themselves not as Americans, just as Americans but some subgroups, some alienated groups, some group with a cause, some group with a complaint. As I say, some group that feels victimized.

We are encouraging that, that whole concept of balkanization of America. We are encouraging that because we operate under what we call a cult of multiculturalism. It is a philosophy that permeates American society, permeates our schools, and it tells people that there is no reason for them to actually become part of the American mainstream, that there is nothing really good or worth emulating in American society or western civilization, for that matter. And our schools drop all references to western civilization, except in the most negative way. They drop classes in it.

We tell people that come here from other countries that they should not become part of the American mainstream, that they should keep their own language, that they should keep their own political affiliations with their country of origin and not integrate into the society. We do all kinds of things that separate us, instead of helping to join us together as Americans.

In this body, we allow groups to organize on the basis of race. Amazing as that might sound to Americans, we allow caucuses to develop, to actually be created here on the basis of race. Just yesterday when I said that this was a bad idea and that I am going to introduce a rule in the next session, if I am here, that prohibits any caucus from being established here on the basis of race, I was vilified by many of my colleagues for being both a racist and insensitive and a lot of other things, because we have the Black Caucus and the Hispanic Caucus and the Asian Pacific Caucus.

It is amazing to me that we can have a huge debate in this country over a

very famous talk show host, Mr. Limbaugh, who makes an intemperate remark relating to the race of a football player and is chastised roundly and resigns his job, resigns from his position. In all of the media, everything I heard today is there is absolutely no place for this kind of thing, no reason we should ever be using or talking about race when we talk about these football players. There is nothing that connects these two, and we should not ever discuss it.

I certainly agree. I see absolutely no connection myself. It was probably a very stupid thing to do and to say.

But at the same day that that story breaks, I am roundly criticized for saying that we should not have a caucus in this House based on race and that all of the rhetoric that emanates out of this body about a colorblind society and all of the admonitions and all of the laws that we pass to ensure a colorblind society are essentially ignored because we allow for people to organize here on the basis of race. Nobody says a thing. I assure you they would say something if somebody tried to organize a, quote, White Caucus or Caucasian Caucus, and I would certainly be one of those people saying, absolutely not.

But what is the difference? What is the difference?

These are uncomfortable things, I understand that. People get very, very uptight and sort of anxious when you bring them up. But the point I tried to make here is that this is just another example of us dividing ourselves up. And when massive immigration combines with this philosophy of the sort of cult of multiculturalism that permeates our society, it can only be bad for America. There is nothing positive I can think of about this.

□ 2015

We can extol the virtues of diversity. I am a full-blooded Italian American. I love my heritage that is that part of me that one would say is Italian, but if someone were to ask me what is my heritage? What is my heritage? What is my country? I would immediately answer, and I would have answered this when I was a little child, it is the United States of America. That is what I thought of as my country, my history, and my heritage. I have never connected politically nor have my parents ever considered allowing me to connect politically and culturally and philosophically with a country other than the United States. It was an alien notion, or idea, and yet we are doing this to ourselves.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. TANCREDO. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman very much and we serve on the House Committee on the Judiciary together.

Mr. TANCREDO. I wish I did serve on the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. We have worked on issues together dealing with these questions and the gentleman is right; I stand corrected. And I think we note that we do have differences of opinion, but I would say to the gentleman that I would much rather have the opportunity for us to address these issues any way that I think draws most of Americans' interest and concern.

The gentleman just made it very clear that his heritage is one of immigrants, or his family came from a place to America for opportunities. I happen to have a heritage of immigrant grandparents who came here from the Caribbean. I would not be in the United States Congress but for their coming to seek a greater opportunity. The gentleman mentioned the mass numbers of individuals here today who came up with the Immigration Freedom Riders. But I what I would suggest to the gentleman is that rather than the broad brush, he noted that there are people who are here in this country who may be undocumented, which seem to be the crux of the crime, who really are attempting to seek legalization. They really want to become documented, and the numbers, unfortunately, suggest that they have been here for over a period of time.

There is a distinction, I think, between securing our borders. I am on the Select Committee on Homeland Security. I will be leaving with the Select Committee on Homeland Security to go to the northern border. I live on the southern border in Texas. And I think we should distinguish those issues that Americans can draw around with the heartfelt desire of undocumented individuals who have been trying to secure legalization, and I would ask the distinguished gentleman that when he comes to the floor if he would consider the fact that there is a degree of compassion. I will probably never get him to agree with me that those undocumented should have at least the ability to access legalization, because I think it is going to be very difficult, realistically, to get these people out of restaurants and hotels and homes and construction sites; and I will say to him because I happen to be, I think it is very clear, coming from a minority group of this Nation but proudly here standing as an American, and there are issues with American workers and there are issues with minorities that are here.

There are a lot of issues that we could be divisive about, but we should not be divisive about the hopes and dreams of the thousands of people that I run into every day when I see that, over a period of time, these immigrants workers who came here on the Freedom Ride, the tears in their eyes. I do not think the gentleman is divided on that. I really do not think so. Even if he will come back at me, when I yield back, even to say, no, I disagree, I do not think we are divided on that. I think if a group of them sat down with

him, he might find common ground because I do not believe any truck, any plane, any bus is going to haul out 8 million. And I leave the gentleman on this, before I yield back: I would feel much safer if these undocumented individuals, and I do not see how we are going to get them out, would be legalized, paying taxes, putting into the Social Security, and being documented so that this Nation knew where everybody who meant to do good was so that we can find the guys and ladies that were here to do us harm.

I think that is the distinction I would like to make and hope that maybe we will have an opportunity, whether it is one on one, whether it is as we proceed with hearings and debate on the floor of the House, to really talk about the concerns that I think the American people want us to address with a real immigration policy that addresses the concerns of all of us. And I thank the gentleman for his kindness in his yielding.

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for coming and expressing those views. I must say that I respect the gentlewoman's opinion immensely; and as a matter of fact, they did come to my office today, and I enjoyed it tremendously. The discussion we had with the people who came to my office, there were five, and we talked about this very issue. And I kept saying to them the one thing I wish they would just help me understand, and I say this to the gentlewoman, how do I explain it? How do I explain our willingness to do this, to provide amnesty for people who are here illegally even though they have? As the gentlewoman says, and I think absolutely accurately, that for the most part 90 percent of them are here doing honest labor and doing it under difficult conditions and have done it for a long time, all that is true.

But there are millions of people seeking that exact same opportunity, and they are all doing it the right way. They are waiting out there. All over the world they are waiting to come here for that same exact opportunity, and they are filling out the information, and they are sending in their visa requests, and they are paying fees to lawyers. And they are doing all kinds of things like that. And millions have come that way and think to themselves this is not fair. This is not fair that I had to go through this or that I am being put through this, but yet the people who have come here illegally have gotten this opportunity. I understand the gentlewoman's concern for these people and for those who are seeking this legalized route, but every time we do this, and we have done this, this is not unique, in 1996 we provided amnesty. What did it solve? It only created a system that increased the flow of illegal aliens into this country.

If we will secure this border, and I believe we can do that, the gentlewoman and I may argue about whether or not this is feasible. I believe it is. I believe

the technology is there. I have seen it on the northern border, by the way, where I go to. I have seen it in operation. We can use technology including unmanned aerial vehicles and radar and a variety of other technologies to help secure the border. If we can secure the border and create a guest worker program that then allows people to come into this country in a legal process that protects their rights so they are not getting in the back of trailers and getting suffocated, so that they are not coming across that border and dying in the deserts, so that they can do it in a legal manner, I am absolutely totally supportive of it. But I cannot possibly support it along with amnesty. There is no reason that we have to add amnesty to any sort of guest worker program.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TANCREDO. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Might I give him a response? I think the response is because the American people, one, are compassionate; but they are practical. And I think this is part of the answer. The other part of the answer is why do we want to do it? Because a young Guatemalan came to this country illegally, and he lost his life fighting for us in Iraq.

I think if we tell the story of immigrants, and I do not like the word amnesty. It was not part of my understanding of immigration law. I do not like that word because I think one thing about Americans, they believe in hard work and they believe that if they are here working hard and if they are here not involved in criminal activity, they can understand that maybe there should be a reward. So I do not like "amnesty." I have never bought into "amnesty." I like this concept called earned access to legalization, and I do not even suggest, Madam Speaker, that it would be, if you will, a question where it is a gift. And you added guest worker. That is a separate thing because the practical part of it is, as I think most Americans know, I do not know how we get 8 million people out of the country. And I do not know how we criminalize 8 million people. So what I am saying is have they been here 3 years? Have they not been involved in any criminal activity? Can they document that? Have they been paying taxes, sales taxes, et cetera? Have they had these three things? Can they then apply?

The gentleman makes a point there is a list. One of the things we all agree with is that we have suffered under the burden of an agency that has not worked. Even the gentleman probably has a long list of immigration issues, business people who say I have sent in all the papers, and I cannot get my employee over here to work with a green card. But what I am saying is I think Americans are practical and I do think they are compassionate, and I think they understand some of the things

that the gentleman is saying. Obviously, we vigorously disagree. But I am looking for places where we can agree. I do not like the word "amnesty." I do not use the word "amnesty." I like earning it. And I like the fact that there is a deciding body now in power with a whole bunch of new rules. I am talking about the new bureau on immigration. So they can actually say no to these people who will come in and they say, You get it; you do not. I am sure we will get complaints on that, but it makes a difference.

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, would the gentlewoman agree with me that before any kind of guest worker program is put in place, it is imperative that we secure the border? Because if we do not secure the border, having a guest worker program legalizing 8 to 10 million people who are here, and creating this guest worker process is essentially meaningless. Because no matter what we do, we will say here are the rules under which they can come into the country under the new program and they have to do X, Y, and Z, and the employer has to follow these. Of course, the minute we constrain it that way, we are saying if they, however, avoid the law, if they can come in illegally, they will ignore it. The employer will ignore it. People coming in will ignore it because there is an easier way to do it, unless we secure the border.

So if the gentlewoman is looking for a place to agree, then I would ask her if she would agree with me that we have to, number one, secure the border, whatever that takes, and we could argue about how that is to occur, but come to a position where we are not looking at this 800,000 people a year coming in. We all know where it is happening. We see it. We reap the whirlwind with it. If we can agree with that, then I will be happy to discuss the possibility about what comes next in terms of a guest worker program.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, let me say to the distinguished gentleman, a guest worker program, those of us who work from the legislative perspective, and as the gentleman well knows, I serve as the ranking member on the Immigration, Border Security, and Claims Subcommittee. The guest worker program we sort of tie to the temporary worker program, and I agree with the gentleman. An earned access would be individuals who work in many other places and would then ultimately seek to have legal permanent status. But I think we are both moving in the same direction, and here is what I would say to his question. I am from Texas; so we have generally had very cordial relationships or relations with our closest neighbor, and that is Mexico. But I think we can take it to the next step when we talk about securing the border. I, frankly, believe Mexico wants the border secured. We want the border secured. But the reason these people come is because of utter poverty.

This is a time, my distinguished friend, if we can work with Mexico to begin to work on that economic base that then draws people home, the woman from California (Ms. SOLIS), and I will be joining her, I believe, will be going to look at the worst poverty that one can imagine. So I would say to the gentleman, I think securing the border in a way that is responsible respects the fact that Mexico is an ally just for the fact that everybody has a sovereign right to do so; but as we do it, let us do it by fixing some of the problems that are broken in terms of the economy over there, in terms of these 8 million that are here, in terms of creating at least a pathway.

Guest worker is one pathway; earned access is another. But I do not think we can quarrel about securing the border, and I would hope that my good friends in the immigrant advocacy area know that that is not a situation where it is condemning immigration. It is suggesting that we all have to work toward balancing the security of our respective nations. But I think if we worked on the economy that draws people out of the deepness of Mexico just to be able to live, we could understand their plight and other places in South America.

And I would just close on this and yield back to the gentleman. And I simply say if we had an equitable immigration policy, if we did for the Haitians what we do for Cubans, if we did for the Africans what we do for others, if we say that immigration includes the Irish or the English and then we got a policy that worked, we might even find ourselves somewhere near thinking that we have a solution.

□ 2030

But I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. The gentleman knows my passion. The gentleman knows my sense of balance and my absolute commitment to the idea that those who come now deserve our respect and admiration because they have come to contribute, they have come to serve in our military, and they have come to get our support.

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. I absolutely respect every single person. I understand entirely why these people come. I would be doing exactly the same thing. My grandparents did exactly the same thing. It is not the individual that I complain about, it is our own government's policy, and I ask us to look seriously at changing it for all Americans.

PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF SENATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan) laid before the House the following privileged Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 71) providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 71

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Friday, October 3, 2003, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until Tuesday, October 14, 2003, at a time to be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble whenever, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

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

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEACH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, October 7 and 8.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1925. An act to reauthorize programs under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2826. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1000 Avenida Sanchez Osorio in Carolina, Puerto Rico, as the "Roberto Clemente Walker Post Office Building".