

before her centennial. She attended the Clinton Iowa public schools and graduated in 1927 from the University of California at Los Angeles and earned a master's degree in English from Ohio State University.

After graduation, she taught English at various historically black institutions such as Florida A&M College in Tallahassee, Florida, and Hampton Institute in Hampton, Virginia, before moving to St. Louis.

□ 2030

In 1943 she moved with her husband, Dr. A.C. Phillips, an educator who served as principal of Washington Technical, Vashon, and Central High Schools, and after retirement as a former president of New Age Federal Savings and Loan in North St. Louis.

Mrs. Phillips continued her love for teaching English at Soldan High School, from which she retired in 1972, and subsequently served as a tutorial volunteer.

During her lifetime, Mrs. Phillips remained engaged in various local and national organizations until she became well advanced in age. As a founding member and first president of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority's Alpha Gamma Chapter, my chapter, at UCLA in the 1920s, she also dated Ralph Bunche, a classmate while in college. She continued an active social life in St. Louis where she maintained membership in the Booklovers Club, the Garden Club, a local women's bridge club, as well as shared activities with her husband as an archouse in the Beta Eta Boule, The Anniversary Club, The Couples Club, and numerous civic and philanthropic projects. She was a voracious reader, avid gardener, a consummate traveler, and a generous hostess who enjoyed sharing her time and energy to make life more pleasant for her friends and family, and especially her grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say I just returned from the Alpha Kappa Alpha Convention, over 10,000 women, and announced to them her passing. But the remarkable thing is that she almost saw a full century of life and we, her family, she was my aunt, need to emulate her spirit because she believed in peace. She loved poetry, and she wrote to us poetically. The last conversation I had with her she said to me, I think I have just lived too long. And I responded, you will live forever in our hearts and our minds.

#### EXPENSING STOCK OPTIONS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to reference briefly, legislation that we are going to be dealing with tomorrow that I think is very important. I have been spending time, as I know a number of my col-

leagues have, questioning the recent proposal from the Financial Accounting Standards Board, FASB, about whether or not we are going to be expensing stock options.

This is particularly important for somebody from the State of Oregon where technology has become a critical part of our local economy. It is the largest export of our State by far, a State originally founded on agriculture and timber. Now, technology exports are twice what we have in those traditional areas. The wages that are paid are twice the State average. They are high-paying, important jobs for a growing part of our economy that is increasingly a critical part of a global economy.

When these proposals came forward, I looked at them closely because, sadly, Congress in the past has not always been the most constructive partner. When it comes to financial regulations, often our participation has hindered rather than helped. I think any objective analysis would suggest that congressional interference with what happened with the savings and loan scandal probably added billions of dollars to the long-term cost to the taxpayer.

More recently, congressional interference dealing with accounting standards probably increased the problems there when we had some of the most difficult fallout. We had an opportunity to play a more constructive role; I am not certain that we did.

That is why I look at this carefully. I started by talking to business people I know back home who were involved with this process to find what impact expensing options would have on their businesses. It was clear that were we to be dealing with the expensing of broad-based stock option plans, the impact would be negative.

Now, it is clear that we are not talking about the vast majority of stock options that are granted to only a small number of high-level employees. Here we have seen expensing take place with little or no impact on shareholder value. That is because they are very limited. In the area that we are talking about with broad-based stock options where the majority of the employees have these options vested, not just the top few, it would have a dramatic impact on the balance sheet.

What it would mean in the long term is that a number of these firms, because of the lower values, they would simply stop offering broad-based stock option programs. That would be a tragedy on several levels. One has to do with the fact that broad-based stock option programs probably are a counterweight, a check and a balance against abuse. If you have a large number of employees who have a stock option program, there is less incentive and it is harder to manipulate. Indeed, to the best of my knowledge, there has not been a single case of a broad-based stock option program that has been one of the problems we have been reading about in the papers. The

Worldcoms or the Enrons have been those stock options that were more limited in nature. So we would lose that check and that balance.

Additionally, we lose an important part of start-up capital. What we are finding in the volatile world of technology finance is that there are a number of people who are willing to grab the brass ring, they are willing to take a chance to forgo salary for stock options, putting, in effect, sweat equity into the business on the prospect that it will prosper and that they will reap handsome rewards in the future. This does not happen all of the time, but it happens frequently enough that people are willing to make that type of investment. It has been a critical part of the success in getting the talent and getting these start-ups off the ground.

It is particularly important in a small State like Oregon which does not have access to capital that we see in other parts of the country like Silicon Valley; and as a result, Oregon would be particularly hard hit if we were to lose the opportunity for broad-based stock options.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues carefully examine this legislation coming before us tomorrow and look at the impact that broad-based stock options have in terms of the entrepreneurial spirit, in terms of what it means for the benefit of large numbers of employees, and the integrity of stock options themselves. Members should look carefully at the problems of valuation for something that is in effect equity in the future that is unknown and avoid a problem of adopting a new policy that could have a very negative effect on our technology industry and small business.

#### BUDGET DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, it has been an interesting time sitting here and listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about the issue revolving around the budget, the budget deficit and spending problems we are experiencing. It is undeniably true that we are spending far too much money. It is fascinating to hear the discussion of this particular phenomenon, spending too much money, and having Members on the other side of the aisle decry that particular activity.

It is fascinating because I sit on the Budget Committee, and on that committee we have for a number of years now looked at budgets that are offered by not just the administration, by the Republican Party, but by Members of the other party. To the best of my recollection, we have yet to see any budget proposed by the other side of the aisle that would address the issue

of spending. Not one. In fact, every single budget proposed by Members from the other side of the aisle spends more.

At no time to the best of my recollection have we said on this floor, while we debated any particular appropriations bill, any one of the 13 appropriations bills the House has the responsibility to address and pass to keep the government moving, I do not recall, and I certainly could be wrong, but I just do not recall any time during the discussion of any one of those appropriations bills where the issue was we are spending too much from the other side. That is to say that they were complaining that the bill was too rich.

They were oftentimes complaining about where the money was spent, but not that we were not spending enough. Nobody was complaining about the fact that it was overspending; complaints were almost always that we were not spending enough on particular programs.

On every single appropriations bill, or at least a majority of the appropriations bills that come to the floor, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), who has been around for approximately 20 years and has certainly seen a lot of budgets come and go in this process, but every year he stands up and to almost every single appropriation bill he attempts to add an amendment. He offers an amendment that is a limiting amendment.

It does something really very scary. The ramifications would be incredible if we were to ever pass it. We fail to pass it every single time; but what this amazing, incredible thing that he offers to the Members of this body who are supposedly concerned about spending, he suggests that we should cut spending on each one of the appropriations bills by an enormous amount, or enormous around here, and that amount is 1 percent. Every single year he gets up and offers this amendment to every appropriations bill, let us just cut 1 percent off of this appropriation, and he fails. Almost all of the Members on the other side of the aisle vote against it, as do many Members on our side.

Mr. Speaker, I do not rise here to defend the spending activities of this Congress, but I do suggest that when one does propose that we should not spend so much, when one stands up at this microphone and condemns the body for spending a lot of money, they should be willing then to vote to stop that, not just criticize it, but stop it.

What, is the devil making us do this? That is what it sounds like: please, somebody stop me; I cannot control myself. Please, somebody out there deal with it. Institute some rule, institute some program because I have to continually vote to spend all of the money that I can possibly vote to spend, and then some. And then it is somebody else's fault. And the one continuing theme that ran through almost every one of the discussions that preceded mine here tonight discussing the appropriations process and the budget

process, the continuing theme was this: the real problem, the real dastardly thing that we, the Republicans, have done over the course of the last 4 years is to reduce taxes. That is the most heinous crime with which we have been charged during the last hour.

There was a lot of discussion about the economic condition that most Americans find themselves in and many families are wondering about how to pay the bills and especially their health care costs. All these things are undeniably true.

□ 2045

Here is the solution, then, as I heard them explain it. The best thing we can do to those people who are trying to figure out how to pay the bills in America is to increase their taxes. This will help us all. This will make everybody happy. It will solve all of our problems because you and I both know, Mr. Speaker, that there are just too many Americans out there, middle-class Americans who are not paying enough to keep this thing afloat.

Again I want to stress, I absolutely do not wish to defend the spending practices of this body, both Republicans and certainly the Democrats. We spend too much money. That is undeniably true. It is also undeniably true that something happened called 9/11 and as a result of that we did have extraordinary things occur. One, a dramatic drop in the economic activity of the country and, two, an inordinate increase in the amount of money we spent on homeland security and on national defense. Those things, I think, are understandable. Our expenses went up, our revenues went down as a result of an event. But I do not excuse the fact that we still spent money beyond what we took in to an ever greater extent every year. I believe that we should have made many more decisions about how to cut in other areas. Whenever the Labor, Health and Human Services bill comes up, which is a huge, huge, huge spending bill, all for social services, we shall see how many amendments will be offered by the other side to that bill to cut spending. We shall see whether or not anybody would vote for that 1 percent cut in that \$400 billion or \$500 billion bill in order to reduce the size of the deficit that we all decry. I will vote for it. I guarantee you I will vote as I did every single time for every single 1 percent and I would have voted for a much higher percentage cut had it been offered, but I voted for every single one of those 1 percent cuts. What a scary thing that we proposed, 1 percent. We failed to get it.

As I say, the issue evidently is spending. Nobody really tries to stop it around here. But the real scary thing to our friends on the other side of the aisle is that we may in fact be allowing people to keep too much of their own wages, too many of their own dollars. This absolutely astounds the other side. It is frightening to them. Every-

body would be happier, as I say. We could go to every one of those families that are sitting around the table, that they talked about earlier tonight, wondering how to pay their bills and say, "We'll help you figure out how to pay the bills. We'll take more money away from you in taxes. That will be better. Believe us. Trust us. That's going to help you out."

Does this sound weird to anybody else out there? It is a very strange philosophy but it is decorated with a lot of rhetoric so that all of a sudden it sounds logical. "Of course, we just need to do that. We have to raise taxes, naturally. We have to spend all this money, take money away from everybody, it is only right. Everybody would be happier if we did, right?"

I do not think so. I do not think so. I think most Americans do not think so, either. They are not delusionary. Most Americans want us to spend less. That is undeniably true. I am with them. I am with them in that regard. I do wish that we could spend less and I do wish that we could prioritize better than we have been able to prioritize and I believe that it is incumbent upon us to continue the effort. But the last thing I think we should do is to turn over that process to the folks whose only history in dealing with budgets, by the way, around here for 40 something years prior to the time that Republicans took control was to develop dramatic spending increases ad infinitum. I just really do not feel safe in thinking that the other way to handle this is to provide the other party with the keys to the treasury.

Of course that is not the issue that I wanted to bring forward tonight. I just had to comment on that as I listened to the discussion. I wanted to talk tonight about an issue that does compel me to come to this floor often and that is an issue dealing with the policy of this government with regard to immigration and to hopefully address the broader concept that immigration, immigration policy, has a tendency to affect. There are many aspects, many facets to the immigration debate. That is why I find it so fascinating, quite frankly. I cannot think of another domestic policy issue that should command as much of our attention as should the immigration debate, what little debate I should say, that goes on. There is not an awful lot. People suggest that we should really pay close attention to this in the presidential race. I hope we do. But the reality is there is not all that much difference, I am afraid and ashamed to say, between the two positions taken by the presidential candidates. One is strictly pandering for votes and one is pandering light, I guess I would call it, but they are both in the process of trying to figure out a way to gain votes among those folks who are here as immigrants and/or people who have come to this country even illegally and who sometimes, in fact oftentimes, do vote.

Let me talk a little about this whole concept of voting. This is really what

has propelled me to come to the floor this evening. About, I guess it was a year or so ago, maybe 2 years now, a year and a half, I read something that was a statement by the then candidate for mayor of Washington, D.C. I found it disconcerting, to say the least, and I have quoted it often because a lot of people when I talk about the issue of immigration and citizenship which, of course, go hand in hand, people are surprised by the fact that there are places around this country, cities in particular, that have called themselves and/or we have called sanctuary cities. Sanctuary cities are cities that develop policies with regard to immigration. Of course, this is bizarre to say the least because the Federal Government is supposed to have the primary and unique role of determining our immigration policies. But what we are seeing happen all over the country, well, I should not say all over the country, primarily on the left coast and on the east coast, we see these peculiar things going on in local communities where they will say things like, in our community, in our city, we will not allow our police departments to communicate with the Department of Homeland Security. If they arrest someone and find out that that person is here illegally, we will not allow our police department to tell the government about that, tell the Department of Homeland Security. Some have gone farther than that, farther than saying that if you are in their community illegally, you will not be hassled essentially, that that little city will not participate in the process of trying to identify your status and/or have anything to do with the punishment of the crime. If, in fact, you have come into this country illegally, they will not help enforce the law of the land. I find this to be quite peculiar.

I have spoken about this. We have attempted to amend other bills, appropriations bills, to stop this from happening but something occurred here just the other night that goes along with what the then candidate, or, no, I am sorry, he was mayor at the time, Mayor Anthony Williams. I see this article was back on October 1, 2002, when he was running again but he was the mayor. Mayor Anthony Williams said on October 1, 2002, that noncitizens in the District of Columbia should be allowed to vote in local elections. He had said this in response to a complaint from a Latino coalition where they issued a report in which they identified a lack of services and access to local government. Mayor Williams said, "I am committed to expanding the franchise. The city needs to develop a new standard for voting."

This is the mayor of Washington, D.C., the Nation's capital. Again, only here on the east coast or maybe in some scattered pockets of the left coast would a statement like this not be incredible and would go without a great deal of attention being paid to it, but he says, "The city needs to develop

a new standard for voting, but it isn't citizenship." When the council's executive director, I think there they are talking about the city council of D.C., the executive director, Eugenio Arene, suggested that all local taxpayers be allowed to cast ballots, the mayor added, "Sounds like a good standard to me." Asked about extending the vote to noncitizens, Williams pledged to work with local government officials and experts on the idea and he said he hoped it would be possible in elections for mayor on down.

By the way, in this proposal, there was nothing at the time that would even indicate that they were entertaining the idea that people who are noncitizens should vote but excluding it from people who are here illegally. There is nothing in here to suggest that that was the case. In fact, it is just the opposite. Anyone who they say is a resident should vote. Anyone who is a resident should vote. This, of course, is an attack on the whole concept of citizenship. It is becoming less and less meaningful to many people, it is true. We are trying our best to eliminate anything that distinguishes a person here as a citizen from someone who is not and to accommodate, therefore, the massive numbers of people who are here illegally. If this is not pandering for votes, you tell me what is, Mr. Speaker. How can we possibly define such a thing, that a statement of this nature could be made and that people could possibly think that it was for any other purpose but to go after a voting group that perhaps is not solidly behind you or you want to sort of encourage, you want to make sure that you pay them back for whatever kind of political support they may give you, that you would even go to the extent of saying that citizenship in this country is not important, it is essentially meaningless. Because, you see, if it is not meaningful to the mayor for voting purposes, what in the world could it be meaningful for? What purpose does it have? What does citizenship mean? Is it of any value whatsoever?

There is an oath that is taken when someone wants to become a citizen of the United States. It has been around for a couple of hundred years. In it we talk about the need to disavow any allegiance to any other government or potentate, I think the words are, in the vow itself. We are talking about somebody who is separating themselves from whatever they were in terms of their political affiliation to something new. We do that for a purpose, because it is important to have that distinguishment. It is important to have people who come here as immigrants. It is important to have people who are born here understand the importance of citizenship. It does distinguish someone here and it distinguishes us from other nations and other people groups. I think that that distinguishment is a good thing.

I am constantly amazed at how much time and attention is spent on trying

to minimize the importance of the whole concept of citizenship, that we are all just residents, that is the theory, that we are just here on the planet in this particular location. Nothing really holds us together as a nation except for the economic benefits that can be obtained by living in this particular geographic area. That is all. As bizarre as that sounded back on October 1, 2002, and to a certain extent I did not really worry about it because you can write that off to a political campaign and the rhetoric of someone looking to pander to voters. Certainly that is the only way I could read what he said there.

Come to find out last week, this particular little seed, bad seed, has begun to sprout.

□ 2100

The other day several Councilmembers here in the District of Columbia introduced the "Equitable Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2004," a bill that will extend full local voting rights to documented permanent residents of the District of Columbia. The bill was co-introduced by Councilmember Jim Graham, and it goes on to describe them. The Voting Rights for All D.C. Coalition is actively seeking other co-sponsors. So in the City Council of Washington, D.C., they are proposing now to implement the Mayor's idea of having people who are noncitizens be eligible to vote.

We know we will have the Washington, D.C. appropriations bill up here soon, and we will certainly look at that for an opportunity to address this particular issue, as the Federal Government does have a responsibility for oversight, and I will have an amendment prepared. But whether or not we offer it, whether or not it passes, I mean the idea that this is happening in cities across the country and here in the Nation's capital has got to be a sobering thought even for those people who press for more and more of the elimination, if the Members will, of anything that distinguishes individuals here as citizens of the United States.

Massive immigration into the country, both legally and illegally, has consequences. And it is absolutely true that we have been successful as a Nation in assimilating hundreds of millions of people into this country and into this culture over the past 200 years. And it is true that sometimes that is assimilation happened easily and sometimes not so easily. It is true that many people faced hardships and discrimination and that it was not an easy thing to do, and that groups came into the country, and every time there was a wave of immigration from any particular area, there would be people here saying we have got to stop that. There is something bad about that particular group coming into the country.

The country not only survived it but grew and prospered, and I think, for the most part, we can look back at the experience and say it was positive for the Nation.

But there is a different phenomenon today. It is a different immigration, not just in terms of numbers. There are far more people coming into this country today legally and illegally than ever before in the Nation's history. But there is also this growing problem, this sort of cult of multiculturalism, as I call it, that has taken over much of certainly the media. Certainly our colleges and high schools and textbooks are influenced by this peculiar philosophy. I say peculiar because it is this: It is not just a recognition of our differences, which I think all of us can appreciate. It is not just extolling the virtues of diversity, of which there are many. It is not that at all. The cult of multiculturalism to which I refer is the kind of thing that pushes this idea that we should no longer identify ourselves as Americans because that is, of course, some unique distinction that is in some way troublesome; and that we should in no way extol the virtues of American society or the American creed. We should not tell our children in schools that there is anything of value in what we have established here, that there is nothing in Western Civilization in our history of which we can be proud, that everything is negative, that the only way that we can portray a sympathy and express a sympathy and an appreciation for another culture is to degrade and debase our own. That is the cult of multiculturalism, and it is rampant throughout the country.

There was an interesting little spot on National Public Radio not too long ago about a school in Los Angeles, a public high school, 5,000 students, most of them, as they said, had "recently arrived," almost all from Mexico, almost all speaking Spanish. And in this NPR spot, they were interviewing the teacher, and they were talking about the fact that they did not have enough textbooks in the school, especially civics or history textbooks. And the teacher said, I do not care that we do not have any textbooks in the school because the textbooks that we have prepared for us and are given to us by the school district do not teach our kids about who they are. She said, They only teach about this other culture.

Now, what was she talking about? Who were their kids and who they are, and who was the other culture that she was deriding and in saying that we should not be teaching children today? That other culture was, of course, ours, America's. Who were these children? She said "our children." Not American children? No. No. So, therefore, she said, I have devised a different curriculum for these kids, and I do not want them using textbooks provided by the Anglo community. She said, Instead of using textbooks, we are going to go out and study murals.

Mural, that is a euphemism, most of the time, for graffiti.

So they went out, and the reporter went out with them, and they walked along the streets of Los Angeles. The

school kids, instead of being in class studying American history, this was her alternative, a "mural walk." That is what she called it. And when the students got there and they talked to the "artist" who had created this thing, this mural, this historical monument, this psychological jewel, they asked him to teach the class. This was on radio. They were interviewing these guys, and this was all recorded. And the guy said, I want the students to know you do not belong here. That flag is not your flag, pointing to American flag. He said, You are just all a colony. This is a colony of the United States. You really do not belong here. You have no allegiance here.

This is the cult of multiculturalism to which I refer. And it is there, and it permeates our society, and it is problematic when it meshes with massive immigration, when there is no longer a press for assimilation or pressure for assimilation, but all the pressure is just the opposite. It is all to divide us into subgroups, into hyphenated Americans in every way.

I had a meeting, I remember, with a bishop in Denver, Bishop Gomez. And we were arguing this issue, and he said to me, I do not know why you are so concerned about people who are coming here from Mexico. He said, They do not want to be Americans.

I said, Bishop, there are two things about that statement that really get me. First of all, that you assume my problem with immigration is that I do not want the people who immigrate here to become American; and, secondly, the fact is you are right. That is the problem, and it is exactly why I am worried. It is not that I should not be worried about that. It is that every American should be worried about it. There are many people doing exactly what my grandparents did and your grandparents and everybody else's grandparents or great grandparents or great great grandparents did. They all come here because they all make a very difficult choice to come to a brand new land. And it is true that that is the one thing we have in common, people coming today and people coming when my grandparents came: They want to come to America. But let me ask you if there is now a difference. Let me ask you if you can just get a feeling that, in fact, something else is different. They want to come to America. The question is do they want to be American?

The answer, according to Bishop Gomez, is no. This is different.

I see the gentleman from Virginia has joined me, and I will ask him to express his observations here in just a second.

But I just want to point out that this cult of multiculturalism is truly having an impact on our society because historically public schools, we could at least rely on them. When I went to school, when my grandparents went to school here, we could rely on a public school as a place to help assimilate

children into the American culture. There was a pressure to do so, first of all, of course, to learn English. That was an absolute must. Secondly, to learn about the history of this country and attach ourselves to it, which I did. That is gone. That is gone from most schools in this Nation.

According to a study of San Diego high school students in the early 1990s, after 3 years of high school, the proportion of students identifying themselves as "American" dropped by 50 percent from the time they came into the school. The proportion identifying themselves as hyphenated Americans had gone down by 30 percent, and the proportion of identifying themselves with a foreign nationality, overwhelmingly in this case Mexican, had gone up 52 percent.

What did we teach them? To what did we say that they should attach themselves? As immigrants or as citizens who have been here for years, whatever that citizenship concept is in anybody's mind anymore? What we taught them is there is nothing unique, nothing that they should, in fact, attach themselves to; that they should stay separate, keep their own language, keep their on special identity, separate identity.

I tell my colleagues this is the problem that the immigration policy has got to address. And I am pilloried many times certainly by the press, my opponents, because I talk about this issue. And there are always attempts to characterize my debate or my desire to debate this issue in the most nasty of terms. And the epithets that are thrown around here and at me oftentimes, we just have to accept that people wish to change the debate away from these kinds of issues that I am trying to address tonight on to the stuff of racism and xenophobia and that sort of thing.

I have watched over the years, and there are people who have been here longer than I and have done far better work than I, far more productive work in many cases, I am sure, in this particular area than I have ever been able to do, and one is the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE), who is here tonight and I am proud to say is a friend.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE).

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) for yielding to me.

I want to thank the gentleman for his tireless efforts on bringing immigration reform to this Congress and before the American people. He has traveled across this Nation. He has gone to the border between Mexico and the United States. He has also been to the Canadian border. He brought back the tax returns and have weighed them of those who I believe were here illegally, trying to get money from the American Treasury and who, no doubt in my mind, many of which have been successful.

□ 2115

The gentleman saw how they were going to utilize the Earned Income Tax Credit on papers that the gentleman gathered in alleged trash near the Mexican border. The gentleman has done the research on items like the papers by the mayor of the District of Columbia. The gentleman has talked to the Border Patrol agents. The gentleman has done countless other things on behalf of bringing true immigration reform to this country, and I want to thank the gentleman.

We heard speakers before the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) talk about the deficit, and I want to see the deficit reduced. I would like to see it eliminated. It is great to identify a problem, but you also need to address the problem.

Reduce illegal immigration and reduce the deficit. Illegals come into this country and soak up not thousands, not millions, but billions of healthcare dollars that taxpayers of this country are paying for. If we stopped illegal immigration, we would have those billions of dollars to apply to the deficit.

We can look at social services and social programs. Again, we are not talking about hundreds, thousands or millions; we are talking about billions of dollars.

If we want to reduce the deficit, reduce illegal immigration. Stop it, and stop that money going to them from these social programs.

Another area of concern are illegals getting Social Security. I have heard some say, "Oh, we passed a law to stop that."

Yes, we passed a law saying if you are illegally in this country, you cannot draw Social Security benefits. But if you go back to Mexico, or you go back to whatever other country you came from to this country illegally, you can start dipping into the Social Security System and getting money out of it.

If we were to get that totalization agreement with Mexico, which I surely hope we do not, the totalization agreement would override the statute that says illegals cannot get Social Security benefits. If that were followed by an amnesty of any type, form, shape or regularization or whatever euphemistic phrase you want to call amnesty, you are going to hear a sucking sound out of the Social Security fund that would turn all seniors whose heads are not gray gray, I would predict, because the drain on the Social Security fund would be significant and heavy. Again, it is not hundreds, it is not thousands, it is not millions; it is billions of dollars.

So, if you want to reduce the deficit, let us stop illegal immigration and put a big dent in the deficit.

Pretty soon we are going to get the September 11 Commission report. It is going to talk an intelligence czar, and I am anxious to see what they have to say about that. But I bet it will not mention too much about the fact that

19 of those terrorists who flew the airplanes into the buildings of this country and killed thousands of citizens in New York, Pennsylvania and across the river in Arlington, were in this country illegally. They had overstayed their visas, for the most part, illegal aliens.

They committed suicide by flying those planes into the World Trade Center and into the Pentagon. They were in this country illegally, and if they were not here illegally, they could not have done the acts. If we stopped illegal immigration, then there would have been 19 fewer persons in this country to do those acts that they did. I hope, but I do not expect, the 9/11 Commission to address this facet of making America more secure.

I remember the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) bringing to a meeting of the Immigration Reform Caucus, and I recollect it was held in the courtyard outside of the Longworth Building, the father of one of the September 11 victims. As I recall, the statements made by that individual, he said, "If I had to pick out a key factor in what caused September 11, it was a huge sea of illegal immigration, whereby 19 illegals could float around in that sea undetected."

What he wanted was to see a reduction in illegal immigration. I hope the 9/11 Commission will address this fact. I want to see America be made more secure, and one way to make America more secure is to reduce illegal immigration, just as one way to reduce the deficit is to reduce illegal immigration.

So I would like to close by doing as I started and to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) for taking the time to come to the floor of this House on a repeated basis and point out the many problems and the many pitfalls of illegal immigration. I hope that the voting standard in this country will always be that you have to be a United States citizen to participate in our electoral process.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, there is another issue when we talk about spending and deficits that I think is intriguing. We just passed last week the foreign operations bill. This is most often referred to as the foreign aid bill. There is an interesting aspect of this particular spending plan that really deserves our attention here, and I think we seldom ever address it.

It is this: That beyond the money that we appropriate in that bill for governments all over the world, most of them, unfortunately, corrupt, and much of the money, of course, as we know, does not get to the intended individuals that most desperately need it, but we, nonetheless, distribute monies to countries all over the world in the form of foreign aid.

But most people I think do not understand or know that a great deal of wealth is also transferred in another way from the United States to other

countries, and this is by the process of what is called remittances.

Now, "remittances," that is just a term that refers to the dollars that flow from people who are working here in the United States to people who are in other countries, mostly to family members who are in other countries.

I was in Mexico not too long ago speaking to a gentleman who was the head of a newly created ministry down there called the Ministry for Mexicans living in the United States. I think it has changed its name, but that is what it was originally. But Mr. Hernandez, the minister, was telling me that part of the responsibilities he had as a minister of this particular agency was to make sure that the movement, the flow of Mexican nationals into the United States, was maintained, and, in fact, increased.

That was such an odd thing, in a way. When I asked why in the world would a government agency be set up to increase the flow of their nationals to another country, he said, "Well, it is actually kind of simple." He said, "There are actually several reasons, but they are all beneficial to Mexico, and you can see why we would be doing this."

He said that the number of people between the ages of 18 and 25, Mexican citizens, that particular demographic profile, the number of people in that profile had doubled in 10 years, and he said the unemployment rate for that same group is about 40 percent.

So on the remittance issue, he said the people coming into the country were in desperate need of a job, and what would happen when they get here, they get employed, and then they send money back home, in this case to Mexico. That was 2 years ago, and that amounted to \$13 billion. \$13 billion.

Now, you say, well, so what? That is a significant portion of the GDP of Mexico, as a matter of fact. Mr. Hernandez referenced it. He said this was an important thing, to have the money be sent back. It actually now approximates the greatest amount of foreign investment in the country of Mexico.

Remittances. Far in excess of any sort of investment by any other corporation in the world; far in excess of the money that goes into Mexico from tourism. It is the highest source of foreign investment they have, except for PEMEX, the government-owned oil company.

"Therefore," he said, "it is important for us to have this continual flow." He went on to explain there were other important things. He said, "You know, the more Mexican nationals we have living in the United States, the more your government will be influenced in a positive way to treat Mexico."

Finally, he said, when I told him I thought these things were incredible in a way, that any government would be set up for the purpose of trying to actually influence our policy vis-a-vis their government by exporting people

into our country, he said, "Congressman," he said this in a relatively condescending way, he said, "Congressman, it is not two countries. It is just a region. It is not two countries."

Interestingly, Vincente Fox was here just a couple of weeks ago in the United States campaigning. The President of Mexico was in the United States of America, in Illinois, in Michigan and in Wisconsin, campaigning, talking to Mexican nationals living here, trying to get them to vote, and also promising them, by the way, that he would defend their rights in the United States, asking them to vote in the election in Mexico, saying that they will pass legislation to allow them to do so, because they wanted them to remain connected to Mexico.

That gets us back to this issue we talked about earlier, about whether or not people come to the United States because they want to be in the United States, or because they want to be Americans. Two different things. In this case he is saying, "I want you to come to America; I just do not want you to become Americans. I want you to stay connected to Mexico."

He is not the only person, and that is not the only country. The countries in the world, there are now seven or eight countries that have actually over 10 percent of their gross domestic product as a result of the remittances coming from the United States.

Now, I suggest that we ought to reduce our foreign aid to every single one of those countries by the amount of remittances that are going there. Actually, the remittances are a better way of getting foreign aid to them, because it actually is going to people and not the corrupt governments.

I have written the committee. I have written the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and asked him to consider this in the creation of the bill. He chose not to. But I suggest to you there is no reason we should not at least count this into the amount of money that we do in fact provide for foreign aid.

The reason I think we should do this is because we have to, I think, begin to eliminate the allure of the remittances to other countries, because as they begin to depend more and more on the United States and their nationals working here to send money back home, then they press us more and more for open borders and for reduction in any sort of obstacles that might be placed in the path of immigration into the country, legally or illegally.

Then we see the Mexican consulates and the Guatemalan consulates, 15 countries that are now handing out these matricula consular cards, these cards to their nationals living in the United States, for the purposes of, again, making it easier and simpler for them to live here, and make money and, of course, send it home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

First and foremost I would like to honor my colleague from Colorado. All of us in Congress who take this issue seriously know that without the leadership of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), this issue would not be getting the attention it is, and it is not getting the attention it deserves as it is.

□ 2130

So the fact is that he has taken many hard knocks; he has been attacked personally and politically for the leadership that he has provided on this issue. I salute him. And, let me just say that I am proud that on most of these fights that I have been able to rush down here and be at his side and fight the good fight, because this issue is determining the well-being of the people of the United States of America.

That is what we are supposed to be doing here, is it not? We are here elected to watch out for the well-being of the people of the United States; more than anything else that we do, that is supposedly our responsibility. Yet, we have seen almost no action on the part of the political establishment of the United States to deal with the issue of illegal immigration, and our people are paying for it. They are paying for it in a big way. There is no doubt what effect this massive flow of illegal immigration that continues into our country is having. And if I would just have any difference with my colleague, it would only be to stress that it is not just illegal immigration from Mexico. And, by the way, we would not care if it was illegal immigration from Ireland or from Germany or Italy or anywhere else. We have an out-of-control flow of illegal immigration into this country. Today, I believe the biggest source of illegal immigration into our country actually is not Mexico, but is China and countries in Asia.

Again, people who come, for them we have, I would say, the most generous legal immigration policy of any country in the world. We admit more legal immigrants into our country than all other countries in the world combined. But to permit millions more on top of that to pour into our country is having a dramatic impact on us, and it is heroes like the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) who are stepping up to the plate and trying to do something about it.

The average person out there knows that his children and the working people themselves are suffering from the fact that their wages are being kept down. Yes, we had a huge growth in our GNP, but the wages of our middle class and our working class people have been kept down by a massive flow of illegals into our country. There is nothing wrong to think that people who work in hotels changing beds and cleaning should earn a good living, but their pay has been kept way down. People who pick fruit and vegetables, yes, okay, so it is going to cost us 10 cents more for a hamburger. The bottom line is, the

people of this country who make hamburgers and are involved with that industry should be paid more money, but they will not be paid more money and the people who clean the buildings and take jobs like this, they are being paid less. The working people are being hurt by this. Of course, we are not going to provide them health care, because we have plenty of illegals who work and are not getting health care. The taxpayers pick up their health care.

In California we know wages are being kept down for normal people. The health care system in our State is collapsing, and around the country there is strain, especially in the southwest. The education system in California, because of the illegal flow of illegals into our system, our children are not getting the education they deserve. It can be traced right back to a massive, uncontrolled flow of illegals into our country, bringing their children, so that they can get benefits that they could never afford in their own country. We should not blame the illegals. Blame us. Blame the government. Because this government is supposed to watch out for the welfare of our people. We are not doing it. The criminal justice system in California is breaking down. Over 40 percent of the people in our prisons and our jails are illegal immigrants.

This is a huge burden on the taxpayers but, also, on our own people. Do my colleagues know what happens when those people get out of jail? They do not send them back to the countries they came from; they let them out among our population and they commit more crimes. Not only the terrorists who came into our country legally and just overstayed their visas, not only have they murdered our people, but every day someone is killed in this country by someone who is not supposed to be in this country because they are not here legally. We are talking about our citizens being murdered, their wages being kept down, their children's education system and health care system going to hell. This is a major issue and it is not being addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), by continuing to bring it up over and over again, he is doing a tremendous service to our people, and I am proud to stand with him tonight again to try to motivate the people in this city, in Washington, D.C. They say that Washington, D.C. is 64 square miles surrounded by reality. We have to bring some reality here to Washington, D.C. Our people are suffering because of this issue. Let us deal with it. Let us deal with it, yes, in a fair way. And again, this has nothing to do with where illegals are coming from, but it has everything to do with getting control of an out of control situation that is hurting our people.

So I thank the gentleman for his leadership, and I am proud to work with him on the issue.



Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I am certainly proud that he is a friend and has become, and has been for a long time, not become, but has been a major and important voice for reason on this particular issue.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, just a note that I will be giving a Special Order in about an hour on 9-11, so if people are looking in to see about this, this is not the Special Order that I will be giving.

Mr. TANCREDO. Stay tuned. Stay tuned.

Mr. Speaker, I will end this Special Order with just this last reference. It is to one thing that was written in a book called "Who Are We?" By Samuel Huntington. This has become I think one of the most important books written, and it just came out actually in May, but it is a fascinating analysis of this whole issue we are talking about in terms of trying to understand the merging of multiculturalism, this sort of cult of multiculturalism and the issue of massive immigration and the erosion of the concept of citizenship.

Samuel Huntington puts it this way: "The erosion of the difference between citizens and aliens, the overall declining rates of naturalization, and the naturalization spike of the mid 1990s, all suggest the central importance of material government benefits for immigrant decisions. Immigrants become citizens not because they are attracted to America's culture and creed, but because they are attracted by government social welfare and affirmative action programs. If these are available to noncitizens, the incentive for citizenship fades. Citizenship is becoming, in Peter Spiro's phrase, one more generally available 'Federal social benefit.' If, however, citizenship is not necessary to get the benefits, it is superfluous. As Peter Schuck and Rogers Smith argue, it 'is welfare state' membership, not citizenship, that increasingly counts. Membership in the welfare state, in contrast to membership in the political community, is of crucial and growing significance; for some, who are wholly dependent upon public benefits, it may be literally a matter of life and death."

It is citizenship, it is the concept of a nation State that we are today debating. Whether or not its existence can be assured, certainly we do not know, but I can guarantee my colleagues this, that the threats to its existence are great and are exacerbated by the cult of multiculturalism and unrestrained immigration.

#### REGARDING NATIONAL SECURITY PRIORITIES AND THE REAL WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am joined this evening by a number of colleagues interested in the safety of America and Americans, and concerned about the future of our military forces. We are speaking this evening because we have great reservations about the way America's national security policy is being conducted.

Sixty years ago next month, the American Army was welcomed into Paris with cheers and flowers and cries of "Vive les Americains!" We had fought a dogged and grueling war against the forces of a cruel dictator. And from every window and rooftop, a liberated populace honored the foreigners who restored their freedom.

Move forward 60 years to another war, another dictator, another country freed. To be sure, many Iraqis welcomed the American invasion and, for all the talk of coalition, this was an overwhelmingly American force. But those who welcomed our forces found they had to keep their voices low lest they become targets of those who rewarded their liberators with bombs and bullets.

We should not accept the appearance of an ungrateful Nation at face value. But neither should we idealize the occupation of Iraq.

It is increasingly clear that at a time when America should have focused its might on punishing those who, callously and in defiance of any known theology, attacked our country, and eliminating the threat they continued to pose, we allowed ourselves, Mr. Speaker, to be diverted.

What we see on TV every night is not the war on terror. The war in Iraq; really, now, the peacekeeping mission in Iraq, is costly and bloody and largely irrelevant. Was Saddam Hussein unpleasant? Yes. Did he bode U.S. ill? Without a doubt. But going to war against Saddam Hussein, taking people and resources away from the search for Osama bin Laden and the destruction of al Qaeda, is like the football defense that goes after the runner while the quarterback sneaks the ball across the goal line. We fell for the fake.

The real war on terror is the war to find and punish those who attacked this country and who would do so again. After nearly 3 years, their networks have been shattered, their organization has been bruised. But destroying such a strong and such a decentralized threat is very difficult. Any one man with a weapon of mass destruction is a superpower. The best we can do, militarily anyway, is to contain and keep the leadership incommunicado or on the run. That is the real war.

Is America safer with Saddam Hussein out of power? Probably. But is America safer because of the Iraq war? No, it is not. Because of the way we entered that war and the way in which we have handled the aftermath, I believe that we have increased the chances of another attack and, sadly, another war. We have incited the anger of millions who previously did not much like

the United States, but probably would have been willing to live and let live. We have become the villain of millions of glittering eyes, and we did it to ourselves.

At the same time, we drove away stalwart friends whose company provided us with such strength. By forcing a political showdown on Iraq rather than focusing on the real war, the proven threat to all western civilization, we made our allies choose between the will of their people on the one hand and the relationship with the United States on the other, and it was unnecessary.

After September 11, the leaders of countless nations expressed their support to our President. Not one, not one called to gloat or said that we deserved what we got. NATO invoked Article 5 for the first time ever to come to the collective defense of the United States. They were all on our side, in the real war.

We chose to defy the will of the international community and take it upon ourselves to unilaterally enforce sanctions that were not solely America's to begin with. The Canadian Mounties cannot come to Lexington, Missouri to enforce Missouri law; that is the duty of the State of Missouri. Similarly, I do not believe it was right for the United States to act to enforce edicts that were not of our creation. That is why the United Nations was created. By taking it upon ourselves to literally become the world's policeman, we changed the view that many of our allies had of us. We became, in their view, not just a victim of a vicious attack, but a potential attacker ourselves.

Let me be candid, Mr. Speaker. I and some of those who will speak later voted to give the President the authority to move Saddam Hussein out. We did that based on the information at the time, much of which has since fallen into question. The former Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, General Jack Keane, told the Committee on Armed Services last week, "We were seduced by the Iraqi exiles."

□ 2145

But regardless of underlying data, nowhere in our votes did we say to go it alone. Never did we say that Iraq should take focus away from the real war. At the same time, I twice wrote to the President and pointed out that ejecting Saddam is one thing, but we have to plan to manage the aftermath. That clearly did not happen.

The peace has been managed far worse than the war, and it has been argued that the United States invasion was justified as an act of self-defense. Indeed, this administration changed the national security policy of our country to assert the right of the United States to preemptively attack anywhere we believe there might be a threat to our Nation.

We have debated, and I am sure we will continue to debate, whether the