Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to 10 U.S.C 4355(a), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy:

Mrs. TAUSCHER of California.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. CUMMINGS 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. COBLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. COBLE 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO 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 New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE 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 Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois 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 Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I will assure those Members, and especially the staff here this evening, that I will give them something to look forward to, and that is that we will probably not go half the time available to me, but I do appreciate the opportunity.

I wanted to address an issue of concern to me, and it is an issue that I have risen before to discuss here on the floor of the House and I think certainly deserves our attention again this evening, and that issue is immigration, and specifically the problems created by massive numbers of people coming into the United States illegally.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, a trial balloon was floated. It was floated by a working group that was appointed for the purpose of coming up with some proposals to deal with the issues of immigration, illegal immigration to the United States, and a variety of other related issues. That trial balloon was a proposal, and the proposal was to provide amnesty for up to 3½ million Mexican workers.

Now, I say it is specifically designed for Mexicans who are here in the United States. It is not Guatemalans, it is not Haitians, it is not any other nationality, it was for 3½ million Mexican people here in the United States illegally, and it was to essentially just give them amnesty if they had been here a long enough period of time. Well, that trial balloon was met with a great deal of resistance, to say the least. Certainly our office received many, many calls. I am sure the offices of many Members of the House and Senate were similarly affected by this trial balloon, and the response was almost unanimously in opposition to such a proposal.

There is a basic fairness issue here, a fairness issue that I think most Americans see. And it does not matter how one feels about the whole issue of immigration in general, those who are pro-immigrant, as I think most of us are. As a matter of fact, I think all of us have to be very cognizant of and very sensitive to the fact that we are all here as a result of someone's decision to come to the United States at some time in the recent past. Even those of us in the country who identify themselves as Native American probably came here, their ancestors, over a land bridge from Asia. So we are all in one way or another immigrants to this country.

The issue of immigration in general is not the point in this case. The point in this case is whether or not we are going to simply ignore the fact that people have chosen to violate the law of the United States to come here and then be rewarded for that action by being given amnesty. Now, we recognize that that, as I say, is at least unfair. I think most people would agree that it offends their sense of justice. And it should. It should.

What would happen if we would suggest that any other kind of crime be treated in such a manner? If someone comes here, if they were in the United States and involved with some criminal activity, and for a long enough period of time and they did not get caught, would we simply say, King's X, it is okay, they were able to avoid the authority long enough, so we should give them amnesty? Well, we do not do that. Of course not. And we should not do that in this case, and I think a majority of Americans feel the same way.

Well, as a result of the kind of reaction that that proposal had, we saw that today another proposal has been floated. This one is designed to be a ''compromise proposal,'' and it says, all right, we will not just go ahead and grant three, four million people, and by the way it will be far more than that when all is said and done, but let us just take their numbers for the time being, we will not grant three to four million people amnesty who are here illegally just because they are here illegally, we will establish some sort of guest worker program into which these people can enroll and then we will grant them amnesty.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is really not a compromise. That is really not something anybody can get too excited about and say, oh, in that case, absolutely, all right, I see that it is worthy of doing. It is, of course, exactly the same proposal. We are simply going to reward illegal behavior by providing amnesty if they have been here long enough.

The other interesting aspect of this whole thing, Mr. Speaker, is that we have tried this before. The idea of giving amnesty to people who are here illegally and who have been here for a long time, or some period of time anyway, and can prove that they have paid rent here or a variety of other criteria that we establish to determine how long someone is here illegally, has been tried before. In 1986, we did this, exactly the same plan, and it was a result of the fact that people were concerned about the massive number of people who were coming across our borders illegally. And in order to get a handle on that and to strike a compromise with people who want massive immigration, people who essentially frankly want to essentially erase the borders, in order to strike a compromise with them and to not look as though we were being too antagonistic to these people who have arrived here and come in here illegally, we decided to have an amnesty program.

That was 1986. We adopted exactly the same thing. And it was designed to stop the flow of illegal aliens into the country. At that point we were going to get a handle on it and say, okay, if someone is here, if they have been here a long time, we are going to give them amnesty. Eventually they can become a citizen of the United States, even though they broke our laws to get here.

Well, of course it did not work. As anyone may have guessed, to suggest