

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to accept sometimes what the real truth is, but the fact of the matter is, we have a huge debt, and we have to assure the American people that we will be honest and accountable. People out there that work hard and play by the rules every day, surely, surely their elected officials such as us that are here in this body can afford them accountability and honesty in dealing with the numbers.

The Congressional Budget Office has reported numbers; the Office of Management and Budget, the administration's fiscal reporting group, offer some other numbers. Remember, I come from the State of Illinois, but make no mistake, I live almost 400 miles south of Chicago. So it is really a different world which I represent, largely rural, small farming area, coal mines, small businesses, people that are just dedicated to generational hand-me-down crafts and work ethic that is invaluable and immeasurable. But when I served 14 years in the Illinois House, I saw the same thing happen there, the frustration of here is the Economic Fiscal Commission reporting how much money they predicted would come in or projected revenues or what is on hand, and then the Bureau of the Budget, the Governor's reporting office. Well, guess what? The Bureau of the Budget reported a year or so ago, almost 2½, 3 years ago when the Governor took office in Illinois that we had over \$1 billion in surpluses. Guess what they all can agree on now? Mr. Speaker, a \$1.5 billion hole in the Illinois budget, and they are like a lot of States scrambling to try to come to the rescue to know what to do. And then the decisions that they were elected to make become even tougher decisions.

What can we do? Well, I think we need to avoid what is always obvious. How would we in the world agree to the rosiest projections of 5 to 10 years on the very best of what can happen, rather than preparing for what could be the worst? That is, to me, beyond reason and comprehension. So budget enforcement. Unless we renew budget discipline, Congress will continue to find ways to break its own rules and pass more legislation that puts still more red ink on the national ledger. Enforceable budget restraints will shine a light on deceptive practices and construct a fiscal guardrail, keeping our spending within the Nation's fiscal means, which is what we ask of the American people and families to do every year, every day, and what they do is stay within their means. Those that are not staying within their means have the credit card debt stacked up; they have marriages falling apart because of financial problems that they brought on themselves. What I have found in life is that most of the problems that come their way are not from some uncontrollable force; they are self-induced. We bring them on ourselves. That is what we have done here. Maybe it has taken decades and generations before us,

other people that have served, and other administrations, but we collectively, all of us, have to take responsibility. So now collectively, let us admit we have problems. We had September 11, we had recession, and we had tax cuts that gave 55 percent of the surpluses or more back, and now we have a problem. Where is the new plan? Where are the people that want to be responsible enough to step forward and say, let us sit down together as reasonable people on both sides of the aisle or Independent, whatever one claims to be, and work out of this mess. Not hope for the best and keep our blinders on, but what shall we do?

Well, we need a balanced budget constitutional amendment, which I have signed on as a cosponsor and feel should require the President and Congress to submit and to enact a budget that is balanced, without using the Social Security surplus. This amendment could be waived, of course, in special times of war or military conflict or threats of national security. But for the first time, all of the other balanced budget constitutional amendments have been presented without addressing whether or not we would use Social Security. This one we intend to bring forth to say we should not use the Social Security Trust Fund. We should balance the budget, and if we borrow from our children and our grandchildren, then we get ourselves in a deeper mess.

So I hope that the Balanced Budget Amendment, constitutional amendment, excluding the Social Security Trust Fund, would be one way that we can show, one way that we can have a plan as to how we intend to get our fiscal house in order.

I could say much more, there are so many other parts of the ABCs, but in order to give time for other Members before we close out our time, I will yield back.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to be a member of the fiscally responsible Blue Dog Coalition and to be fighting with the gentleman, along with my other Blue Dog colleagues, for simple common sense in budgeting. A lot of people think there is a lot of complications and complexities with respect to how we budget in Washington, but the way we do it should be no different than any household in America budgets, how any small business budgets. We have to make sure that we have the revenues. We have to make sure that the books are balanced. We have to make sure that the checkbook is reconciled at the end of the month. If we do not have revenues, somehow we increase them. I voted for every single tax cut we could because the American people need that kind of tax relief. Some say we have to cut expenses. What is there to cut? Are we going to cut prescription drugs? Are we going to cut Social Security? Are we

going to cut defense budgets? Nobody supports that. Others say we should borrow the money.

But there is another thing that we can do. We do not want to borrow the money. We do not want to ask our children to shoulder the burden for the fiscally irresponsible decisions that we make in Washington. There is another alternative. Once again it was brought to our attention in today's New York Times in a story by Paul Krugman called *The Great Evasion*. We are losing about \$70 billion a year in revenues by irresponsible and unpatriotic American corporations who rush off to Bermuda, open up mail drops in Bermuda, say that they are now doing business as foreign corporations and do not have to pay their fair share of taxes. They wrap themselves in the American flag to sell their products and then renounce their American citizenship to do business abroad and do not pay their fair share of taxes.

Now, there are colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have had enough of this kind of irresponsible behavior. Rather than increasing taxes, which so few of us want to do, and rather than gutting important programs, which so few of us want to do, it is time for the administration to step up to the plate and say, enough is enough.

□ 2030

We are not going to allow American corporations to run to these Bermudan tax havens, flee their fair share of taxes. No American family is permitted to do that. No American family was able to register themselves in Bermuda to escape their fair share of taxes. We should not allow American corporations to do that as well.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, before I get into the main topic of this evening's discussion, that being immigration and immigration reform issues, I am compelled to respond to some of the comments made by our colleagues on the other side with regard to the budget dilemma that we all face here this evening. It is the dilemma faced every year, I suppose, and has for many many decades; and that is that we will always be spending more money in this body than we take in, or at least that was the case for all of the time, for the at least 40 years prior to the time that the Republicans took control of this body.

The Democrats, of course, ran an imbalanced budget for many, many, many years. And I am in complete sympathy with those Members of the Democratic Party who say that that is an improper way to run government; that, in fact,

we should be looking more to how businesses and industries run their business and States run theirs by having balanced budgets every single year. And I certainly completely and wholeheartedly agree. But I must say that as I listen to, on one hand, what I believe is an articulate plea for a balanced budget and, on the other hand, an articulate excuse for a vote for the farm bill which we just passed, it is hard to reconcile those two concepts.

This farm bill being, of course, one of the, percentage-wise, the greatest increase in any domestic policy program in, I think, history. I am not sure, but certainly in a long, long time. Widely criticized for being what it is, an incredible pork-laden boondoggle, and then to say in the next breath we have to do something about government spending, we have to control government spending.

And, if I may be so bold, I had to ask a staff person, because I am not really familiar with all of the variations of shades of different colors, and I asked one of the staff here a few minutes ago, What is the palest blue there is? And the young lady told me it was cornflower. Cornflower is the name of the color. Cornflower blue.

So I would suggest that the Blue Dog Democrats think about changing their names to the Cornflower Blue Democrats because they are not really Blue Dog Democrats. They are not really stuck to this issue of balanced budgets. What they are saying, I think, is that, and there are exceptions to this rule, that we are going to establish today, and, yes, I will yield to the gentleman who I assume is coming up to ask for that particular motion.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the good humor in which the gentleman is approaching the cornflower blue. But let me point out that the farm bill, the \$73.5 billion, the gentleman, I believe I am correct, voted for that budget that provided the \$73.5 billion that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and I, the speaker tonight, and others then proceeded to mark-up the bill. It was not called those critical comments when it passed as a budget, but it is only after we have put together the policy in which the criticism comes.

I would appreciate the gentleman acknowledging that as I was talking about balancing the budget, that I included farm spending in any reductions in spending that must accompany any kind of a new budget. That is what we are saying, and I do not think that is inconsistent at all.

Mr. TANCREDO. Reclaiming my time, and I appreciate the gentleman's observations, it is, of course, true that I have voted for a budget resolution that I wish we could hold to and this is a way in which we can all, I think, contribute to that possibility; and that is a vote against any appropriations bill that does not conform to that budget resolution. Any budget, any appropriations bill that puts us outside of that

scope which I intend, that is the way in which I intend to vote and have in the past voted.

I mean, we have to be, as I say, consistent with this because it is difficult for people who listen to this debate to understand that on the one hand we call for fiscal constraint, which I appreciate the gentleman has in the past and certainly even today has been a strong supporter of that issue, but we cannot accept that mantle of a fiscal conservative while at the same time doing things that bust the budget. But because of our issues, our individual concerns, the gentleman was very articulate in explaining the problems of the farm community in America, and no doubt his observations are accurate. But do you not see, every single person who is connected to any one of the various 13 appropriations bills we have here can come up, and do regularly, talk about the particular issue. It is the problem with education in America that we must, in fact, involve the Federal Government to the extent now that was never conceived of in the past.

We should both, I think, use the Constitution as a measure to help us determine what is an appropriate role for the Federal Government. And the gentleman, I must ask and I will yield for his response, what is the constitutional role of the Federal Government? Where in the Constitution does it set out a purpose for us to be the primary support for the farm, for the agricultural community? As I would say the same thing, by the way, in the area of education and Health and Human Services, I believe it is not there. I look at the Constitution. I do not find it. I find only a relatively narrow role for us, especially in the area of defense. Other than that, we could use that. That is the way we could defend our vote against these pork-laden, constituent-driven pieces of legislation that put us every single year in the position of saying, My stuff is okay. My stuff is appropriate. Everybody else's is out of the question and is a budget-busting bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

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

Let me say, in the Constitution there is a little part of it that says "promote the general welfare." And I appreciate the gentleman's pointing out that it is difficult to find supporting our farmers in the Constitution.

I do not stand on the floor and say that we are special or we are different than anyone else. Well, I guess I do. That was not a correct statement. I do believe that American agriculture and producers have done a pretty good job of feeding America and a good part of the rest of the world and do believe as we argued strenuously for the amount of money that was passed. So I guess, yes, I do, I do believe that.

But I also believe very strongly that anyone else that has an opinion should have the opportunity to stand and

make the same arguments. If I can get 217 of my colleagues to agree with me, it passes, and that is our system. If I might just continue. I want to get back, I agree with the gentleman, on the 13 appropriations bills, and that is why if the gentleman heard what we were talking about a moment ago, we think we ought to put a meaningful, reasonable cap on discretionary spending as part of the budget process. I think the gentleman and I will find, maybe not an agreement on the amount, but at least that we would find an agreement on the policy and procedure that we should follow to have a little bit of restraint.

I appreciate the gentleman's generosity. I appreciate the gentleman admitting that he voted for the budget that provided for the \$73.5 billion. So I take a little bit of offense when the gentleman stands on the floor as he did starting tonight by decrying this \$73.5 billion when he was the one joining, not with me because I did not support this budget, but he said \$73.5 billion was not an obscene amount of money for the budget we operate under.

Now times have changed; and, therefore, we are saying now let us take another look at the budget. If we need to trim, let us trim; but let us trim across the board.

Mr. TANCREDO. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his observations. Of course, times have changed and exactly that. First of all, we are talking about a \$73 billion maybe \$140 billion farm bill. There is a big difference there. It could go to \$140 billion. That was not in the budget resolution. And so to say that I have voted for the latter as opposed to the former is inaccurate, and I would also suggest that the gentleman is absolutely correct. If one can get the required number of votes in the House, one can pass anything. And I guarantee you, we have done it year after year, time after time. And it is the way, I understand entirely, it is the way the process is run. But I suggest that it should be perhaps incumbent upon all of us as we approach all of these bills coming up, the supplemental, I do not know, I think this week sometime, and a variety of other spending bills, I will watch for the Democrat and the Cornflower Blue Democrats to see how they vote because I will be voting "no" on all of them because I believe we should stick inside the budget. I thank the gentleman for his cordial relationship and his willingness to discuss this issue with me tonight.

I also remember thinking while I was listening to the discussion earlier here there was a comedian during the 70's and 80's. And his tag line was, "The devil made me do it. The devil made me do it." And he used to end his little skit with that all of the time. And of course, what he was saying was I did not want to do all of these bad things, but the devil made me do it, so it is okay.

I listen to all of this discussion about how bad it is to have these horrendous

expenditures and budget-busting bills all over the place for which my colleagues on the other side voted for most of the time as far as I can remember. And then to say, The devil made me do it. I do not know how we got here but this is bad, and somebody has got to impose some fiscal discipline on me. Somebody has got to make me behave. Somebody has got to make me say, you know what, I do not think we should vote for all this stuff. If everybody imposes a balanced budget amendment, then I will be able to take my medicine.

I am all for a balanced budget amendment, Mr. Speaker, absolutely. I will vote for it anytime, anyplace, anywhere. It is okay with me. But I think it is just the funniest thing in a way to listen to people who, as I say, from the other side of the aisle especially, and talk about budget constraint and fiscal responsibility, the devil must have been making him do it here for 40 years before we ever came in control in this body and now they want to seek forgiveness. Well, the Lord says that that is possible. So who am I to suggest that they are not truly repentant?

On to another issue, the issue of immigration and, specifically, immigration reform. In the past several weeks we have passed legislation in this body, and, as a matter of fact, yesterday the President signed a piece of legislation into law that will have the effect of tightening down on what heretofore can be described only as the most liberal immigration policy in the world of any country in the world. It is almost a misnomer to indicate there is an immigration policy in the United States because that implies, of course, that we have control over the process; that we establish how many people are going to come into the country every year like every other nation in the world does. We control it. We know who is coming in. We know how many. We know what they will be doing here. We know when they leave. I say that is the implication of saying you have an immigration policy.

The reality, of course, is we do not. We have not. And even the passage of this recent legislation euphemistically called the Border Security Act, we will not have accomplished the goal of border security.

A couple of weeks ago the House passed a bill by an overwhelming margin that was designed and is often referred to as the abolishment of the INS and the creation of a new body. Well, of course, it really was not all of that. As is often the case here, we have a tendency to name things, I guess, a little euphemistically and to create these illusions about what we do here.

Now, the reality is we passed a very tepid bill designed to reform the INS, the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

□ 2045

Much more needs to be done to actually reform that organization, much

more than what we did in our bill in the House. In fact, what has to happen is that we must take from every agency presently charged with responsibility for border control, that being the Customs under the Treasury, Agriculture, a variety, DEA, all kinds of agencies have border control responsibilities, of course Border Control under the INS. The Forest Service has some responsibilities in areas. We have national forests that adjoin international boundaries, and what we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is to consolidate all of those agencies, all of these parts of agencies into one agency, with a clear mandate, with a very clear line of authority, so that everyone who works for that agency knows exactly what they are supposed to be doing and know that they have the full support of this Nation in that endeavor. That agency should be put into the Homeland Defense Agency, should be run out of Tom Ridge's shop or whoever is the subsequent head of that organization.

That is what we should do. That is what everyone who studies this area understands needs to be done. Now, we did not do that. We did not do that in the bill we passed in this House. We split the agency into two, which is good. We said they are going to have an enforcement responsibility and they are going to have what I call the immigration social worker side of things, the welcome wagon. Those will be the two separate responsibilities. They will be reporting to two different chiefs who in turn will be reporting to a single individual in the Department of Justice.

That really is not a lot different than what we already have. It really is not because among other things almost all of the people who will be running those two separate organizations within Justice are the people who are presently running the single organization we call the INS. Names will be the same but titles will be different, and we assume that by changing someone's title we will change their attitude or improve their competencies, but my colleagues and I know, Mr. Speaker, and I think the American public understand fully well that just changing titles will not change the way it is run.

Unfortunately, today within the INS we have people who are not, number one, competent to do the job and it starts from the top. The gentleman, very nice gentleman, Mr. Ziglar, whom I have nothing against personally, seems like a very pleasant individual. Unfortunately the water is so far above his head in trying to operate this agency that it is almost pathetic.

Mr. Ziglar was appointed several months ago because he had been the doorkeeper of the Senate. That was his job before he became the head of an agency with 30,000 people and an \$8 billion budget. He should not be there. He is not able to run the agency. He is not able to run it because the force of his personality cannot control it, and secondly, he is not able to run it because of course it is an enormous bureau-

cratic organization, moribund, plagued with inertia and internal incompetence and protected by Civil Service.

So even if we had some of the finest people, even if we had someone with enormous capabilities as head of the organization, their ability to actually change the course of this big ship, they could be turning the wheel as hard as they can and they will notice that the bow hardly ever moves because all of the people are turning the wheel as fast as they can, they realize there is nothing connecting the wheel to the rudder. It is going its own way, and that is a problem, and it will not be solved by the bill we passed in the House.

Here is the rub with that particular bill. It is going to the other body and it will not be improved. It will not be made better. We will see a conference report on this. It will pass and it will be something far short of what we passed in the House, and then we will all walk away from here and tell our constituents not to worry, we voted to abolish the INS and we are going to construct a really great agency to handle this problem.

Okay. That is the problem. That is a big problem, and I ask my colleagues to just think about that for a minute over here, that the INS today, regardless of what we pretended to do in the House, abolishing the INS, that was the way it was presented to us, regardless of that, regardless of the words we used, the reality is we added a lifeboat to the Titanic. I voted for it. It is a pretty good idea. I think it is a good idea. In fact, who would say we should not have added lifeboats to the Titanic? That would be good. I voted to do it. It is not going to stop the ship from sinking.

Yesterday in the Rose Garden the President signed a bill that, as I mentioned earlier, called Enhanced Border Security, and it is adding a couple of more lifeboats to the Titanic. It is good. Glad we are doing it. It will give us the ability to track people eventually. 2004, 2005, it will give us the ability supposedly, and we have done this before actually. We have actually mandated this before, and nobody ever carried it out, so we will see. If agencies carry out the law, it will give us the ability to track people who come into the United States. People who request a visa will actually have to have some sort of identifier, a biometric identifier, which is a term for fingerprint probably. Eventually other maybe more sophisticated approaches but initially fingerprints. So we will know if, in fact, the person asking for this visa is, in fact, who they say they are. That is good. Good idea.

Also, schools will be required to participate in this and tell us whether people who are here on student visas are still in school. We have done this before. Everybody complained. We pulled back because the schools said, please, we do not want all that paperwork and what if it discourages all our foreign students from coming here. We make a

lot of money, and we said, okay, well, never mind, we are going to try again. Try again when students were not coming to class, when they were not educated anymore in the course work. That will be good. I am all for it. Another lifeboat.

It will create a database that will allow various agencies of the Federal Government, the FBI and the INS and everybody, to identify potential terrorists or people who pop up on a terrorist list. We will be able to go and this name will come up, and it will say, oh, that guy came into the United States, or lady as the case may be, on such and such a date and he is here or he has gone, and that is good. I am glad.

We will still have, by the way, Mr. Speaker, we will still have the visa application that anyone can go to the Web site for the State Department and look this up. I love it. This is great. I always think it is a metaphor for the entire INS debate. It is called the temporary visitor visa, and it says about the third or fourth question, I am paraphrasing only slightly. It says are you a terrorist; are you planning to come into the United States and blow things up and commit acts of terrorism; have you committed acts of terrorism in other countries; are you a member of the Nazi Party. It is all one series of questions, and then the person checks over one box, yes or no.

So this potential terrorist says, yeah, I am, I am terrorist, I am a member of al Qaeda and I am coming in to blow up a building or distribute some sort of biological warfare agent, and at the bottom of this visa, because of the efforts of a Member of the other body from Massachusetts, very big Member of the body, there is an additional little asterisk and it says, after you answer yes or no to this question, are you a terrorist, if my colleagues go to the bottom and it says answering yes does not mean that you will be denied access to the United States.

So we still have that, but now that is okay because we will know if the terrorists come in, they will sign up. Naturally, they will say of course I am coming in, I am a terrorist, here I am and here is my terrorist credentials, and I am coming in to do a lot of damage.

Now, for those folks who admit to being terrorists this is a good idea that we have them register. I am all for it, but supposing, just supposing, I mean, I know this is a great hypothetical, but just supposing a potential terrorist decides to come into the United States and not sign up as a terrorist, not actually apply for a visa, now my colleagues say that cannot be because of course everybody coming into the United States applies for a visa, comes here as a visitor, a guest of the United States, tells us who they are, where they are going to be and for how long.

I say these things, of course, with tongue in cheek because everybody knows that our borders are porous and that only our most honest people in

the world for the most part say they are coming in, especially to apply through the regular process, but of course millions and millions of others come in a different way. They do not wait, they do not waste time filling out visas, requests for application to the United States. They come across the border.

These are two pictures of the border along the Arizona-Mexican border near Nogales, Arizona. We took them a couple of weeks ago when we were down there on a fact finding trip. This barbed wire fence, if it can be distinguished on the television, I am not sure, here, that is separating Mexico on the other side of this fence from the United States. Down here, same thing, barbed wire fence, but there is only a cattle guard separating Mexico from the United States.

This part of our border is actually more demarcated, more defined than many parts of the border that have absolutely no distinguishment, here and on the Canadian border. We have 1,900 miles in Mexico of the border and 4,000 miles on the northern border.

I guess I ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, when I hear people on the other side, people on our side, people in the administration, people talking about the fact that we should not try to connect immigration to terrorism, because most people come into the United States and they are completely and entirely looking, they are mostly looking for a good job, a way to send some money home, and they are not looking to do us damage, and this is absolutely true. Undeniably true, but of course, there are people who come into the United States for other reasons, and when they come into the United States for other reasons, may I ask my colleagues if they think it is logical for us to assume that they are all going to come via a visa process, especially when we start to tighten it up.

The 19 hijackers who committed the atrocities here in the United States in September were all here on visas. Some of them of course overstayed their visas. Some were here fraudulently, but they were all on visas. If we make it tougher for those people, Mr. Speaker, which I am all for, I am all for asking if you are a terrorist, please, let us know on this document, sign up right here, tell us you are a terrorist, and we can keep track of you. I am all for doing that.

□ 2100

But just supposing, I mean wildest stretch of your imagination, supposing they choose not to tell you that they are a terrorist and not to sign up that way on the visa. Why, may I ask, is it so hard to understand that there is a connection? Why is it so hard to understand that they would in fact come in a very easy portal, that they would walk across the border?

Here, this one on the bottom, the cattle guard, at least that protects us from illegal cattle coming into the

United States. This one does not even protect us from that because there is no cattle guard. It is just a big deeply rutted road. And by the way, this road is not on any Forest Service map. It does not exist on any map you have ever seen because, of course, it is just illegals coming into the United States.

And this is the greatest thing of all, Mr. Speaker. You know, you can go to our Web site, it is www.House.Gov/Tancredo, then you go to the immigration part of it and you will see all this stuff in greater detail, and I encourage you to do it because it is hard to see this. But here is a sign that is facing our side of the border, and it says here: "All persons and vehicles must enter the United States at a designated port of entry only. This is not," underlined this is not, "a designated port of entry. Any person or vehicle entering at this point is in violation of the U.S.," certain codes and blah, blah, blah, blah, and a \$5,000 fine or penalty.

This is on our side. This is facing the United States. Then it is printed down here in Spanish. I am glad they are letting people know. I know a lot of illegal aliens coming into the United States finally get on our side, turn around and look at the sign and say, "Oh, wait a minute, I guess I better go back. It says here this is not a designated point of entry." So certainly they are going to turn around and go back and find wherever that point of entry may be. Probably it is in Nogales. Yes, that is right, it actually is; and they will go on down the road certainly and they will enter the country legally. I am sure that happens a thousand times a day, would you not agree, Mr. Speaker?

Here they are not even able to see a sign such as this. They are not able to say, "Well, gee, after I cross this cattle guard, I see now that I am in the United States illegally. I best turn around and go back." And one reason why there is no sign here, Mr. Speaker, as they were often placed there, folks from the other side of the border, primarily Mexican police, come across and tear them down every night.

We actually got to the point, the Forest Service people, because this is right on the Coronado Forest, a national forest, where the trafficking in illegal aliens and drugs is so great it is destroying the national forest. The degradation of that national forest is a national disaster. But not one single environmentalist has spoken out against it, interestingly. Not one.

The tracks, as I show you here, go on up into the forest. They have worn footpaths through the forest that now make it look like cobwebs all over the forest. There is trash. It looks more similar to a national dump than a national forest. And they set fires, campfires; and then they walk away from them. And of course especially at this time of the year, and this year the drought being what it is, the day we were there and just as we were leaving a fire started, again by someone coming across illegally. They believe it is

UDAs, that is the way it is referred to, undocumented aliens, because it is in the very remote areas; and it had consumed 35,000 acres in less than a day.

I do not know where it is now. I do not know if it is contained. I do not know. We cannot even go in and use the most up-to-date methods of fire suppressants. We cannot drop slurry because there is so many illegals going through the forest that it actually may harm them. They may get some stuff on them so they do not drop it. And they only fight the fire during the daytime, because in the nighttime they have had fire crews up there and the crews have confronted armed men, people carrying M-16s, because they are the people protecting the people carrying drugs; and they are coming in huge bands 20, 30, 40, 100. The forest is being destroyed.

Here, people who are hiking, picnicking, whatever, around the national forest, could mistakenly enter into Mexico, you see, because there are no signs telling you, like this one, be careful, you are leaving the United States, you are going into Mexico. And they do. They go into Mexico. And the reason why is, and I started mentioning this earlier when I spoke of them tearing down the signs time after time, we have actually put up over here, just a little farther inside here, two metal posts, two big metal posts with a metal sign. That had been cut out. The Mexicans came across that night with a torch and cut the sign down, because they want people to wander over, then nab them and throw them into the local hoosegow and then extort money from them. It is a way of making a few bucks down there. They want people to wander in so that they can then say you are here in Mexico illegally and we are going to make you pay the price.

But there is no connection, Mr. Speaker, no connection whatever; and how can we even talk about things like immigration reform and terrorist activities? How could we suggest that there is anything related here, just because you can waltz across this border with great impunity? And believe me, hundreds of thousands of people a year come through right here, millions of people across the border, both north and south. By the way, this is not unique in any way, shape, or form to Mexico. Of course the greatest numbers coming through are Mexican nationals. But nonetheless, we have the problem on both our borders and in our ports of entry on both coasts.

Recently, 25 suspected Middle Eastern terrorists evidently came in on cargo ships. They are here someplace. We do not know where. I do not know exactly how we found out about it, but I am glad we at least know they are here. Makes me feel a lot better. And hopefully they will be caught. I know we are judiciously looking at everyone in the United States who is not here legally and returning them to their country of origin, so certainly in a short time we will have them.

We have a huge problem, Mr. Speaker. It is a national security issue. To suggest anything else is to be naive to the ultimate. And to suggest that we cannot clamp down on this kind of situation, we cannot in fact protect our own borders, even if it means putting troops on the border, because it will be insulting to Canada and Mexico, to suggest that trying to enforce our own borders and protect the lives and property of the people in this Nation is an act that would turn certain constituencies in America against us defies the imagination. It defies anyone's ability to actually and appropriately characterize such a position.

There are people in the United States of America, regardless of their ethnic background, who are opposed to their own government trying to protect them and their property? I want to hear that. Because most of the people, Mr. Speaker, I guarantee you, by magnitudes that are actually astounding to me, numbers that are incredible, tell me that they are asking more from their government in terms of protecting them, and they are asking us to do something to cut down on illegal immigrants.

And, Mr. Speaker, this is not just something that white WASPish Americans are asking for. This is something all Americans are asking for. Everybody. Because everybody here who has come here legally, who believes in the sovereignty of this Nation is saying to us, What are you guys doing up there? And I mean we are talking Asian Americans and we are talking Hispanic Americans. I do not care what the ethnic background. By and large these people support our efforts to try and actually do something about border security and to reduce even the amount of immigration.

A vast majority of the people in this country recognize that is necessary. It is not ethically driven. This is not racially motivated. This is a matter that strikes at the heart of everything we should be doing here in this Congress. We should be looking, first and foremost, at the security of the Nation. And you cannot go in front of your constituents, I do not care who you are or where you are from, Brooklyn or Timbuktu, no, strike that, Brooklyn or Ray, Colorado, you cannot go in front of your constituents and say that we have in fact done anything to significantly increase the protection of our borders and, therefore, your safety. Because we have not.

I repeat: the tepid bill we passed here on INS reform will be destroyed, I predict. And by the time we see it in a conference, it will be something totally different and much less dramatic than it was even leaving here, and that was not much.

I also predict that unless we do this, unless we actually reform the INS, actually create an agency that has the resources and the direction to protect our borders, and the commitment internally, the people working for it who

know why they are there, who are on our side when it comes to whether or not we should be letting people in here illegally, and our side means saying no, unless we do that, we have not done anything to improve security.

All of the other stuff we have done, including the bill the President signed yesterday, which I supported because it was that life boat, and I am all for adding another life boat to the Titanic, but it will not keep the boat from sinking. Signing a bill and calling it border security implies, I think, far too much. It is not security if we have an agency that is completely and totally incapable of actually providing that security.

We must reform the INS first. And I mean real reform. Then all the other things we do, all of the other jobs we give it in terms of tracking, all of the other responsibilities we give it in terms of protecting the borders, expanding our observation and control of the border activity, all of those things will be easier to accomplish with an agency committed to that task. Because I know this, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell you, I have spent many hours with the folks who we give the responsibilities of being on the ground down at the borders, and they want to be supported by us. They want clear lines of authority. They want to be able to protect America. But they are working for an agency which is incapable of providing them with the leadership, direction, and resources to get the job done.

They will tell you personally, time after time after time, of the horrendous frustration they feel in trying to deal with this issue and do their jobs, do their jobs for their own families and for America. They want to do their jobs, but they are prevented from doing so because the agency itself is so incredibly, incredibly incompetent.

We will move just for the next few minutes to one final issue about which I am greatly concerned, and that is the issue of amnesty. We may talk about all that we have done in this body to protect the borders; but every single time we reconstitute, regenerate support for amnesty, every time that the administration pushes it, every time the other party brings it up, we are doing great damage to our ability to actually control the borders; and we are doing great damage to the moral character of the United States of America.

Here is why I say that. We call ourselves a Nation of laws. We tell the world to emulate us. We tell every country how important it is to disavow the rule of man and to accept the rule of law as the philosophy of government that all people should abide by and hearken to. And yet we suggest that 11 million people who are here illegally, who broke our laws coming into this country should be forgiven for that and given citizenship, in fact, rewarded.

□ 2115

Put them in line for citizenship ahead of all those millions of people

around this world who are reading the words on the Statue of Liberty: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free," and say how do I do that, I want to go there, I believe that the principles of the United States of America are the principles I want to live by; and I want to leave my country, I want to disavow any relationship, political relationship that I have with the country of my birth, and I want to start a new life in America, as perhaps your grandparents, I know my grandparents did.

We are telling all of those people every time we give them amnesty, we are telling all of the people who are waiting that they are suckers, and that the better way to get into the United States is to sneak in, stay under the radar screen long enough, and we will give you amnesty. It is a slap in the face to the people who have done it the right way, filled out the paperwork and waited the appropriate length of time, learned the language, learned our history, things we actually require of people coming into the United States. They did it right, and we are telling them, you are suckers. You should sneak in.

I know the allure is on our side. It is like the drug issue. We say there is the demand, there is always going to be the supply. There is the demand for cheap labor; and, therefore, they are going to come. I understand that part of the equation. I will be for any attempt on the part of the government, we have the laws, it is illegal to hire people who are not citizens of the United States or not here on the appropriate visa. It is illegal. Recently we finally started actually cracking down. I know Tysons Food and a couple of other big employers who acted covertly to bring workers into the United States for cheap labor are being fined. I would try to dry up the demand, but that does not excuse the supply. It does not excuse the fact that people come here illegally. We cannot reward them for that.

I am concerned because Monday, yesterday, President Vicente Fox said in a speech in New York, it may have been just a couple of days ago, President Fox of Mexico said the number one litmus test of our relationship with Mexico will be our willingness in the United States to give amnesty to the people who are here illegally. The number one litmus test.

One needs to ask himself, why would a President of one country demand from a President of another country the complete revulsion, if you will, of our own laws? Why would they demand that we ignore our own laws as a litmus test for their friendship, while at the same time, Mr. Speaker, at the same time they are asking for our friendship and declaring themselves to be the best friends of America on the continent?

We find that in calendar year 2001, Mexican government border incursions. Here is the seal of the President of the United States. This is the slide that I

was witness to, a slide presentation I was witness to when I went down to Douglas, Arizona. The briefing was presented by something called the HIDA, High Intensity Drug Area, and it is all of the agencies that get together and try to control the flow of drugs into the United States and the flow of illegals into the United States.

In their presentation they showed me this slide, and it says "Calendar year 2001, Mexican Government Border Incursions." I said Mexican government border incursions, what are you talking about? There were nine from the Mexican military and 14 from the Mexican police for a total of 23 in 2001. When I had a little more discussion about this, it turns out this is not unique in the year 2001; we have had over 100 such incursions over the last 7 or 8 years. The hundred have been documented. Many others go undocumented, we are told by the border police.

Some of these incidents have resulted in shots being fired by the Mexican military. Some have resulted in confrontation when guns were drawn on both sides, and finally people backed off. You have to ask yourself, what were they here for? What were members of the Mexican military and Mexican federal police doing in the United States of America?

I called the State Department, and they said they were probably lost. Probably lost? I do not suppose anyone wonders why we have 4,000 miles of border with Canada, much less defined, we have 1,900 miles with the border of Mexico, and we have at least 100 of these incursions by the Mexican military on the southern border, and I called the Canadian desk in the State Department and the Canadian Embassy and said, How many times have we had Canadian military wander into the United States getting lost because they could not find the line? They said never.

I said, How many times has the Canadian Mounted Police come riding across the border chasing someone and we found them in Detroit because they just got too far? It is not happening.

I will tell Members why it is happening on the southern border. Unfortunately, a large part of the Mexican military and the Mexican police establishment are corrupt, and they are coming across the border. Ask any member of our service on the border, any member of the border patrol there on the spot, ask them why it is happening, and they will say they are coming across to protect large shipments of narcotics coming across the border. Sometimes they come across to create a diversion pulling our people away from where that shipment is coming through.

Mr. Speaker, 90,000 pounds, and this is another slide. This is a gentleman coming through carrying several bags in these makeshift backpacks carrying drugs. This is Coronado National Monument, Arizona. This is May 7,

2001. Most come 20 or 30 or 40 protected by armed guards. In calendar year 2001, 11,300 seizures amounting to 2.476 million pounds of marijuana; cocaine, 42,000. That is just in this particular area, and I am just talking about the Coronado National Forest area.

Now, is this the act, I ask, of a friendly country? Why are we facing this is because President Fox, who I believe is a man who is trying to do a good job, I think he is an honest person; but, unfortunately, I do not believe he controls his own government. He certainly does not control some of the most important parts of it, including his own military. Corruption is so endemic, it is so bad that the President of that country cannot guarantee the actions of his own military and/or federal police. It is a sad commentary. I am sorry for him.

If I could wave a magic wand, Mexico would be a place with enormous wealth and a driving middle class, with everybody having the same chance to achieve their dreams and goals. But there is nothing that I can do about that, there is nothing that this body or the President of the United States can do to change the situation in Mexico.

The corruption is so endemic and it is connected to a government that still has connection to a socialist economic theory. The government still owns the oil company, for heaven's sake. While that is the case, while you have this combination of socialistic thought and socialistic economic thought and internal corruption, the economic prosperity of the nation will never, ever be achieved; and there is nothing we can do about it. No matter if we open the border tomorrow and walk away from every port of entry, which some would like us to do, even take away the barbed wire fence, for what little good it does, and walk away from the border. That is what some people want. Members know it is true. But it will not change the situation in Mexico. It will not be something that improves the lives of the people down there.

I am concerned that the Mexican government is not doing what is necessary to help us control our own borders. I am concerned that they are not helping us as the President asked them to do so. The President said, If you are not with us, you are against us. Then why are they not patrolling their own borders to stop incursions? Frankly, people are coming in through Mexico, not just Mexicans looking for jobs, other nationalities, Middle Eastern. One hundred ten Iranians were captured on a guy's ranch in Texas all dressed in string ties, white shirts and black pants thinking they could blend in, I guess.

This is a terrible problem connected to our own national security. It is also connected to the kind of country we will be, how many people will be here, the kind of environment we are going to leave for our children. Will it all be the environment that is today part of

that national forest which has been destroyed? Is that the kind of legacy that we want to leave? I think not.

We have to reduce immigration into this country. We have to reduce legal immigration to a manageable number; 300,000 a year is plenty. We have to put the same amount of effort into the protection of our borders as we put into the prosecution of the war in Afghanistan and around the world. We have to put the same degree of resources and the same degree of commitment into the defense of our own borders as we do to the prosecution of the war halfway around the world.

That may mean, as a matter of fact, troops on our border and demands to our neighbors, Canada and Mexico, to help us patrol it. It is incumbent upon us to do it, Mr. Speaker. It is our responsibility and no one else's. The States cannot do it. The Congress and the President must provide the leadership that the American people are demanding. We and the administration have to stop turning a deaf ear to the pleas of our countrymen to protect and defend our borders.

□ 2130

MIDDLE EAST CONFLICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIBERI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the very serious problem that exists in the Middle East and to report back to the House with several colleagues this evening on a trip taken to Israel the weekend before last to express solidarity with the people of Israel and with the government of Israel in light of the campaign of terror that has been directed against them by the Palestinians. We will be joined later this evening by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), who has organized, or attempted to organize, this evening an Oxford style debate between those of us who voted in favor of a resolution to express solidarity with the people of Israel and those few Members of the House who voted in the negative on that question. Unfortunately, those that opposed the resolution of solidarity with Israel have chosen not to participate in the debate this evening.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker. We are missing an opportunity, I think, to have a good debate and a good discussion regarding the right of Israel to defend herself and the position of America that in my view should be not to try to limit Israel's right of self-defense. But I am happy to report that the gentleman from Florida has arrived, the organizer of the discussion this evening and the man who tried to organize this Oxford style debate to his great credit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. We had scheduled it for 9:30. It is about 9:30. As you described, we made an offer and we actually had an agreement this evening to have an Oxford debate about the resolution. As many people who are watching and obviously as Members, we know that our normal debate that we have is not really debate. People almost read statements and they read them to each other and there is no discourse. I think those of us who supported the resolution, many of us sat through literally several hours of debate and at some level a great deal of frustration, because people say things that there really is no opportunity to ask them to respond to try to clarify their position or really even ask them to defend their position. So we had set up this where under the House rules there is an opportunity for an Oxford style debate to interact with Members. We offered that opportunity and again, I guess there were 21 Members that voted against the resolution and 29 that did not vote. It is less than 15 percent of the membership of the House, but a sizable number of people.

We had the opportunity to cancel this evening or go forward, and what we thought we might do is in a sense maybe try to even literally re-read some of the arguments that the opponents of the resolution made and really in an attempt to maybe flesh out what their thoughts were. I think those of us who will be here this evening defending the resolution obviously find it hard to articulate their positions. Maybe they are in fact positions that cannot be articulated.

I would like to start maybe this evening and read one and I have a number of quotes from opponents of the resolution and there is no point in mentioning names but you might remember this one. It was in a poem that was spoken by a good friend and a good colleague of ours whom I respect on so many issues but I was extraordinarily disappointed with his comments.

By poem he stated, "Oh, little town of Bethlehem, we witness and we cry, Israelis and Palestinians, both practice eye for eye."

Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania would want to respond to that statement.

Mr. HOEFFEL. What struck me as off-target with that statement was the notion that there is some kind of equivalence here between the behavior of the Palestinians and the behavior of the Israelis. Our colleague who said that, who is a fine Member of this House, seems to feel that there is some moral equivalence between the actions of the two sides that he stated. That does not persuade me, Mr. Speaker, because what we are seeing on the side of the Palestinians are acts of terror directed intentionally against innocent, unarmed Israeli civilians, men, women and children. What we are seeing from the Israeli side are acts of self-defense, military acts by the armed forces of

Israel, but acts that are not designed to kill Palestinian civilians in some kind of retribution but acts by the Israeli army to defend Israel.

Mr. DEUTSCH. If the gentleman will yield, I think there are so many parallels between what the Israelis did with their incursion into the West Bank areas and what the United States did with our incursion into Afghanistan. This poem, I think, would in a sense give the same moral equivalency to the murderers who attacked the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and the plane that crashed in Pennsylvania with the United States military action in Afghanistan and really trying to set up a moral equivalency of that. There is a fundamental difference.

Again, these are different Members that spoke during the debate. I am going to quote another Member: "I thought there was one thing that might turn the tide in this struggle and it was a horrible tragedy in the end of March." And he showed a picture that actually was on the cover of Newsweek magazine, I believe, of two young girls.

"Look at these two young women. They look like sisters. One, Ayat al-Akhras, 18, was a suicide bomber who killed Rachel Levy at the grocery store, age 17. I thought that both sides would be so appalled by this unbelievable tragedy and see the hopelessness of this that they might turn toward peace. But, no, that has not happened there."

If we can, maybe if the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) can respond.

Mr. WEINER. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield, what is interesting, I would say to the gentleman from Florida, that that dynamic has been portrayed several times in the media, that there are so many parallels between the 17-year-old that straps dynamite to his or her chest and the 17-year-old that might have been taken as an innocent victim. But the fact of the matter is that that suicide bomber, that homicide bomber, is bringing the Palestinian people further, not closer, to their objective of having a homeland. I do not think any of us would agree in this body that if the Palestinians announced and did more than announce, they actually began to operate without violence and to sit down and really negotiate for a Palestinian homeland, if they would have done that arguably years and years ago, it would be a reality today.

We have to recognize one thing that some of my colleagues did not recognize in the debate. Someone who blows themselves up and anyone around them blows them to bits is not engaged in political speech. They are not engaged in debate. They are not furthering the cause of bringing the two sides together. What they are doing is murdering people.

We have to recognize what sometimes often gets overlooked is this notion that someone who is engaged in