

would burn while older larger trees survive were part of a natural process that made the forest healthier. We need to recognize that a century of aggressive fire suppression has rendered western forests susceptible to these massive conflagrations that cost us billions of dollars annually and that much of the cost and the agony can be attributed to structure protection for homes that are in the forested fringe.

There is a lot of talk these days about the wild land-urban interface. It is a serious question, Mr. Speaker, because we have in this interface between the developed areas on formerly undeveloped forest land, it is putting people in direct contact with what earlier had been a healthy natural phenomenon of wildfires that have just rushed through. We found that people have a difficult time accepting the reality. A recent survey in the Arizona Republic showed that people in this wild land-urban interface have an attitude that, well, they know that it is risky, but I think I will take my chances because it is not that risky. Of course it is not just their chance. They will not bear the costs alone when the worst scenario plays out. Since 1985, wildfires have burned over 10,000 homes.

I see my good friend Mr. TANCREDO from Colorado in the Chamber. My understanding is that there will be a million people in the foreseeable future in Colorado who will be located under current policies in areas that are heavily forested, putting them in harm's way and giving us a very difficult choice about allowing the fires to burn on, risking people's homes and lives, or making some changes to deal with a more rational approach. It is not appropriate for us to continue to put thousands of men and women in harm's way needlessly, and in some cases there are bizarre situations that are a result of human activity on formerly wild forest areas.

We had in Fort Windgate, New Mexico, firefighters having to stay away from certain areas because there were explosions of unexploded ordnance beneath the surface of the public land in areas that had been used for target practice. We had this a couple of years ago in Storm King State Park in New York where firefighters were out fighting a blaze and all of a sudden explosions started to occur. This was a result of shelling from cadets from West Point.

Well, it is not just these unusual situations that deal with unexploded ordnance in military activities. We have to have a comprehensive approach to how we are going to permit activities into the forest land, who is going to bear the risk, what we can do to minimize that in terms of if we are not going to prohibit it outright, to regulate where it is, building materials, what is happening in terms of landscaping. In too much of the West, people have just turned their back on their responsibility, creating serious, serious problems.

Since 1970, over 2.8 million housing units have been constructed along this forest fringe and out into the forest land. The total now is over 5 million dwelling units. If population growth continues at current rates, and we continue to have the ex-urban housing development and we have resort development, there will be an additional 2.4 million housing units in the next 30 years, approaching 9 million in all.

As staggering as these numbers are, they only represent primary residence. They do not include tens of thousands of residences that are second and seasonal and vacation homes, particularly near resort towns. We are seeing the consequences of unplanned growth and development. Some may call it sprawl or dumb growth when it occurs in and around suburban areas; but the facts are we are seeing it leak out in the countryside, and we are going to be penalizing the taxpayer, costing money to extend services, penalizing the taxpayer for fighting fires, for example, where it is going to be exceedingly expensive and difficult to solve in the future.

The final area of concern that I have that I wanted to talk about this evening deals with the way the global climate change has the potential of accelerating and compounding these difficulties. Now the unprecedented drought that we have seen in the West, we have seen in Wyoming, it is the worst in 100 years. We are seeing it throughout the eastern seaboard in places like metropolitan Atlanta where we are not used to thinking about drought conditions.

This is merely a preview of what we can expect if we are going to continue to have the effects of global climate change, as droughts are going to be contributing to concerns about wildfire vulnerability. Unusually dry winters and hot summers increase the likelihood, and we are going to make it more and more difficult to contend with multiple challenges across the country.

I find it ironic that the President will tour the fire sites in Arizona, but really does not have anything in the way of a plan for American leadership when it comes to mounting a plan to deal with global climate change which might forestall or minimize this very serious problem in the future.

It is research from our own federally funded studies that have shown that climate change is going to have a dramatic increase in the areas burned and the number of potentially catastrophic fires, in fact, more than doubling the losses in some regions. And the changes are going to occur despite deployment of fire suppression resources at the highest levels, implying that the change is going to precipitate an increase in both fire suppression costs and economic loss due to just wild fires alone.

And it is not just wild fires that are a concern dealing with the change in greenhouse gasses and global climate. Worldwide, the number of great weath-

er disasters, including fires, in the 1990s was more than five times the number of these disasters for the 1950s. And the damages, the costs that were incurred by governments, by insurance, were more than 10 times as high adjusted for inflation than in the 1950s.

We have seen in the last year of the previous decade 47 events, more than double the average for the 1980s. Well, the United States, with less than 5 percent of the world's population, is playing a huge role in greenhouse gas contributions. We produce approximately five times our per capita contribution.

We as Americans know that we can do better. I sincerely hope that the administration will work with concerned people on both sides of the aisle to not abandon the principle of "polluter pay" and make sure that Superfund cleanup is the priority that the American public wants, to deal with the abuse of the mining industry, hardrock mining in particular, to not make it easier for them to have assaults on the environment, to fill miles of streams and valleys in violation of current law, that instead encourage, indeed mandate, that the industry clean up after itself, that we deal with the current realities of this urban-rural interface that has created such a problem with forest fire protection. And last, but by no means least, that we deal with national leadership for global climate change.

Next month the United States will join with over 100 other nations in the environmental summit in Johannesburg. Mr. Speaker, this would be an excellent opportunity for the United States, if the administration cannot abide by the Kyoto Protocols, which ironically even some large businesses are stepping up and agreeing to meet those targets, at least we are obligated to have our plan, our approach, and it would be a perfect time for the administration to reverse its position, come forward with a leadership approach to make sure that these problems of global climate change, storm events, and wildfires, are not going to be worse as a result of our stewardship, but instead would be better.

□ 1945

ITEMS OF CONCERN TO AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota). 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, I rise tonight to bring to the attention of my colleagues a number of issues. I have listened, as I have been sitting here preparing my notes, to the previous speaker, and there are many concerns that he expresses that I certainly share.

Before I get into the main part of my comments, I do just want to make one statement regarding the issue of wildfires and their cause, the reason

for the severe nature of the fires we are having in my State and the others around the West.

I certainly agree with the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) when he says that what has contributed to this condition in our Nation's forests has been 100 years of fire suppression philosophy. The idea that we had to try to put out every fire that started in our forests has undoubtedly been a wrong-headed approach. We recognize now that fires, of course, can be healthy. I say "can be," because it is not necessarily the case. It is not always the case that every type of fire that you have is a "healthy" phenomenon.

There are certain kinds of fires that are enormously destructive, not just in the terms that we naturally think of when we hear of a wildfire, but there are certainly other aspects of it. So not allowing for a natural process to occur, constantly getting in there and trying to stop all fires, is not good, and I agree.

Now the question becomes one of how to deal with it. Is it to simply ignore the fact that we have forests in the Nation that have accumulated up to 400 tons, 400 tons per acre, of fuels, when the average amount, what we would call a healthy natural forest, is around 10 tons per acre? Is it to simply ignore that, leave it, and say because we do not like the idea that mankind, that governments have attempted to intervene in this process, and that has been problematic, is it to suggest that we have no role to play?

I would state categorically that it is just the opposite. Now that we know what the problem is, now that we have some sense of what has contributed to this enormous problem, then what we need to do as a government and as a public policy is to try to address it, and it is not to ignore it. It is not to pretend that the potential for these catastrophic fires does not exist and to simply walk away from the forests and the management thereof to some other kind of bucolic world in which, after all of the forests in the United States have burned to the ground, in a couple of hundred years they will all be back in a more natural and pristine state. That is essentially what our environmentalist friends are asking us to do.

However, we do have options. We do have alternatives. What we have learned is that you can actually now reduce the catastrophic kind of fires that we are experiencing in the West by management, by enlightened forest management. Part of that is what we call controlled burning, where we go to the area, the Forest Service goes into a particular area and does in fact burn a lot of the underbrush and burn those fuels in an area and in a way that they can contain it so it does not, hopefully, get out of control. It has happened in the past, Los Alamos is a horrible example, but, for the most part, it does not happen that it gets out of control. We have in fact over the years had hundreds, if not thousands, of controlled

burns. They have all worked perfectly well. It does help create a more natural environment.

It also helps stop the spread of catastrophic fires like the one we are having. I have seen it with my own eyes in Colorado, in the forests we are now dealing with, with the firings we are now dealing with, where we have allowed for a controlled burn. The Hayman fire, which is the one that has consumed 150,000 acres, you can actually see where it has come up against what was called the Polhemus burn, which was a controlled burn, come up against that area, and essentially stopped because there was not the fuel to have it continue.

We can manage the forests by controlled burns. We can also manage the forests by thinning, by going in and actually taking out a lot of this underbrush, by cutting down trees, yes, I am saying it, cutting down trees, especially the trees with the small circumference, and a lot of the underbrush that has been so problematic in these fires. We can do this.

There are ways to manage forests, not to stop all fires, but to make the fires that do occur a product of or manifestation of that healthy ecosystem. It is this area, this point of conflict, that we find ourselves in with our friends in the environmental community, especially the more radical elements of that community, who have stopped every single attempt on the part of the government to try and manage the forests, of the Forest Service to try to manage those forests, and, as a matter of fact, were successful in stopping the Forest Service from doing any sort of thinning right in the middle of the area we now call the Hayman fire.

A year-and-a-half ago the Forest Service proposed to go in there and thin parts of that area, to clean out that kind of underbrush. The environmentalist community filed appeals. They worked for a year-and-a-half with them to try to come to some resolution of their concerns. When the Forest Service thought the concerns were met, they went ahead to start the process. What do you think happened? Guess what? The environmentalists went in there and filed the appeal again, stopped the process again. That was a year-and-a-half ago, and, of course, now that issue is moot, irrelevant, because that part of the forest, along with another 150,000 acres, are simply pieces of charcoal.

So we can do a lot to mitigate the disastrous effects of the fire. As for the wildlife wildland-urban interface, that is problematic. We can also control that. There are zoning laws we can adopt and, in many, many cases, have already. It is not the fault of an American who wants to live near a forest or in the forest area. It is not their fault that we have fires or that the fires are catastrophic.

To this point, we have not had a fire in Colorado, of which I am aware, actually, that was started because someone

was living near a forest. I am not saying that has not happened. Nothing I am aware of recently. None of the major fires were started by people who happened to live in or near the forests.

Unfortunately, the two most horrendous fires we have burning or have just brought under control in the United States, one in Colorado and one in Arizona, were started by Forest Service personnel. In Colorado, the lady that started the fire apparently, apparently started the fire, I should say, is a Forest Service employee directly. The gentleman in Arizona who apparently started this fire is someone who is employed by the Forest Service to go in and help the Forest Service fight fires. He is a smoke jumper and he wanted to essentially be employed, so he started this fire thinking I will get the job; I can go in and fight the fire. It got away from him, and 500,000 acres burned down. An area actually now larger than the size of Los Angeles has burned in Arizona.

So this idea that you have got people living on or near the land and therefore we have these big problems, that is really not it. Yes, there are homes that are destroyed, and it is true and horrible, but the people who have chosen to live there take that kind of risk and pay insurance premiums that reflect that, for the most part.

Anyway, I just wanted to talk about that. There are many other issues, but that was not the main purpose of my coming to the floor tonight.

I did want tonight to reflect upon another speaker who had the hour before the gentleman from Oregon, and this was my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), a gentleman whom, by the way, I respect enormously and whose opinions and attitudes I believe are incredibly profound and need to be heard. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is a devout libertarian who has in many, many cases and many, many times, I think, been a lone voice for a variety of different causes here and a perspective that is not heard often enough.

Of course, there are certain aspects of his presentation, of his discussion tonight, with which I must disagree, especially in terms of what our responsibility is as a Nation to defend ourselves against the war that we are now involved in and whether or not we can argue about the purpose of the war, I should say the genesis of it. But I do not think we can argue about the fact that we are in one.

The question that I think this House must always deal with, and I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), for being such an articulate defender of the fact or the idea, the philosophy, that we must never surrender individual freedom and liberty in the pursuit of ultimate security. I certainly agree with that, that that is a terribly difficult balance that we are asked to try and maintain here in this Congress. And the issue is to what extent does this government have

a responsibility to actually try to defend itself against the threat that we, I think, that we now face, and what are the measures that we can legitimately take to defend ourselves, considering the nature of our opponent, our enemy.

That is really the ultimate debate we are having. What is the nature of the fight we are in? Is it just against this small band of terrorists who have, as we have been told, hijacked a particular religious philosophy? And, if so, if it is just against a small band? Maybe we can name them al Qaeda. If that is it, if that is our only war, I would agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), that the steps presently taken, the steps we have taken up to this point in time, may have been overreaction, because it is a relatively small group and we can identify who they are by name, we can go after them wherever they are, find them, arrest them, kill them, if that is the only alternative.

But I believe that that is not the nature of the battle or of the enemy that we face. I believe it is much broader than that. I believe it is in fact fundamentalist Islam that we are fighting tonight, today, yesterday, and will be fighting for many years to come. It is something far larger than this small group of people.

Tonight, maybe, during this discussion we will have the opportunity to go through this at greater length, to determine what exactly it is then our Nation should do, if we are faced with that broader, more broadly defined enemy. One of the things I believe we must absolutely do is to work to control our borders.

It is incumbent upon us, it is incumbent upon us because we call ourselves a Nation State, because we believe ourselves to be a sovereign Nation. We claim that, and I believe we are, I believe we are separate and distinct from the other nations of the world.

I believe that becoming an American citizen, for instance, means more and should mean more than simply crossing a line, simply stepping over a boundary. I believe there are all kinds of things that are incumbent upon an individual when they become a citizen of this country, and I believe that there are people in this world, there are, in fact, far too many people in this world, that would destroy this Nation, everything we stand for, everything we believe in, and physically destroy us, not just our philosophy, but all of us living here.

I believe that that is the nature of the fight we are in, and I believe that there are many things we need to do. Among them is to actually secure our own borders. It is to say to the world that we have a right, a responsibility, to defend ourselves. Part of that may be to seek out our enemies in Afghanistan and in Iraq and in the Philippines or wherever they may be hiding. But it is also to defend our own borders from those who would come across for the purpose of doing us harm. And I do not

think we should be condemned for that or called myopic or xenophobic or anti-individual freedom. It is the least that our citizens can expect of us, to defend them, so that they can be free to practice their religion and their political philosophies and their individual ways of life.

□ 2000

I see that I am joined tonight by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and another colleague whom I will introduce in just a moment. I am glad that they are here. I will gladly yield to my colleague.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, I would like for the record and for anyone who is observing this presentation this evening, to understand the pivotal role that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is playing in this battle for our Nation's security in terms of the fight against illegal immigration.

Now, I may or may not agree with the gentleman about the nature of the terrorist threat to the United States; I tend to think that there are many, many Muslims throughout the world who are as much against terrorism as we are, standing right here in this body today, and that they are horrified that the bin Ladens of the world are being presented to the American people and to others as spokesmen for Islam. They are just horrified by this.

But to the degree that there is a threat there, what is important is what the gentleman from Colorado has been doing to make sure that we focus on a major vulnerability of our country, which is the fact that our government is not concerned about the sanctity of our immigration system and the security of our borders, so that the people of the United States of America are being made vulnerable every day in many ways; economically, but also in terms of their own personal safety, as well as the safety of our government and our institutions, by a massive flow of illegal immigration into the United States of America.

The gentleman from Colorado has taken it upon himself to try to mobilize public opinion and mobilize the opinion of Members of this body so that the public, as well as this body, will understand the great risk we are putting ourselves in by not controlling the flow of illegal immigrants into our country. It is a risk that has economic ramifications, which the gentleman from Colorado has time and again talked about, and about how the standard of living of the average working person has been going down; and yet, of course, we have the ownership class in America who seems to be able to take advantage of cheap labor.

We have also heard from the gentleman from Colorado about the criminal elements that are coming into our country; and now the gentleman from Colorado is also warning us about the potential terrorist implications of not having control over our borders.

Now, I have been fighting illegal immigration for as long as I have served, and have been privileged to serve, in this body; and that is why I feel so strongly that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is playing a role that is just indispensable to the security of our country, because he is carrying much of this load on his own shoulders.

But I have been especially concerned over the years about the security risks that illegal aliens pose to our country. We do not need to just make this fundamentalist Muslims, because I happen to believe that there are a lot of fundamentalist Christians and fundamentalist Jews that say crazy things about other people's religions, and there are radicals who would murder people in every faith. We must make sure that we are opposed to any of this type of radicalism, and it should be denied access to the United States of America. If you have a radical Christian or a radical Buddhist or a radical Communist or a radical Hebrew or a radical Muslim, any one of those who are willing to kill other people because of their faith, should not be permitted in the United States of America, period.

Well, since 245(i), which was an amnesty for illegal aliens, was proposed in 1996, I have talked myself hoarse about why this was such a grave matter to our national security. Mr. Speaker, 245(i), as we know, permits people who are in this country illegally not to have to go back to their home countries in order to readjust their status so that they could in some way be here legally. In the past, if someone is here illegally, they have to go back before they can adjust their status.

Well, others in this body have openly scoffed, saying that 245(i) is about, what they claim, is about uniting families, or fairness, or economics, or anything else than what it is.

Mr. Speaker, 245(i), which is an amnesty for those people who are here illegally so they do not have to go home to adjust their status, they can do it here, is an invitation to criminals and terrorists and anyone else who would overstay their visa to come to this country and break our laws. It is an invitation for everyone who comes here on a visa to overstay their visa because, after all, now that they are here in the United States, and they can be adjusted. And while 245(i), which we put into place, was supposedly a limited right of these people who are here illegally to adjust their status, it has had already horrible impacts on the safety of our people.

Now, the 245(i) amnesty for illegal aliens has claimed the first victims that can be officially proven to be the victims of the action of 245(i) by this Congress, and it is a very prominent case. The INS Congressional Relations Office confirmed to my office that the Egyptian gunman who killed two people at the El Al counter in Los Angeles Airport, at LAX, on July 4, was in this country only due to a 245(i) amnesty.

That is that Hesham Mohamed Hadayet, an Egyptian citizen, a man who apparently either was part of a terrorist system which we do not know, he may not have been, but we do know that he lost his composure or perhaps he did it intentionally, but he went to LAX and murdered two people, two innocent people.

Think about this. Mr. Hadayet, and I do not know if that is the way you pronounce his name, who was due to be deported, became a resident of this country due to a 245(i) amnesty. What a travesty.

Now, this is a case that we can document. I would contend that there are probably many other cases in this country where people have been brutalized or murdered or raped or robbed, or that you have someone who imposes a terrorist threat in our country because of this, but this one we can document. If we had deported him, those two people there at LAX, those beautiful young people, may be alive today, would certainly be alive today, and their families and their friends would have been saved this enormous grief.

Estimates from the INS and others are literally several hundred thousand, by the way, in terms of how many illegal aliens have already applied for and received legal permanent status through 245(i). So let us make that clear. Hundreds of thousands of people have received their permanent resident status, even though they were in this country illegally at the time, because of 245(i).

Now I might add just for the record that the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), my good friend and colleague, the two of us debated this issue out. I was claiming at the time that hundreds of thousands of people would seek to utilize this loophole if Congress passed the 245(i) extension. The gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) emphatically stated that it would only be 30,000, he could never imagine more than 30,000 or so people claiming this, and this was his official estimate by some, of course, source that either did not know what they were talking about or were intentionally misleading the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

But I remember him saying, if you have over that many people apply, I will buy you dinner. Well, I say to the gentleman, I am ready for dinner. I am ready for dinner. And I want the gentleman to know that I will not mention over dinner the death of those two poor people at the El Al counter at LAX, because they can be traced right back to that 245(i), and there are not just a few thousand people who applied, there are hundreds of thousands, and it is a gigantic loophole that we do not need to open wider, we need to stop that loophole. We need to plug it so we do not have any more maniacs in our midst who might have been deported; at least they would not have been here. Who knows.

I had a person from the INS tell me that the reason why we want them

here, if they are here illegally, the reason we want them deported back to their home country to check them out is because that is where the records are. That is where all the authorities in those countries know in their country who has been arrested for unstable behavior. Maybe this man was not a Muslim extremist. He may have just been a very disturbed person.

Well, guess what? We do not want a very disturbed person in this country who is here illegally either. And if Congress should pass another extension of 245(i), which is, of course, what we were being pressured to do, and let me add that the vote that they were leading up to, and there is enormous pressure on us to pass 245(i), that vote was supposed to be on what day? 9-11.

If those people would not have flown those planes into the World Trade Center, if those terrorists would not have slaughtered thousands of Americans up there in New York, this body would have been in session and we would have been voting for 245(i) that would permit these types of threats to our security and to the personal safety of our people to remain in the United States. Had Congress passed 245(i), there would probably be, and we estimate, another 300,000 illegal aliens permitted to stay here and to start to legalize their citizenship status and their immigration status.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time for just a minute, the gentleman makes a very interesting and, I think, dramatic point here, something I did not know, something that I think a majority of Americans did not know. And I will guarantee my colleagues this: What my colleague has just stated about the status of the gentleman who was here and killed those two people at El Al, that fact, I would be willing to bet anyone dinner and anything else, would never, ever, ever have come out had it not been for the dogged determination of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

These are the things that we hear about, but the INS will never admit to. And I hope to see, but I wonder if tomorrow morning we will see on the front page of every newspaper in this country and on every talk show in the country this fact, the fact that my colleague has just pointed out to us; and I will bet again, if it is brought up at all, it will probably be buried, except for the very few parts of the media that have a tendency to support our point of view on this.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is precisely correct. My staff, when this happened, noticed that there was a discrepancy about why this person was actually in the country after he had been given deportation notices. I talked to them about it and, frankly, several of my staff members worked very diligently to find this information out. Rick Dykema, who is my chief of staff, headed the investigation; and the

INS, although they finally confirmed it this evening, right before I came up here, the INS was being very nebulous and it was like, oh, well, they did not want to admit that this was it.

How many people around the country are going to hear this? As the gentleman says, how many newspapers are going to report that? I am very grateful, and I thank the gentleman very much for noting that it took a lot of hard work for us to do this.

I would just hope that those people who want to extend 245(i) go down and take a look at the blood on the floor of the LAX airport before they do. Take a look at the picture of those poor people who were murdered by this either fanatic or unstable foreigner who was here illegally, whom we could have sent back, but instead, we kept, because our colleagues have bought into this idea that it is in some way a positive thing to permit this loophole to exist.

□ 2015

By the way, if there are another 300,000 people who now the INS has to process because of 245(i), let us remember that the INS is already 3 million cases behind in processing people who already have made their application. Why are we adding to their work in processing these applications, and while they are doing it, permitting these people who are here illegally to stay here in this country?

If there is a backlog of 3 million people, it is going to take them years to work and to try to find or go over everyone's case like this, and now we are just adding more and more people who are able to stay here without the serious background check that they would get if they were sent home because they were here in this country illegally.

With the July 4 attack, we knew that we were in a horrible situation. We must take a look at 245(i) and the entire immigration policy of this country after this attack on July 4, but we should have been doing this after September 11, as well.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, absolutely. Here is the thing: we are now 10 months past 9-11. We can talk about the errors we have made in the Congress in the past and the errors this government has made in the past in the crazy-quilt patchwork type of immigration policy that we have been dealing with here for years, and we can affix blame there, and rightly so.

But would the gentleman not think that subsequent to 9-11, subsequent to that horrible event, we would have done something to correct this action, to say, okay, we have made mistakes and we recognize it?

But not only have we not done anything significant to correct it, but an interesting article that I came across just the other day said that, since 9-11, we have given out over 50,000 visas to people from countries on the terrorist watch list. This is not just people from

countries that are kind of on the fringe; these are people from the countries on the terrorist watch list. We have given out 50,000 visas since then.

It is still the case that if people live in Saudi Arabia and want to come to the United States they do not have to go see an actual counselor; they can put it in a drop-box. They can get the visa. No one interviews them. This is coming from Saudi Arabia, a country that we already know many people have come from who have done horrible, horrible things to the United States.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, all 19 of those people who flew the planes into our buildings and murdered our people were Saudi citizens. I think there are some people in Saudi Arabia who are friends of the United States and allies of the United States, but we have to take a look at what is going on in Saudi Arabia. We have to protect ourselves, to make sure that we just do not have an open door, because they have not cleaned up their own house. They have not put their own house in order. Thus, they have made it unsafe.

How many other countries are like that?

Mr. TANCREDO. Reclaiming some of my time, I want to say that the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has been enormously flattering in his description of my efforts, and I sincerely appreciate it. But I also know that long before I came to this Congress, there were people here laboring in this vineyard, and the gentleman is one.

I want to tell the gentleman how much I appreciate what he has done in this area. It is by circumstance and event and whatever that I ended up in the position of being the spokesman for our caucus, but it is only because of work like the gentleman has done and another colleague I will introduce right now that we have the ability to actually bring, I think, some sanity to this discussion. It is because they have been here for some time, and they have been really and truly pressing this issue.

Now, of course, it is on everybody's plate. It is on everybody's top list of things to be concerned about. Why? Only because of horrendous events. They should have been listening to my colleagues a long time ago.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL).

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership, as the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has already expressed, for leadership on the Immigration Reform Caucus.

I would like to take a few minutes to share more information. I think the information just brought forward by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is certainly pertinent to the issue of the 245(i) matter that is still pending before this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we should learn some things when we have studies and cen-

suses and other reports made, because we spend a lot of money doing this. If we will just look at a few statistics. For example, the latest census of 2000 tells us that approximately 8.7 million people are undocumented illegal aliens living in this country. That is about 1 million more than most people estimated was going to show up in the report.

According to those figures, we are having about 700,000 a year illegal immigrants entering this country. If that translates down to 1,918 per day, 80 per hour, and approximately one per minute, in other words, since 9-11, we are approaching a half a million illegal immigrants who have entered this country and virtually nothing is being done about it.

Let me share some other things. As the gentleman has already alluded to, the 19 terrorists in the 9-11 attack all had Social Security cards, all had Social Security numbers. In fact, 13 of them obtained Social Security cards legally. In that regard, a recent report was issued by the Inspector General of the Social Security Administration in which he said that one in every 12 foreigners receiving new Social Security numbers have done so using false documents. He indicated in his report that preliminary results show that some 100,000 Social Security numbers were wrongly issued to noncitizens in the year 2000.

He goes on to say that even before 9-11, that he had been recommending that the Social Security agency check its records with the INS before issuing Social Security cards, and had received no support and cooperation from Social Security. Since that time, Social Security has agreed with that recommendation, but still is having difficulty coordinating records. We, of course, have tried to pass legislation previously to deal with that issue.

Let me deal with another subject. Speaking of ironic situations, I have discovered in my research and in my talking with local INS agents that one of the reasons we are having difficulty deporting illegals is that a lot of times we do not have any detention facilities to keep them until we can process them for deportation.

One of the major reasons is we cannot use many of our jails where we are housing American citizens for criminal activity. They do not comply with the INS detention standards. The INS has adopted detention standards that do not correspond with the American Correctional Association standards. Now, these are the standards that are used in over 21,000 detention facilities all across our country, but the INS says they are not good enough.

Let me give the gentleman just a few examples. Non-English speaking detainees must be provided with more than just simple access to a set of English language law books. They must also be allowed to have presentations made by outside groups informing them of U.S. immigration laws and

procedures, and the INS encourages these presentations.

What about meals? Detainees under the INS standards must be served at least two hot meals a day. Any sack meal shall contain at least two sandwiches per meal, which at least one must be nonmeat and one must be meat, and that must be nonpork, and they must also include one piece of fresh fruit and a dessert item.

I was recently told that in my hometown in Hall County, Georgia, we could not use the local detention facility which houses all other detainees simply because that facility serves a cold breakfast and a balogna sandwich for lunch, and that was just not good enough for the housing of people who are illegally in this country.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman tells me that it is all right to detain our neighbor who has a traffic violation or a bad-check charge, or even our children in the school lunch program who do eat balogna sandwiches and are sometimes served cold breakfasts, and it is not good enough for those who are illegally in this country, but it is good enough for American citizens, let us get real about this.

What about telephone access? We have all heard the proverbial, I am entitled to my telephone call. If one is an illegal alien in this country, let me tell the gentleman what they are entitled to about telephone calls. They cannot, first of all, be placed in a detention facility unless they have unlimited access to telephones; and they cannot be limited, except if they do attempt to limit the time, it can be no less than 20 minutes.

They have also required, the INS has required, their telephone service provider to program the telephone system to permit detainee calls to numbers on the pro bono legal representation list, and permits them to use debit cards to make the calls. Now, that is not the same privileges that are entitled to Americans who are detained in our detention facilities.

They also say that if one is a normal detainee, one has to make all long distance calls, and they have to be collect. Not so if one is an illegal alien. They are entitled to use a debit card. I am told by one that even the detention facility may have to have international telephone access to meet the requirements.

I know that we all recall some of the debates that surrounded the 1996 Immigration Reform Act. We are in the process of looking at that act again, trying to clarify some things. One of the issues was what is a deportable offense. Generally, it was considered to be certain felonies that are of an aggravated nature.

For example, just to have a DUI is not enough to get one deported. Let me read from a letter from a local judge in my hometown. This is what he said:

"Last week I sentenced a gentleman on his fourth DUI committed in the last 2 years. This gentleman is an illegal immigrant. I directed the probation

department to contact INS in an attempt to prevent further violations in Hall County." He goes on to say that that was not enough to get him deported.

He also makes reference to local gang activity. I might just say within the last months we have had two drive-by murders and gang-related activity in my community.

He goes on and summarizes. He says that people who repeatedly drive drunk and are known to be involved in gang activity are allowed to basically run free, with no fear of prosecution, because of the current INS policies. That is a real tragedy and a real shame. It needs to be corrected.

How many DUIs does the gentleman think a person should have who is, first of all, illegally in the country to begin with? One is not enough to get them deported, two is not enough, three is not enough, and in this case he cites an actual case where four DUIs is not enough to get him sent out of this country.

I ask, where is MADD on this issue? Where are those who say that we ought to get tough on drunk driving and the other things that disrupt communities and endanger the safety and lives of our local citizens?

I commend the gentleman, and I will conclude with this comment. It is a comment that was presented to our reform caucus by a senior INS special agent. I think he says it very well when he says this: "The first laws that aliens entering the United States encounter are those laws that the INS is supposed to enforce. When the INS fails to effectively, consistently, and fairly enforce these laws, we are sending a very dangerous message to aliens seeking to enter the United States. In effect, we are telling them that not only can they expect to get away with violating our laws, they can anticipate being rewarded for violating our laws."

I think he says it very well.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Although the gentleman did say it very well, it was made even more profound, I think, and more articulate by the gentleman's brilliant analysis. I do sincerely appreciate the gentleman coming down this evening.

The gentleman points out several ironic, would be one way to describe them, or infuriating is another way to describe these situations, these events, these things with which we are now dealing almost daily. It seems to me I confront something like this all the time where we hear something like this and we say, How could this be? This could not really be. For instance, four DUIs, and he cannot be deported?

We have constructed on our Web site a list of things that we call "incredible but true," and Members can go to that Web site, www.house.gov/Tancredo and go to the immigration page on that Web site, and Members will see these.

If they wish, people are able to go to that Web site and sign a petition to the

President of the United States asking him to please augment the forces that we presently have on the border, the Border Patrol people that are so, right now, inundated. They are so overrun, outgunned, outmanned by the people they are trying to keep out of this country that they are in desperate shape. So we are asking the President to actually help us help them by putting military on the border. Members can go there and sign a petition.

I see that my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), has something else he wants to say.

□ 2030

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to reaffirm something we talked about earlier, and this is for people who may have missed the beginning of this Special Order, that due to research from my office, we have discovered that the murderer who may well be a terrorist or may well be just a very disturbed man or may be a cold-blooded murderer who is in this country illegally, managed to stay in this country through the use of the 245(i) process, this is the murderer who killed those people on July 4 at LAX. So we have confirmed officially for the first time at least, these are known victims of the 245(i).

This is outrageous. And hopefully by exposing this, it should wake up some of our colleagues to just how serious it is to not regain control of our borders which are just totally out of control. And, number two, hopefully this will alert our fellow colleagues to the danger of the 245(i) reform, which they call it, which is a gigantic loophole which permits people who should be deported or should not be in this country because they are here illegally, to stay in this country and adjust their status here in the country rather than having to go back to their native country.

Had this man who came from Egypt been forced to return to his country as was the law without 245(i), those two people who were murdered on July 4 at LAX at the El Al counter would be alive today. And this grief that we brought upon their families is the grief that can be brought upon any American family.

We just heard from our colleague of someone having four DUIs. What does that mean? That person was driving, that person was a threat to killing our families on the street. Now, why are we permitting people who are in this country to pose a risk to the safety of our people and the security of our country? This is ridiculous. I would hope that those listening understand just how serious this issue is and demand that Congress act on this, and watch what Congress does, and, again, that people pay attention to people like the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), who is offering tremendous leadership on this issue and he has taken a lot of personal hits.

I can tell you years ago I was called a racist skinhead for suggesting that

instead of giving hundreds of thousands of dollars to medical benefits to illegal immigrants, that they should be sent home to their own countries for medical benefits. There was one man in my district who received over \$300,000 worth of medical treatment. He had leukemia. Now, I am sorry he had leukemia, but \$300,000? What does that do for the amount of money that we have available to take care of our own people?

Obviously, America has not been taking the steps necessary to secure our own borders. Obviously, the leaders in America are not putting the safety and security and well-being of the American people first. Who is to care about America unless we do?

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) has been in the forefront of this type of patriotism, caring about his country and watching out for our people.

I thank the gentleman very much for letting me participate.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining us this evening.

The gentleman brought up several interesting points, not the least of which is the cost of illegal immigration, the cost to the country. There are a whole host of ramifications of illegal immigration into the country. People do not like talking about any of them. But there is an enormous economic cost to illegal immigration, and it far outweighs the amount of money that is contributed, quote/unquote, to the American society by the taxes that many of these people pay.

It is true that if they come here and they work and they are working for wages that can be taxed, that is to say they are not working under the counter, just being paid under the table, they will pay some sort of tax, and they pay a tax on the things they buy. But the reality is that for the most part 90-some percent of the people who are here and especially who are here illegally have the lowest-paying jobs. They are low-skilled people who, therefore, of course are employed at a marginal level. They pay relatively little, if anything, number one, in income tax and certainly not all that much even in the sales tax because their purchasing power is relatively low. We do not gain a tremendous amount of revenue from the people who come here and are working illegally. But we do gain a tremendous amount of cost.

Recently Rice University estimated that the undocumented aliens in the United States cost taxpayers \$24 billion every single year. And by the way, in Arizona a Federal judge has just added to that. To go on the list of incredible, but true, things about immigration, let us add this one: right now 175 illegals in Arizona are getting free kidney dialysis treatments, free kidney dialysis. Many of them came across the border to obtain this service.

Now, it was supposed to end on June 30, but Judge Browning has extended

the benefits for five illegals who are "very ill." Now the question we have to ask ourselves, how many people in our own districts, how many people who have been here all their lives, that were born here, grandparents born here, that are citizens of the United States, paid taxes all their lives, how many of them can afford kidney dialysis or have it paid for or that were able to have it paid for by the State? And yet people who can come into this country illegally, take advantage of our system, take advantage of our laws, can receive this treatment? It is not fair. I am sorry for them that they need the treatment. How much can we possibly afford, is the question? How much can we afford? And why should we be doing it for people who are not citizens?

There are a lot of people who would suggest that in reality there is nothing different from being just here physically in this country and being here as a citizen. But I suggest to you that there is an enormous amount of difference, and we should not ignore it.

Another colleague who has joined me this evening, another member of our Immigration Reform Caucus and another member who, long before I came to the Congress, has been laboring in this vineyard and bringing to the attention of the American people concerns about illegal immigration, my colleague from Virginia (Mr. GOODE).

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO). First, I want to thank him for his tireless effort on behalf of reining in the huge problem of illegal immigration in this country. I also want to thank the Congressman from Georgia for pointing out the situation where four drunk driving convictions are insufficient for deportation. I would also like to thank the Congressman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER) for pointing out the background of the killer of the three persons at Los Angeles Airport on July 4. He mentioned one cost and this gentleman has mentioned one cost, and that is the free medical treatment that illegal immigrants impose on the United States.

I was just reading a letter from another Member of Congress in a Dear Colleague about a cost of a million dollars for treating immigrants in the State of Florida. In Patrick County, an illegal immigrant ran a citizen off the road in an automobile accident. That citizen had to go to Baptist Hospital in North Carolina, was in a coma, and the young man is still not recovered. And this treatment of him has been going on and that is a tangent cost. It is not a direct cost, but it has long surpassed the resources of that family.

I also wanted to talk this evening a few minutes about the need for troops on our borders. This past week we celebrated Independence Day. And I think one of the best birthday presents this Nation could have would be secure borders. With secure borders we could

greatly reduce or stop terrorism. We could greatly reduce or stop illegal immigration. And with secure borders we could greatly reduce or stop the illegal drug traffic. And I know that several of us with the gentleman's leadership have urged the administration to deploy the military on our borders; and we stand committed towards that end, either administratively or through legislation. In particular, the southern and northern borders of the United States are porous.

Canada and Mexico are still not doing an adequate job of screening the immigrant traffic and cargo in and out of their countries. Aside from obviously being dangerous to the welfare of citizens in this country, the porousness of our borders adds an unacceptable burden on our already overworked border patrol.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service is struggling to meet the demands of new threats, and it is in urgent need of the support of our military. Congress is working to give the administration greater authority to use the military on our borders. As the gentleman noted, the House adopted an amendment to the defense authorization bill that would allow the Department of Justice, if requested by the INS or the Customs Service, to utilize troops on our borders. This legislation would allow the direct involvement of the military in assisting Customs and our border patrol in preventing the coming into this country of terrorists, drug traffickers, and illegal aliens.

If we really want to make our homeland secure, we have got to do more than reorganize homeland security. That is a good positive step. And we have taken other good and positive steps, but to have our borders secure we need troops; and that will have a three-fold purpose of stopping illegal drugs, stopping illegal immigration, and stopping terrorists. And, again, I want to thank the gentleman for his tireless efforts on behalf of this.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely appreciate it.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) has been also enormously helpful as a member of our committee and a person to whom I turn often for advice and consultation. It is important I think that we should point out that it was the amendments of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) to the defense authorization bill that did, in fact, provide, if it is passed by the other body, signed into law, it will provide the President with that authorization. And I sincerely hope that it is retained by the Senate.

This would not be the first time we have passed that resolution, and every time we have done so in the past the Senate has chosen to simply ignore it. This is, I hope, a change as a result of all of the events of the last several months. The last 10 months really would help the Members of the other body understand the need for doing this and certainly would help the President also.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to just say that there has been an enormous amount of talk about the need to protect the United States from future terrorist attacks. Unfortunately, there has not been enough action, certainly far more talk than action. Since 9-11, we are absolutely not one bit safer today in this country. Our borders are not one bit more secure than they were at the time that the terrorists flew the planes into the buildings here in the United States and killed 3,000 of our citizens. That is an unacceptable position to be in for the Members of this body. For the administration to ignore the security of our borders as one aspect of this war that we are fighting, is irresponsible to say the least. And all I can hope is that they will heed the advice of the colleagues that joined me tonight, especially the President, in putting troops on the borders, that is the number one thing, and the rest of the Members of this body to tighten up our immigration policy.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of a family illness.

Mr. HOLT (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a family emergency.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a typhoon in Guam.

Mr. WALSH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

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 Mr. HOYER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mrs. THURMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today and July 10.