

people move through a country, but when they reach the border of that country and cross it, it is called immigration, and when they do so without the permission of the host country to which they are coming, it is called illegal immigration.

Mr. Hernandez turned to me and the other two Members that were with me and said, Congressman, we are really not talking about two countries here. It is just a region. It is just a region. That was a very, very interesting statement, and a very candid one on his part. And that is what I appreciate about Mr. Hernandez. He was up front with us the whole time. He essentially agreed with the proposition that the United States public policy is. He understands it is made as a result of voting blocs. He wants public policy in the United States to change vis-a-vis Mexico. How do you do that?

Well, you have millions of people here in the United States who have cultural and linguistic ties to Mexico and who will vote for a policy shift in the United States. I mean, he was absolutely clear about it. This is not just some sort of, I do not know, hypothetical that he was talking about. It is not a conspiracy with deep, dark secrets. He was explaining exactly. It is a very logical political strategy if you think about it.

There was a time especially in Mexico that people leaving Mexico were thought of in derogatory and spoken of derogatorily as people who were abandoning their homes, but that has changed. But now they are encouraged, in fact, to do so, but remain connected somehow linguistically, politically to Mexico.

These are interesting facets of the problem we face, and they are part of what should be the debate that goes on in this body and throughout the country over whether or not we should eliminate borders. But if we are going to maintain borders, or at least the facade of a border, then it behooves us, I think, Mr. Speaker, to try and do everything we can to provide integrity to the process.

The first thing we need to do is abolish the INS or that portion of it that deals with enforcement. The first thing we need to do is create a brand new, a brand new agency. We can call it a lot of things. I would suggest that it would be something that would be attached to Governor Ridge's Office of Homeland Security. But whatever we do, we need a brand new structure, one that has a clear line of authority, that has a singleness of purpose, that is given the resources necessary.

We should take away the responsibility from Customs and from the Agricultural Department and all the other agencies that now get in each other's way essentially at the border trying to do their job which sometimes conflicts with the other agencies' jobs and makes it easier for people to come across the border here.

Here is another one of those amazing but true things I was telling you about

earlier, Mr. Speaker, another interesting point. Because we have so many different agencies handling our border security, they are assigned each one of stations that people are coming through in their cars. One may be run by Customs. One may be run by Agriculture. One may be run by INS, but each of them have different responsibilities, and different ways of dealing with the issue, and different questions they ask and different things they are looking for.

So people actually will sit on the hills observing this situation down on the border, people coming through; and they will watch through binoculars to see which line is being managed by which agencies. And if you are smuggling people in, you will want to come in through this line. And if you are smuggling drugs through, you will want to come through that line because they have a different sort of emphasis. Amazing, but true.

We have to stop that. We have to combine the agencies, take the responsibilities away and create a brand new one. That is not easy to do here. As you know, Mr. Speaker, this body and the government is not set up to allow tough issues to advance very far. Everybody gets very jealous, very, very guarded about their little kingdom, their little piece of the action here. So when recently Governor Ridge and his staff developed a white paper on border security, and it said that we needed to do exactly what I have just described, it said we must take all of these responsibilities away from the other agencies, we must create one new agency with a singleness of purpose, a clear line of authority and all the rest of it, it set off a firestorm of protest. I think that is the way the article characterized it, a firestorm of protests within the administration, within all the agencies that would be affected.

So we called over there. My office called the Office of Homeland Security; and we said, we were reading an article in the New York Times about this white paper. They said, we do not know what you are talking about. They are taking on the INS logo. I do not know. I am not sure. And we do not know. We said we are reading, we have a white paper that talks about how we should create the new border control agency. They said, no, no, it is all theoretical. Nothing is on paper. Of course, that is not true.

As a matter of fact, maybe I am breaking the news here to the Office of Homeland Security, but the paper is out. The media has it. The one you say does not exist exists. So you might as well 'fess up to it and let us get on with it. Let us try to do it regardless of whether or not the INS gets mad, regardless of whether or not the Department of Agriculture gets mad, regardless of whether or not Treasury gets upset because some sort of their little bailiwick will be affected. Who cares? Who cares?

The job of this body is not to protect any particular agency. The job of this

body is to protect the United States of America. And it is impossible to do in this way on the particular system we have created and it is being maintained.

So now we are seeing one or two bills that will come to the floor, and we will try to tinker with it and pretend the rest of it is not a problem. And if we separate the agency into the two parts, enforcement and social services, everything will be okay. But it will not, Mr. Speaker. It will not be okay at all.

The problems will remain, and what we will have done here so many times is create an illusion, created an illusion. We have fixed the problem with INS, we will say. It will not be fixed. People will still stream across the border illegally. Thousands upon thousands of people will be here. Right now there are at least 300,000 people who are here in this country who have been ordered deported. They have actually somehow gotten arrested.

Now, be sure and understand, Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about people who overstayed their visa and we somehow found out about it. I mean, the INS was out there doing their job and said, you know what? I think so-and-so may have overstayed their visa. Let us go find them. No. No. That is not what happened, of course.

What happened was so-and-so violated a law, broke a law, broke some other law. They violated one law because they overstayed their visa, but then many times they also robbed somebody, they raped somebody, they murdered somebody, whatever, but they have been found. They have been brought to trial.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to once again consider the importance of this issue of immigration reform and treat it with the respect that it deserves and do not just create another illusion.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2207

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR) at 10 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2356, CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 344, I hereby announce my intention that the following amendments be offered by the following designees: Amendment No. 10 to