

voice will be missed in this body, but never forgotten.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, It is with a heavy heart that I stand here today to honor the memory of a dear friend and respected colleague, FLOYD SPENCE. FLOYD was a patriot and a statesman who devoted his 30 years in Congress to securing America's defense and supporting our nation's veterans. As such, he was a well-known voice of experience and leadership on both the House Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs Committees, on which he proudly served for much of his career.

FLOYD assumed the powerful chairmanship of the Armed Services Committee when Republicans gained control of the Congress in 1995. He quickly proved himself a skilled chairman, pushing for and securing billions more in desperately needed defense funding when the Clinton Administration was seeking to gut the military to pay for the massive growth of government social programs. FLOYD helped to save and protect our national defense and laid the groundwork for the current drive to rebuild and redefine our defense capability to better respond to the challenges of the new century battlefield.

Winning tough battles was not uncommon for FLOYD. During his tenure, the gentleman from South Carolina was successful in instituting instrumental legislative initiatives while gaining the admiration and friendship of members from both sides of the aisle.

His quiet strength also got him through some very rough health challenges. Despite these problems, I never heard FLOYD complain. In fact, I can't recall him ever walking into a room without a smile and kind word.

FLOYD was a great American and a personal friend. I greatly value my days serving with him, especially on the Armed Services and VA Committees. He was a source of wisdom and counsel on difficult issues, and his presence in these hallowed halls will be sorely missed.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, also on the note earlier echoed by the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. BUYER, we will miss FLOYD but he has made us all richer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF THE LATE HONORABLE FLOYD SPENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, August 2, 2001, the Speaker on Tuesday, August 21, 2001, appointed the following Members to attend the funeral of the late Honorable FLOYD SPENCE:

Mr. SPRATT of South Carolina;
Mr. HASTERT of Illinois;
Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma;
Mr. CLYBURN of South Carolina;
Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina;
Mr. DEMINT of South Carolina;
Mr. BROWN of South Carolina;

Mr. YOUNG of Florida;
Mr. HUNTER of California;
Mr. SAXTON of New Jersey;
Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado;
Mr. McNULTY of New York;
Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland;
Mr. MCHUGH of New York;
Mr. CHAMBLISS of Georgia.

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.

CURRENT IMMIGRATION ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first let me offer my deep appreciation and sympathy, appreciation for FLOYD SPENCE's life and sympathy to his family.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that we have been expecting new immigration agreements to be announced when the Mexican President, Vicente Fox, visits Washington this week. Instead, we have the White House issuing a statement that they expect a comprehensive U.S.-Mexico immigration reform package in the next 4 to 6 years.

Since their elections last year, both President Fox and President Bush have pressed immigration to the top of their agendas. President Bush has stated that he is willing to embrace a more inclusive vision of America, one that would welcome the talents and contributions of immigrant communities all over this Nation, hardworking, tax-paying immigrants coming from places as far away as Poland, England, Brazil, Guatemala, Singapore and other places that people would be interested in coming to the United States.

It is disappointing that both Presidents believe that reform will take so long to broker. Immigration is extremely complex; however, we cannot delay dealing with the issues involved. The time has come to bring these people out of the shadows and allow them to bask in the sunlight of mainstream American life. The time has come to educate the American people, to make them stakeholders in improving the lives of all Americans and those who access the American dream. Given the momentum the two Presidents have generated up until now and given the expectations, if they do not take advantage at this moment, they will have missed an historic opportunity.

By pushing back a reform in immigration policy, President Bush is losing sight of the millions of hardworking, tax-paying immigrants who have lived in this country for a number of years

and have contributed to the economic prosperity of our Nation. What the White House is doing with our immigrant community is nothing more than gesturing, lip service designed to attract badly needed Hispanic support to the Republican fold. We cannot wait 4 to 6 years for real immigration reform. The time has come for a change in U.S. immigration policy.

The Democratic Principles on Immigration provides this necessary immigration reform by rectifying current problems in immigration policy. The principles of the statement are family reunification, earned access to legalization, border safety and protection, enhanced temporary worker program, and ending unfair discrimination against legal immigrants.

A policy based on these five principles will bring stability to the lives of millions of people. In addition to strengthening the national economy, such a policy would honor family values, reward hard work, provide worker protections and enhance civil rights. It would also benefit people who have come to the United States from every corner of the globe. Any new program to expand the number of guest workers in the U.S. should be considered only after hardworking, tax-paying immigrants already in this country are legalized and it must provide guest workers with full labor and civil rights and a clear path to legalization.

Furthermore, the Statement of Immigration Principles reflects the Democratic Caucus philosophy and core values of family reunification, bringing mothers and fathers together, families with children, fundamental fairness and economic opportunity. Furthermore, the immigration principles stand by the people who fuel the economic engine that drives the American economy and the people who play a vital role in our communities and culture. America's immigrants need redemption for what our Nation's policies have forced them to go through and Americans who are already here need to be recognized that they too need job training and enhanced economic opportunity. We do not separate the immigrant community from our hardworking Americans as well.

We need to empower our immigrant communities so that they can earn a living wage that will help provide for their families. By doing so, we are giving hardworking immigrants the chance to become permanent members of our society rather than continuing to treat them like second-class citizens. If President Bush is serious about immigration policy, I wish to join him as the ranking member on the immigration committee. He needs to remember that immigrants helped build this Nation and that they too are a part of our Nation's prosperity. We must stop the antiimmigration forces in the Republican Party and elsewhere

and begin to work together and build America together. Four to six years is absolutely too long.

And if we are to improve our immigration policy, we must restructure the INS, an agency with conflicting priorities and mission overload. Thousands of individuals can attest to the unclear lines of accountability and poor intra-agency communication and coordination and the enormous backlogs. Talk to any Member of Congress and find out how many years and hours and days that they wait in order to access immigration services for their constituents, people who actually want to access legalization and do the right thing. Customers are frustrated. There is no doubt that the INS needs to be restructured because it lacks good customer service.

I have introduced the Immigration Restructuring and Accountability Act of 2001, H.R. 1562, which includes the objectives of improving accountability and performance. It creates a proper balance between enforcement and services. To achieve the goal of restructuring and reorganizing the immigration function fairly, effectively and efficiently, H.R. 1562 replaces the current INS with two new and clear subordinate entities, one for immigration services and one for law enforcement, within one agency. H.R. 1562 separates the enforcement and service functions of the INS into the Bureau of Immigration Services and the Bureau of Immigration Enforcement. Services and enforcement would have separate and clear lines of authority at all levels, from field to headquarters, so current INS regional and district offices would be eliminated and replaced with separate networks of immigration services and enforcement area local offices.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as I close, let me simply say, we have got to address this question head-on, help our hard-working immigrants, and restructure the INS. That is a real policy. I ask for President Fox and President Bush to ensure that we work together.

There is no question that we have been expecting new immigration agreements to be announced when the Mexican President, Vicente Fox, visits Washington this week. Instead, we have the White House issuing a statement that they expect a comprehensive U.S.-Mexico immigration reform package in the next four to six years.

Since their elections last year, Fox and Bush have pressed immigration to the top of their agendas. President Bush has stated that he is willing to embrace a more inclusive vision of America, one that would welcome the talents and contributions of immigrant communities.

It is disappointing that both Presidents believe that reform will take so long to broker. Immigration is extremely complex; however we cannot delay dealing with the issues involved. The time has come to bring these people out of the shadows and allow them to bask in the sunlight of mainstream American life. Given

the momentum the two presidents have generated up until now, and given the expectations, if they don't take advantage at this moment, they will have missed an historic opportunity.

By pushing back a reform in immigration policy, President Bush is losing sight of the millions of hardworking, tax paying immigrants who have lived in this country for a number of years and have contributed to the economic prosperity of our nation.

What the White House is doing with our immigrant community is nothing more than gesturing—lip service designed to attract badly-needed Hispanic support to the Republican fold.

We cannot wait four to six years for real immigration reform. The time has come for a change in U.S. immigration policy.

The Democratic Principles on Immigration provides this necessary immigration reform by rectifying current problems in immigration policy. The main principles of the Statement are family reunification, earned access to legalization, border safety and protection, enhanced temporary worker program, and ending unfair discrimination against legal immigrants.

A policy based on these five principles would bring stability to the lives of millions of people. In addition to strengthening the national economy, such a policy would honor family values; reward hard work; provide worker protections; and enhance civil rights. It would also benefit people who have come to the U.S. from every corner of the globe.

Any new program to expand the number of guest workers in the U.S. should be considered only after hard working, tax-paying immigrants already in this country are legalized—and it must provide guest workers with full labor and civil rights and a clear path to legalization.

Furthermore, the Statement of Immigration Principles reflects the Democratic Caucus philosophy and core values of family reunification, fundamental fairness and economic opportunity. Furthermore, the immigration principles stand by the people who fuel the economic engine that drives the American economy and the people that play a vital role in our communities and culture. America's immigrants need redemption for what our nation's policies has forced them to go through.

We need to empower our immigrant communities so they can earn a living wage that will help provide for their families. By doing so, we are giving hard-working immigrants the chance to become permanent members of our society rather than continuing to treat them like second class citizens.

If President Bush is serious about immigration policy, he needs to remember that immigrants helped build this nation and that they too are a part of our nation's prosperity. The anti-immigration forces in the Republican Party should not dictate the future of millions of hard-working men and women seeking better opportunities.

We cannot wait four to six years to lead to a positive, fair and meaningful difference in the lives of these millions of hard-working families is too long. Current immigration policies must be recrafted as soon as possible to reflect our core values of family unity, fundamental fairness, and economic opportunity.

Consequently, the Democrats will fortunate the Statement of Immigration Principles into legislation.

In addition to reforming our immigration policy, Congress must address the much needed restructuring of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Despite the fact that INS has experienced a significant expansion in its budget and staff, the Agency continues to be the most mismanaged agency in the US government.

INS is an agency with conflicting priorities and mission overload. Thousands of individuals can attest to the exacerbation of unclear lines of accountability and poor intra-agency communications and coordination. One result has been for the Agency to allow lengthy backlogs to develop for processing matters such as citizenship applications, visas, and a host of other immigration benefits.

There are accounts of delayed cases that cause two and three fingerprint clearances, lost files, mistaken information on the computer that causes INS to believe that a person is naturalized when they are not. Others account extreme delays in inputting fingerprint clearances in the computer so that applicants can be interviewed and delays in Service Centers sending files to District Offices. Unbelievable to many is the fact that INS sends receipts to inform applicants of the time frame which their application should be adjudicated; however, these time frames are frequently, if not almost always, wrong.

Furthermore, the Agency lacks good customer service. Many INS offices around the country are understaffed and the staff is inefficient and mismanaged. In addition, there is an obvious lack of training that most employees receive.

There is no end to the frustration felt by customers.

There is no doubt that INS needs to be restructured. The INS must dedicate itself to changing the manner in which it addresses the needs of people who require, deserve and pay for—in the form of fees and taxes—the services that it is charged with fulfilling.

What remains in question is when will we restructure INS and how will we restructure the agency? The first question has a simple response. Restructuring is long overdue. We need to commence restructuring immediately.

As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, I have introduced legislation of how INS should be restructured. This legislation, the Immigration Restructuring and Accountability Act of 2001 (H.R. 1562), includes the objectives of improving accountability and performance. Furthermore, it creates a proper balance between enforcement and services. It also provides an effective way to direct, coordinate, and integrate enforcement and service functions.

To achieve the goal of restructuring and reorganizing the immigration function fairly, effectively, and efficiently, H.R. 1562 replaces the current INS with two new and clear subordinate entities—one for immigration services and one for law enforcement—within one agency. H.R. 1562 separates the enforcement and service functions of INS into the Bureau of Immigration Services and the Bureau of Immigration Enforcement. Services and enforcement would have separate and clear lines of

authority at all levels, from the field to headquarters. So current INS regional and district offices would be eliminated and replaced with separate networks of immigration services and enforcement area local offices. Not only will restructuring in this manner enhance enforcement of the Nation's immigration laws and improve the delivery of services, but it will greatly improve the ability of the INS to perform its duties effectively and efficiently and will increase accountability.

In addition, a strong, centralized leadership for immigration policy-making and implementation would be created. This position would be within the Department of Justice and called the Associate Attorney General for Immigration Affairs. This single voice is needed at the top to coordinate policy matters and interpret complex laws in both enforcement and adjudications, so as to ensure accountability and effective implementation.

The single executive would report to the Attorney General and be responsible for (1) integrating immigration policy and management operations within the Department of Justice, (including coordinating policy-making and planning between offices so as to ensure efficiencies and effectiveness that result from shared infrastructure and unified implementation of the law); (2) maintaining the crucial balance between enforcement and services; and (3) ensuring a coherent national immigration policy. It is crucial that a single, high-level Department official speak for the Executive branch on matters involving immigration policy and that this official have the authority to direct and manage our immigration system to ensure that immigration policy and management is fully integrated and coordinated.

H.R. 1562 also mandates that immigration enforcement and services functions must be supported by a set of shared services, including records, technology, training, and other management functions.

Finally, it is important that the service/adjudication as well as the enforcement function is fully funded. All offices need to have stable and predictable sources of funding. Appropriated funds must supplement user fees so as to improve customer service, offset the costs of those adjudications for which no fees are charged, and fund all costs not directly related to the adjudication of fee based applications.

I urge my United States House of Representative colleagues adopt this legislation. The INS desperately needs restructuring. We must continue to fight to solicit not only promises of better services from the INS, but actual, better service. We must compel the agency to redouble its efforts to assist immigrants rather than simply increase the fees that it imposes on its customers.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk for just a couple of minutes following the eulogy and the little memorial discussion that we had with respect to our old friend FLOYD SPENCE

who really represented the idea that you needed to have a strong national defense to maintain all of our other freedoms and who dedicated his career as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and ultimately the chairman of the committee to national defense.

I thought that the best service we could render to FLOYD right now would be to remind our colleagues that we still have a lot of work to do with respect to national defense. We are still short on ammunition, measurably short. We are \$3 billion short in terms of the Army's requirements and several hundred million dollars short with respect to the Marine Corps. We are still vastly short on ammunition. Spare parts, we have now cannibalization taking place across the array of front line aircraft, the front line fighter. I am talking about F-15s, F-15Es and F-16s. Their mission-capable rates are dropping off the cliff, meaning that they now are not as ready as they used to be to be able to go out and do their mission and come back.

We still have personnel problems. We are still some 800-plus pilots short in the United States Air Force and across the services. We have lots of personnel shortages.

□ 1945

So we have a need, Mr. Speaker, to spend about an additional \$50 billion per year on top of what we are spending right now. I would remind my colleagues we are spending roughly \$125 billion a year less than the Reagan administration did in the mid-1980s in real dollars.

So I think that the best service we can do to FLOYD's memory is to carry the flag that he carried, which is to remind our colleagues that we need to preserve a strong national defense.

I would yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), a good friend, a former member of the Committee on Armed Services, a veteran, and a veteran of the Gulf War, and a person who believes in defense.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When the gentleman comes up with his \$50 billion number, what he did not mention, and I ask him to elaborate a little bit, is on the question of deferred maintenance. When one looks at this past decade of the 1990s, in the post-Reagan buildup, we began to use a lot of the equipment, use those maintenance facilities, and now the bill is coming due, is it not?

Mr. HUNTER. That is absolutely right. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is going to speak later on on this trip that he took across the bases in this country and reviewing all of the deferred maintenance, the potholes on the runways, the repair on aircraft, but also the infrastructure maintenance, just keeping

our buildings in good shape, keeping military housing in good shape.

When we would have to go to a mission, let us say to a Bosnia or another place, another operations area, instead of the administration, then the Clinton administration, asking for more money from Congress, they would simply reach into the cash register and take out money that was going to be used for maintenance.

So having used that money and not replaced it, when the services looked for money to be able to repair their old buildings, repair their runways, furnish spare parts, it was not there.

Mr. BUYER. When I look back now at the 1990s, I say as Congress sought to react to some of the personnel problems, we repealed the reduction, we reformed the retirement system, we made reforms in the pay tables, we increased military pay, we addressed the health care, we addressed the food stamp issue, so we focused a lot on personnel and people.

Now we need to focus on all that deferred maintenance that is going to come crashing down upon us. And shame on us if we do not focus on it, because the gentleman is absolutely right, it is the water lines, it is the pipes, it is the roofs, it is the equipment, it is the automobiles, and the list goes on and on. I am most hopeful that it is something that the administration will be leaning forward on.

Mr. HUNTER. I hope the administration works with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction in the Committee on Armed Services to come up with some new ways to buy military housing for military families, because, as the gentleman knows, a lot of that housing is 20, 30, 40, 50 years old; and in a lot of places around the country our young families do not have housing available on the bases. There is not housing. They have to go out on the economy, and in places like San Diego you are looking at \$1,000, \$1,200 a month for the smallest amounts. So we have some major problems to fix, and that means money.

Mr. BUYER. The gentleman is bringing a defense bill to the floor next week. What are the major themes of that defense bill?

Mr. HUNTER. We are going to try to do a lot of things with what we have, with the \$18 billion in extra spending that we anticipate this year above and beyond what we call the "Clinton baseline." But that \$18 billion, once again, does not come close to solving the equipment problem, which is about a \$30-billion-per-year problem, solving the ammunition problems, the people problems, the other problems we have across the board. We are going to do as much as we can.