

School has offered the students of IHM the opportunity to continue striving for academic excellence in a Catholic environment right next door. These two high schools have always shared a special relationship in which students from both schools have shared some specialized classes and extracurricular activities. As a result of this relationship, the transition into creating a co-educational environment should be relatively smooth. For any of the remaining 238 students who choose not to attend St. Joseph High School in a co-educational environment, IHM officials and counselors will help them and their parents to choose an alternative school.

Although IHM is closing its doors, it has left an indelible mark on today's world through the actions and successes of its graduates. It will be sorely missed by the community and by the entire Illinois 7th Congressional District.

THE LANGUAGE OF IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Georgia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, as children we are taught the phrase "sticks and stones will break my bones, but words will never hurt me." I can tell my colleagues that the same rule does not apply to politics. The easiest way to kill an initiative is to apply an unpopular label to it, whether it fits or not.

Opponents of meaningful education reform know they can kill it by calling it "vouchers." Those who do not want Social Security reform can poison the well by calling it "privatization." It is easy to repeal the "death tax," but it is more difficult to get rid of the "estate tax."

In a similar vein, critics of the President's immigration reform plan are trying desperately to kill it by attaching the dreaded "amnesty" label to it. These critics would do well to heed another childhood axiom that applies very much to politics: "You can't throw mud without getting it all over yourselves."

Under the President's immigration initiative, which largely mirrors the legislation that I have introduced along with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and Senator MCCAIN, those who are here illegally would have the opportunity to stay as temporary workers provided they pay a fine and have no criminal record. Those seeking to become U.S. citizens would not be given preference over those going through the legal, orderly process in their own countries.

Now, according to the critics of the President's plan, this represents amnesty, because those who enter the country illegally would be allowed to stay for a period of time, even if they pay a fine and go to the back of the

line. Now, the President's critics are welcome to use this broad definition of amnesty, but they should be aware that it applies to their own plans as well.

Noticeably absent from any proposal advanced by the President's critics is a plan to deport the estimated 8 million to 10 million illegal aliens who are currently in the U.S. workforce. Much is said about deporting criminal aliens, who number some 400,000; but if you are an otherwise law-abiding alien worker, you are apparently safe from deportation. Now, if you are wondering how this is any less of an amnesty than what the President is proposing, you are not alone.

The irony is for those searching for a get-tough policy, the President is offering a far more serious approach than that of his critics. Under the President's approach, after a date certain, every illegal alien currently working in the United States would have to be registered as a temporary worker in order to continue in his or her job. Severe employer sanctions would be leveled against employers who hire unregistered workers beyond that point, and every employer would, at long last, be given the tools to immediately ascertain who is here legally and who is not.

Contrast this with what appears to be the critics' approach: employers would be given the tools to ascertain the legal status of workers or new hires, but apparently would not be required to check the status of current employees. To do so would reveal the presence of some 8 million to 10 million undocumented workers that not even the President's critics have the stomach to deport.

Our current situation is this: we have millions of illegal aliens here in the United States who are a part of our workforce. We can pretend that these workers do not exist, but that will not make them go away. The call to "enforce our current laws" makes for good rhetoric, but it would require rounding up all undocumented workers and shipping them home, which makes it just that: rhetoric. Let me repeat, not even the President's critics are saying that we should round up all illegal aliens and workers and ship them home.

So that leaves us with just two options. We can continue with a wink and a nod to allow illegal aliens to enter the workforce with fraudulent identification and live in the shadows. If we thought this was acceptable prior to 9/11, we know it is certainly not today. Alternatively, we can create a legal, regulated framework under which workers can be hired and retained, as the President has proposed.

Now, those who question whether or not we can follow through and enforce the new law with severe employer sanctions have a right to be skeptical after what happened after the last round of major changes to immigration law in 1986 when we failed to address the future need for workers. The only certainty here is that we cannot afford to

continue with the status quo. And failing to acknowledge that we need a temporary worker program, like we failed to do after 1986, simply ensures that the status quo continues.

Mr. Speaker, all of the name-calling in the world will not change that reality.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, 109TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I hereby submit the rules of the Committee on the Judiciary for the 109th Congress for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These rules were adopted by the Committee on January 26, in a meeting that was open to the public.

RULES OF PROCEDURE

RULE I.

The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on the Judiciary and its Subcommittees with the following specific additions thereto.

RULE II. COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee on the Judiciary for the conduct of its business shall be on Tuesday of each week while the House is in session.

(b) Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman and a regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with when, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need therefor.

(c) At least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays when the House is not in session) before each scheduled Committee or Subcommittee meeting, each Member of the Committee or Subcommittee shall be furnished a list of the bill(s) and subject(s) to be considered and/or acted upon at the meeting. Bills or subjects not listed shall be subject to a point of order unless their consideration is agreed to by a two-thirds vote of the Committee or Subcommittee.

(d) The Chairman, with such notice to the Ranking Minority Member as is practicable, may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(e) Committee and Subcommittee meetings for the transaction of business, i.e. meetings other than those held for the purpose of taking testimony, shall be open to the public except when the Committee or Subcommittee determines by majority vote to close the meeting because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House.

(f) Every motion made to the Committee and entertained by the Chairman shall be reduced to writing upon demand of any Member, and a copy made available to each Member present.

(g) For purposes of taking any action at a meeting of the full Committee or any Subcommittee thereof, a quorum shall be constituted by the presence of not less than one-third of the Members of the Committee or