

military intelligence company from Lake Oswego is rotating through Bosnia.

Madam Speaker, these deployments come at a high personal and professional cost. Activated Guardsmen and women not only leave behind their families, they leave behind careers and their own businesses. Additionally, the Pentagon often activates these units for 179 days, a day short of the 180-day-period which would give nonprior-service Guards VA benefits. Many of these activated troops lose their private health insurance, forcing their families to enroll in military health insurance plans, which means a whole new set of doctors, dentists and pharmacists to deal with.

The list of hardships goes on and on. They are well known to anyone who cares about the impact this war is having on our local communities. That is why I think it is important that our Guards and Reservists receive more than just a pat on the back for the job they are doing in this war against terrorism.

I am developing comprehensive legislation which would remedy some of the concerns I just mentioned. The Citizen Soldier and the American Patriot Relief Act recognizes the sacrifices made by our citizen soldiers, and I look forward to sharing it with my colleagues.

Until then, I ask that every American keep all of our troops in their thoughts and their prayers. It is because of our military men and women and their service, and their service alone, that we enjoy the privilege of meeting in this institution, free from terror and other failed attempts to strip away our liberty.

I thank all of our military men and women for their service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WYNN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KIRK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE FISCAL YEAR 2003 BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Madam Speaker, I rise today as we celebrate Women's History Month to review some of the budget items that impact on women's issues.

There are some issues in the FY 2003 budget proposal impacting on women that I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues.

It was disappointing, Madam Speaker, to find that the title X family planning program is not going to see an increase in funding. In fact, the program will be level funded at \$266 million for the 2003 fiscal year.

Title X is the only Federal program devoted solely to the provision of family planning and reproductive health care. The program is designed to provide access to contraceptive supplies and information to all who want and need them. Title X is designed to assist low-income women. For many clients, especially women of color, title X clinics provide the only continuing source of health care and health education.

A growing number of uninsured women desperately need this care offered by title X clinics, because they cannot meet the increase in cost of Federal services. If the title X program had kept pace with inflation in recent years, it would now be funded at \$564 million. That would have been more than double the current level.

We Democratic women are pleased to see that the budget would provide \$8.4 million for the Women's Bureau at the Department of Labor. Unfortunately, this is a decrease of \$1.8 million from the 2002 fiscal year. The question I have, Madam Speaker, is what services to women are going to be cut to make up for this shortfall?

Already, one organization has been threatened with closure. Women Work, the national network for women's employment, was led to believe that the Women's Bureau did not intend for its continuing funding. Happily, this did not happen. Programs continue to be needed to assist women to find their way into employment. The Women's Bureau, especially the decentralized Women's Center, have played a major role in this area and deserve to be fully funded.

The welfare of children is, of course, of great concern to all of the Members of this House, not just the women Members. I am pleased to see that this budget includes \$421 million for child welfare and abuse programs. These funds provide services to prevent child abuse and neglect. While it is laudable that this money has been allocated to such a worthy cause, it must be noted that the funding has been maintained at the same level as last year.

Americans want to see all children in happy and safe homes and protected from abusive situations. For this reason, Democrats would like to see these programs strengthened.

It is pleasing to see that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention will

receive \$5.8 billion in this budget, but Democratic women have noted that there will be a decrease of \$1 billion from the 2002 fiscal year. This is a very large reduction in the CDC budget.

We all agree that every child born should be a healthy baby. It is disappointing to see that the Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities Center will receive \$1 million less than last year.

There is also a tragic imbalance and racial disparity in terms of babies born in the African American and white communities in our country. A black baby born today is twice as likely to die within the first year of life as a white baby. That baby is twice as likely to be born prematurely and at low birthweight. In order to help address these major problems and health concerns, we would like to see a modest amount of \$3 million restored to the Public Health Service's Office of Minority Health that is located in the Department of Health and Human Services.

The Fiscal Year 2003 budget includes \$156 million for environmental disease prevention. This is a \$1 million reduction. Cutting funding for environmental disease prevention is another unfortunate budgetary reduction.

Madam Speaker, we Democrats are deeply disappointed with this budget and believe that it will have some very unfortunate repercussions for the well-being and provision of social and health services to the American public, and particularly how these cuts will affect women.

2003 BUDGET RESOLUTION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. TANCREDI. Madam Speaker, several of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have risen tonight to decry the budget that has been proposed by the majority party and that we will be voting on tomorrow, the budget resolution, that is to say, and they have each identified specific parts of it that they find unattractive, unappealing, or in some way something that they can complain about.

The real issue, of course, that is perhaps annoying to them, I think, or at least discomfiting to them, and the one that was never referenced, but is the one accurate representation of the budget resolution that the majority party will offer tomorrow, is that it is balanced. That is to say, this budget resolution will set out for the Congress of the United States and for the American people a budget that will spend no more money than we will take in.

Now, this is something that is not very comfortable to the minority party. They have really not operated under that kind of restriction for as

long as they held control of this House. For 40 years, of course, profligate spending of the minority party Members, when they were in control of this House, put us into a situation that we in fact had robbed the Social Security trust fund every single year. There were IOUs in that trust fund that approximated \$800 billion by the time that we took over.

In the last 4 years, something again that the minority party does not discuss when they talk about the budget or our control during that period of time, in the last 4 years we have paid down almost \$450 billion of the national debt. That is an unheard of, unprecedented phenomenon that came as a result, of course, of the fact that we had an economy that was expanding and government revenues were increasing.

But does anyone listening to the debate tonight on this floor think for a second that if the Democratic Party had been in charge during that particular period of time that we would have taken the dollars coming in to the government and not spent them on new programs and expanding the Federal Government?

□ 2015

Madam Speaker, I hasten to add that I think even Members of the other party would recognize that is the history that they give us. So to come tonight, and I am sure as will happen tomorrow to the floor of the House of Representatives, and talk about the need to be more concerned or more focused on the budget issue begs the question.

What happened when they had the reins of control here? What did they do? The fact is that they spent not only every dollar that came in, but hundreds of billions of dollars that did not come in, hundreds of billions of dollars that we had to borrow from the taxpayers.

We have tried to change that direction in the last 4 years; and we are going to offer a balanced budget, a frightening concept perhaps to the other side, but it is one with which they will have to deal.

The primary issue that I raise tonight is not, however, the one dealing with the budget. There will be plenty of discussion dealing with that tomorrow; but it is the issue of our national security, because of course that is the most important thing with which this Congress can ever deal. Whether we are talking about budget or anything else, the reality is we have relatively few true responsibilities given to us by the Constitution of this Nation. They are delineated in the Constitution, and the Constitution is added to by the Bill of Rights.

The last of the 10 amendments to the Constitution is very specific, and it says in case there is something you are confused about in the list of things that are the responsibility for the Federal Government, we are going to make

it even more clear, that is, if it is not clear, it is not your responsibility, it is the responsibility of the States and the people therein.

But there is something that is uniquely our responsibility, and that is the defense of the Nation. We cannot rely upon States individually to raise the budget to defend the country through any other process. That, of course, is our responsibility. There are several ways to do that. One is to make sure that our military is quality funded, make sure that the men and women serving in the military of the United States have every possible weapon at their disposal and in our arsenal that would first protect them; and, secondly, get the job done wherever we send them.

Time and again when we are watching television or reading reports in the Congress about the marvelous and incredible undertakings with which the military is involved, we recognize that the valor of the men and women who serve really and truly is the bottom line. We can give them all of the equipment in the world, but it boils down to the individual that is there on the field of battle and what is in his or her heart at the time. We can be proud and we are proud of the people that serve in our military, and we work hard to make sure that they have what is necessary to get the job done and to protect them because they are, in turn, protecting the Nation.

We recognize that the fight for the Nation, that the battle goes on in a variety of different venues. It is not like any other war. This has been said many times. The war we are in is not like any other war we have ever been in, or likely to be in, in that it will not be marked by a confrontation between two huge armies until one capitulates and the state that they represent or are fighting for has fallen. That is certainly not going to be the conflicts of the 21st century. The conflict arises in Afghanistan, the Republic of Georgia, the Philippines, and Indonesia. All over the world, we find we have to stamp out the tentacles of fundamentalist Islam as represented by al Qaeda specifically, and the terrorists who have as their end-desire the destruction of this Nation.

We know that is the case, and we know we are doing a good job there. I commend the President of the United States for his leadership and my colleagues for their support of all of the appropriations that have been passed and made available so that all of the people out there are fully equipped.

But there is another thing, there is another side to this battle that we pay little attention to, unfortunately. Far too little attention. It is the battle that goes on to defend our own borders.

The one thing that is typical in this battle, in this war, typical to other kinds of wars we have been in, is the fact of invasion where large numbers of people come across the border of one country undetected without permission

of the country they are entering; and some of them, certainly not all, thank God at this point in time, but some of them have ill-intent. Some of them choose and come here with the very purpose of doing us harm.

Many others, unfortunately, who come across the border, do not choose to do us any physical harm, but are not really connected to the United States in any way similar to the immigrants who have come to the United States in the heyday of immigration, in the past 100 years or so. For the most part, people coming into the United States during that period of time, during the 1800s, early 1900s, came with the distinct purpose to separate themselves from the land from which they came, and to attach themselves to a new land and a new idea and new set of principles. They wanted to break the political and even linguistic ties they had with their country of origin and start something new. They committed to America. Of course they wanted a better life and of course they looked forward to giving their children a better life, just like the immigrants of today do.

But there is a significant difference. Millions of people are looking for that better life, but they are not disassociating themselves from the country of their origin, not linguistically, not culturally and sometimes not even politically.

Today, as I speak, we find that there is something happening in the United States which has never happened before, and that is a dramatic rise in the number of people who are here in this country, relatively recent immigrants to the United States, who claim dual citizenship. That is to say they claim to be both Americans and citizens of the country of their origin. They choose not to break those ties. Now that I would suggest, Madam Speaker, has never happened before. That is a new phenomenon. Something is peculiar about that, and something is dangerous about that when we talk about what is going to be necessary in order for us to survive this clash we are in with international terrorism, which can be characterized as a clash of civilizations.

Samuel Huntington in a book I reference often called "Clash of Civilizations" talks about the fact that the United States will be significantly hobbled in its ability to lead the West if we ourselves are a cleft Nation, a Nation divided in half. That is exactly what is happening to us, and one of the reasons why I have raised the concern about massive immigration, legal and illegal, into the United States, over the past couple of decades.

The agency to which we entrust the responsibility for protecting our borders and for helping us maintain some sense or even a tiny bit of hope that we can actually control the process of who comes in, for how long, for what purpose and knowing when they leave, the

agency to which we entrust that responsibility is the INS, the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

This agency has 35,000 employees. It has a budget of about \$7.5 billion. In the budget resolution we are going to pass tomorrow, it will call for about a billion dollar increase. It is an increase of 250 percent over the last 10 years. I bring that up because we are going to hear from that agency when we talk about the problems within it that they do not have enough money, they do not have the resources. They will talk about not having enough people, but in fact we have actually increased the number of people serving in the INS by 83 percent over the last decade. A 250 percent budget increase, 83 percent personnel increase, and what do we have to show for it? We have an agency that is incapable of managing the responsibility that is given to it. They are both incapable and undesiring of doing so, and that is the real crux of the matter here.

Madam Speaker, if we had an agency made up of people from the top to the bottom who had the intent, the desire internally to patrol the borders of the United States and make sure that our Nation is secure against people who are coming in illegally, making sure that the people who do get by them there are found in the United States and deported, making sure that the people who are here even legally but then commit some crime, taken to court and ordered deported, making sure that those people leave the country, if we had an agency like that, we could be somewhat sympathetic to their needs and desires and to their protestations of wanting to do a better job.

Today, the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary held hearings; and called in front of them, among others, were the commissioner, the head of the INS, Mr. Ziglar. I want to preference my remarks by saying that Mr. Ziglar seems to be a very nice man, a very pleasant individual. I have no doubt of that. Certainly that is my observation.

But I am going to make another observation here; and that is from everything I have been able to see, read and hear about Mr. Ziglar and the situation in the INS, I will say that he is in water way over his head; that he is not really capable to do what we have asked him to do. Perhaps we should not blame him. Perhaps the fact that we brought him from a position that had absolutely nothing to do with immigration, perhaps the fact that he has absolutely no background in the area of immigration or immigration control, perhaps that is the problem; that no one with a similar background could possibly be expected to begin to wield control in an agency of 35,000 people, all bureaucrats for the most part, or I should say they are mostly bureaucrats. I think there are 5 or 6 political appointees in that entire agency.

And it is difficult, certainly, I know. I ran the Department of Education's

regional office for 12 years, and I am aware of the difficulty of trying to manage an enterprise that is peopled by employees who have civil service protection, and in my case had the protection of the public employees union. It is difficult to fire somebody from doing a bad job.

Indeed, Mr. Ziglar said in a recent television interview which I watched, when he was questioned about the problems in the INS, specifically what was going to happen to the people who had approved the visas for Mohammed Atta and his colleague Marwan al-Shehhi, the visas that arrived on March 11, 2002, 6 months to the day after they were killed in their attack on America, visas arriving at the school that they were attending to learn to fly, that has made the news. That has made a lot of people begin to say, What is going wrong? That is a peculiar thing.

□ 2030

When Mr. Ziglar was questioned about this, he said, I can fire no one, absolutely no one that was responsible for this. I have control over five or six people, but that is it.

We remember that the President said he was furious, he was mad, hopping mad or some words to that effect, but no one was fired. Furious is another way I think you could describe the President of the United States about this incident. But no one was fired. Four or five people had their job titles changed. That was it. That was the response to the visa flap.

It is almost incredible, Madam Speaker, but it is indicative of the problem we are having with this agency and our need to do something about it.

As I say, Mr. Ziglar came from a situation that did not give him any sort of real background. He came to this position after having served as the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper for the Senate. That was his job. That is his background. Again, I want to reiterate, I am sure he is a very pleasant fellow. That is not the issue. The issue is, we are in a world of hurt here.

There is another aspect to his philosophy that needs to be brought up. He has stated on more than one occasion that he is a lifelong Libertarian. Fine. There are certain aspects of Libertarian philosophy that I think are intriguing, but the fact is, there is one part of it that is quite peculiar when you consider that to then place him as the head of the INS, the agency designed to help us control the border because, of course, Libertarians believe that we should have no borders, that borders are sort of artificial and sort of anachronistic barriers to the flow of goods, trade, ideas and people, therefore, we should abolish them and have these open borders.

Not only does he feel that way, but the one political appointment he was able to bring in as his second in command is a gentleman who shares those

feelings exactly, coming from the Cato Institute. The Cato Institute is again an organization of, I think, great allure for some people, I use some of their stuff myself, but the Cato Institute is a Libertarian think tank. Their position on these issues of immigration is quite clear, open borders.

They have every right to espouse that position at the Cato Institute. Mr. Ziglar, when he was the Doorkeeper for the Senate, had every right to feel that way, to espouse that point of view. He is now the Commissioner of the INS. I would suggest that that is akin to the old fox in the henhouse. There are a million analogies you can come up with, but it is a wrong place to be for him. He is the wrong person to put there.

Now he is forced to try to defend the actions of this agency which heretofore have been allowed to essentially begin an open border or continue the process of developing open borders, because it is not unique to this administration, of course; but now, because of 9/11, because of all these embarrassing things that have happened, he is forced to try to defend this situation and to say, we really are trying. Because he is not going to stand up and say, I am still committed to open borders, I do not think, so he is going to have to suggest that there is a way he is going to deal with this.

But in reality, Madam Speaker, there is nothing that is going to change in that agency, and there are bills, I know, that are being proposed to do that, to actually split the agency in two so that it has as its one responsibility the complete, what I call social work side of immigration, the benefits side, helping people get their green card, helping people become legalized; that is one thing. And then the other side is enforcement. Today they are sort of a mixed bag, and they do neither one, not just they do not do it very well, they are a complete disaster in both cases.

So just splitting that agency, keeping all the people there, the same people who internally, in their minds, are not on the right side of the issue, they are not intent on trying to defend our borders, Mr. Ziglar actually said that himself at some point in time in a more candid interview, I think it was, with, I think it was the New York Times. He said, "I don't like the policeman part of my job. I don't want to be a policeman. I don't like that." Of course, the reality is, most of the people who are there in that agency do not like it and do not want to be that.

I am going to try to narrow it down, because I am not talking about the men and women who serve on the border, the Border Patrol people, the agents whose job it is to try to find people in the United States who are here illegally. For the most part, I should tell you that almost every single one of them I have met, and I have met many, are dedicated to doing exactly what that job says. They are

dedicated to trying to stop people from coming here illegally and find them when they are here, but they know that there is absolutely no support they get from anyone up the ladder in their administration. They are, most of them, afraid to talk openly about this.

Mr. Cutler today did testify in the hearing that I mentioned, the Subcommittee on Immigration from the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. Cutler felt a little freer to talk today because, frankly, he was fired last week. Although the INS will suggest it was not because he is a whistleblower, I think that it is hard to make that case. I think he was fired because he is a whistleblower. That sends, of course, shock waves throughout the INS. People become less and less willing to say what they know to be the case.

I had a similar situation, someone, not a patrol agent but a judge, an immigration law judge several months ago called my office because he knows that I have been a critic of the INS. He said, "I've got to tell you something. I've been a law judge for X number of years," I will not say, because that could help identify him and he wants to be sure we do not do that. He says, "I have been an immigration law judge for several years. I am frustrated to the point that I just don't know what to do, because every single day I try my best to make sure that the people who are brought in front of me, that the adjudication process is fair; and when I know there is someone who should be sent back, who should be deported because they have robbed somebody, murdered somebody, raped somebody," because frankly, Madam Speaker, you do not come in front of an immigration court just because you have overstayed your visa. That is not it. Usually you have gotten caught doing something and then they find out, by the way, you are here as an alien or an illegal, and they bring you to immigration law court.

He said, "Every single day, I bring the gavel down and order someone to be deported and some of these people have made threats against the United States. Every day they walk out of my courtroom and they walk right back into American society."

I said, "How can that be? What happens?"

He said, "The problem is at that point in time, the INS is in charge of incarcerating, taking them away. And they just don't do it. They just don't do it. Oftentimes the INS comes into the courtroom and they are supposed to be the prosecutor in the case, but they act as the defense attorney. I know that there are thousands," he says, "I think hundreds of thousands of people who have been allowed to essentially walk, people that I know I and my colleagues have ordered to be deported for various reasons who are still simply out there."

I said, "How many do you think?"

He said, "I've done some preliminary checking here, and I think there are at least 200,000."

I said, "That's incredible. I'll check with the INS."

Of course we called them. I often say on the floor of the House here that the logo for the INS, something that should be on all of their documents, on the top of everything they send out, the logo on their Web site for the INS should simply be a person shrugging their shoulders. That is it. INS, that guy going, "I don't know, I'm not sure." Because that is all you get from them, whenever you call them, "I don't know, I'm not sure. Could be."

We said, "Do you realize there are a couple of hundred thousand people, that someone has alleged that there are a couple of hundred thousand people here?"

They say, "We don't know." We kept, of course, pushing the issue. Finally, we got the INS to say that yes, they looked into it and maybe there were 200,000 people, 250,000 people.

Shortly thereafter, I cannot remember the exact time line, but I happened to be at a meeting with Mr. Ziglar, the head of the INS. He was here in the House, he was meeting Members of the House. I went up to him at the conclusion of his speech. I said, "Mr. Ziglar, do you know about these people who have been ordered to be deported but they are still here?" He said, "Well, no, I don't."

I said, "Do you know how many we're talking about?" He said, "No, I really don't."

I said, "There are at least a couple of hundred thousand." He said, "That have been ordered deported?"

I said, "Yes." He said, "I don't know. I don't know anything about that."

It was shortly thereafter that we got the information from the INS and it was, they said, a couple of hundred thousand. It turns out, because we pressed the issue and because the media kept hounding them about exactly how many are there, how many have been actually ordered deported, they put out some sort of directive, whatever, they sent something to Congress.

In fact, after that, Mr. Ziglar testified under oath in Congress to a specific number. He said there were 314,000 that they had identified. Remember, he told me first he had no idea, he had no idea what I was talking about, he did not know that there was anything like that happening, he certainly did not know how many. But several months after that he testified in front of the Congress, 314,000.

Recently, a reporter for "Human Events," Mr. Joseph D'Agostino, has been doing his own work and looking at the records. According to his analysis, it looks to him like there were 425,000 in just the last 5 years, from 1996 to 2000. We do not know because there is no record of anything that happened before 1996, people who walked away who are still here.

So he went back to the INS. He said, "Could this be? I have come up with at least 425,000. We don't know. That is

just from 1996. We don't know. It could be a lot more than that. It could be double that amount."

They said, "Well, you're right, we're not sure ourselves. We're not sure ourselves."

Then today I am told, in response to this, they said, "We don't think he is right, either." But, Madam Speaker, this was evidently something that Mr. Ziglar said in response to a question, that he does not think these numbers that Mr. D'Agostino has pointed out are right. He does not know.

But this is the guy that told me he did not know it even existed. So why would we feel comfortable in listening to him tell us what the real numbers are when he did not know that they even had a problem? This is the head of the agency. We do not know how many. Let us say it is between 300,000 and 1 million. I think from everything I can read, that is a pretty good guess. Between 300,000 and 1 million people have simply walked out of immigration law courts and back into society.

This is a national security issue.

I started out my comments this evening by explaining that we are in a war. We are fighting it overseas, but we are not doing a very good job fighting it here at home. The borders are undefended and unprotected for the most part. Good men and women, working hard, but frankly all we do is we hand them a sieve to hold back the flood.

They know that they are working really almost against their own agency. They will tell me that and they would tell you that if you went down on the border today, Madam Speaker, and you talked to them, they know that their agency does not support their efforts.

That has got to be the most frustrating feeling, to be putting your life on the line, and I assure you they do. There have been seven killed in the recent past, seven Border Patrol people, by people who are simply waiting. By the way, not waiting just to cross the border and waiting for this Border Patrol agent to get by, but waiting to ambush them, waiting in the bushes to ambush them, just to kill them, because they hate America, for whatever reason, I do not know, but there have been seven killed in the line of duty. I was made aware of that when I went down there, and that is in the recent past. It is getting worse. It is getting more dangerous all the time.

I have tried to portray the picture, an accurate picture of the INS, of the organization to which we have entrusted the responsibility of protecting the border.

□ 2045

I have indicated that they have two roles: one is in enforcement and one is in the social work side of things, the benefit side of things.

Let me tell you about a GAO report that came out just a month ago, released February 15. By the way, this is

one of a series of GAO reports on this particular agency. This report focuses on the benefit side, the social work side of INS, the thing they tell us they like to do and that they are good at.

The GAO says the INS allows the fraud to flourish by stressing that applications must be processed quickly. In some districts, adjudicators who decide whether a benefit will be granted are ordered to spend no more than 15 minutes on an application. This effectively discourages checking for fraud, the study says.

The GAO found that 90 percent of 5,000 petitions for workers sought by foreign companies, particularly in the Los Angeles area, were fraudulent, a 90 percent fraud rate. An official in the INS operations branch said that a follow-up analysis of about 1,500 petitions found 1,499 fraudulent.

This is the same agency and, by the way, these are the things that we just a few nights ago on this floor, we actually passed something called 245(i), and it provides amnesty for people who are here illegally. If they come in, all they have to do now, they can be here illegally, but we have said to them, that, okay, come on in and give us your application to determine if you are here under certain guidelines, whether you have had a job for a long time, whether you are married.

We know the last time we did this, by the way, fraud was rampant. Sham marriages occurred in the hundreds of thousands. Bogus documents for work histories were drawn up. We know that. We know what happens. And we are going to entrust to the INS the responsibility to look at another 1 million.

By the way, Madam Speaker, the 1 million or so that will apply as a result of the 245(i) extension that we passed will be added to the 4.5 million backlogged applications that the INS has right now, so there will be 5.5 million backlogged. What do you think the INS will do when they are told they have 15 minutes for every one of these things? Does anybody think anybody is going to get really checked here to determine whether the background is appropriate for coming into this country?

Now, I am told the 245(i) extension is going to be held up in the Senate, partly because Mr. DASCHLE does not want to give this win to the President, partly because a particular Member of the Senate, of the other body, I should say, has decided to put a "hold" on it.

I hope the hold works. I hope they hold it forever. I hope they never, ever, let it go in the Senate, for whatever reason. I do not care. If they want to do some political shenanigans, whatever it is, I hope they hold it and do not pass 245(i), because it is the wrong thing to do.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia). The Chair would remind the Member to refrain from improper references to the Senate.

Mr. TANCREDO. I thank the Speaker for that reminder.

The issue is, of course, this particular agency and the security of the Nation is dependent upon having an organization like the INS do its job, do it effectively and efficiently. I hope that I have indicated to you and to the Members and our colleagues the difficulty we would have if we were to just give this agency the responsibility to actually increase border security. It has to be abolished.

We have to start with something new. It has to be something we create. The President today, as I understand, has called for something far more dramatic, far more significant than the original proposal to just split the agency into two parts. He has called for the complete elimination of this part of the agency, the enforcement side, creating a brand new one that would combine various other offices, various other functions of other agencies, including Customs and Agriculture, perhaps DEA, putting them into one agency, with the clear purpose, the clear line of authority, with people who are not philosophically inclined to open borders, but actually have a belief that they have a responsibility to help defend our borders. He has called for that today, and I applaud his call for a new agency, brand new, new people, and I would suggest we take it out of Justice and perhaps put it into Governor Ridge's Homeland Security Agency. That would be appropriate.

Now, we have to do something like that, and it will be dramatic. It is a big test of our will in this body and in the other body as to whether or not we can actually accomplish this, because, of course, there is a lot of turf we are going to be treading on, and in this town turf is very important and people do not give up their turf, even a tiny little bit of it, without a big fight.

What we are saying here is we have to take some things away from you, and some things away from you, and we have to put it into another agency. It is going to be tough.

It has to be done, and I will tell you why. People will often say, hey, who are we really afraid of? Are we afraid of the people coming across the borders? They are just coming for jobs. They are not really coming here to do us any harm and that sort of thing.

Madam Speaker, I am going to be quoting from something here, an article that was put out on WorldNetDaily, written by J. Zane Walley. A lot of the references I will be making will be to this particular article. It is called "Arab Terrorists Crossing the Border."

This was a very elucidative analysis, I think, of the problem, and something that every American should be aware of, especially when we talk about the need to make sure that we are fighting the war on terrorism both here and abroad, because if we do not have a two-front war, we will certainly lose.

The article says that to date, the U.S. Border Patrol has apprehended, and this is up to this time of the year, 158,722 illegals, just in the year 2001. By

the Border Patrol's own admission, it catches one alien in five, and admits that about 800,000 have slipped across this year. Others contend that this is inaccurate. These are the ranchers down there, and they contend the agency only nets one in ten. An estimate is that over 1.5 million unlawful aliens have crossed into America in what the Border Patrol calls the Tucson Sector. By the way, that is just one part of our border, of course.

Many border ranch owners are validly apprehensive of speaking about their desperate situation because of likely retribution by narco-militarists, the drug runners, and coyotes, the smuggling of human beings. Unsolved murders and arsons are alarmingly ordinary in Cochise County, so pure fear keeps locals from speaking on the record.

The foot traffic is so heavy that the back country has an ambience of a garbage dump and smells like an outdoor privy. In places, the land is littered a foot deep with bottles, cans, soiled disposable diapers, sanitary napkins, panties, clothes, backpacks, human feces, used toilet paper, pharmacy bottles, syringes, et cetera.

U.S. Border Patrol agents are doing the best they can, considering their sparse numbers and the impossible terrain they patrol in four-wheel drive vehicles, quad-runners and on foot. Agents of the Border Patrol have their other fears besides being ambushed by rock-chucking illegals and confrontations with assault rifle-armed narcos. They are not allowed to speak about what they cope with each day.

This is what I mentioned, Madam Speaker, as being endemic in this agent. They have intimidated their employees so that they are afraid to speak out in what they see to be as clear violations of the regulations they are asked to uphold.

One agent who spoke anonymously said, Look, I can tell you a lot of stories, but I have to be unnamed or I will be blackballed and might lose my job. He worriedly added, I have a family depending on me.

Another agent of supervisory rank stated that smuggling traffic of Mexicans has really slowed. We are experiencing a tremendous increase in what he calls OTMs. That is border lingo for "other than Mexicans." When queried about the ethnic makeup of the OTMs, he answered Central and South Americans, Orientals and Middle Easterners.

When he was questioned about that further, Middle Easterners, he said yeah, it varies, but about one in every ten that we catch is from a country like Yemen or Egypt.

Border Patrol spokesperson Rene Noriega stated that the number of other than Mexican detentions has grown by 42 percent. Most of the non-Mexican immigrants are from El Salvador or other parts of Central America, she said, but added that the agents have picked up people from all over the world, including the former Soviet Union, Asia, and the Middle East.

Arabs have been reported crossing the Arizona border for an unknown period. Border rancher George Morgan encounters thousands of illegals crossing his ranch on a well-used trail. He relates a holiday event:

"It was Thanksgiving, 1998, and I stepped outside my house and there were over 100 crossers in my yard. Damnedest bunch of illegals I ever saw. All of them were wearing black pants, white shirts and string ties. Maybe they were hoping to blend in," he chuckled. "They took off. I called the Border Patrol, and a while later Agent Dan Green let me know that they had been caught. He said all were Iranians."

According to Border Patrol spokesman Rob Daniels, 10 Egyptians were arrested recently near Douglas, Arizona. Each had paid \$7,000 to be brought from Guatemala into Mexico and then across the border.

According to the San Diego Union Tribune, hours after the 9-11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, an anonymous caller led Mexican immigration officials to 41 undocumented Iraqis waiting to cross into the United States.

The Associated Press reported that Mexican immigration police detained 13 citizens of Yemen on September 24, 2001, who reportedly were waiting to cross the border into Arizona. The Yemenis were arrested Sunday in Agua Prieta, across the border from Douglas. Luis Teran Balaguer, in the northern state of Sonora, said the evidence indicates that they have nothing to do with terrorist activities.

The Agua Prieta newspaper clearly did not agree with his assessment. The editor, Jose Noriega Durazo, claimed in a front page El Ciarin headline, "Arab terrorists were here." He quoted Agua Prieta police officials as identifying the 13 Yemenis as terrorists.

Reportedly the Mexican immigration police returned the Yemenis to a federal detention center near Mexico City, but the new information would indicate they were released and returned to Agua Prieta.

Carlos Carrillo, assistant chief, U.S. Border Patrol, Tucson Sector, told WorldNetDaily in a telephone interview Monday that nine Yemenis were reportedly holed up in a hotel in the border town of Agua Prieta, Sonora. "We have passed the tip on to the FBI," he said. When pressed for information, he said he could not confirm the number, because they were under OP/SEC, which is a counter-intelligence acronym for "operations security."

The Border Patrol field patrol agent, who spoke anonymously, confirmed the presence of nine Yemenis. The agent said they could not get a coyote to transport them, and they are offering \$30,000 per person, with no takers.

The article goes on. Some people are being offered \$50,000, specifically of Arab descent. This is happening at the same time that we are debating wheth-

er or not we actually can control our own borders or whether we should.

Today I had an interesting discussion with a member of the press, specifically a lady I think from USA Today, and it became apparent after a short time she was annoyed with the fact that I was pressing for border control. She put the pad away for a second and talked to me, you know, sort of "off the record"; and she said you cannot really expect to do this. We are going to turn into a police state. Are you really going to try to keep these people out?

So I said to her, Tell me the alternative to trying to defend the border. Just tell me what you think the alternative is? It is to abandon it. There is no other way.

You have two options. You either defend the border as well as you possibly can, and it does not mean we will absolutely be sure that no one will ever be able to get into the country without our permission. Of course not.

□ 2100

But we do everything that we can do, just like the President has said that we are going to do outside the country. He said we are going to do everything we have to do.

I ask the President to do everything that he can do, and I certainly will do everything I can do, and I will ask my colleagues in this body to do everything that we as a body can do to stop people from coming into the United States illegally, because it is dangerous.

It is not just the person coming across to get a job in a factory or a field somewhere. We cannot discriminate. We do not know. It is not easy to determine which one is coming across illegally for some purpose that is benign and which one is coming across illegally for some purpose that is quite deadly. It is impossible for us to know that.

We have only one ability, only one charge, only one responsibility. That is to defend the border against all people coming across illegally. It is our responsibility as a Congress, and although there are many people who shy away from it, who are frightened by that because they know that politically we will be attacked by the immigration support groups and various other organizations, and by people who in fact have as their purpose, even here in this body, there are many reasons that many people vote against tightening immigration laws. Some are directly political.

Some people know that massive numbers of immigrants coming into the United States, legally and illegally, will end up supporting the Democratic Party, and therefore they say, we do not want to reduce immigration, whether we are talking legal or illegal.

Many people on our side are split in that Libertarian camp that say, "I want open borders," or say, "I want cheap labor." That is the problem we deal with here.

But I ask all of my colleagues to overcome those very parochial, partisan interests in the hope of and in the desire to try and defend America as successfully as we are doing in Afghanistan. It is imperative that we do it here, also. Our very Nation's survival is at risk.

We recognize that, and we respond to the call that the President makes when we appropriate money and in every other way indicate our support for the effort to fight terrorism overseas. But why, why, Madam Speaker, is it so hard for us to get the same job done here in the United States?

It should be the first place we look, it should be the first thing we do, because the defense of this country begins at the defense of its borders.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MOORE. Madam Speaker, last year it was announced by the Congressional Budget Office that, and I am talking about February of last year, that the projected surplus over the next 10 years would be approximately \$5.6 trillion. At that time, the surpluses ran as far as the eye could see, and everybody was talking about the surpluses and how we might use those surpluses to benefit our country.

In fact, the debate at that time was how we might use those surpluses to pay down our national debt, which was approximately \$5.7 trillion at that time. The debate was how much we should pay down our surplus and whether we should pay down our surplus or if we should pay down our surplus, if we might pay it down too fast. In fact, Chairman Alan Greenspan of the Federal Reserve Board said there would be some danger in paying down our national debt too quickly.

Well, that problem has been solved. We no longer have surpluses. In fact, and I am not pointing fingers or blaming anybody here, but as the result of an economic slowdown, as a result of the horrible tragedy that confronted our Nation on September 11 last year, the economy slowed down, number one. It was really put into a tailspin on September 11. The surpluses have virtually disappeared.

In fact, the \$5.6 trillion surplus last year that was projected over the next 10 years this year, in February of this year, was projected by the Congressional Budget Office to be approximately \$1.6 trillion. Somebody said to me when I was back home, what did you all do with the other \$4 trillion? I said, well, it was a projected surplus. Projections are hopes for the future.

In fact, I speak virtually every weekend when I go home to either college classes or high school classes, government classes. I remember several