Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank each and every one of these individuals for their service to our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan. My colleagues and I will continue this tribute on other evenings as we finish up the over 1,900 fellow Americans who have given their lives, and intend to continue by recognizing each of our fallen heroes by name on the floor of the people's House.

On behalf of my colleagues, I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the brave men and women and their families who continue to serve our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan. Our thoughts and prayers are with you and your families.

**HOMELAND SECURITY**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader. Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, tonight we will be engaging in a discussion about our Nation’s homeland security. I will be joined by several of my colleagues here tonight who have some very interesting thoughts and perspectives they would like to share with the American people on this most important issue. Homeland security is a matter of concern to all Americans irrespective of their political affiliation. This is especially true in the United States Congress. The Committee on Homeland Security, of which I am a member, reflects our national concern.

In the last 6 months, our committee has sent to the floor of the House some very important legislation designed to make America’s borders, ports, and transportation facilities less vulnerable to terrorist attack or other catastrophes. One such bill is H.R. 1244, the Faster and Smarter Funding For First Responders Act of 2005.

Prior to this bill, grant funding for first responders tasked with responding to homeland emergencies was provided in equal percentage to all States with an allowance upward for population. Because these funds are distributed without regard to safeguarding against risk, there were many documented abuses within the system. Of the $6.3 billion in grants appropriated by Congress and awarded by the Department of Homeland Security since fiscal year 2002, only 31 percent of those funds have been spent. Let me repeat: of the $6.3 billion in grants appropriated by Congress and awarded by the Department of Homeland Security since fiscal year 2002, only 31 percent of those funds have been spent.

My own home State of Pennsylvania, that State has only spent 17 percent of these homeland security funds. Hundreds of millions of dollars earmarked for homeland projects are currently unaccounted for. Moreover, in some instances, local communities received these funds, but utilized them in ways that were not consistent with the promotion of our homeland security.

The chart I have here, and I will have those displayed in a moment, but these charts that I have here highlight some of the most egregious examples of misspent homeland security funds:
In Washington, DC, Dale Carnegie public speaking training for sanitation workers, $100,000 was spent. These were homeland security dollars we are talking about.

Again in Washington, DC, a rap song to teach children emergency preparedness, $100,000.

Santa Clara County, California, four Segway scooters to transport bomb squad personnel at a cost of $16,000.

Mason County, Washington, bi-chemical decontamination units left sitting in a warehouse for more than a year, with no one trained to use it, $65,000.

South Dakota, on-site paging system for the State agricultural fair at $29,905.

Converse, Texas, a trailer to transport lawn mowers to lawn mower drag races, $3,000.

Des Moines, Iowa, traffic cones, State of Missouri, 13,000 HazMat suits for every law enforcement official at $7.2 million.

Tiptonville, Tennessee, purchases totaling $11,000 including a Golf terrain vehicle at $8,700 and two defibrillators, one for use at high school basketball games, $5,200.

Washington, DC, computerized car towing service, $300,000. Again, we are talking about homeland security funds here.

Montgomery County, Maryland, 8 large screen plasma television monitors for $160,000.

Prince Georges County, Maryland, digital camera system used for mug shots at a half million dollars.

Newark, New Jersey, air-conditioned garbage trucks at a quarter million dollars.

H.R. 1544 seeks to rectify this deplorable situation by awarding grant funds based on risk. It requires that moneys be disbursed to those areas where threat vulnerability and consequence of attack is the greatest. It provides priority assistance to those first responders and first preventers that in fact are facing the highest risk. It streamlines the process by which local authorities can apply for and receive terrorism preparedness grants. It establishes specific flexible and measurable goals for the Department of Homeland Security and promotes the development of national standards for first responder equipment and training. It encourages regional cooperation to increase emergency preparedness. It follows the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission which had this to say about the prior funding formula: “Homeland Security assistance should be based strictly on an assessment of risks and vulnerabilities. Federal Homeland Security assistance should not remain a program for general revenue sharing. It should supplement State and local resources based on the risk or vulnerabilities that merit additional support. Congress should not use this as pork barrel.” That was the 9/11 Commission.

By directing grant funding to threatened areas without regard to politics, H.R. 1544 has become a key part of the national security reforms necessitated by the September 11 attacks.

The second piece of legislation that reflects the Homeland Security Committee’s bipartisan commitment to the preservation of homeland security is H.R. 1817, the Homeland Security Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006. This act promotes our national security in a number of different areas. To help secure our porous borders it authorizes funds for 2,000 new border patrol agents. In addition, it provides $40 million so that local law enforcement agencies have access to the training required to apprehend illegal immigrants, some of whom may be involved in terrorist activities. To safeguard the cargo coming into our ports, it provides money to promote risk-based screening of containers in transit to the United States. The Container Security Initiative, or CSI, is a Department of Homeland Security initiative or program that trains employees at 36 foreign ports to target and inspect these containers before they can gain entry to the United States. H.R. 1817 not only funds the existing program, but also makes provisions to expand inspections to other ports.

Finally, with regard to deterring a nuclear or biological attack, the act promotes the improvement of the department’s intelligence-gathering capabilities that is necessary to detect activity before it is too late to develop the means to prevent these efforts.

H.R. 1817 provides the authorization to maintain the funds necessary to keep the country secure, while H.R. 2360, the Homeland Security Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006, appropriates the moneys required to do the job. Our committee has approved $30.85 billion for operations and activities of the Department of Homeland Security. This represents an increase of $1.37 billion above the Department’s Appropriation Act for Fiscal Year 2005. It represents a 13.3 billion above the President’s budget request. The authorization bill, border security is a high priority in this legislation. We have appropriated $1.61 billion for border security and an additional $3.2 billion for customs enforcement, which will allow the Bureau for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or ICE, to hire an additional 150 criminal investigators and 200 immigration enforcement agents. We have appropriated $5.665 billion to develop vehicles and cargo inspection technologies and we have given the Coast Guard $2.6 billion to perform its homeland security missions.

H.R. 2360 also helps local first responders perform their vital homeland security mission. Among other expenditures we have earmarked $200 million for a first responders training, $400 million for State and local law enforcement terrorism prevention programs and $600 million for firefighter grants. Since September 11, 2001, Congress has provided over $32 billion to our first responders, including terrorism prevention and preparedness, general law enforcement, firefighter assistance, airport security, seaport security, and public health preparedness. And this year’s share of that funding comes to approximately $6.5 billion.

Finally, H.R. 2360 goes a long way toward helping us to maintain security at our transportation hubs and places deemed to be critical infrastructure. We have directed moneys for air cargo security, rail security and trucking security. We have earmarked $1.3 billion toward research and development, including $651 million to develop radiological, nuclear, chemical, biological and high explosives countermeasures designed to protect power plants, other industrial properties, and the people that work in or live near those particular facilities. These programs are expensive, but no mission is more important than safeguarding the country against the threat of attack by chemical, biological or nuclear means.

And with that I would like now to turn to some of my colleagues who have joined me here tonight from the Homeland Security Committee, each of whom, many of whom, bring very interesting skills and background to this issue. And the first Member of the committee I would like to draw your attention to introduce is a good friend, my colleague from Texas, Committee Chairman Cox.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Cali- fornia (Chairman COX), an extraordinary man who the President quite wisely nominated to become the head of the Secretaries and Exchange Commission, has an outstanding job. Chairman Cox and the rest of the Homeland Security Committee possess the highest possible commitment to keeping our Nation safe from terrorist attack and from other catastrophic events. While all these measures were thoroughly debated in the committee, they all passed to the floor with relative ease, a testament to the timeless adage that so aptly characterizes our political process. In America, debates about homeland security, like those regarding partisan politics, end at the water’s edge.

And with that I would like now to turn to some of my colleagues who have joined me here tonight from the Homeland Security Committee, each of whom, many of whom, bring very interesting skills and background to this issue. And the first Member of the committee I would like to draw your attention to introduce is a good friend, my colleague from Texas, Mr. McCaul.

Mr. McCaul is a former Texas deputy attorney general and chief of terrorism and national security in the Department of Justice in the Western Judicial District of Texas. Further, because of his expertise in homeland security affairs, the Governor of Texas...
appointed him to be the adviser to the Governor’s office on homeland security.  So with that, I would like to introduce to all of you my good friend from the 10th District of Texas (Mr. McCaul).  

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I would like to also thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Dent) for managing this important debate on probably what is the most important issue facing this Nation today. As we heard the names of the men and women who served in Iraq and Afghanistan who paid the ultimate sacrifice just a few minutes ago in this Chamber, I say to the families, we remember. We thank you. We will never forget.

Every day I meet, it is part of our job, we meet with the families who have lost loved ones over there. And they all tell me the same thing, and that is, finish the job; I do not want my son to have died in vain. And finish the job we will. We thank you for your sacrifice, Mr. Speaker. We are praying for our troops that are overseas now so that we do not have to face it here at home. And it has made this Nation more secure in our homeland.

Back home, this Congress has moved faster than ever in passing legislation, which, among other things, fulfills the 9/11 Commission’s recommendations by bolstering the security along our borders and sending the badly needed funding to those areas of our Nation the terrorist sees as targets. In fact, recently the Homeland Security Committee visited Ground Zero. The tragic events of 9/11 are still very much alive and well in that city. We met with the police commissioner. We met with the Liberty Street Firehouse, the fallen heroes, the families who survived that tragic day, who lost so many people. And I can tell you, you can feel it. It is as if it happened just yesterday.

And everything we do in this Congress is to provide the tools necessary to ensure that another 9/11 never happens again in this country. The need for this hard-hitting legislation comes from the United States grave and growing problem with undocumented aliens. An estimated 8 to 12 million undocumented aliens are here in the United States, and it is also estimated that two slip across the border for every one that is apprehended. That means that almost 3 million undocumented aliens enter our country every year; to put it in perspective, roughly the size of the city of Dallas. And in the post-9/11 world, these figures no longer represent just an immigration problem, but rather one of national security.

This Nation is being compromised by our inability to identify those who are coming into our country. And I am convinced that the first step we need to take to solve this problem is to secure our borders and to better enforce the laws currently on the books. Congress knows what needs to be done. We are a part of our national security. Accordingly, we have provided more than $1.5 billion in spending for border protection, immigration enforcement, and related activities in the 109th Congress.

When combining the homeland security authorization and appropriations bill that the House has passed, Congress has supplied funding for all 2,000 of our border patrol agents recommended by the 9/11 Commission and fully authorized by last year’s intelligence reform bill. These agents will have greater authority to detain and incarcerate illegal immigrants, instead of sending them back into our communities where they may go into court, something very few abide by.

Indeed, we do not have to look too far back in history to see an example of this when Ramsey Yusef entered our country in 1992 and was apprehended. He too was given a notice to appear. He failed to show up to the hearing, and instead he joined his fellow colleagues from the bin Laden academy to join the first al Qaeda cell in the United States. He then conspired to blow up the World Trade Center. Fortunately, he was not successful. But that day would come later and his dream would be realized with Osama bin Laden’s dream to bring the towers that fateful day.

But I say to you, the days of this catch-and-release policy are numbered. Congress has also worked hard to ensure that our Federal law enforcement gets the assistance it needs. And by closing these gaps in the law, immigration laws can be only enforced by Federal law enforcement officials. Couple that with existing immigration policies in most of our big cities and one can easily see why our Federal officers have such a difficult time enforcing the laws on our borders.

This is why I offered an amendment to the Homeland Security Authorization Bill that would fund local law enforcement training at Federal facilities in order to create a force multiplier so that our Federal law enforcement gets the assistance it needs.

These additions will crack down on illegal immigration in between our borders and ultimately lessen the threat of terrorism. Congress has also passed legislation to make America’s first responders more effective by improving the process by which they receive their resources. The Faster and Smarter Funding For First Responders Act guarantees that the States with the biggest risk and the greatest threats receive the necessary funding to provide their local emergency services. For example, currently ranks last in the amount of homeland security dollars received per person.

And that in a State which claims an international border, the Western White House, and a prominent State capital.

Texas and other States like New York should be receiving more money than those other States with fewer targets. And by closing these gaps in the defense of our homeland, we have learned what our weaknesses are and how to better prepare for, defend against, and preempt a terrorist plot.

And with that in mind, this body has moved to address that threat. The House passage of the 2006 Homeland Security Authorization and Appropriations Act and Faster and Smarter Funding For First Responder Act send a clear message to our enemies that we will not stand idly by while they plot to do harm to our Nation.

As the President stated, we will not waiver, we will not tire, we will not falter, and we will not fail. Peace and freedom will prevail.

Mr. Dent. The next speaker tonight will be joining us in this discuss on homeland security is another good friend who brings to us a great deal of experience. I would like to introduce to you now my colleague from the third district of California. In addition to working on the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on the Budget, he also serves with me on the Committee on Homeland Security where he is assigned to the Subcommittee on Prevention of Nuclear and Biological Attack and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing, and Terrorism Risk Assessment.

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. Daniel E. Lungren). Mr. Lungren. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and commend him for having the Special Order.

When we talk about homeland security, we have to talk about those investigative techniques that are necessary for us to be able to forestall terrorism, terrorist attacks on our homeland, and the reason I would like to make this point is prompted by comments that aids to the ranking Democrat on the Committee on the Judiciary of the United
States Senate said that he would introduce legislation aimed at limiting the government’s ability to detain material witnesses indefinitely.

The reason I mention this is that this is just a part of an overall criticism of this administration’s investigatory community. As a matter of fact, the New York Times recently described it this way: that we, that is the Federal Government, are “thrust into a Kafkaesque world of indefinite detention, incommunicado, secret evidence, and baseless accusations.” Dozens of people, some were held for weeks and even months and the majority were never even charged with a crime. The Times seethes, did “the Bush administration twist the American system of due process.”

An interesting article appeared today in the National Review by Andrew McCarthy, who is a former Federal prosecutor who has actually prosecuted some of the major terrorist cases in this country, that aptly responds to these criticisms of this effort by the Federal law enforcement community.

He says, in point of fact, material witness detentions have been with us for decades pursuant to duly enacted law, specifically 3144 of title 18 of the U.S. Code. They were used countless times prior to 9/11. Hysteria aside, it should come as no surprise that these are detentions without charges since by definition the person being detained is being detained as a witness, not being charged with a crime.

What would require baseless accusations would be to hold such a person as a defendant, which is precisely what the government refuses from doing in detaining on material witness law. The proceedings, moreover, involve secret evidence only in the sense that all proceedings before the grand jury or the court un- less the person is given the same kinds of protections that are afforded to actual defendants. The witness must promptly be presented upon arrest to a judge so that a neutral official can advise him of his rights which includes his right to counsel. And with respect to my second point, if he is a foreign national, the United States is obligated by law to advise him of his right to have counsel and his right to apply for a writ of habeas corpus. And frequently the consulate will not only obtain counsel on behalf of its citizen but will also closely monitor the case, including by demands for information from the U.S. State Department.

The lawyer is given information about why the witness is being detained. Counsel is permitted to be present at any interview of the witness by the government. And although counsel is not permitted to accompany the witness inside the Federal grand jury, no witness, material or otherwise, has that right, the government is not permitted to interview the witness outside the grand jury unless counsel allows it.

In addition, at any time during the course of the detention, counsel is permitted to make a bail application to the court; and if the judge is satisfied that the bail offered vitiates the risk of flight, the witness is freed on the promise to appear for his testimony.

Furthermore, if at any point the length of detention or the condition of the witness’s confinement actually offended the witness’s fundamental rights, counsel may submit a habeas corpus petition seeking the witness’s immediate release.

Mr. Speaker, I have to ask, how is this responsive? How is this putting people outside the bounds of law? How is that having this administration twisting the Constitution in some way?

It is, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that kind of hyperbole, this kind of dis- misstatement which makes it more difficult for us to do our duty with respect to homeland security. We need to have those investigative tools that have been used against organized crime, that have been used against organized drug dealers and organizations. We need to be able to use those investigative techniques, those same prosecutorial tools against those who would destroy us as a Nation, against those who have allied with those who would destroy us as a Nation. And it is the Bush administration that is responsible for any American, man, woman or child, anywhere in the world, combatant or non-combatant.

We are in a new world, a world of terror, in which we have to respond in ways that, yes, are consistent with the Constitution, but ways that allow us to protect ourselves in a proper and forceful way. And these kinds of criticisms that come from the outside, whether it is with respect to Guantanamo or whether it is with respect to the use of laws which allow our application of the law against material witnesses, these kinds of attacks weaken our ability to do the job.

And with respect to my second point, let me talk briefly about what we have done here in the House of Representa- tives to respond to the demand for us to respond to this unique challenge that is the challenge of terrorism.

One cannot criticize a Congress for responding as best it could. It could not do the job of responding as best it could. It could not do the job of responding as best it could. It could not do the job of responding as best it could. It could not do the job of responding as best it could.

Secondly, they told us, Congress should not use this money as a pork barrel. Third, they said, Federal homeland security assistance should not remain a program for general revenue...
sharply. Fourth, they told us, the Federal Government should develop specific benchmarks for evaluating community needs and require that spending decisions be made in accordance with those benchmarks. Fifth, they told us, each State receiving funds should provide an analysis of how funds are allocated and spent within the State.

Finally, they said, each city and State should have a minimum infrastructure for emergency response.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN). I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) just said, we now live in a different world. After September 11, the role of the first responder has changed. It still includes those things Mr. Speaker talked about, the stuff that cops do every day, helping people, arresting crooks, criminals on the streets of our cities across this country, but the added responsibility now of also being a part of the team and protecting our homeland, and they truly are on the front line of that effort.

In our local community in Seattle we have a Joint Analytical Center where police officers from local police departments are assigned to the Federal Intelligence task force. We have a regional intelligence task force gathering information within our specific region in the Northwest and sharing with the FBI Joint Analytical Center. That information is analyzed, prioritized, and then assigned to the joint terrorism task force where, again, local police detectives are a part of and member of and participate in investigating and following up those leads that have not yet been prioritized by the analytical center. Every day, cops on the streets today are following up leads to find terrorists, people who are in this country to do us harm, and we in the Committee on Homeland Security are here to support that effort.

We would have never thought years ago that police officers on the street would have to respond to calls or train in HazMat uniforms. We would have never thought 5, 10, 15 years ago that we would have had to worry about our police officers and first responders responding to a dirty bomb, a biothreat, or some other weapon of mass destruction, but these are the things today
that our local police officers are trying to deal with, and it is a tough, tough job.

So let us not forget them. Let us support them and we will continue to do our work on the Committee on Homeland Security, and I am proud to be a member of that committee.

I thank the gentleman so much for the time to speak tonight on the role of first responders.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) for sharing his thoughts and perspectives with us, again a 33-year first responder and police officer from the Seattle year.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), another fine individual, member of the committee, from the Third District of Alabama. In addition to working on the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Agriculture, he also serves with me on the Committee on Homeland Security and also serves on the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science, and Technology and chairs the Subcommittee on Management, Integration, and Oversight.

As chairman of this subcommittee, my colleagues and I are particularly concerned about making sure that the Department of Homeland Security operates in the most efficient and effective and transparent way possible.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) for organizing this discussion tonight. It is vital we take the time to talk about these important issues, and I appreciate the gentleman’s efforts to highlight some of our accomplishments this evening.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has done many good things to help secure our homeland, some of which we are discussing tonight, but in other areas, we still have a ways to go.

Take, for example, the issue of border surveillance. About 2 weeks ago, the subcommittee I chair held a hearing to discuss the camera system that monitors our Nation’s northern and southern borders. Known as the Integrated Surveillance Intelligence System, or ISIS, these cameras are a critical link for helping secure our border.

Unfortunately, this system is not working as planned. What began as a program to monitor the border crossing of illegal immigrants, drug trafficker, and even terrorists has morphed into what one of our witnesses called “a major project gone awry.”

According to a 2004 GSA audit, the problem did not go even further. For example, the initial $2 million contract was awarded without full competition. Just 1 year later that same contract ballooned to over $320 million, again without full competition, and the problems do not end there.

The GSA audit also reported significant issues relating to the surveillance system itself: 60-foot poles that were paid for but never installed; sensitive equipment that failed to meet electrical codes; an operations center where contractors and government employees did little or no work for over a year; and not surprisingly, numerous cost overruns. To top it off, in September 2004, the GSA abnormally ended the maintenance contract. This left approximately 70 border sites without monitoring equipment.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. What we have here, plain and simple, is gross mismanagement of a multimillion-dollar contract. This agreement has violated Federal contracting rules, and it has wasted taxpayers’ dollars. Worst of all, it has seriously weakened our Nation’s border security.

Before DHS spends another $2.5 billion on a replacement system known as the America’s Shield Initiative, we need to first fix the system we have got. With Federal dollars scarce and budgets tight, it is vital that the American people know what they are getting.

Thanks to the work of this Congress and many of my colleagues here tonight, we are improving the safety of American citizens. We still have a ways to go. As we move forward, I hope we can continue to address these issues at DHS.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their support.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for his comments as well and appreciate his leadership on the Committee on Homeland Security.

I would now like to further this conversation tonight, this Special Order and this discussion with the American people, and I would like to say a few words about the interrelationship between immigration and homeland security.

While so many immigrants who come to this country do so legally and with the sole intention of seeking a better life, there are those who have links to terrorist organizations or who come here to do us harm. To be fully effective, then, the homeland security programs need to contain measures to curb illegal immigration and to prevent those who would seek to propagate acts of violence from crossing international borders.

Unfortunately, prior to the act, an alien could provide funding or other material support to many terrorist organizations and then escape deportation merely by claiming he did not know the funds would be spent on weapons or explosives.

The REAL ID Act, by contrast, directs that an alien who provides funds or other material support to a terrorist is deportable. If he knew or reasonably should have known that he was giving to a terrorist organization.

Finally, the REAL ID Act provides an important component to the physical security of the United States. In 1996, Congress mandated the building of a 14-mile border fence inland from the Mexican border in the San Diego area.

The goal was to curb illegal entries into the United States from the southern border of the United States and to guarantee security at the U.S. naval base in San Diego. More than 8 years later, that fence is still not completed, in large part because the construction is tied up in litigation. In order to facilitate border security and protect the important security perimeter, the act waives all Federal laws necessary to ensure the expeditious completion of this structure.

Immigration as a security issue was also the subject of portions of the Homeland Security Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006. The act fully funded the hiring and training of some 2,000
border patrol agents. It also clarifies the existing authorities of State and local law enforcement personnel to apprehend, detain, remove, and transport alien illegals in the routine course of their duty.

Further, it buttresses up that policy determination that local police have the right to help enforce U.S. immigration laws by appropriating $40 million in training funds for these same municipal authorities. These funds are available to those communities that choose to send officers to the Department of Homeland Security programs run by ICE, Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, designed to train and certify these officers in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws. Having officers trained in this way can only work to the detriment of a would-be terrorist detained as a result of his committing a crime unrelated to national security.

As I have described, the Homeland Security Act has a strong border security component, but so does the homeland appropriation bill. The appropriation bill provides $19.4 billion for border protection, immigration enforcement, and related activities, an increase over our fiscal year 2005 enacted levels and $285 million over the President’s budget request. These funds support a robust revitalization of immigration enforcement efforts, both along our borders and within our interior of the Nation.

Specific funding includes, but is not limited to, $3.2 billion for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, providing an additional 150 criminal investigators and 300 immigration enforcement agents; $61 million for border security technology, including surveillance and unmanned aerial vehicles; $20 million for replacement border patrol aircraft; $590 million to fund 3,870 beds to house illegal immigrants detained in U.S. facilities; $50 million to fund anti-terrorism training operations teams; and $211 million for transportation and removal of undocumented aliens.

All these measures I have previously described are designed to enforce immigration laws, but we must also remember that in doing so we are contributing to the preservation of our homeland security as well. By preventing access to this country by undocumented aliens, by removing those who are here illegally, by training local police officers to help enforce immigration laws, we will increase the odds that a would-be terrorist seeking to enter our country will be stopped before he can wreak any acts of violence against our citizenry.

Another comment I would like to make with respect to this whole issue of homeland security is this. We have heard from a number of speakers tonight about what the United States Congress is doing to make our homeland more safe and more secure. We have heard about the PATRIOT Act, the Homeland Security Authorization Act, the First Responder Bill, and the appropriations act. But, really, the bottom line is, why are we going through this? The events of 9/11 should have woken up everyone. I believe they did. Many of us lost friends. I had a relative in the first tower on the 91st floor who escaped, luckily. The plane ended up on the 86th floor, and he lived to talk about it.

So we have all been touched by this in one way or another, and certainly as a freshman Member of Congress I spend a great deal of time going to orientation sessions and hearing a lot of information. I have felt sometimes that being a Member of Congress is sometimes like drinking water out of a fire hose. A lot of information is thrown at you very quickly, and you do your best to absorb it all.

When I was up at Harvard University to be engaged in the orientation program, I met an interesting individual up there, a man name Graham Allison, who wrote a book called “Nuclear Terrorism: The Ultimate Preventable Catastrophe,” written by Graham Allison, but he quotes an individual named Suleiman Abu Gheit, who was Osama bin Laden’s official press spokesman. Nine months after the 9/11 attacks, Suleiman Abu Gheit made this announcement, and it was put out on al Qaeda Web sites. He says: “We have the right to kill 4 million Americans, 2 million of them children, and to exile twice as many and wound and to cripple hundreds of thousands.”

What a frightening and extraordinary statement. He says he wants to kill, that al Qaeda wants to kill 4 million Americans. He did not say 1.5 million Americans, he did not say 8 million Americans. He said 4 million, 2 million children. How did he get to that number? He goes on to explain. He itemizes the number. He goes on and he says that for 50 years in Palestine he blames the Jews, and with the blessing and issuer of edicts from the caliphate, he says the Jews exiled nearly 5 million Palestinians and killed nearly 260,000. They wounded nearly 180,000 and crippled nearly 160,000. And he talks about the American bombings and the siege of Iraq, as he says more than 1.2 million Muslims were killed in the past decade.

So he blames Israel and the United States. He says in the war against the Taliban and al Qaeda in Afghanistan, America killed 12,000 Afghan civilians and 350 Arab jihad fighters. In Somalia, America killed 70 Muslims. So as he itemizes this number, he somehow gets to 4 million. This is what our enemies are saying about us.

So, then, he asks the rhetorical question as to how should a good Muslim, in his case what he considers a good Muslim, which is not what most of us or most Muslims would consider to be a good Muslim, I am sure, but he said, “Citing the Koran and other Islamic texts and traditions, he answers his question by saying, “anyone who peruses these sources reaches a single conclusion: the sages have agreed that the reciprocal punishment to which the verses referred to is not limited to a specific instance. It is a valid rule for punishments for infidels, for licentious Muslims, and for the oppressors.”

He concludes: “According to the numbers in the previous section of the lives lost among Muslims because of Americans, directly or indirectly, we are still at the beginning of the way. The Americans have still not tasted from our hands what we have tasted from theirs. We have not reached parity yet. He says that al Qaeda will require killing 4 million Americans.”

This is very frightening. And I would suggest to everyone here today that 4 million Americans is a very big number. On September 11 we lost nearly 3,000 of our own. This would require 1,500 attacks of 3,000 people to get to 4 million.

Al Qaeda is quite clear in their intentions, and it is my belief that they intend to pursue whatever weapons are available to them, to raise the amount of damage they can upon the American people. And that is why our committee is so dedicated, is so committed to making sure that our folks at Homeland Security have what they need to do the job to protect us.

Finally, I want to turn to another man who is a great leader and a friend from my home State of Pennsylvania. I would like to introduce my colleague from the Seventh District of Pennsylvania, Mr. Weldon, who is a member of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Science, he also serves with me on the House Homeland Security Committee, where he is vice chairman. He is also active on the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science and Technology, as well as the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing and Risk Assessment. He is a former first responder himself, an active student of international relations, and an expert on ballistic missile proliferation.

He, too, is an author of a highly acclaimed book, “Countdown to Terror.” I have been talking about books, so I might as well mention this one too. It has been talked about quite a bit in the press, and it highlights his concerns about terrorist failures and the spread of ballistic missile technology in Iran. So without any further discussion from me, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and
Mr. Speaker, later on this evening I will be offering another Special Order that will reveal some absolutely amazing intelligence for the American people. I will divulge tonight the information that prior to 9/11, not only did we know about the Mohammed Atta cell, but that the Special Forces Command in our military actually wanted to take action against that cell, and we did not take that action.

I will be discussing our intelligence in detail, and by following through on a special project that was initiated under the leadership of General Shelton focusing on al Qaeda. But at this point in time, I wanted to stop by and thank my good friend and colleague for yielding to me and thank him for this outstanding Special Order. I hope that our colleagues tonight have been listening, because they have seen an outstanding assemblage of excellent young Members of Congress who are picking up the mantle and taking the lead on homeland security issues in our committee.

This is the first year for the full operation of the authorization committee for homeland security funding and oversight, and it is extremely important that we get off to a good start. I just want to say, as a Member who was very aggressively behind this committee, I am overwhelmingly pleased and positive with the type of membership we have on this committee. My colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), is an example of an outstanding leader who is committed; and he has brought together an assemblage of Members tonight who have articulated the various parameters of the concerns we face, from first responders, to our borders, to protecting our ports and our airports, and for all of the significant work that has been accomplished under Secretary Ridge, now being accomplished under our chairman and under the able leadership of the chairman of our House Homeland Security Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. Cox), and our appropriations subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Thirty-Something Working Group

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for half the time until midnight, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again it is an honor to address the House, and the 30-Something Working Group would like to send our appreciation to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) but also the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), our chairman, and our vice chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), we have not only an ongoing, but are working toward a bipartisan approach.

Mr. Speaker, I would also add there is a discussion going on now, there was a press conference last week talking about we have a bill and private accounts. It is not as bad as the President’s bill, but it is starting us off on private accounts. Whatever press conference it was admitted by the sponsors of the bill that this will not hold onto Social Security. I do not know why we are trying to fool the American people. I do not know why we are going through this dance tonight is not about the 30-Something Working Group and what we want to talk about. It is factual. It is not the Tim Ryan report or the Kendrick Meek report, it is what is going on. We know exactly what they are doing, and we are here, elected by the people from our districts, and also representing the people of the United States of America, to make sure that they know exactly what is going on.

Tonight is not about the 30-Something Working Group and what we want to talk about. It is factual. It is not the Tim Ryan report or the Kendrick Meek report, it is what is going on. We know exactly what they are doing, and we are here, elected by the people from our districts, and also representing the people of the United States of America, to make sure that they know exactly what is going on. We talked last week about the issue of the ever-growing deficit. Guess what, we are going to have to pay it off, and I do mean all of us, some