

wolf. It is at our door today, but it will be at your door tomorrow. And we have to team up. This partnership has to stay together. This partner, the United States of America, does not want to take Iraq on by itself or take on the war against terrorism. And our partners have come to the table in large part against the war on terrorism. But they are not coming to the table like they ought to be on Iraq. And it is time for this partnership meeting, for us to cut to the chase, to get down to the work that has to be done, and it is dirty work and it is a large task in front of us; but if we do not do it today, we will have let down, in my opinion I do not think it is too strong a word to use the word betrayed, we will have betrayed future generations by knowingly allowing a threat to be built of nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, biological weapons, to knowingly let that threat and those weapons be built by a mad man with the kind of commitments they have made to target our kindergartens and we do not take the fight to them.

It is inherently a responsibility of those of us in Congress to debate this. I do not argue that, I said that earlier. But as inherently, as strong as the debate is to get that debate completed and to move in a unified fashion as this Congress and as the United States Senate signaled it would with President Clinton in 1998, and the threat has only grown greater.

I think it is time for both of these Houses to come together in 2002 and move against the cancer that exists out there as a threat against the borders of this country, and as I have said, against the borders of our allies wherever they might be located throughout the worlds.

So I would hope that in the next, I hope in the very immediate future, I know that the President is going to the United Nations this week, I hope our allies in the United Nations and the people of the United Nations understand what a threat this malignancy is out there, understand how unsuccessful we have been to convince through diplomatic efforts, through inspections, through economic sanctions, through no-fly zones, how unsuccessful these efforts have been to get Saddam Hussein to stop proceeding with these weapons, what the ramifications are of these weapons.

□ 2130

Do my colleagues think that the al Qaeda, if they would have had nuclear weapons within their hands, do my colleagues think they would have used aircraft on September 11? They would have used nuclear weapons.

Do not forget, this country suffered an attack, a chemical attack, anthrax within days of September 11. We got hit with a chemical, with a biological attack against this country. Do my colleagues not think if the al Qaeda did not have that in their hands in sufficient quantities that they would not

have used that? They were probably surprised that the World Trade towers collapsed. We know from the video that we have seen, they were elated by the success of their attack, but this only set the base for countries like Iraq.

The next attack, they want to make sure those casualties, children, women and men, they want to make sure those casualties are many, many multiples of what September 11, the horror that September 11 brought to this Nation.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I am trying to think of my history. I have been in Congress 10 years. The horrible fires we suffered in Colorado this year, all of the different things, big issues that I think over these last few years we have dealt with, I cannot think of anything that is of a more of a threat, that has more serious future consequences than the international situation that we face today. Not the economy, not the impeachment several years ago, not the fires. We have got to go after that cancer that has centered itself in Iraq and has spread to al Qaeda and throughout rest of the world.

Again, at the conclusion of my remarks this evening, let me repeat what President Bill Clinton said 4½ years ago. President Clinton, “We have to defend our future from these predators of the 21st century,” he argued. “They will be all the more lethal if we allow them to build arsenals of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and the missiles to deliver them. We simply cannot allow that to happen. There is no more clear example of this threat than Saddam Hussein.”

I will wrap up my comments with 15 more seconds. I would ask my colleagues to take 15 seconds and read the poster, and once again, what more of a threat, what more of a warning do we need, do we need as a Nation than exists out there today? If in 1998 what Saddam Hussein did in 1998 was not enough, then was September 11 enough? Then was the acts of aggression against Kuwait enough? Was the assassination against Bush, Senior enough? If that was not enough, if all of that was not enough, this statement standing alone, this statement standing alone ought to be enough to bring all of us to bear arms to assure the security of this Nation and our friends throughout the world.

DEFENDING OUR BORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). 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 join my colleague from Colorado tonight in raising some concerns about the present situation in which the United States finds itself in terms of its relationships around the world, and as we all know, we are about to begin the debate on one of the most serious, per-

haps more, in fact, the most serious topic that can ever confront this or any legislative body, and that is, whether or not we should commit the young men and women of this Nation who have valiantly volunteered their services to the defense of the Nation, whether we should commit them into harm's way in a far-off land in a war that could certainly become catastrophic in its dimensions.

We do not know, of course, how to plan for its outcome except to say that we do know that it will be fought, if, in fact, we engage in this thing, it will be fought by brave men and women who have always, as the President said, made us proud. If we commit those precious resources to the task at hand, the task that was laid out by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS), then it appears to me we must do everything humanly possible, everything humanly possible to protect and defend them in their duty and to protect and defend the people of the United States of America. That is, after all, our primary responsibility, our *raison d'être*, our reason for being.

The Federal Government has assumed many responsibilities over the years since the Constitution was written, and we have assumed those responsibilities sometimes, I think, without regard to what constitutional restraints were so clearly identified by the Founding Fathers. We are involved in innumerable activities, programs and sponsorships that were never, ever contemplated by the Framers of the Constitution, but the one thing that we must carefully consider is the responsibility that we were given to protect and defend the people and the property of the United States of America.

I can be persuaded by the gentleman from Colorado's (Mr. MCINNIS) arguments that our interests, our vital interests do, in fact, demand that we take a preemptive strike. I should say that we take preemptive action in Iraq. I can be persuaded that that is possibly the case. I must admit, however, that I need more information personally to cast a vote about which I have absolutely no misgivings if I am going to be voting to send sons and daughters off to war because I, I am sure like hopefully most of our colleagues in this body, will consider this in the following fashion.

Do I believe personally that this problem we face, that the threat that we face in the United States is so great that I am willing to send my son off to war, not just vote to send someone else's son or daughter, but am I willing to do so myself? This is a very high standard, and it is one that I believe every single Member must establish for themselves, and I can be persuaded that it is necessary to do so.

I must say that in this deliberation, there is something that is being left out. When people, even the President of the United States, says things like we will do everything necessary to defend the interests of this country, I like

hearing it. I want to believe it. I want to believe that we will, in fact, do everything necessary to protect country, and while that might very well be to send men and women to Iraq, or places far flung all over the world, it is also completely logical, self-evident, that what we must do even before we do that in order to protect and defend the people of this country, what we must do is to defend our own borders, and this, I suggest, has not been done and is not being contemplated.

Over my August district work period I went to the borders and went to the southern and northern borders of the country. I first went to Arizona and then on to California where I observed firsthand the problems that we face on those borders, and let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the face of illegal immigration into this country, people coming across our borders without our permission or without our knowledge, the face of illegal immigration in my district, in Littleton, Colorado, perhaps the Chair's in Arkansas, but the face of illegal immigration in my district is one of a benign activity for the most part, people working menial jobs, for the most part in restaurants and landscaping activities, and people we say to ourselves, well, yes, they are here illegally, but after all, they are just trying to make a living.

The face of illegal immigration on the border, on our borders with Mexico and on our borders with Canada, that face is much, much uglier. That is the face of drug smuggling, of murder and of people coming into this country for the purposes of doing us great harm. That is what we see when we actually go to the border before it becomes diffuse throughout the land.

I visited the Tohono O'odham Indian reservation where they are under siege, and I mean that in the most literal definition of the term. They are under siege. The Tohono O'odham Indians have a 76-mile border coterminous with Mexico. Across that 76-mile border come 1,500 illegal aliens a day, and they are not just people coming for the good life. They are not just people coming to work at some sort of menial task in the United States, a task that "no American will take" and send their money back home, in this case to Mexico for the most part.

They are coming into the United States, many, in fact, perhaps even a majority, of the people coming across that border a day, 1,500 a day, it is estimated that well over 1,000 are involved with the drug trade and they are bringing with them literally tons of illegal drugs every single day. They have, in fact, put this Indian reservation into the status of being a captive nation. They have taken over two of the small communities in this reservation. When I say taken over, what I mean by that, I mean that they have threatened or coerced or bribed or addicted so many people in these two communities that they are essentially now nothing more than extensions of the drug trafficking of several Mexican cartels.

□ 2145

I met with people who told me that they are afraid to go out on their street at night; that they cannot let their children out. I saw 5-year-olds who were stoned, who had been given drugs. Their parents had been given drugs in order to coerce them and/or entice them, is perhaps the better word in this case, into becoming part of the drug trafficking network established by these cartels.

I saw the devastation to this particular Indian reservation. They are begging for help. As they say, their way of life is being destroyed. The vandalism, the robbery, the rapes, the incidence of all these things has gone up dramatically. Just one aspect, the trash alone that is hauled in and discarded by 1,500 people a day coming into their reservation is enormous. Where, may I ask, is the Sierra Club when we need them? Where are the Friends of the Earth? Where are all of the people who decry the devastation of our, of the natural habitats around the country and around the world? This Nation's natural habitat, their ecology is being destroyed by illegal immigrants coming across that border.

Hundreds of thousands of plastic water bottles, clothing, trash of every kind and description, discarded everywhere along their path. People racing through their communities, either trying to escape the border patrol agents or simply trying to make their way north have endangered the lives of their children so that they do not allow their kids to go outside and play. What I have just described, Mr. Speaker, is the face of illegal immigration on the border.

One of the things that they told us when we were down there is that it is not just Mexican nationals coming across now, but a dramatic increase, they have witnessed, in what they refer to as OTMs, or other than Mexicans. A dramatic increase in the number of Chinese coming through, a dramatic increase in the number of Asians from countries all over that part of the world, a dramatic number of Middle Easterners coming through. For what purpose, I would ask?

Does anyone think these people are coming across in order to get landscaping jobs? Are the Middle Easterners that are coming across that border illegally looking to work in restaurants as dishwashers, cooks and servers? In my own State, and in my own city, the biggest gang element is Asian. And they are quite predominantly illegals. But beyond that, what, we may ask, I think, are the Middle Easterners coming in for? What are they doing here? Why are they coming in illegally through Mexico?

Now, I suggest that there is a great possibility that they are coming in for purposes that are heinous. I do not know that. I have not been able to interview them because, of course, they come through without the slightest bit of intervention on our part. We do not

stop them. We cannot stop them because we have no resources in place to do so. And even when we do stop them, even when they are interdicted farther inland, farther up into the United States, and when the INS is called and told we have a lot of people here in a van, in a truck, in a house, we have a lot of people here who are here illegally. the INS tells the local law enforcement agents, let them go, we do not have time. We do not have time.

Twenty-five illegal aliens were caught in a tractor-trailer truck in Dallas on July 27. The INS initially detained several, then released even these and "paroled them" into the United States. They have an automatic parole process. The INS can do this. The INS can say we will parole these people we have just caught, let them go, and then we will send them a letter later on telling them to report for their deportation hearing.

Now, this would be laughable, of course, if it were not so dangerous. This is a Saturday Night Live skit. "Here is your letter. We know you have snuck into the United States, so please report in 6 months to the following location for your deportation hearing." Right. "Thank you. Of course, I will." They actually call these letters "run letters." What they mean by that is that when the people receive them, of course they run. They go away. They do not go back to their country of origin, they run into American society.

Now, if we are so concerned about the possibility of a terrorist attack on the United States, which is the only thing we have heard again and again and again from the leadership, from Members of Congress who support our efforts, support the President in his desire to depose Saddam Hussein, if we are so concerned about that, and believe me, I am, then why would we not take just as much, no, not just as much, why would we not take even more care and concern about our own national borders?

On August 4 in Rogers County, Oklahoma, State troopers caught seven aliens who admitted they were illegally present in the country. The INS again would not pick them up and remove them.

During the Memorial Day weekend in New York the INS reportedly "did not want to be bothered," so they refused to take custody of several Mid Eastern illegal aliens. Local police officers had caught them at the Brooklyn Battery Tunnel during a terror alert. I remember this incident, Mr. Speaker. They actually had these people in custody. These were Mid Eastern illegal aliens. They called the INS. It was Memorial Day weekend, and so the called was routed from New York, because no one was at their workstation, it was routed to Vermont, where the person answering said to the police in New York City, "let them go."

These are just a few of the literally hundreds, if not thousands, of cases like this that I could relate to the body

tonight. With all of the talk about the need to increase our efforts of vigilance and be careful about things we see and things we hear, with all of that, and with all of the efforts being made now to extend the war against terrorism beyond Afghanistan and into other parts of the Middle East, it is amazing to me, it is incredible to me, and it should be to every single Member of this body, that we leave our own borders undefended.

Does anyone believe for even a second that should we prosecute this war in a more aggressive fashion than is presently the situation that there will not be some reaction on the part of the people, specifically Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda and fundamentalist Islam? We are told that if we go into Iraq, we must be concerned about the ramifications throughout the Middle East; that perhaps other countries with governments more friendly to the United States may fall as a result of having internal dissent because the phenomenon of fundamentalist Islam is so pervasive in these countries. We are told that that is what we must watch out for, what we must be careful of. But we are not told, and there is no precaution being made right now, for our own security within this Nation. We know there will be a reaction. What will that reaction be? Does anybody think it will simply be confined to the Middle East?

Now, everyone knows, certainly Saddam Hussein knows, that he cannot win in a conventional war against the United States. He can make it bloody. He can make it ugly. But he cannot win. He knows that. The world knows that. What makes us think for a moment that we will be left unscathed in the United States if we embark upon this path of action in the Middle East? Certainly the possibility exists that al Qaeda agents, that fundamentalist Islam will react in a way so as to increase the number of people that they already have in the United States, the cells that are operating here, that we are told by our Justice Department are operating, that are here in the United States and are ready to go into action at a moment's notice.

We know there are cells operating in Canada. We know there are cells operating in Mexico. Why is it not the most logical thing for us to say, well, we have to be careful here. Before we even go into Iraq, we must secure our borders. The reason, I fear, Mr. Speaker, that we do not do that is because, as Governor Ridge said, right there in the well of the House, to a question posed to him from, I think, this microphone about his reluctance and the reluctance on the part of the administration, and in fact most of the Congress, I suppose. No, I should qualify that, because the House has in fact passed an amendment to the defense authorization bill allowing for the military to be used on the border, and we have done that year after year after year, but it has failed in the other body. But when

asked why we have not used all of our resources to defend our borders, including the military, Governor Ridge said there are political and cultural reasons why we cannot do so.

Well, there may be political and cultural prices to pay. I do not even know what he meant by cultural reasons. I do know what he meant by political reasons. We are concerned that if we in fact secure our borders and prevent people from coming into the United States illegally, we will in some way or other jeopardize our relationship with the government of Mexico and that we will simultaneously lose votes from Mexican Americans who somehow feel that this is a personal affront if we try to defend our own borders.

□ 2200

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that for a moment. I do not believe Mexican-Americans are any less concerned about the safety of themselves and their families than any other group of Americans. I believe that a case can be made to them and to every single person in the United States as to why it is imperative that we secure our own borders. I believe we can do that. I believe that we will benefit as a result in terms of the politics, but whether we do or do not benefit politically, who cares. Is it not our absolute and total responsibility to do so?

There are cultural and political reasons why we cannot defend our own borders. I wonder how if there is another event of some great magnitude, which we all anticipate, which we hear every single day is a distinct not just possibility but probability, and if this is perpetuated by someone who has entered this country illegally, and/or people who have been recruited into a terrorist network by people who have come here illegally, I wonder what we will tell the spouses, the sons, the daughters of those people who are killed in that event.

We will make many, many speeches about how heroic their loved ones were, how heroic the efforts were of the people who tried to save them. Will we also say, I wonder, that there were political and cultural reasons why we could not protect them? I do not know how anyone could look into the faces of the people whose loved ones have been lost in an event of that nature and say those words. But say them we would have to if we follow the path we are on today.

The President has just submitted an action plan in which he calls for smart borders, and there is quite a lengthy list of things the administration has proposed: biometric identifiers, permanent resident cards, single alternative inspection systems, refugee and asylum processing reforms, handling of refugee asylum claims, visa policy coordination, air preclearance, advanced passenger information, joint passenger analysis, a lot of stuff about customs and how to bring goods into the United States; and I applaud them all.

I do not for a moment suggest that these are not good and salutary measures to take; but I look in here, I look in vain for the most important measure we can take to create a smart border, and that is to put the military in place to defend that border. Right now we cannot do that. We cannot do it with the Border Patrol. They are inhibited from actually achieving the goals of securing our borders by the fact the administration, the INS, is incompetent and completely unmotivated to act in this particular capacity. They are restricted by a myriad of laws we have passed here, confusing, conflicting laws, allowing for people to be retained in this country even after they have been found to be here illegally. We have refused to provide the resources necessary to actually secure the borders for one reason and one reason only: because it is politically and culturally unacceptable.

Well, I do not know who it is culturally unacceptable to. I do not know who it is politically unacceptable to, but those are not legitimate reasons for abandoning our own defenses. And no matter how much we do in the Middle East, no matter how many resources we put into accomplishing the goal of deposing Saddam Hussein, no matter what we do around the world to increase the number of countries that would be categorized as democracies rather than dictatorships, we will be at every step of the way in that process putting our own people in greater and greater danger if we do not do everything possible to secure our borders.

I, of course, cannot promise even if we do everything I have asked for, even if we completely reform the INS, even if we give Border Patrol agents greater authority and ability to actually do their job, even if we put military on the border, I cannot promise that someone with malicious intent cannot or will not get through; but at least I can say we did everything we can do, which is living up to the President's admonition to us, that we must do everything that we can do. That includes defending our own border.

What an amazing world we live in. What an interesting and incredible dilemma we face. We are told every day that it is a war that we are in, a war for our own survival, that America's way of life is at stake. What nation can we think of in history that knowing that that is the situation they face, have not in fact done the most obvious thing to try to protect themselves? What this demands is leadership. It demands that the President of the United States tell the people of the United States what needs to be done, even if there is a political price to pay.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it would not be a negative reaction politically. I suggest that the people of this country are yearning for and desiring him to establish the exact nature of the conflict and also the exact way in which we are going to defend against it. They are hoping that he will say to them that

we will in fact secure our borders, and this may mean that we will not have the opportunity to hire cheap labor or recruit people into a political party as new voters. But nonetheless, it has to be done, along with all of the other things that have been outlined by the President, with which I agree and for which I commend him. The border must be secured.

I ask, no, I beg the President of the United States to use his power, to use his executive authority to do just that: protect our borders; order the military to the border, allow us to use the expertise and the technology and the manpower we have available to us on our first line of defense.

I mentioned that I went recently to the Mexican border, but I also shortly thereafter went to the Canadian border, a little town called Bonner's Ferry, Idaho, where I witnessed a very interesting activity. At the time I got there, there were 100 Marines stationed there just to see whether or not they could in fact coordinate their activities and help the Border Patrol and the U.S. Forest Service and the customs agency control the northern border because I assure Members, although I have spent a great deal of time talking about the southern borders, I assure Members that the problems are just as large on the northern borders.

There are over 20,000 Muslims living in Calgary, Canada, which brings into the United States component parts of methamphetamines. They are sold and the proceeds go back to the Muslim groups in Canada, and the money is used to finance terrorist activities throughout the world.

Osama bin Laden, because of Canada's peculiar process of establishing who is or is not a refugee, Osama bin Laden could land in Ontario, claim he is Omar the tent maker, not show any identification, and walk immediately into Canadian society, and, of course, shortly thereafter walk unfettered probably into the United States.

The problems up there are significant. So there are 100 Marines, and I do not know the genesis of the stationing of these people on that border. I do not know if it was part of a larger strategy or not, but they were using three UAVs, unmanned aerial vehicles, more often commonly referred to as drones, and a couple of radar stations that were to help identify people coming across that border illegally. It worked. The Marines told me that it was the best training they had ever received because it was real time, real bad guys, and very difficult terrain.

We need the resources of the military. We do not have to put people arm in arm along 4,000 or 5,000 miles of border. We have the technology to aid in this. I saw it with my own eyes. It can work. We can make our borders very secure, not perfect but much more difficult to cross illegally than is presently the case. We can do it. The only thing we do not have is the will to do it.

□ 2215

We unfortunately create a facade, a Potemkin Village. Prince Potemkin used to put up facades along the villages in his area and when Catherine the Great would sail down the river, she would see these beautiful villages. But behind these facades, of course, it was abject poverty. That is where the phrase Potemkin Village comes from. In a way that is what we have created or we have tried to create on the borders. We have increased the number of border patrol. We have established something called smart borders. We have told Americans that we are doing what is necessary to defend our borders, but it is nothing more than the creation of a Potemkin Village along the borders. They are just facades. They are not true defense mechanisms. Because what we are trying to do is to pretend to the American people that we are taking our responsibility of border defense seriously while at the same time assuring that people can come through illegally in order to, quote, take the jobs that no one else will take and in order to increase the ranks of political parties in the United States that benefit as a result of massive immigration, one particular political party, of course, the Democratic party, and the fear that if we actually got tough on the borders, there would be a political reaction. And there would be certainly outcries by immigration advocacy groups, especially immigration lawyers. They would raise Cain.

But is our responsibility here to pander to those political extremists? Or is our responsibility to protect and defend the people and the property of the United States of America? Again what a strange world we live in, whereby we can be talking about going off to war, recognizing all of the danger that that entails for the people we are sending but also for the people who are here, the people who remain, and not do anything to protect us. What an amazing situation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that our words, our admonitions, our concerns will be heeded by our other colleagues and by the administration. The stakes are so high, the risks are so great that we cannot possibly avoid doing what is right even at our own political peril should that be the case which, as I say, I do not believe for a moment would happen, but even if it did, that is what is required of us here, to do the right thing, even if it is politically or culturally problematic.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

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

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, September 10 and 11 on account of personal reasons.

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and September 10 on account of business in the district.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of activities in the district.

Mr. WELLER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and until noon September 10 on account of medical reasons.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness in the family.

Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and September 10 on account of congressional business.

Mr. WAMP (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of family reasons.

Mrs. ROUKEMA (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week 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 Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SNYDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. NORTHUP, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, September 12.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, September 10.

The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, 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. 351. An act to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to reduce the quantity of mercury in the environment by limiting the use of mercury fever thermometers and improving the collection and proper management of