

agencies and most importantly those firemen on the scene on the line put into this effort.

So I want to publicly acknowledge from the House floor those firepeople from across the country and all those Federal agencies that are helping fight these horrible fires that we are seeing besiege us this year.

In the next couple of days or perhaps next week, I want to take an entire hour and speak about the water situation in the West. As many of my colleagues know, I have had a series of discussions here talking about the public lands and what impacts us that is different in the West than the East.

I am continuing to make a very conscious effort at trying to educate and work with my colleagues to tell them how the geographical difference, the public land location difference in our country has significant, significantly different needs, for example, in the western United States than we have in the eastern United States; and I want to spend a good hour talking about the issue of water, defining and making clear the difference between what is surface water, the water that originates on the surface or is accumulated on the surface, versus the water that is subsurface, that we dig a well down into.

Many in the East get their water from wells. Where I live most of our water is surface water. In fact, in Colorado 80 percent of our water that we use in Colorado is dependent upon the snow pack. Colorado happens to be the highest place on the continent, and our mountains reach high into the skies, and they gather that snow; but water storage is very critical for us, and just the same as I have seen an effort in health care towards a socialized type of system, i.e., the government takes care of all of it, the government pays for all of it, do not worry about the prescription costs, the government will pay for all of it, we are seeing the same kind of effort being made in the West in regards to water.

Right now water in the West is a private property. This country was built on the premise of private property. If we were to list some of the freedoms, say the top 10 freedoms that Americans feel so strongly about, that were the foundation of the founding of this country and the foundation of the greatness of this country, in those top 10 items we would find private property listed by almost everyone who listed those top 10, private property; and in the West water is a property issue.

Generally what we see is those who do not have it or did not buy it or did not think to get it make a very conscious effort of saying, wait a minute, those who have it ought to share it with us. That is exactly the premise upon which socialism was built, and we are seeing it in the West; and it is being seen in the West by something called the public interest doctrine, i.e., when it comes to water, we do not consider the individual's private property

rights. We do not consider the individual's rights of usage. What we consider is what is good for the public as a whole.

So in other words, it might be that someone has owned these water rights out in the Colorado mountains for a long time, and it might be that that family is dependent upon ranching; but the fact is, since in Colorado agriculture is only a small percentage of the entire economy, but yet uses a larger percentage of the water in proportion to the size of its economy, public interest demands that we take water from them.

That is exactly the effort that is being made, and frankly, I think this year in Colorado under a populist type of banner, they are going to attempt to put a question on our ballot, should a person's water rights have to take backseat to the public interest doctrine. It is a very, very dangerous move towards a socialistic society. I can tell my colleagues that there are some people's water I would like to have, some people's property I would like to have, but it is not my private property. It is their private property. They earned it, they paid for it, they worked it or whatever; but it is their property.

For us to begin to move this country in a direction that because we as a public think we can put it to a better use, that the public interest doctrine should be introduced and the property should be taken from them is the wrong approach. So next week I fully intend to spend a full hour talking about the special needs of water, the special needs in the West.

In the West water is like blood. That is what they say. Water runs thicker than blood, in fact, they say in the West. We will talk about where it originates, the importance of storage in Colorado and the West. We will talk about the public lands that are primarily located in the West and not located in the East. We will talk about gravity, how gravity has a lot to do with the situation that we are in today.

We will talk about those who do not want water being utilized for their home or for no development, for example, and see it as a way to control or stop development. Frankly, in some regards, I think the abuse of water has been ignored. We will talk about that, too.

We will talk about the environmental issues of water. Water is a very boring subject by the way. It only becomes interesting to all of us when all of the sudden we are in a drought or when we turn on the faucet and the water does not come out; but in fact, when we look at the future generations, what issue is so, so important to sustain life, to sustain agriculture, to sustain recreation, to sustain the environment, we are almost always going to come back to water.

Colorado politicians and Colorado citizens throughout its hundred-plus years of being a State have recognized

the importance of water. If we go in the State capital of Denver, we see in every painting in the rotunda somewhere depicts someone doing something with water. It is very, very important.

The Colorado River is called the mother of all rivers. Why? Is it a big river? No. It does not look like the Mississippi. In fact, I grew up understanding how important the Colorado River was, but I also thought it was the biggest river.

□ 2100

I about fainted when I saw the Mississippi River, the first time I saw a picture of it. It was huge.

The importance of the Colorado and what makes the Colorado the mother of all rivers is the fact that it is the only water available for many of the people out there. Whereas when you get into the Mississippi, in fact, in a lot of the East, the difficulty is getting rid of water. In the West, it is the capability of being able to store water.

So I look forward to visiting with my colleagues next week, Mr. Speaker.

CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES AND SPENDING HABITS OF THE CONGRESS

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of issues, of course, that come to mind today for purposes of a discussion for a period of time here. Something brought to mind when I was listening to my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McINNIS), and he was talking about the propensity of this body especially to spend money in ways that I think we could call profligate.

It is true, unfortunately, whether one party is in charge or the other, it seems like it hardly matters, we do spend a great deal of money, sometimes without benefit, I think, of enough analysis and enough debate. And a constituent of mine e-mailed us a couple of days ago concerned about everything he had been hearing with regard to the proposals on both sides of the aisle for support of a new program for Medicare, a program that provides for insurance and/or some subsidy in some way or other for prescription drugs. As my colleague from Colorado said, it is a compelling argument.

We have all heard from constituents who over and over again explain to us the need for some help in procuring their prescription drugs, and our heart goes out to them because we recognize, just as I do with my own parents, and certainly I think everybody has someone who they can think of who is in desperate need for medication, the cost of which is skyrocketing. It seems like almost every week it goes up again and it becomes an incredible burden. And,

naturally, that kind of thing happening out there will result in pressure here on this floor and in this body to do something about it to respond.

The reaction that most of us have is to say, well, what is it that the Federal Government can do. But unfortunately I think the reaction that most of us should have, but do not, is what is it that the Federal Government is empowered to do, empowered by the Constitution. Day in and day out we confront issues here on this floor that are severe, they are significant, they matter to millions of people in this country, and because they matter and because people are interested in them and there are pressure groups that develop, we find ourselves responding over and over again to the political pressure that boils up.

People say, well, is that not the purpose of a democracy? But, of course, this is a republic and not a democracy. This is a republic. And what that means is that we elect people to represent the interests of our constituents. We do not have a majority rule of the population of the country, which is what a true democracy is; everybody meeting all over the country on every issue and deciding the fate of that issue on an up-or-down vote. That is not what the Framers of the Constitution gave us and that is not what we should be about. It is mobocracy, perhaps would be a better way of describing it.

A republican form of government charges us, the people who are elected, to come here and analyze the issue and cast our vote in the best way we think that will fit our constituency and our responsibilities as a Member of this Congress. And this is always a challenging experience because we are torn, every human being on this floor, every human being in the Congress of the United States is torn between doing what political pressure pushes them toward doing on the one hand, and on the other what the Constitution prevents them from doing.

The Constitution cannot speak for itself. It has no voice here except that given to it by those of us who are concerned about it. It is just words. It is just words on a piece of paper, on a piece of parchment, actually, and, therefore, it can be interpreted, broadly, widely, liberally to say that everything we do here in this body is constitutionally approved. Well, of course, I think that if that were the case, we would not need a Constitution. We would not need a written document.

Britain has, for centuries now, existed without a written constitution. Everybody sort of understands what the parameters are and tries to deal with it. But, of course, Britain is a far more socialistic economy than ours and far more down the path towards socialism than we are, thank goodness. And that is inevitable. Without the constraints of a constitution, it is inevitable that it will lead to a government that will respond to all political pressures by taking away someone's hard-

earned money and giving it to someone else that we deem appropriate.

This e-mail that I received had such a logical way of approaching it that I thought I would bring it to the floor for our edification. I received this from Randal Morgan, who lives in Aurora, Colorado. And he said, "Are you willing to insert the Boortz amendment, the Boortz resolution in all legislation you introduce and/or support? It is as follows:" And I must admit to you, Mr. Speaker, I had not heard of this particular resolution, that has evidently come up in the past, but I just did not know of it. It says: "Every sponsor or cosponsor over this legislation hereby affirms his or her belief that the need for the Federal Government of the United States to spend taxpayer funds on the purposes outlined herein is of greater importance and urgency than the spending needs which the party or parties who actually earned these funds may have. Such needs being, but not necessarily limited to, spending for medical care, child care, housing, food, clothing, transportation, education, insurance, savings and retirement planning."

Well, I think that is a great amendment to add to any bill that is passed by this House or introduced by any Member. Certainly I will be happy to do so if I am ever in the position of actually introducing legislation that spends money. So far, in my tenure in this Congress, I have been able to avoid that particular distinction. But should I ever find myself in that situation, I will be happy to add this particular resolution as an amendment.

I think it is a great statement. It is saying what we all are in fact doing. It is saying, clearly, that we are making a decision, we as a body, that everyone here believes and understands that whatever we decide is the important cause for which we are on the floor imploring our colleagues to support is more important than the concerns and the needs of the people from whom we are taking the money. I mean that is exactly what we do here time and time again.

Now, if we use the constraints of the Constitution as our guideline, then we will say that, yes, there are some things that we will take money away from all people in this republic to fund. Because we are charged with the responsibility of doing such. We are charged with the responsibility of maintaining the republic intact. And that is just my interpretation, now. I mean, I recognize that there are 534 other Members of the Congress who make their interpretation, but what it means to me is this; that the primary responsibility of the Federal Government is not education, it is not health and human services, it is not transportation, it is not energy policy. None of those things are the primary responsibility, yet we have committees and we have appropriation bills for all of these. We have 13 appropriation bills for 13 separate activities, and they en-

compass every imaginable activity, by the way, and some unimaginable, I should say.

But if we were to analyze the Constitution and think of that as the template over which we overlay the proposal that we use to determine how we should vote on any particular issue, I think that we would all walk away from here after having voted no on about 99 percent of the things that confront us. Because if our primary responsibility is, as I believe it to be, the preservation of the republic, then the defense appropriation bill that comes before us every year is of primary concern to me.

□ 2115

It is my responsibility to make a determination as to whether or not it is enough, but not whether or not it is the appropriate thing for the Federal Government to do. Of course it is. That is understood. It is understood that an agency like the Federal Government needs to be there for the coinage of money and for the regulation of the transportation of goods and services across State lines. There are a lot of things that the Federal Government has a responsibility for that the States do not.

Mr. Speaker, I am more than willing to vote to take money away from people in this Republic and give it to others for the purpose of meeting the constitutional requirements placed upon us. Individuals cannot defend the country. They may hopefully be able to defend themselves if we let them keep their firearms, but they cannot defend the country. We have to organize for that, and that is the purpose of the appropriations bill for defense. So our only question at that point in time is: Is it right, is it enough, is it too much, and should we support it on that basis? But really not whether it is appropriate. But all of the other things we do here that do not fit into the constitutional framework can be called into question and they are, I think, by the e-mail to us from Mr. Morgan. I agree we do far, far too much. I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have gone far too far in the direction of federalizing crimes.

The Constitution again gives us certain responsibilities, and we can interpret them in various ways, but it is difficult for me to understand how or why we can impose Federal statutory limitations on certain actions throughout the Nation that are not directly related to our role as the Federal Government and the Congress of the United States.

I think that we have so strained the resources available to us, especially in the FBI, for instance, giving them now over 3,000 laws that they have to enforce, 3,000 criminal laws that they have to enforce. We have so overstrained their resources they find themselves in the position of not being able to do their primary job, and that is to protect the United States from

those who will do us harm from internal or external threats as a Nation, not a bank robber, someone who has taken a hostage, taken a drug, something that they are now responsible for getting involved with because we have passed laws here forcing them to do so.

And then we say how is it that we could have possibly missed so many clues, so many signs that there were people in the United States of America that were here to do us harm, and we should have known and done better. The FBI got information from the CIA. Did they not interpret it right?

Frankly, they are doing a million things, and I am glad to see that the Attorney General has determined that there is going to be a priority for the Federal Government, especially FBI involvement, and it is going to start with threats to the Nation. That is where it should end. That is where it should end because we have this thing called States rights. We have this thing called the federalist system of government which delegates to States all of the responsibilities for law enforcement of other activities.

Yet people come to us constantly and ask us, and it is hard to turn down a request to make a law against certain activities, to make a law against pedophilia and child molestation. I do not know anyone who supports that activity. But is that our role? Is that what the Constitution says the Federal Government should be doing?

I suggest that because there have been so many attempts to federalize criminal statutes and federalize certain crimes, I should say, that we have now become bogged down in that quagmire of activity that could frankly take all of the resources that we could possibly devote and would never, ever solve the problem.

We all need to know what our role is. What is the job of the Federal Government when it comes to enforcement of criminal statutes? What is the job of the counties and the cities? When each one knows what they are supposed to do, they can devote their resources to accomplishing that goal. But we have done far, far too much because we have responded, as is natural, to the requests, the demands, the political pressure, to make certain things a Federal crime.

Guns, guns. Now, I happen to represent a constituency that has suffered through one of the most traumatic events that can possibly be described. Columbine High School haunts our memories. It is replayed even today on television stations, in the newspaper with charges of malfeasance, with charges of ineptness on the part of various officials who were responsible for dealing with the issue.

Parents will actually never, ever feel the healing salve of forgiveness when it comes to this issue, and when it comes to what happened to their children, both those killed at Columbine High School and those who remain or were injured, both physically and mentally.

The tragedy is horrendous. So what happens then is political pressure develops. People come to the Congress of the United States and demand action. Certainly I felt that pressure. People demanded that we take dramatic steps in trying to restrict someone's ability to own firearms.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, let me say first of all and clearly, I believe there are people in this country that should not be able to own a firearm. Maybe that puts me in direct confrontation with those who say the second amendment says everyone should be able to own firearms. I disagree. We do not go through the penitentiary system in this country offering catalogues for people to order firearms. We restrict a lot of people from being able to own firearms, and logically so. We do not want felons, criminals, especially violent criminals, to be able to easily access a firearm. And I must tell Members that seems completely logical to me. We do not allow people who have certain mental instabilities to obtain firearms. That seems logical to me.

But what is the Federal role? That is the question that one must ask themselves. What is the Federal Government's role in this prohibition? Now, there are people who are federally licensed to sell firearms, and because they have chosen individually and voluntarily to in fact make that determination as a federally licensed dealer, then they must be regulated by the Federal Government. They must accept that regulation. That is their decision. They chose to be federally licensed. That gives them certain responsibilities and certain abilities that other people do not have. It is a privilege, in a way. So we regulate it. I can understand that, and I can even support it.

And I understand the desire of many, even here, to go far beyond that and regulate the ownership of firearms to anyone, regulate the ownership of various kinds of firearms and number, all those things that we are able to do. Where in the Constitution does it give us that responsibility?

That is just one example; and as I say, believe me, I want to keep firearms out of the possession of people who should not get them to the extent we are able. We cannot create a perfect society. We cannot guarantee against every kind of risk, yet that is the constant pressure we face in the United States Congress. People want a risk-free society, and they expect us to deliver it.

All of this comes about as a result of a misunderstanding of the form of government that we have, and the blame can be placed at least partially, if not squarely on the shoulders of our public education system that does not do a very good job of telling children who we are, what we are, and what this Nation was founded on, what principles we were founded on.

Without that knowledge, Mr. Speaker, we are at a loss to understand what we should be doing here and what State

legislatures and county and local governments should be doing. We would think, without the knowledge of the Constitution, we would think that we here should be doing everything. That we are the ultimate authority, and I suggest that it is a misinterpretation. It is a lack of knowledge of the Constitution and of basic American history that has placed us in that situation, along with just the dynamics of human nature that when they see a problem look to a legislative body for resolution of that problem.

But we have to tell people that we have certain responsibilities, and those responsibilities are limited, limited by this thing we call the Constitution of the United States; and there is an important reason why we have such a document: it is to curtail power of the Federal Government. The Constitution is not something that is designed to broaden the power of the Federal Government; it is designed to limit the power of the Federal Government. And we should understand and appreciate that, and we should teach our children about that to the extent we are able, both as parents and as schools. Schools should be the reflection of these values and attitudes and ideas about our system of government. After all, although there are a lot of reasons why we should argue about what should be taught in a public school system with regard to morality and everything else, the fact is we are talking about a system of government that we all share, that we all have a responsibility for looking into and voting, and a variety of other things that demand our participation.

When we do that, we should demand the participation of intelligent voters, people who understand what this process is all about. If we do that, Mr. Speaker, it would come naturally to mind the next, I guess, topic of my Special Order tonight, the issue of what is the proper Federal role in the government of this country.

I will suggest that there is one area that is uniquely Federal in responsibility, and that is of course the area of determining who comes into this country, how many, for what purpose, from what countries, and how long they stay.

□ 2130

We call that an immigration policy and no State can adopt one. The State of Ohio cannot determine who comes or goes across its borders, but the Federal Government can and should and has an absolute right to do so. There is a philosophy of government referred to often as libertarianism that suggests that borders are meaningless and that they should be erased for the purpose of advancing economic activity, that borders are anachronisms, that they do not in fact reflect today's reality and should be erased. This philosophy would suggest that the European Union is a good example of the elimination of borders, at least partially, and that everything that comes about as a result

of that is good and that is a way of looking at life through strictly economic lenses, and there is something to be said for that. I mean certainly the philosophy has merit. The gentleman who wrote to us, who I referred to earlier, Mr. Morgan, tells me later on in this e-mail that he is in fact a libertarian. I guess I would challenge a libertarian's view of this particular issue. I would suggest that although an ideal world is one in which all movement of goods and services can flow without interdiction, the real world in which we live requires the existence of borders and there are a lot of good reasons why borders should exist, not the least of which is the fact that people coming across borders without permission of the country they are entering can do nasty things, do do nasty things if they do not like that country's government, if they do not like what that nation stands for. So of course we have seen this happen on September 11. We know that 19 people, actually several more came into the United States for the purposes of destroying as much of the country's governmental infrastructure as they possibly could, killing us here, killing civilians in the World Trade towers, crashing their planes into the Pentagon, hoping to crash them into the White House and, as I say, the Capitol.

We face that dilemma. Libertarians face that dilemma. How do they rationalize their desire for a borderless world with a world in which people exist for the sole purpose of destroying others, in this case us? And that the economic system, whatever grows out of this dismantled world that would be the result of the elimination of borders, would not be one in which free enterprise would thrive, in which capitalist ideals would be upheld. It would be one, if it were democratic at all, in which the masses of people would vote if they had the opportunity to vote, for some sort of world government. I assure my colleagues that right now, knowing what we know about human nature and the lack of information and understanding we have in our own country about what a republic is designed to do, can we imagine what would happen if we overlaid that template across the world and said everyone is to vote for some sort of world government to control various aspects of human behavior which would, of course, be necessary? Even if we eliminated borders, there would be a world government that would be necessary.

Does anyone think for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that that world government would be one that would advance the concepts of liberal, small L, democracy? And of private enterprise? And of capitalism? Does anybody believe for a moment that it would be that, as opposed to a world government in which everything would be taken from those who have and given to those who have not?

I think it is simple and pure and it is again an ideal, but it is an ideal to

which I do not aspire. Therefore, I say, Mr. Speaker, we need borders. This country, all countries, need borders. We need borders to distinguish who we are, where we are and why we are. It is true, I think, Mr. Speaker, that there are distinctions among countries, among governments. I believe with all my heart that there are differences among cultures and among political philosophies, and I believe some are better than others. I know that that is a frightening thing to say to some people, and they would see that as very chauvinistic. But the reality is if we raised all of the gates all over the world, where would people come? To what country would they come?

How many people, do you think, Mr. Speaker, if all of the gates in the world were raised, would go to China? How many would go to Russia? How many would go to Mexico? That is a test of this theory that all cultures are the same, essentially, all systems are essentially the same, no real difference and, therefore, why should we worry about things called borders? I suggest that we should worry about it because we are different. The United States of America is different. It is, in fact, unique, and I will say unequivocally it is better. Because if we raised those gates, Mr. Speaker, they would all come here. There is, I think, no question about it. Millions of people every year attempt to come to the United States legally. Millions more come into the United States illegally. We for the most part have abandoned our borders at the present time. We have abandoned the borders for a variety of reasons, some of them purely cynical and purely political, some of them quite philosophical in nature, as I say, a libertarianesque attitude about the need for and importance of borders. But regardless of the reason we have done it, we have done it. For all intents and purposes, we really do not have borders.

I was recently in Arizona in the Coronado National Forest that has a 60-mile coterminous border with Mexico. The forest manager there had asked for help because he has a total of four people to patrol that border of his forest, a 60-mile border with Mexico, and we are now getting hundreds of thousands of people coming across, some looking just for jobs, some looking for a better way of life that would be provided them even if they did not work because of the welfare system in the United States, and some of them coming across to carry the illegal drugs that are provided them by the cartels in Mexico. Regardless of their purpose or intent, they are coming in illegally and they are essentially destroying the forest. In a microcosm, what is happening in the Coronado forest could be said to be happening throughout the country, to our Nation in a way. We are essentially destroying the forest, the Coronado forest, because the human traffic through there is at such a level as to actually negatively affect the ecology.

There are thousands of footpaths that have been worn into the ground by people coming across in a very fragile environment. There are thousands and thousands of water bottles that have been strewn. There are clothes. There are other aspects of human movement through there, human participation in the movement through that forest and it is degrading to the forest itself. People coming through there illegally at night start campfires to stay warm and in the daytime walk away from them and now over 50,000 acres this year have been destroyed through fire. If this were happening in any other forest in the Nation, the Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth, a variety of other environmental organizations, would be up in arms. Well, they do not like arms. They would be irate. They would be chaining themselves to the scrub oak that comprise the forest. But there is not a word said about this forest degradation because, of course, it is a result of illegal immigration and something that many of these organizations, the Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth and the rest, are averse to trying to criticize, essentially because of political correctness.

So States look to us, the forest manager in the Coronado looks to the Federal Government and says, "Help me do something about this." We turn a blind eye to it. I used to say all the time that the logo for the INS, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, should be a guy who simply is shrugging his shoulders. That should be on the top of the page, a guy going, "I don't know. Don't ask me. I have no idea," because every time we ask the INS about anything, any questions you have of them, no matter what it is, they give you that kind of an answer. But now there is another way I would like to describe the reaction of the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States to the issues of massive immigration, illegal and legal, and that is the classic see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil, the three-monkey sort of statue we have seen before. That is the logo we should have here. No one wants to talk about this because it gets a little antsy. Are we actually talking about racial issues? Are we talking about just one country? Plus there are all those votes that are here in the United States. If we talk about trying to secure our borders, which is a Federal role, a uniquely Federal role as opposed to all the other things we do that I mentioned earlier in my discussion here tonight, the uniquely Federal role of immigration is disregarded because of the fear of the political backlash that would occur in this country from voters, from certainly minority groups and the desire on the part of the Democrats to enhance their numbers by a large pool of immigrants into the country. They recognize that they vote often for the Democratic party, so they are averse to doing anything that would stop the flow.

We, on the other hand, are averse to doing anything because we are afraid of the economic ramifications of businesses coming to us and saying, "I need cheap labor and I don't care if they are coming here legally or illegally." And there is that libertarian flow through the body that says we should just simply open the borders. So we have all of those converging pressures here that stops us from doing anything about this tragedy.

□ 2145

It is a tragedy in the Coronado. It is a tragedy also for the United States. Any country that cannot define its own borders and cannot actually protect and defend them is not a nation. Any country that says we recognize that there is massive violation of our laws, of our immigration laws, but we choose not to do anything about it, does not deserve to be called a country, and one wonders for how long it can be called a country.

Interestingly, this issue of elimination of borders and sort of a world economic system, or at least in this case a North and South American economic and political system that converges, this is not something that is a hidden agenda. There used to be people that I know, and the Speaker knows of many people, who would confront us at various meetings, town meetings and the like, with this world economic order, a new world order, and it is all very conspiratorial; and they feel that it is all in the hands of certain people who have economic interests. Well, this is not conspiratorial. This is out in the open. It is absolutely clear for anyone to see and hear.

For instance, not too long ago, less than a week ago, I think, the President of Mexico, Vincente Fox, was speaking in Spain, and he said that all of his efforts, all of the government's efforts to try and liberalize immigration policy, were really devoted to one goal. This was incredibly insightful, hearing what he had to say. This is the President of Mexico, and he has said something similar on many occasions, but he said just the other day that his goal is to end up with a system that allows for the free flow of goods, of services, and he stopped for a minute, and he said of people, not inhibited by borders. He has said in the past that he believes in a relatively short time there will be no borders between the United States and Mexico.

The gentleman who is the head of an agency of the Mexican Government that is called the Ministry for Mexicans Living Outside of Mexico said earlier, told me personally in Mexico, that there were, when I was questioning him about the use of his term of "migration," and I said it is really immigration, and when they cross the border illegally it is called illegal immigration, and this is Mr. Juan Hernandez, who is, by the way, both a Mexican and an American citizen, he said to me, "Congressman, it is not two countries; it is just a region."

This, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is the end goal of this game we are playing. It is debatable as to whether it is good or bad. I think it is bad. At least it deserves a debate, a national debate. Should we eliminate our borders, or not? That is where we are going. I want it to happen in a de jure way as opposed to a de facto way. Actually, I do not want it to happen at all, but, if it does, it has to be through a legal process and not one where we just several years from now look around and say, how did this happen to us? We lost our sovereignty as a Nation. I do not want to say I was responsible or had no part to play in that process.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. EVANS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of travel delays at O'Hare Airport.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

Ms. MCKINNEY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of mechanical airline problems.

Mr. MENENDEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of the New Jersey primary election.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and until 12:00 noon on June 5 on account of a death in the family.

Mr. GRAVES (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and June 5 on account of family business.

Mrs. ROUKEMA (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. KAPTUR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material):

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ORTIZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SANDERS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORAN of Kansas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material):

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 5.

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, June 5.

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, June 6.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1983. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 Main Street, Lake Placid, New York, as the "John A. 'Jack' Shea Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Relations.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on May 29, 2002 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 3167. To endorse the vision of further enlargement of the NATO Alliance articulated by President George W. Bush on June 15, 2001, and by former President William J. Clinton on October 22, 1996, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4592. To name the chapel located in the national cemetery in Los Angeles, California, as the "Bob Hope Veterans Chapel".

H.R. 4608. To name the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical and Regional Office Center in Wichita, Kansas, as the "Robert J. Dole Department of Veterans Affairs Medical and Regional Office Center".

H.R. 4782. To extend the authority of the Export-Import Bank until June 14, 2002.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 5, 2002, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7124. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report required by the Grain Standards and Warehouse Improvement Act of 2000, Public Law 106-472; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7125. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Trifloxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2002-0052; FRL-7178-6] received May 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7126. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of the intention to reallocate funds previously transferred to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) from the Emergency Response Fund (ERF); (H. Doc. No. 107-220); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7127. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request for an FY 2003 budget amendment for the Department of Defense; (H. Doc. No. 107-