

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times on this floor concerning the need to secure our borders. We must do so if we are going to have any kind of responsible immigration policy and retain our national sovereignty. We know with somewhere between 36,000 and 50,000 additional enforcement personnel on our southern borders, we can catch virtually all of the potential terrorists and drug dealers trying to enter this country illegally.

But we now find that other-than-Mexican illegals, or OTMs as they are referred to by our Border Patrol, have discovered a large loophole in our law. Under this loophole, OTMs can cross our border illegally and be apprehended by our border patrol. The border patrol is then forced to give them paperwork allowing them to bypass all other immigration checkpoints and virtually release them into our country.

This criminal scheme is not the fault of some quirk in U.S. law. It is being forced on our border patrol by international law which we are allowing to undermine our rule of law, national immigration policy, our Constitution, and our sovereignty. International law says illegal immigrants must either be deported to their country of origin or placed in detention. If there is no room in detention, they must be released on bail with a promise that they return later for trial.

There is never any room in detention any more for the millions of illegals violating our southern border every year. And since these illegals are not Mexican, our border patrol is required to buy them airfare back to Brazil, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, China, Iraq, and on and on. So they sign an agreement to show in court in 30 days and are released.

With that paper in hand, they can pass legally through all other border patrol checkpoints and vanish into cities in America. We have caught 90,000 OTMs since October 1, 2004, and 98 percent have failed to show back up in court. Once hidden in large immigration communities inside our country with new false identification, it becomes virtually impossible to apprehend them.

Mr. Speaker, I have stood here before and called for deploying 36,000 troops to our border to effectively close it. But with this situation in place, we could send 1 million troops to our borders, and it would not make any difference. Border patrol says these people swim across the Rio Grande and come looking for our officers with a demand "permiso," for the warrant that gives them a free pass into our Nation illegally.

Mr. Speaker, we need a new law right now. Anyone who crosses our border with Mexico illegally should be considered a citizen of Mexico for enforcement purposes. They should be returned there or incarcerated here immediately. This is not the United Nations or WTO. We represent the people

of our districts. We are responsible to the people of the United States and are sworn to defend our Constitution. We have an inherent God-given right to national sovereignty, and this House must not stand by while foreign nations undermine our laws and our independence.

Mr. Speaker, I will be back next week to further this conversation.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SMART SECURITY

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 12 at Fort Hood, Texas, President Bush told an audience of thousands of servicemembers that for the first time Iraqi soldiers outnumbered U.S. soldiers in Iraq. That was April 12. Specifically, he put the number of trained and equipped Iraqi forces at 150,000.

This rosy assessment of the situation in Iraq is shocking not only for its arrogance but also for its ignorance. The President was either totally oblivious to Iraq's true security failures, or he was intentionally misleading the American people into thinking peace has taken hold. His statement was uninformed at best, deceitful at worst. Either way, the President's assessment misleads the American people in knowing the true situation in Iraq.

Take, for example, his claim that 150,000 Iraqi soldiers have been trained. Iraq's military leaders reveal the number is closer to 75,000, half of the President's statement; and we are not sure what the quality of training is and how those trained individuals are measured.

Also, the actual number of trained security personnel committed to a secure and democratic Iraq is probably less because, as the chief of police in Basra, General Hassan al-Sade stated, at least half of his 14,000-member militia is openly opposed to a secure Iraq, and another quarter are politically neutral but do not follow his military orders. General al-Sade recently told the Guardian newspaper, "I trust 25 percent of my force, no more."

After giving his Fort Hood speech last April, the President never again

mentioned that 150,000 Iraqi security personnel have been trained. Perhaps that is because he realized his assessment was entirely inaccurate; but the President never admitted to the American people that he was wrong in his assessment, and he has still not told the American people when he will determine Iraq to be secure or how and when he plans to bring the troops home.

Mr. Speaker, the best way to secure Iraq is to remove U.S. troops from the country. Nothing enrages and unites the Iraq insurgency more than the presence of nearly 150,000 American soldiers on Iraqi soil. One option is to bring one American soldier home for every Iraqi soldier that has been trained. If 75,000 Iraqi soldiers have been trained, half of the President's April 12 assessment, why can we not remove the same number of our own soldiers and bring them home? This is just one idea for exiting Iraq. I encourage the President to come up with his own plan. I am not against supporting the President's plan if it is a good one, but right now he does not even have a plan.

Fortunately, there is a plan that would secure America for the future, SMART security. SMART is Sensible, Multilateral, American Response to Terrorism for the 21st century.

□ 1415

SMART will help us address the threats we face as a Nation. SMART security will prevent acts of terrorism in countries like Iraq by addressing the very conditions which allow terrorism to take root: poverty, despair, resource scarcity and lack of educational opportunities. SMART security encourages the United States to work with other nations to address pressing global issues. SMART addresses global crises diplomatically rather than resorting to armed conflict. Efforts to help give Iraq back to the Iraqis must follow the SMART approach: humanitarian assistance, coordinated with our international allies, to rebuild Iraq's war-torn physical and economic infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 2 years since the United States started this war in Iraq; and now the American people, especially the soldiers who are bravely serving our country halfway around the world, need and deserve a plan for ending this war. It is time for the President to create a plan to end the war in Iraq and to bring our troops home.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). The Chair will remind all Members that remarks in debate may not engage in personalities toward the President. Policies may be addressed in critical terms, but personal references such as accusations of mendacity are not in order.

THE GREATEST GENERATION

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

Mr. McCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the most monumental battles of World War II took place in October of 1944 in the Pacific theater in the Battle of Leyte Gulf. One of those heroes who fought on Hell's doorstep in this battle was Major Alan McKean. Major McKean served in the United States Army and was among the millions of others who answered freedom's call in the largest armed conflict in recorded history.

When we consider generations of our past, no one exemplifies the essence of America better than those, part of what we now call the greatest generation. For this generation of Americans, like Major McKean, whose character and resolve was molded by the Great Depression, defeating Adolf Hitler and the Axis powers' reign of terror was just another call to answer. They performed their duty with honor. It was not theirs to question. It was simply expected. We will never forget their triumphs, and we will never forget those victories like the battle of Leyte Gulf which came at such a great cost. Few causes were as worthy. Few prices were as great. Perhaps Winston Churchill said it best when he said of this generation, This was their finest hour.

Men like Major McKean saved an entire world from tyranny and gave people the chance to live under flags of freedom by answering the call to service. To this day and forever, we recall these heroic deeds and we remember and honor those who liberated the world.

Like the soldiers of America's greatest generation, today's service men and women are in distant lands fighting the threat and horror of terror by spreading freedom and making our homeland more secure. America will continue to honor our past and present military because the triumph of its ideals resides in the actions of its heroes. I salute Major Alan McKean and all the service men and women who put themselves in harm's way so that we may live in freedom.

May God bless America, may He bless Major Alan McKean and his wife Dorothy, and may He hold them in the palm of His hand.

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

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

THE ROAD NOT TAKEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, last month dozens of world leaders, including President Bush, gathered in Moscow to celebrate the 60th anniversary of V-E day. It was fitting and proper for the President and other heads of state to pay homage to the millions who died defeating Nazism and fascism and to commemorate the end of the Second World War.

The year 1945 also marked the beginning of the nuclear age, and even those who had become inured to the destruction that years of fighting had wrought were stunned by the devastation caused by the atomic bombs dropped on Japan. Nuclear weapons have been the dominant feature of the international security landscape ever since, and preventing their proliferation has been a central goal of American Presidents from Harry Truman to George W. Bush.

That is why I cannot understand the failure of the administration to take a leading role at the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty review conference that was held at the United Nations from May 2-27. There is near unanimity among policymakers and our Nation's political leadership that nuclear terrorism and the proliferation of nuclear weapons are the greatest threats to our national security. The President has said so himself. But the United States did not dispatch any senior officials to New York and downplayed the importance of the conference. This was shortsighted and dangerous, and the failure to achieve any concrete results at the NPT conference was a major national security setback for the United States as well as for the rest of the world.

The Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, which took effect in 1970, has for the most part been successful in limiting the spread of nuclear weapons beyond the original five members of the nuclear club, the Soviet Union, Britain, France, China and the United States. In 1960, John Kennedy wrote that he expected 20 nations would have nuclear weapons by the end of the 1960s. He considered this the gravest threat to world peace and set in motion the events and discussions that culminated in the NPT.

During the 35 years that the treaty has been in effect, only three nations are known to have developed nuclear weapons, India, Pakistan and Israel, and they are not parties to the NPT. North Korea is believed to have a handful of nuclear weapons, and Iran is engaged in a diplomatic game of chicken with the West in its pursuit of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, after three and a half decades, the NPT is showing its age, and the review conference was held at a critical time for the international community's efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. In December of last year, a panel of experts convened by the U.N. issued a stark warning that we are approaching the point at which

the erosion of the nonproliferation regime could become irreversible and result in a cascade of proliferation. One of the members of that panel was Brent Scowcroft, who served as national security adviser to President George H.W. Bush.

The twin nuclear crises with North Korea and Iran have exposed flaws in the NPT's "grand bargain," which was first articulated in President Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" proposal. In exchange for the commitment to forgo the acquisition of nuclear weapons and to agree to international safeguards and inspections, the NPT guarantees non-nuclear weapon states who are parties to the treaty the peaceful development and use of nuclear energy. The problem with this bargain is that it allows nations like Iran or North Korea access to fissile material and technological know-how that is the necessary precursor for a nuclear weapons program. When the state feels confident it is ready to proceed with a weapons program, it simply opts out of the NPT.

Had it chosen to do so, the administration could have used the review conference in New York to make it more difficult for states to access nuclear material and technology under the NPT and then walk away from the treaty by providing tough penalties for those who would try.

One proposal by a group of experts at Princeton and Stanford would bar parties withdrawing from the NPT to use fissile materials or production facilities acquired while they were parties to the treaty to make nuclear weapons. The German government also proposed preventing a party from withdrawing from the treaty if that state was in violation of that treaty.

But reinvigorating the NPT requires more than cracking down on Iran and North Korea. It also demands leadership from the declared nuclear weapons states which as part of the NPT committed themselves to reduce their own stockpiles significantly in exchange for non-nuclear states renouncing nuclear ambitions. Unfortunately, the five nuclear weapons states have not done enough, and General Scowcroft and his colleagues chided them in their report for their lackluster efforts.

Matters have not been helped by a State Department brochure handed out at the conference which listed arms control breakthroughs since the 1980s and touted reductions in the U.S. arsenal. But the time line made no mention of the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, a pact negotiated by the Clinton administration and ratified by 121 nations but rejected by this President. The brochure also ignored the 2000 NPT review conference at which the U.S. and other nuclear weapons states committed to practical steps to achieve nuclear safety, including entering into the test ban treaty and negotiation of a fissile material cutoff treaty to ban manufacture and production of additional bomb material.