(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IMMIGRATION AND AMNESTY

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, I rise tonight to discuss a topic not unfamiliar to those who know that I have a passion for and an interest in the issue of immigration and immigration reform. Tonight, I wanted to specifically refer to a proposal that has made its way forward and that has a number of interesting aspects.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, over the last couple of years anyway, there have been attempts on the floor of the House here where many people have tried to advance the cause and idea of amnesty for people who are living here in the United States illegally. It is something we have done before, something we did in the mid-1980s, and it has proven to be disastrous from a variety of standpoints.

You may recall that as a result of amnesty for millions of people living here illegally, millions more people came illegally. Of course, this is only logical. It is not surprising whatsoever that if you tell someone that they can enter the United States without going through the legal process, without going through the expense and waiting in line, and that if they do that they will be rewarded for that activity; that we will provide you with all of the benefits of those people who did wait in line, well, then, of course, people will not wait in line. It is pretty logical.

Nobody really, I think, is too surprised by the fact that when I do travel to the border and I talk to the border patrol, they always say, I hope you guys up there will stop using the word ''amnesty.'' Because every time you even utter the word, the flood I am trying to stop down here, with the sieve that you have given me, turns into a tidal wave. And, of course, it would always do so.

Now, we have been successful, those of us who have been opposed to the continuation, or an expansion, of this concept of amnesty, expansion of what is bureaucratically and legalistically referred to as 245(i), those opposed to 245(i) expansion have been successful in stopping it from actually occurring. It came through the House here, and it did pass the House by one vote but failed in the Senate. Actually, it failed because Senator BYRD put a hold on the bill and it did not come up.

There is little sentiment in the Congress of the United States for this concept. The President has pushed it, but there is little sentiment for it here. And, frankly, I doubt that there is going to be a major effort to push it again through this Congress. There may be, but I think that we would be able to stop it.

So what has happened as a result of the fact that those people who want open borders, those people who want to reward people for having come into the United States illegally? I mean, what do they do next, I guess is the question. Well, what they do next is to try to attain the same goal only in a different venue. Instead of coming through the Congress with a bill to create an amnesty for people who are living here illegally and rewarding people for violating our law, a new strategy has been hit upon.

Now, this strategy is a strategy that has been employed by other governments, but in this case specifically, the government of Mexico, and maybe I should say other coconspirators in the United States, people who are in league with them, who believe that we should abandon our borders and provide no barrier whatsoever to the movement of people, ideas, goods and services. But the Mexican Government has decided to use something to achieve the same goal that they could not achieve by coming through the Congress, and that is the use of a card, an ID. It is referred to as the matricula consular.

The matricula consular is an identification card that is given to nationals of any country by their own government. It is not unique to Mexico, and Mexico has actually been using them for a long, long, long time. What has changed in the last year and a half or so is that Mexico has decided to go big time into this particular kind of endeavor, that is to say, to distribute as many of these Mexican identification cards as possible to Mexican nationals living in the United States.

Now, again, my colleagues might say, well, so what? What has that got to do with amnesty? Well, here is the deal. Everyone realizes, everyone realizes, that there is only one purpose for this card. There is really only one reason why someone would need this card in the United States, and that is if you are here illegally. It is a passport for illegal aliens. We know there are between 13 and 20 million people living in this country illegally, the vast majority being Mexican nationals. So the Mexican Government has already distributed, by their own count, about 1.4 million of these ID cards in the United States.

Now, as I say, they have the right to do that. No one is suggesting that Mexico cannot give an ID card to their nationals living anywhere. But what is peculiar about this whole thing is that they then went to their consular offices throughout the United States and they said, your job, if you are a Mexican consular official, is to go out into the States for which you have some responsibility and begin to lobby those States and begin to lobby the cities, the counties, the police departments to get those entities to accept this card from anyone who presents it for a valid form of identification.

And this has been enormously successful. They have been successful in

getting police departments all over the country to say yes to this idea, to accept the matricula card. They have been successful in getting States to go along with it. California is in the process of actually passing legislation to force their cities and counties to accept this ID, an ID that is given by a foreign government to a foreign national living here illegally.

It immediately sets up a lot of questions, of course. The first one that would come to mind is how many immigration systems are we running in the United States? There is one that supposedly we have some responsibility for here and we say who can come and who can go. Now, we know that people ignore it quite routinely; but, nonetheless, we have a whole system of immigration law that we are supposed to be enforcing. Then there is another system of immigration law that is developing out there, in this case the States are employing it, and counties and police departments. They are doing it on their own.

These States and local agencies are saying, well, we do not care if you are here illegally, we are going to give you our passport. We are going to accept this card from you and say that that is your passport for anything you want to obtain in the United States, for anything that a legal resident may be able to obtain: a driver's license, certain other benefits. And, in fact, beyond that, they are asking for cities and counties to extend social service benefits to people who carry this card, and police departments are to adhere to this card.

Now, let me just tell you what that sets up. We arrested someone in Colorado not too long ago that had seven matricula consular cards with their face on it, but with seven different names. There is absolutely nothing, absolutely nothing, that we can rely on to suggest that these cards are in fact valid forms of ID. For $28 and a photocopy of your Mexican birth certificate, which of course can be created quite easily on a computer, you can go to the Mexican consulate, and it does not matter what you say your name is, it does not matter what you look like, it could be a person that looks completely anglo, it just does not matter, and you go in and say who you are, you present this birth certificate, and for $28 you will get yourself a new identity.

So it is not just people who are living in the United States illegally who are benefited by this; but it is also, of course, people who are felons. They may be legal United States residents, but they have a desire to change their identity. This is a great way to do it, and people are doing it in great numbers.

Now, this has started another set of discussions going, and specifically there are parts of the Federal Government that are interested in trying to address this issue, namely Homeland Defense. Because not too long ago, in California, a Federal office building in San Francisco began to accept the matricula consular as a valid form of ID for someone wanting to gain entrance to the Federal building.

□ 1930

This was done as a result of the insistence of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and there were a number of repercussions to this, I should say. In fact, there was such an outcry and enough people concerned that a Federal building in the United States was allowing entrance into that building by someone who presented an identification card that our government did not give them, a foreign government did.

So GSA, which is the government landlord, decided to put this whole thing on hold while they did a study of the whole concept of using the matricula for ID purposes, and a working group started. It was really housed originally in the Department of Homeland Security, and they were charged with the development of a draft proposal. They completed that not too long ago.

I happen to have been able to see a copy of that proposal. It was interesting in that it talked about the very dangerous repercussions to allowing Federal government agencies to accept the matricula consular as a form of identification because, of course, you cannot just regulate this to one country. You cannot just say you will only accept the matricula consular from Mexico. Right now, there are five other countries that are using this form of identification for their illegals living in the United States, one of them Poland.

This is something many countries are looking at. If a country is not looking at it, a lot of terrorists are looking at it, a lot of people who are figuring out a way to become part of the American mainstream, to get into American society. They are looking for a passport into American society, something that allows them to open bank accounts, get a driver's license, your library card, and anything else that a regular citizen of this country would be able to do.

So terrorists have a strong incentive to see how this thing unfolds. So at certain points in time we could certainly see governments of a lot of foreign countries providing these matricula consular to their nationals who in turn would use them in the United States because the law says the government accepts them, and the law in your particular city or State says you can do so.

Banks became very involved with this whole thing and started encouraging people to open accounts in their bank. Wells Fargo Bank and Citibank, Bank America, all of these banks saw a huge potential there, a niche market. They call them the unbanked. What they mean is the illegal alien living in the United States and looking to open an account. I do not blame the banks for seeing this as a true profit center. They are completely able to do that.

But what is interesting is not too long ago we passed something called the PATRIOT Act here, and we made it difficult, supposedly, for people to do things and supposedly difficult for banks to do things that would allow people to use bogus accounts to transfer money because we recognize that is something that terrorist organizations do. So the banks, even without any sort of legal imprimatur, if you will, to allow them to do this, went ahead and started accepting the matricula consular to open accounts.

Well, the Treasury Department last week promulgated rules in response to the PATRIOT Act. Now this is the great irony here. The PATRIOT Act demanded that the banks do something to make it more secure, to make the whole process more secure when people open an account so we really know who these people are and we can track the money flow if we have to. That is the part of the PATRIOT Act that banks were responding to.

So what did they do? The Treasury Department, recognizing that this was happening in the banking industry and that banks were making millions of dollars off of the ''unbanked'' community, the Treasury of the United States, in response to the PATRIOT Act, promulgated rules saying, in fact, that banks could accept the matricula consular. This is amazing, and it is I think something that we should all be concerned about. I think that certainly we are going to try to bring this to the attention of the House in a short time by filing a request for a resolution, a joint resolution to stop the implementation of these regulations.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here is something that is being used to avoid the law. We passed a law in this Congress saying that the only way that you can come into this country is through a certain process and that if you do not do that you are in violation of the law. But how hypocritical is it to then say, however, if you get here, we are going to ignore the fact that you chose this particular route and we are going to give you access to every single amenity that this country has to offer, including the right to vote which is being pressed.

There are cities not too far from where we are tonight in Maryland and in Connecticut, along the East Coast especially, that call themselves sanctuary cities, and they allow people to vote in elections even if these people are not citizens of the United States. Even if they are not even legal aliens, they allow them to vote if they can show residency. If they can show them a utility bill, they can vote.

What the end result of all of this is, if we give people the ability to obtain all of the benefits of citizenship without ever being a citizen, then of course the whole concept of citizenship is meaningless. That is the end result of

things like this matricula consular activity or movement. We have to deal with it. We may not think that is important, and it becomes esoteric for some. You say matricula consular, and they do not care. It is a strange concept. We are just going to let somebody else deal with.

Luckily, some States are dealing with it: Colorado, Iowa, Tennessee, and Arizona have all introduced laws to abolish or to stop their State and/or any entity in their State from accepting the matricula consular. That is, of course, what I believe this government should do.

I hope that we will follow carefully this issue, and I hope that we will support either my bill or the bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY). Either one of these two bills are designed to put a stop to this movement, at least at the Federal level, and I hope we can do that.

We endanger homeland security by allowing these cards to be accepted. We establish a precedent that says, even if you violate our laws, we will not do anything to you. You can come here and have all of the benefits. What a slap in the face that is to every other citizen who has done it the right way, everyone who has waited in line, paid the price both emotionally and monetarily, to get to the United States. What a slap in the face it is to them to say it does not matter. All you have to do is jump the line, come in and you will be rewarded the exact same way that someone who did it the right way is rewarded.

So this is an attack on our sovereignty. This is an attack on citizenship itself, and it certainly sets up a very dangerous situation in these very trying days.

We went recently to Code Orange, and that means that we are even more fearful of an attack by a terrorist organization. We are taking more steps to try to prevent it.

What is fascinating to me is everything we do is designed to stop someone from committing an act, committing a terrorist act once they get here, but very little is designed to stop them from getting here to begin with. Hence, our open border policy invites terrorists into the country, and then we scurry around trying to stop them. We say we are not going to defend our own borders. We suggest that in doing something like making a secure border that there would be repercussions, that there would be political and cultural repercussions to it. Other countries, Mexico in particular, would not like it if we put military on our border to defend against people coming in here illegally, so we do not do it.

What a bizarre concept that we will let other countries and vocal minorities inside our own country stop us from defending our own people. The one responsibility we have in this Nation, the one responsibility we have in this House is to protect the people and the property of the United States of America, and we shirk that responsibility because we are afraid of those political ramifications.

Well, there will be other ramifications to open borders: successful terrorist attacks. Those are ramifications of open borders. People will die in this country as a result of that kind of behavior on our part. Our almost guilt-driven sort of compulsion to move this concept called multi-culturalism to where it permeates every aspect of our culture and society, we must make sure that we do nothing, say nothing that would make anyone else upset with us, any other country or culture. We have to be so careful about that that we disregard our own security measures. That is what we are really trying to deal with here, is what it means to be an American and what it means to defend the concept of being an American.

There are so many aspects of this particular problem and issue. There are political and economic and social ramifications of open border policies, and I touched a little bit on what I consider to be the national security implications of open borders, but there are many others. One that I wanted to talk about a little tonight is the economic impact of massive immigration of low-skilled, low-wage people, both legal and illegal immigration.

For many years, the old adage dealt with the fact that massive immigration translated into economic opportunity and economic power and growth. It turns out, study after study is now showing us, like so many other things that we believed to be true at one time or another, that is a myth. Massive immigration of low-skilled, low-wage people does not in fact create wealth, except for a few.

Specifically, those people who actually hire low-skilled, low-wage people and pay them low wages, it does provide for them a certain degree of profit. But for the rest of us, for the taxpayers of the country, massive immigration of low-wage, low-skilled workers creates a cost, a cost for housing, a cost for roads, hospitals, infrastructure costs which come about as a result of population growth. There is absolutely no way that the number of people coming here and taking those jobs, a lot of which of course are paid for sort of under the table in cash and we do not see any sort of cash revenues, but even those who come here and file fake Social Security numbers or get a tax identification number from the Internal Revenue Service and pay some taxes end up being a significant cost to the United States.

First of all, they pay little or no income taxes.

Secondly, they consume a great deal in terms of infrastructure costs.

Now there is another aspect. You have to admit, it is kind of a clever strategy.

□ 1945

There is a provision of our law called Earned Income Tax Credit that says if you do not make enough money during the course of a year, we will in turn give you extra dollars back to sort of make up for that low-wage kind of poverty cycle in which you may be stuck. This has already been identified by GAO and other studies as being one of the most fraud-ridden government programs. Billions of dollars every year are sent out to people who falsify documents in order to obtain their Earned Income Tax Credit.

It is not just American citizens who have figured this out and figured out a way to scam the taxpayers of the United States. It has become a big business for people who are here illegally.

Not too long ago, I had the opportunity to be observing the situation on the border in Arizona. We went through an area where there were a number of these things called pickup sites. Pickup sites are places in which illegal immigrants gather for the purpose of being picked up like these folks, the unfortunate folks in Victoria, Texas. They were picked up at a certain location by a big truck, in this case a semi, and driven into the interior of the United States.

These pickup sites, these places where all these folks gather, are all around the American Southwest. They become trash heaps after a while because, after a while, literally thousands of people will actually gather there. They throw everything around. They throw their trash and their water bottles and everything else out there.

We were walking through one of these pickup sites not too far from Douglas, Arizona. I looked down, and I saw this, actually this copy of an IRS tax return document enclosed, it says. I picked it up, because this was an odd thing to be there in the trash pile in a place where only illegal aliens gather.

This particular form is an Earned Income Tax Credit form that was filed by Mr. and Mrs. Delgado, Mr. Delgado who is here apparently illegally. As I say, this is a place, a site for people who are here illegally. Mr. Delgado claimed that he paid $64.12 in total Federal income tax, and he claimed $3,581 in Earned Income Tax Credit.

We know this is happening. We also know, as a matter of fact, that the IRS is so interested in making sure that even if you are here illegally that you benefit by your status that if you have used a fake Social Security number to get the job you have because you are here illegally and file an income tax form with a request for an Earned Income Tax Credit, the IRS will actually send you back a letter that says, your Social Security number is inaccurate. So, therefore, we have assigned you a tax identification number, and here is your check. Here is your Earned Income Tax Credit.

It is a great scam. As I say, millions of American citizens take advantage of the lax enforcement procedures attendant to Earned Income Tax Credit, and so do illegal aliens by the thousands,

maybe by the hundreds of thousands. We are really not sure, but it is certainly something that we know happens and happens a lot.

So when we talk about the costs of illegal immigration into the United States, we have to really and truly consider the fact that these costs are more than just the jobs that are taken.

Let us talk about the jobs issue for just a moment. We passed a bill in the House. It has gone to the Senate. It is going to come back to us in the form of a conference report, perhaps. There is a great deal of attention being paid to this particular piece of legislation. It started out and it was referred to as a tax cut bill. I still think of it as that, but we now talk about it as a jobs creation package, because the purpose of it is to stimulate the economy, to provide more dollars for employers to hire more people, to invest in their own plant and equipment. And I believe it will.

I certainly supported the legislation. It is interesting to me to note that various economists come in and tell us how many jobs will be created by the different levels of tax cuts that we propose. It is several hundred thousand for this one, 100 and some thousand jobs for this one. I always think to myself, there are between 13 and 20 million jobs we could create instantaneously for American citizens, and that is, of course, we could deport people who are living here illegally, which is exactly what we should do.

That is what should happen to someone who is here illegally. They should be deported. Anyone who hires someone who is here illegally should be fined. There is a law that says you cannot hire people who are here illegally. We all know that it goes on constantly, and we all know for the most part everybody sort of turns a blind eye to it.

It is fascinating that we spend an enormous amount of time, energy and resources in the discussion of exactly how many jobs we need to create by tax cuts, and again I am all for it, but we ignore the fact that there are millions of Americans who are looking for work and they are looking for work in places where the jobs have been taken by people who are here illegally.

I hear all the time about people who are here taking jobs that only they would take, that no other American would take, that no citizen would take. Maybe those jobs really exist. Maybe all of the American citizens out of work from whom I hear, by the way, are people who really would not go do the hard labor that is done by illegal immigrants.

I suggest that it is not true. I suggest, and there is plenty of anecdotal evidence to lead me to the conclusion that, in fact, Americans are ready, willing and quite able to take the jobs that are being held, low-skilled, low-wage worker jobs that are being held by illegals.

As evidence of that, I can remember an article that appeared in the Rocky Mountain News, oh, several months ago now. It was about a restaurant in Denver called the Luna Restaurant. It is a Mexican restaurant. I have had occasion to visit and had a great meal there a couple of times. The article in the paper, interestingly, was about an ad that had been placed by the restaurant in the paper, an ad for a waiter, a $3-an-hour waiter, the type of job that we are always told no American would do. The reason that that ad turned into a story in the paper is because the Luna Restaurant received 600 applicants in one day for that job. Maybe, it is possible, of course, that all 600 people who applied were illegal aliens and that every American citizen who looked at that ad said, no, that is below me. I'm not going to apply for that job.

It is really not within the realm of possibility. I really do not think it happened, Mr. Speaker. I really believe that a lot of the people who applied for that job were American citizens, lived here all their lives or came here legally and I think should have had the first shot at that job, frankly.

But let us say that there is that need out there for low-skilled, low-wage workers and that need cannot be supplied by American citizens, that we have all become too spoiled.

Let us go to the next level of unemployment that we face in this country. It is called the high-tech industry. We all know, especially Members from California recognize fully well the enormous change that has occurred in that industry, the shake-out in the industry, if you will, the number of firms that have gone under and the many, many thousands and thousands, in fact, millions of people who have been thrown out of work in that industry. Several live in my neighborhood. Thousands live in my district.

We run a program in this country, an immigration program referred to as H1B. H1B immigrants are different in many respects than other people we let into the country legally in that we say that these folks have skills that are so unique that we will give a certain amount, in this case 150,000 a year, of these particular H1B visas because these are given to people with certain skills, high-tech skills that we again, quote, can't find Americans that would qualify.

We have had this program operating for, oh, 5 or 6 years, I think, longer than that; and every year we have been bringing in 100-, 150,000 of these folks. They do not go home. They are supposed to go home when their job ends or after a certain period of time, but they do not go home. The INS tells us that they have absolutely no idea how many are still here but probably close to 90 percent of everybody who ever came. So we have well over 1 million people in the United States today who have come here with an H1B visa. That is a visa that allows them to displace an American worker.

Because even though the law is supposed to prevent someone from coming in here and replacing an American worker and paying this newcomer less money than the American would be paid, it happens all the time. Everybody knows it. Everybody knows that the employer will look for that individual, and these people have skills. They are competent for the most part. I am not saying they are not. So the employer gets somebody that they can get to work for less, and the American worker gets the unemployment line.

What is happening to the H1B visa? Are we going to abolish it? Not on your life. I certainly have a bill that would significantly reduce the numbers. I have no great hope that that bill will be heard or ever come to the floor. Why not, I guess I would ask? I do ask that question. Why not? What is there about our economy today, how many people are out there looking for a job who have all the skills necessary to be placed in that high-tech industry but, of course, their job has been taken by someone who is not an American citizen with an H1B visa? They are, some of them, here legally. Many of them have, of course, overstayed their visa and are now here illegally but they are still employed and still taking jobs away from American workers. Yet no one discusses that issue when we talk about jobs creation. I just wonder why.

I really know why. I just rhetorically wonder why we do not talk about it. There is an economic price to pay for massive immigration into the country.

I hope in the near future that we will get the courage in this body to actually engage in a debate, a full-blown debate on this concept of open borders. I would love to have a bill before us that says you have two choices, America. You either abolish the borders, take down the ports of entry, take back the Border Patrol and abandon it, let people do what libertarians in both this House and even in the administration want, and that is to have the free flow of goods and services and people without being impeded by borders.

That is one picture that people have. It is bizarre to me, but it is a picture that people have about what the world should look like in this century, a world without borders. I would very much like to have a debate as to whether or not that is the world we wish to live in, that is the future of this country, or a country that secures its borders by every means possible. Those are the two choices we really have. Because anything in between that leads us to where we are today. It leads us to a situation where you call something illegal, people can actually be arrested for violating the law, they seldom are, but they could be, but we all know that we do not really enforce the law that much, so we entice a lot of people to come into the United States illegally.

It is partially our fault. It is this government's fault that things like the incident in Victoria, Texas, occurred. Nineteen people die in the back of a trailer, one small child. Of course, hundreds of people are dead in the deserts

of America, in the Southwest. Hundreds of people die every year coming into this country. They do not do so quite as dramatically. We do not find them all in one place. We find bodies scattered throughout the Southwest and deserts, but this is what happens.

Also, on our side, people, of course, die in the defense of those borders.

□ 2000

Park rangers die. Border patrolmen die. This is a dangerous place to be. And yet we entice this movement of people by making it very or relatively easy to come into the country, yet still illegal. So people pay coyotes, people who bring them into the country; and they will pay them $1,000 or $1,500 to coming into the United States, and the coyotes will then oftentimes take advantage of the people. They are oftentimes robbed of their life's savings, the people coming across. The women are raped. They are thrown into the desert and they die.

It is a horrible situation on the border, and today we passed an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 that allowed the President of the United States, in fact, encouraged the President of the United States to place troops on the border. We passed that bill here before and it has always failed over on the Senate side. We will see what happens this year. But I suggest that that is exactly what we have to have in order to prevent the kinds of things that we see on the border, both to protect our own people, border patrol, the Forest Service personnel, park rangers, to protect them and also to protect and stop people from coming into this country illegally and, in fact, protecting them from some very bad things that could happen to them. So it is a lax border policy that encourages people to come and events like Victoria, Texas, to occur.

The other thing is that the Nation itself has to make a decision as to exactly what it wants to do, what kind of a policy it wants to have, whether or not we truly, as I say, want borders or we do not. Because if we make the decision that we want borders, then there are a whole bunch of other decisions that follow after that. How are we going to defend them? Are we going to make them secure? What are we going to do to people who violate our borders by coming in illegally? These are all very difficult questions, but they are questions this Nation has to begin to deal with because there are major implications to massive immigration combined with this cult of multiculturalism that permeates our society. It is a very dangerous combination. Massive immigration and the cult of multiculturalism. The country needs to make that kind of decision. It has to engage in that kind of debate.

It would be great, I think, if a Presidential candidate would enter into that debate, would bring it to the focus and the attention of the Nation and make people, all people running for office at every level, talk about how they feel about this issue, whether or not secure borders mean anything, whether or not massive immigration is an acceptable activity today, and whether or not we are going to have porous borders especially in light of the terrorist threat that exists in this country.

Let them explain to their constituency why open borders is a good idea. Let them explain why massive immigration even just in terms of the numbers anymore is justified. Let us talk about what is the need of this country. Is it for millions of low-skilled, low-wage workers every year? Is that what we need? If it is, okay, that is the kind of immigration policy we establish. We say, here is how many people can come into the country. Here are the skills that we need, that our country needs to make us a better country, to make the people living here have a better quality of life. That is what a rational immigration policy is.

Or, as I say, abandon the border. Forget the whole charade that we call immigration and immigration law because when we operate the kind of system that we are operating now, all we do is put people in harm's way. All we do is put our border patrol people and the people trying to come across that border illegally into very dangerous situations; but in fact we do not accomplish any of the goals that should be established for immigration. So if we do not believe in it, if we think that this is not a legitimate goal for the United States, if it is not a legitimate function of the government to say who comes and who goes, then just abandon the border. Defend that to the population. Go out to their constituents and explain to them this is their concept of America, an America where borders are no longer relevant, they are anachronisms and new maps should be drawn up that erase the borders. Go ahead and explain that because that is exactly where we are headed. We are heading there in a de facto way, not in a legal sense; but that is exactly where we are heading.

And as I say, Mr. Speaker, I believe there are major implications to that, and they deserve to be debated. And maybe I am 180 degrees off center here. Maybe I am completely wrong about my concerns with regard to open borders. But at least does it not deserve an honest debate in a very public forum and at the highest levels? Is it not an appropriate thing for Presidential candidates to discuss?

I would love to see, really, a very thorough discussion among the candidates running for both the Democratic primary and I wish the President of the United States would discuss it to a greater extent than he does. I would like to know exactly where all of these candidates stand, and so would people of this country, so would Americans like to know where their representatives stand on this issue. Today it is not all that clear because we can sort of take a powder on this by saying we have got this immigration policy and we will let them do their job but knowing full well that it is a total abject failure and that it is the worst of all possible worlds. It is a place into which we have put people who are, as I say, in great danger, and yet they actually are defending something we do not believe to be of great value, and, that is, the border.

I went down to Ajo, Arizona, not too long ago to attend a funeral, a funeral for a gentleman by the name of Kris Eggle. Kris Eggle was 28 years old. He was a park ranger. He was killed not too far from Ajo. He was killed by two illegal aliens who had come into the United States as part of a drug deal that went bad in Mexico. They had killed four people there. They came across the border. They confronted Mr. Eggle and killed him. And I went there with Mr. Eggle's father, and we stood at the very spot where Kris was killed, and this had been the fourth time that the father had visited that particular location. And that was hard even for me, and I cannot imagine how difficult it was for Mr. Eggle. But he does it, he said, and he will continue to go there to draw attention to the plight of the border, to draw attention to the fact that we have people like his son down there in great jeopardy but truly without the intent of having them defend our borders or else we would do what is necessary to protect them and the border. But we are fearful of it because there are political obstacles, political and cultural as Governor Ridge told us. When we asked him why we did not put troops on the border, he said there are political and cultural problems there. That is true. There are no two ways about it. It is an honest statement, an honest reflection. But I would suggest that it is not a good enough reason for not defending our own borders.

There are other very significant implications to massive immigration combined with the cult of multiculturalism, and I can save them for another evening. But I do want to encourage all of us, Mr. Speaker, to become acquainted with this matricula consular, this card that is being handed out. I want us to become acquainted with it because it is something that could be used to achieve the goal that we were able to block here sometime ago, and that is creating amnesty for everybody in this country illegally. It could be used eventually essentially to destroy the whole concept of citizenship. That is what it is designed to do, and it will do if we allow it to. So although I know the issue is somewhat esoteric and people become a little glazed over when we talk about things like matricula consular, it is nonetheless important, important for us to understand, important for our constituents to understand. So, therefore, I will continue to raise that issue as long as it is necessary.