

this. They are looking to have more transportation options, more investment in our transportation, more lanes, more roads, as well as opening up alternatives like bus rapid transit, as I spoke of. But it is also supported by our chamber in Minnesota. They know how important this is to our economy. They know how important it is to our competitiveness. They know how important this is to jobs, and so they are supporting it. It is being supported by the Taxpayers League in Minnesota because they understand that this is a true user choice; that people only pay when, in fact, they are getting a return that is worth it.

I am very pleased that our own Governor, Tim Pawlenty, and his Lieutenant Governor, and Transportation Commissioner Carol Molnaw have also stepped forward and endorsed this. It has gotten great support on a bipartisan basis in Minnesota, just as it is a bipartisan bill here. And I think we need to build on that to make sure that we continue to build that support nationally, which I am expecting will happen.

It is a big concern here, because we are admitting that we do not have all the answers here in Washington; that we want to embrace those local and State and private entities that can help us with this. Admitting that is sometimes difficult, but it is critically and fundamentally important.

One other thing that we need to do, though, to make this whole equation work is that we need to look at how can we help finance these projects. Right now public entities with the ability to issue municipal type bonds that are tax-free have an advantage over private entities. Having private activity bonds and expanding the use of those is something that we need to encourage. So I will soon be introducing a bill that encourages that as well; that picks up on an idea that the prior Senator CHAFEE had to put forward private activity bonds which give these private entities, when they are doing the public work of expanding transportation corridors, the same tax benefit that would otherwise be available only to public entities. In many of these public-private partnerships that I talked about earlier, that is what is being used.

We just came from a hearing where we heard the administration's proposals on SAFETEA, and I am very pleased to see that they included private activity bonds as part of their proposal. I applaud them on that and will look to maybe see if we cannot even expand it beyond what they have done.

I also applaud them for continuing programs like the TIFIA program, the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act, that helps provide financing components that make it easier for public-private entities to step forward and be involved in this. I also applaud them for inching towards the type of loosening up of the outdated restrictions that are currently in

law. And as I spoke with Secretary Mineta and Administrator Peters, I encouraged them and was pleased with their response that they were willing to work to take a couple of further steps along the path of what we are talking about here in FAST to move in that direction.

□ 1700

I would just conclude by saying that this is not new. Prior to President Eisenhower stepping forward with the bold new program to build an interstate highway system for national security purposes, the idea of using user fees was the predominant idea for how we funded and expanded our core transportation corridors. Since that time, we have gotten our interstate system largely built. I believe for many it was an expectation when that was started half a century ago that we would return to that after the interstate was built. I think we need to.

This is an innovative approach, a new source of transportation resources to help bridge that gulf between what we need and what we have available to invest in our significant transportation needs. It does it in a way that empowers the States, empowers public-private partnerships, empowers local areas, yet assures the confidence of the consumers that they are going to get something that is a return for what they are giving in, that they can be assured that the resources they are devoting to transportation are in fact going to be addressing needs that they see, needs that they want to be addressed.

I would just encourage all my fellow Members to consider joining with us in pushing for the passage of the FAST Act, Freeing Alternatives for Speedy Transportation. Let us end congestion. Let us encourage local control. Let us restore consumer confidence. Let us not have congestion. Let us not have more tolls, but let us let people get to where they want to get to fast, along fast lanes, and get this economy moving again fast.

CONCERNS IN THE AFRICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHOCOLA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, there was a historic leadership summit held yesterday. Today is May 15. Yesterday, on May 14, there was a historic African American leadership conference held here in Washington. I want to salute the sponsors. It turns out that most of the sponsors, practically all the sponsors, are Republican. Every year the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation sponsors a legislative weekend where people in the African American community, certainly leaders from all over the Nation, assemble here in Washington; but they are nonpartisan.

Republicans come, corporate heads, the labor people. It is wide open as a non-partisan event. Everybody discusses common problems.

It is very interesting that this African American leadership conference, which is very new, I suppose I want to say at the outset, is certainly welcome. The attention African Americans are getting from Republicans is welcome. We have no problem with that. The myths that arise as a result of past Republican Party behavior, we would like to see put to rest. There is a myth that Republicans do not care at all for the concerns of the African American community, and, therefore, they are left to the Democrats who take them for granted because they are sensing or knowing that the Republicans do not care to be bored with the concerns of the African American community; the Democrats take us for granted, and they do not exercise themselves too much either over our concerns.

Those myths, neither one probably is true. Republicans are showing that they do care. They recognize simple arithmetic, that even if they got 15 percent of the African American vote, which would be unusual, it would be 15 percent taken away from the Democrats certainly in a national election, and it would go a long way toward guaranteeing victory. If they got 25 percent, of course, they would be unstoppable. So the arithmetic is understood by the Republicans as well as Democrats. If they did not understand it before, they understand it now. Democrats have never ignored taking African Americans for granted. The history of legislation, of positions and actions in the Democratic Party, when you look at them quickly, make it quite clear that they are very much concerned about African American concerns.

Democrats are concerned with things that benefit most Americans. What is good for most Americans is good for African Americans and vice versa. What is good for African Americans is good for all Americans. Attention paid by the Republican majority to African Americans will not only redound to the benefit of African Americans, but I expect it will help a lot of other Americans out there at the same time, because African Americans are on the cutting edge when it comes to suffering, when it comes to being at the bottom of the pile and receiving resources, when it comes to being at the top of the pile when it is time to lay off people and fire people. They are barometers.

We know what is coming with the larger community when we look at what takes place in the African American community. This is something that we have said for a long time. We had problems with diseases. The drug problem when it first arose was primarily in the African American slum communities where it could breed because people had all kinds of problems and the rackets could flourish; but it

got so powerful, the rackets flourishing in those communities, that they were able to branch out and swept all over America like an octopus that leaves no community untouched, the drug trade and all of the kinds of addictions and diseases that are spawned by the drug trade.

And so it is with any other problem. The health care problem is deepest and most egregious in the African American community. New figures have shown that instead of 40 million Americans not being covered by insurance, we are now at a point where it is more like 60 million Americans are not covered by any insurance. Among those not covered percentage-wise, within the whole African American community, a greater percentage of African Americans are uncovered, and they have been that way for a long time in terms of health insurance. So our cry for universal health care, health insurance for all is certainly good for the African American community, but it is good for all of America. Therefore, I welcome the African American leadership summit.

I am taking the time now to just tell my colleagues here who did not know about it that it did take place. It started Tuesday with a welcome reception in the Russell Caucus Room. Senator RICK SANTORUM and Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON gave welcoming remarks at that session. And none other than Senate majority leader BILL FRIST opened it up as a guest speaker, the keynote speaker. You cannot beat that in terms of the importance, the elevation of it in the priority scale of the Senate. You had the top leadership there.

Then they had a continental breakfast on Wednesday. You had Senators HUTCHISON and SANTORUM again, I guess they are the primary sponsors here, opening up. The African American leadership summit was addressed by U.S. Secretary of Education Rod Paige. That is quite a coup, because as the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus education brain trust, I have been trying for 2 years to get Secretary Paige to come to our annual fall legislative conference, and both times I have gotten no response. He is the Secretary of Education. We wanted to hear from him and invited him just as we invited all previous secretaries of education, and he has never responded.

So this leadership summit for the African Americans yesterday pulled a coup. Secretary Paige was there. Of course he was part of a process which involved a panel of distinguished people: Ed Dorn, the dean of the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas; Dr. Ernest Holloway, the president of Langston University; and the great Robert Woodson, Sr., founder and president of the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise, which usually focuses on problems related to African American housing. Then they had a health care forum after that and a luncheon with a keynote address de-

livered by none other than the chief of staff of the President, Mr. Andrew Card. Then they had an economic empowerment panel after lunch with the Honorable Johnny Ford, Alabama State House of Representatives; Kay Coles James, the director of U.S. Office of Personnel Management; Karen Johnson Street, Office of Entrepreneurial Development; and the U.S. Secretary of Commerce, Don Evans. Then later on they had an affirmative action discussion, "Expanding Opportunity and Diversity," it was called, with HUD deputy Secretary Alphonso Jackson; Veterans Affairs deputy Secretary Leo Mackay; and Maryland Lieutenant Governor Michael Steele.

I have taken time to run through this schedule quickly because so many of my colleagues knew nothing about it. Many of them would have welcomed the opportunity to participate in a nonpartisan way, but let us salute the Republican majority for taking this initiative. There were a few other ceremonies, I understand, in addition to that, with the Speaker involved at the Frederick Douglass House. There was a ceremony at the White House, also. It is just important to note.

I would like to take that as my starting point by saying what is good for the African American community is good for America as a whole. If it is good for Americans as a whole, it is good for the African American community. Let us go back to the fact that Secretary Paige was there and they were addressing matters relating to education. Because I am alarmed, I am upset, I am angry about what is happening to education all across America. We have done a 180-degree turn in terms of the progress that was being made. After all the hype and the high pitch of success that we decreed after passing the No Child Left Behind legislation, we are now in worse shape than ever before, not only with respect to the Federal Government's support for education but also, in general, local and State support.

In this year, 2003, we have numerous States and local governments, local education agencies facing the situation where they are not sure they have the money to get through the school year. They are not sure they can pay their teachers and administrators and all the other costs. At a time when we expect education reform, education improvement to be going forward at a more rapid rate to meet needs that are definitely there in our society, we are going backwards. The Federal Government's refusal to live up to its promises, this administration's refusal to live up to its promises is complicating things.

We are not just not improving the situation; we are making it worse. We have mandates out there, requirements out there that require resources, dollars, to fulfill. In the absence of those dollars and those resources, we are putting an extra burden on the school systems. We have increased the bitterness

and the cynicism. It comes down in very concrete terms in a system like New York City's large school system, where they are projecting the layoff of 1,000 or more teachers, at a time when we have worked hard to get more teachers and smaller classes, at a time when No Child Left Behind says that we require that every teacher be certified, that they meet certain standards.

It is imperative that the teachers really know what they are doing, especially those in the early grades who have generally been neglected when it came to certification and standards. We are in the situation now where we are laying off teachers. In the process, we increase the class sizes. In the process we make the job of teaching more difficult and we lose many talented people, who were interested in teaching, under this set of conditions.

There is no relief being offered in any way for the problems that plague schools in terms of facilities. No teacher relishes the idea of getting a bachelor's degree or a master's degree and going to work in a building which has safety and health conditions worse than the average factory. So many of our schools are more hazardous than the average factory. In fact, we would fine some factories if they had the kind of conditions that have existed in some of our schools. The buildings get older every year. In big cities, especially like New York where many buildings are more than 100 years old and many more than that over 75 years old, there is almost no turning back renovations, and various attempts to maintain these buildings is a losing proposition. But there are no new buildings on the horizon for most of these communities. Many of those that were on the horizon, in a building program, now are forced to step back because the funds are not there.

What does all this have to do with the Federal Government and the budget-making process here? What does it have to do with the African American leadership summit? The African American leadership summit, the people there ought to know that of all the communities that are suffering most from the dearth in resources in respect to education, the minority communities are suffering the worst situation. As we strive to improve the Federal performance in the area of helping African American schools, schools where most of the students are predominantly African American in the inner cities, some rural areas, we will also raise the level of assistance for other schools.

Title I was primarily designed to help youth, children who are poor. The proportion of children in the African American community who are poor is greater than the proportion in the population as a whole. African American children and Hispanic children make up the bulk of the children who are eligible for title I funds. Title I funds were supposed to be increased, doubled,

over a 5-year period. That is what the administration promised. They backed away. In the first year, instead of getting \$6 billion of an increase, we are getting \$3 billion of an increase.

□ 1715

There are definite concrete dollars-and-cents reasons why the suffering that is setting in out there taking place, definite reasons why principals and teachers and education officials are feeling bitter, are feeling more overwhelmed, are feeling more cynical about the commitment of their Nation and their government and the leaders to education.

If we are not committed to education, what are we committed to? We are committed, very much so, to the expansion of our military might. We voted overwhelmingly for a \$79 billion budget for the war in Iraq and the effort related to the war in Iraq. I am not going to discuss in great detail how much of that is going to be wasted, how it is going to be counter-productive, but the point I want to make is that if we can go further into deficit, and we do not have the money, it is going to be borrowed as part of the deficit financing, if we can go \$79 billion into deficit related to the war in Iraq and related activities like bribing our coalition partners and making certain that they support us and numerous other activities that are not specified, if we can do that, we certainly could use deficit financing to come to the aid of the cities and the local education agencies and the States that now are faced with the prospect of not being able to finance the education system through the whole year.

Why not have a revenue-sharing bill which helps to close the gaps that the States and the cities and the education agencies are fielding? Why not go further? Let us take \$79 billion and divide it over a 3-year period and phone it into the States and the cities for specific expenditures related to education, maybe half of it to go to education-related expenditures and the other half to go to municipal and State functions that are suffering as a result of the layoffs.

It is getting worse every day. New York State, New York City, has a huge budget gap between revenues and expenditures. At the same time they have a constitution, a charter, which does not allow them to go beyond the revenue collected. They have to have a balanced budget. Most States in the country are in the same position. They have to have a balanced budget.

The United States Government does not have to have a balanced budget. We are able to do deficit financing, and we have embarked on a course of deficit financing that is unprecedented under the Bush administration, the present administration.

There was a time when Mr. Gingrich was the head of the majority here that the great emphasis was on balancing the budget. We heard nothing from one

end of the year to the other except the ideology of the need to balance the budget. Suddenly nobody talks about balancing the budget anymore, and I do not want to raise the issue. At this point balancing the budget is not half as important as coming to the aid of our cities and our local education agencies with Federal dollars. Where else will the dollars come from?

So I want to say to the African American leaders who gathered at summit that it is important for them to make a case with Secretary Paige and with the other hosts for the summit that there is an education emergency in the United States right now, and the worst part of the emergency is unfolding in the African American community.

A very interesting event occurred and was written up in the New York Times last week. The teacher of the year for 2001 was a black teacher from South Carolina, a young lady who was selected because of her outstanding performance in the classroom as teacher of the year, and she was given a \$25,000 prize, given a fancy car by one of the automobile manufacturers to drive for a little while, lent to her, and showered with all kinds of accolades, et cetera. This year she is facing unemployment. This same teacher, the best we had in 2001, the system cannot find a place for her in South Carolina. When she came back from that 1-year hiatus she had, she was put to work training teachers because the model teacher, outstanding teacher, that is the best use for her, to train teachers, and she had a job that was very useful. She enjoyed it. They have eliminated the position now, and they are not sure they have a place for her, but they probably will find some teaching position somewhere for this exceptional teacher who has shown great leadership ability and the ability to train other people.

Is this going forward, or is it going backwards? That is going backwards in an obvious way. But the school system in South Carolina that she worked for is laying off quite a number of people. They have to balance their budget.

We are giving the American people the impression that America is almost bankrupt, that they should tighten their belts and go with it because what else can we do? Where if my colleagues would just open their eyes and our constituents would just open their eyes, what could we do? We could borrow money for education and for municipal services just the way we borrowed money for the war in Iraq or any other defense expenditure we want to make. We have already busted the budget. We are already into deficit financing during this period of recession, which everybody assumes is a temporary period of recession, and it probably will be. We do not foresee the collapse of the American capitalistic economy. We are going to come back, but this is a period of crisis. Why not in this period of crises come to the aid of our citizen States?

African American leaders should tell Secretary Paige that we are dying. A generation cannot wait until the recession blows over. We need to have the education there now. We need educated people everywhere more than ever before.

Even in our military there is a gross problem of education. In the first days of the war in Iraq, we were losing people to friendly fire and human error at a faster rate than we were losing them as a result of enemy fire, because we have a high-tech military. We have a high-tech apparatus that requires some very outstanding minds to operate. Even under on the ground at lower levels, there is a lot of need for a more educated population. That is going to get worse in terms of the need. I should say get better. There is nothing wrong with needing more educated people, but the society must rise up to the challenge and guarantee that educated people are there.

Most of the people in our Armed Forces, everybody concedes, more than 90 percent are people, men and women, from working class families, working families. They are from families that need public education. They cannot go to private schools. They are from families that need help from government in various ways, including housing. Too many of our military personnel are forced to utilize food stamps, and a small percentage are forced to go on welfare in order to maintain their families. That is a disgrace. That is not just.

One of the criteria for success in the war on Iraq and the surrounding occupation of Iraq and the creation of a democracy in Iraq is the degree to which we bring justice to Iraq. We will succeed or fail. And this war has not been won. The war has just gone through phase one. Phase two is can we occupy Iraq and really create a democracy as a result of our efforts there, or will we be consumed by something that gets totally out of control and we end up in a violent malaise with the people of Iraq in urban guerrilla warfare where all of our advantages of high-tech warfare go out the window because it is on the ground, man to man, bayonets, rifles, block-by-block fighting. I hope we are not consumed in that kind of quagmire.

But even if we do not go into that kind of quagmire, the question is will we be able to really convince the people of Iraq to go forward and establish a just and democratic society? The degree to which we succeed there will depend on the degree to which we bring justice to Iraq. One of the problems with our bringing justice to the people of Iraq is we do not know much about justice at home if we do not find ourselves able to create a healthcare system here that covers everybody. If we cannot find the money for a public education system that educates our children adequately, how are we going to bring justice to Iraq and provide those kinds of benefits? Justice in Iraq right

away means do we care about whether they have running water? Do we care about whether they have electricity? Simple matters like that are evidences of whether the occupying power cares about justice.

We secured every oil field. We boasted of that. It has been repeated over and over. Every oil installation in Iraq was immediately secured. We got the military to guard it, no looting, no abuse, no stealing of equipment and machinery, and we also got technicians in there right away as a part of Halliburton's \$7 billion contract, technicians and people there on the ground to make sure that a speedy effort goes forward to get them running. In many cases they never stopped running. We want to maximize the output of every oil well. We care about oil wells, and we have let the whole population of Iraq know we care about oil wells because that is what we focussed on. We left the museums unguarded. They got looted, trashed. We left the schools. We left the hospitals unguarded. So the looters went in there and looted hospitals and looted whatever was unguarded because the occupying power showed those things were less important.

The New York Times had in the front page the day before yesterday a front picture of an insane asylum in Baghdad, a maximum security insane asylum which was set up to hold the most worst and the most violent people who were insane, and the story that the director told was very heartbreaking. The insane asylum was secure until the marines came with battering rams and knocked down the walls, and some of them were screaming, "We are here to liberate you." I guess they did not know where they were, and they liberated all of the insane prisoners, insane inmates, and they are gone. They left the place unguarded, of course, and some of the patients there, particularly women patients, were greatly abused. They raped the women patients, and it is a nightmare, on the front pages of the New York Times.

We sent a message about justice that is the wrong message. We do not care about sick people. Hospital beds are still begging for security. They want somebody to come and guard the hospitals because they have rampant lawlessness in a nation of 24 million people that we expect to occupy on a shoestring. We say we have 150,000 to 160,000 troops there, but the military certainly never tells what it has. I am sure we have more than that. But even if we have 200,000 troops there, it is a nation of 24 million people, 24 million people. It is going to take more than 200,000 troops to establish order, for technicians and other kinds of people to get the electricity running again, to get the water system running.

All these things are doable. There is no magic needed to make the electricity flow again. We have the technicians and the people to make it happen, but we have to assign priority to

it. Justice for the average Iraqi family is do we care enough to get their electricity back on? Do we care enough to have decent drinking water for their kids? Those are the first signs of justice.

Iraq sits on an oil pool that is second only to Saudi Arabia. So Iraq eventually will pump enough oil for whatever it needs. From beneath the soil of Iraq, with the more efficient, effective systems of modern oil pumping and production, they will be a rich nation on paper. All they need is there. The question is are we going to be just and make certain that the oil revenues that come from the soil of Iraq, the first priority is to go to people of Iraq?

They do not have to have aid from the United States. They do not have to raid our Treasury to pay for their education system or their healthcare system or anything else if we would just let them use the oil revenue from their own soil.

Justice means directing the resources of Iraq to help the Iraqi people. We are off to a bad start if we will not give them electricity, we will not give them water. There is great fear that the oil barons of the world would descend on Iraq with contracts and various schemes, are going to carve up the oil resources of Iraq, and the money flowing out of the oil wells will flow out of Iraq into the hands of others. That is a great challenge. I hope we meet it. I hope we do not make the error of assuming that we can use the resources of Iraq and expect the people to believe in democracy and capitalism as being a good system for them. We are going to have to have justice, or we are off to a bad start because we have not cared about electricity, water, food, basics.

□ 1730

So, I say all this to say that African Americans who went to the leadership summit who have the ear of this administration now, great, it is wonderful they are listening. Tell them that we need examples of justice here at home.

There are too many hungry African American children. There are too many situations where African American children go to schools that are more dangerous than their homes in terms of health hazards, because of the still existing problem of lead paint, of various erosions in the buildings, of situations in the wintertime where kids have to sit huddled in their coats and all winter long, are racked with colds, with situations that have a lack of appropriate ventilation, and asthma is exacerbated, and on and on it goes.

We need justice for the children of America. I heard a speech by the President early in the war where he said, do not worry, we will guarantee that every Iraqi child has a good education, that every Iraqi child will have a textbook. Well, I hope so. But I would believe it if we had guaranteed, first of all, that every American child, African

American and others, had the textbooks they need. So justice at home here has to be practiced before we can really believe that it is going to happen abroad.

We are going to fail in Iraq, we are going to have a monumental failure, if we do not bring justice to that foreign land. With all of its various problems, its violent history, its different religions, all the things that are there, they cry out for the maximum effort being made by the occupying power to convince people that we are indeed a just society. MacArthur did it in Japan, the Marshall Plan did it in Europe, in Germany. It is not undoable, it is not impossible, but it has to have leadership that understands and is committed to justice.

It is very interesting, at the end of World War II, the people who were able to succeed so marvelously in occupying Japan and Hitler's Germany, what was left of it, were all people who favored Social Security here; people who created Social Security, people who created social programs here; people who led the government into an unprecedented commitment on safety nets; people who created the first farm subsidies. The administrations of those people were in power when we occupied Japan and Germany. So it was not by accident that they were able to bring a sense of justice and move on from justice to create a democracy that the people themselves in Japan and Germany could take over.

I say to the African Americans who have the ear of the administration, please send this message: We have an education crisis. We also have a health care crisis. There are individuals out there dying who should not be dying, because we have the modern science, the modern pharmaceutical tools, we have everything it takes to keep those people alive. But they are dying because they are poor. It just comes down to that.

You may have countries in the world with far less wealth than the United States of America who are providing decent health care systems. I hope that on economic empowerment, there was a special panel for the African American Leadership Council there, I hope they understand economic empowerment means, first of all, creating jobs for people on the bottom.

Henry Ford was not a great lover of poor people necessarily. He was not a great lover of his workers. He fought them tooth and nail in their attempts to unionize his plants. He looked out there and said, if I pay these guys a better wage, they can buy my cars. He had common sense.

There is nothing sounder in economic theory than the simple Henry Ford theory. If I pay these guys a better wage, they can afford to buy my cars. The American consumer has become the engine of the economy because we pay them well, because we fought to get decent wages, we fought to have leverage implemented, executed, by our labor unions.

We have a situation where people are making a decent wage. They can buy the products, and, boom, we took off. Nothing in the history of the world has existed like the American economy. At the heart of the economy is the consumers.

The heart of the recession is the consumers have run out of money, and it is now snowballing because of the increasing automation, because of high-tech production. You can produce products without human beings. You can produce products by using foreigners.

We even have listening complaint setups in the health care systems now, where you are an HMO in New York or New Jersey, and if someone calls to complain, if the person calling has a problem to be resolved, the person who answers the phone sounds like they are from Brooklyn, New York, or New Jersey, but it is an Indian young woman. The Indians speak English, and they study very carefully the accents in America, and we have contracts with groups in India answering our telephones. The cost of high-tech transmission from the U.S. to India is so low that you can let young ladies from cities in India take over the job. They get paid in 1 year what the same American operator on the telephone would get paid in 1 month.

That is the kind of undercutting of the economy that is taking place. You are wiping out the consumers. The Indians will be paid less, but they will spend their money in India. They will not spend it in the economy of the United States. On and on it goes with examples of that kind.

So, African American leaders who were at the Economic Empowerment Panel, creating jobs and wealth, will you please try to get the ear of the Republican host and make them understand that a stimulus package advocated by the Democrats, advocated by the Congressional Black Caucus, advocated by the Congressional Progressive Caucus still is a package that puts people to work by establishing public works projects, by creating revenue-sharing.

That stimulus package would revive the economy at a far faster rate than a tax cut of billions of people for people who already have plenty of money. If you give them more money, they are not going to spend it in this economy in the way the people at the bottom will, the consumers who are forced to, who have needs and have to meet the needs.

The suffering can be brought to a halt with simple, time-honored measures. We have had public works projects in the past. We have had revenue-sharing in the past. Nothing proposed by the Democratic minority or the Congressional Black Caucus or the Congressional Progressive Caucus is radical and new. We have had it before.

So, Mr. Speaker, I submit this draft timeline of the African American Leadership Summit for the record. It is an historic document, and it ought to be part of the RECORD.

AFRICAN AMERICAN LEADERSHIP SUMMIT

TUESDAY, MAY 13, 2003

3:30-5:30 p.m.: Early Bird Registration—Hyatt Regency.

5:30-7:00 p.m.: Welcome Reception—Russell Caucus Room, 325 Russell Senate Building.

5:40 p.m.: U.S. Sens. RICK SANTORUM and KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON welcome remarks.

6:15 p.m.: Guest Speaker: Senate Majority Leader BILL FRIST.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 2003

8:00-8:20 a.m.: Continental Breakfast.

8:20-9:15 a.m.: Opening Briefing: Sens. HUTCHISON and SANTORUM (15 mins each w/25 mins Q&A).

9:15-10:30 a.m.: Education: Raising American Achievement.

9:15-9:55 a.m.: U.S. Secretary of Education Rod Paige (15 mins w/25 minutes Q&A).

9:55-10:30 a.m.: Panel: (5 mins each w/20 mins Q&A). Ed Dorn, Dean, LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas; Dr. Ernest Holloway, President, Langston University; President's HBCU Board of Advisors; Robert Woodson, Sr., Founder and President, National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise.

10:30-11:35 a.m.: Health Care: Ensuring Affordable Access and Quality.

10:30-10:45 a.m.: Panel: 4 mins. each w/15 mins Q&A after Dr. Carmona speaks). Harry Alford, President, National Black Chamber of Commerce; Renee Amooore, Founder and President, The Amooore Group; Dr. Natalie Carroll, President, National Medical Association.

10:45-11:20 a.m.: U.S. Surgeon General Richard H. Carmona, M.D., (15 mins w/20 mins Q&A).

11:20-11:35 a.m.: Balance of Panel Discussion (Alford, Amooore, Dr. Carroll).

11:35-11:45 a.m.: Transition to Lunch in another room.

11:45-1:00 p.m.: Luncheon with Keynote Address.

11:45-12:15 p.m.: Lunch.

12:15-1:00 p.m.: Keynote Speaker: Chief of Staff to the President of the United States Andrew Card.

1:00-1:15 p.m.: Transition back to General Session room.

1:15-2:30 p.m.: Economic Empowerment: Creating Jobs and Wealth.

1:15-1:50 p.m.: Panel: (5 mins each w/20 mins Q&A). Hon. Johnny Ford, Alabama State House of Representatives, 82nd District; Kay Coles James, Director, U.S. Office of Personnel Management; Kaaren Johnson Street, SBA, Office of Entrepreneurial Development.

1:50-2:30 p.m. U.S. Secretary of Commerce Don Evans (15 mins w/25 mins Q&A).

2:30-3:45 p.m.: Affirmative Access: Expanding Opportunity and Diversity.

2:30-3:45 p.m.: Panel (7 mins each w/45 mins Q&A). HUD Deputy Secretary Alphonso Jackson; Veterans Affairs Deputy Secretary Leo Mackay; Maryland Lt. Governor Michael Steele.

3:45-4:00 p.m.: Summit Wrap-Up/Adjournment. Sens. HUTCHISON and SANTORUM.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just continue for a moment by saying that there are solutions. We went from an April unemployment rate of 5.8 percent to 6 percent. It is going up. Things are not getting better as a result of the first tax cut that we have given, and are not likely to get better at this point when we are talking about more tax cuts. And, even if we achieve them, it is not likely to get better.

The reality is that we are in a recession that will exist until jobs are created. So I want everybody, my colleagues and everybody, the African

American Leadership Summit folks, to understand that the simple matter of creating wealth through providing means to earn high income has to be on our agenda first.

Just one final note on the African American Leadership Summit. I wonder if they discussed the fact that a recent report of the Federal Reserve showed that in the African American community, the median family wealth was at \$17,000 per family, versus the median family wealth for white families being at \$120,000; \$120,000 versus \$17,000. There is a great gap there that I hope the African American Leadership Summit people will suggest to their Republican hosts as rapidly as possible.

One solution I would propose for the immediate situation is an old, time-honored solution. I have introduced a bill which I would call on my colleagues to think very seriously about, because it is an old-fashioned remedy to the problem. I am introducing this bill, and another one next week, a companion piece, called the Domestic Budget Protection Act, H.R. 1804. I welcome all of my colleagues to join me in getting on H.R. 1804. H.R. 1804 is legislation that will raise revenue and reduce increasing budget deficits which are due to the cost of the war in Iraq.

Beyond the \$79 billion we have already authorized, increased defense spending for the Iraqi war and occupation and rebuilding of the country will grow rapidly and uncontrollably. Nobody should be fooled by the fact that \$79 billion has been appropriated. That is not going to be the cost. It will be far greater than that. Collected revenues will continue to be substantially less in this country than projected Federal expenditures, placing strains on the budget appropriations process.

Vital federally funded programs are already facing devastating financial assistance cuts. Education, public housing, Medicaid, Medicare, Temporary Aid to Needy Families, these are only a few of these programs. Currently the proposed budget cuts over a 10-year period, Medicaid will be cut by about \$93 billion, Medicare has no protection, \$28.3 billion in veterans' health care benefits, \$38.5 billion from education, training and Social Service programs. All these cuts are leaving the American family behind at a time when 90 percent of our troops in the field are from working families.

Historically a special tax placed on the profits of the Nation's largest corporations has been used to fund the U.S. war effort. I repeat, historically a special tax placed on the profits of the Nation's largest corporations has been used to fund the U.S. war effort. The Domestic Budget Protection Act follows in these historic steps, and it offers a solution to increased assistance to domestic programs by placing a surcharge on corporations with assets greater than \$10 million.

This special revenue will be used to fund the war and the occupation, and

because it will be used to fund the war and occupation, it will free up revenue to fund domestic programs.

In the last 25 years, corporations have borne less and less of the overall tax burden. Their share, while dropping as low as 6 percent within the last 20 years, is currently 8 percent of overall tax burden. Corporations are paying only 8 percent of the overall tax burden.

On the other hand, individual income taxes as a share of the overall burden has risen from 13.6 percent in 1940 to the present level of 46.3 percent. So individuals and families who can afford to pay income tax the least are paying more, and corporations that are very rich, you look at the Fortune 500 list, you know corporations are not suffering at all, they are paying less and less income taxes.

On the back of my "Dear Colleague," I have some excerpts from my Domestic Budget Protection Act, and I quote: "The Congress finds that there is an established precedent for the long-term financing of a U.S. war effort. A special tax on the profits of the Nation's largest corporations would be in accordance with previous precedents, World War I, World War II, Korea and Vietnam.

"The Congress finds that in the last 25 years corporations have borne less and less of the overall tax burden, and, therefore, the corporate share of tax burden has dropped, while the individual's has gone up.

"The Congress finds it is necessary to suspend further reductions in assistance to domestic programs, and it is also imperative that any increases in revenue be utilized for assistance to these vital domestic programs."

In other words, if we take away the competition of the military budget for Iraq and have the corporations finance that through a surcharge on their profits, we would be able to have the vital domestic programs funded at a higher level, minus all of the cuts that are taking place at this point. The profits of some of our corporations are mind-boggling.

□ 1745

If you look at the Fortune 500 report, or the Forbes 500 report, corporations like Wal-Mart, \$8 billion in profits last year; Exxon Mobile, \$11 billion in profits; General Electric, \$14 billion-plus; Citigroup, \$15 billion-plus. On and on it goes. Microsoft, \$7 billion-plus. So long before you get to those little corporations down there who have assets of \$10 million, you would be able to fulfill the need to fund the war in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD at this point in its entirety my letter to my colleagues, which is entitled, "You Are Invited to Cosponsor the Domestic Budget Protection Act, H.R. 1804."

INVITATION TO COSPONSOR THE DOMESTIC BUDGET PROTECTION ACT—H.R. 1804

While the Congress has allocated 79 billion dollars for the Iraq War and occupation, un-

precedented hardship devastates state, local, and education agencies.

Thousands of teachers and government employees are threatened with layoffs.

Since the Bush Administration offers no revenue sharing relief, taxes are being increased in states and localities across the nation.

During past wars a surcharge on corporate profits has lessened the competition of the military budget with domestic budget priorities.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am writing to ask for your support in cosponsoring H.R. 1804, legislation that will raise revenue and reduce increasing budget deficits due to the cost of war in Iraq. Beyond the 79 Billion already authorized, increased Defense funding for the Iraqi War, occupation, and rebuilding the country of Iraq will grow rapidly and uncontrollably. Collected revenues will continue to be substantially less than projected Federal expenditures placing strains on the Budget/Appropriations process. Vital federally funded programs are already facing devastating financial assistance cuts. Education, Public Housing, Medicaid, Medicare and Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) are only a few of these programs.

Currently, the proposed budget cuts over a period of ten years; Medicaid by \$93 billion; no protection for Medicare; \$28.3 billion in Veterans' health care and benefits; \$38.5 billion in education, training and social service programs. We are leaving the American Family behind at a time when 90 percent of our troops in the field are from working families.

Historically, a special tax placed on the profits of the nation's largest corporations has been used to fund the U.S. War effort. (See findings on back) The Domestic Budget Protection Act follows in these historic steps and offers a solution to increase assistance to domestic programs by placing a surcharge on corporations with assets greater than 10 million dollars. This special revenue will be used to fund the war and occupation and thus free up revenue to fund domestic programs. In the last 25 years corporations have borne less and less of the overall tax burden. Their share, while dropping as low as 6 percent within the last 20 years, is currently 8 percent. On the other hand, individual income taxes as a share of the overall burden has risen from 13.6 percent in 1940 to the present level of 46.3 percent.

Cosponsoring H.R. 1804 sends a clear message to American Families as well as their relatives on the front lines. We continue to support them here at home. Please join me by supporting the Families who need vital domestic programs. To co-sponsor H.R. 1804, "The Domestic Budget Protection Act of 2003" please contact Mary S. Anderson at 225-6321.

Sincerely yours,

MAJOR R. OWENS,
Member of Congress.

EXCERPTS FROM FINDINGS OF THE DOMESTIC BUDGET PROTECTION ACT

The Congress finds that there is an established precedent for the long-term financing of a U.S. War effort. A special tax on the profits of the nation's largest corporations would be in accordance with previous precedents: World War I, World War II, Korea and Vietnam.

The Congress finds that in the last 25 years corporations have steadily borne less and less of the overall tax burden. The corporate share of the tax burden has dropped from a high of 35 percent in 1945 to a level of 8 percent in the year 2002. At the same time the individual income share of the tax burden has grown from 13 percent in 1940 to 46 percent in 2002.

The Congress finds that it is necessary to suspend further reductions in assistance to domestic programs. It is also imperative that any increases in basic revenue be utilized to increase assistance to vital domestic programs.

CORPORATE PROFIT CHAMPIONS

(In millions of dollars)

Fortune 500 rank and name of corp.	Total assets	Profits before taxes
1 Wal-Mart	94,552	8,039
2 General Motors	370,782	1,736
3 Exxon Mobil	152,644	11,460
4 Ford Motor	289,357	(980.0)
5 General Electric	575,244	14,118
6 Citigroup	1,097,190	15,276
7 Chevron Texaco	97,359	1,132
8 Intl Business Machines	96,484	3,579
9 American Intl. Group	561,000	5,518.9
10 Verizon Communications	167,468	4,079
15 Boeing	52,342	492
19 Cardinal Health	16,438	1,056.2
20 McKesson	13,324	418.6
22 AT&T	55,272	(13,082.2)
31 Proctor and Gamble	40,776	4,352
34 Johnson and Johnson	40,556	6,597
37 Pfizer	46,356	9,126
38 MetLife	277,385	1,605
44 Allstate	117,426	1,134
45 Walgreen	9,878.8	1,019.2
47 Microsoft	67,646	7,829.0
49 United Technologies	29,000	2,236
56 Lockheed Martin	25,758	500
92 Coca-Cola	24,501	3,050
98 Bristol-Myers Squibb	24,905	1,895
99 Northrop Grumman	39,791	64
100 Abbott Laboratories	24,259.1	2,793.7
103 Wellpoint Health Networks	11,302.5	703.1
172 Eli Lilly	19,042	2,707.9
252 Occidental Petroleum	16,548	989

As I said before, along with this domestic budget protection act, I am introducing a companion piece next week which is called The Emergency Revenue Sharing Act, and it simply states that during this period of recession, for the next 3 years, effective immediately, as soon as possible, we should have a revenue-sharing act which sends money back to the States and the localities from the Federal Government. A good figure to begin with would be \$79 billion. We should have an amount equal to the amount of money we have appropriated for the war in Iraq and related activities. Why not \$79 billion over a 3-year period going to the States, going to the cities to make up these gaps so that we do not lay off teachers at a time when we are trying to improve education, so that we can go forward with the modernization of our schools, so that we can go forward with maintaining decent health care in our hospitals?

We are not going to go backwards. Everybody should understand out there that America is not broke. We are not near bankruptcy; we are not paralyzed. It is only the will of the people reflected through the decisionmakers here in Washington that has to express itself appropriately to solve the problem. We are doing deficit financing anyhow; we can go forward and do more deficit financing to take care of the needs of the cities and the States.

I have numerous people who are friends of mine who have been laid off already, paraprofessionals in the schools. They laid off 3,000 people in city government last week. Those people came half from the school system and half from other municipal services. Those in the school system were paraprofessionals, people who are not

teachers, but who are classroom aides, lunch room aides, et cetera. Those are people who live in the community, those are people who are mothers and fathers and relatives of the poor children who attend our schools, and most of our children in our schools are poor children. The other people laid off in municipal services were sanitation workers. Large numbers of them live in our communities. They are people on the bottom. They are laid off.

I think along with my other colleagues from New York, we want to join with our colleagues across the Nation to send a message that we do care. We are not impervious to the fact that this is going on. Tip O'Neill said, "All politics is local." In the same manner, all taxes are local. Taxes do not come from Washington, D.C.; they come from localities, from States. They come here, so there is nothing wrong with sending some of it back and revenue-sharing. Revenue-sharing is a simple answer. We send it back, we might earmark it, we spend half of it for education and the other half we can spend on any other municipal State services. But that is a simple process of helping to close a budget gap. The budget gap in New York is not the largest. I think California is ahead of us there. There are some other States that do not talk much about it, and they are in such serious trouble that symbolically and proportionately they are in as bad trouble as we are.

An article in *The New York Times* on March 25 I think expressed it very well. It is entitled, "Budgetary Shock and Awe."

"The American public transfixed by the unfolding invasion of Iraq may some day look up and discover too late what the Republican Congress did while the world's attention was elsewhere. Led by the Bush administration, the House and Senate are about to march under the public's radar screen and lead the Nation into a decade of budget disaster.

"The country is facing plenty of financial problems: the economy, the cost of the war on terrorism and the war in Iraq. Stuningly, Congress is preparing to make these far, far worse with more than \$500 billion in tax cuts for the upper 1 percent of taxpayers. To finance these spoils for the wealthiest Americans, House leaders, who have taken the lead in hammering a budget together, plan deep cuts in vital programs for the bottom 99 percent. These direct hits will raise from Medicaid to child care, education to food stamps, environmental protection to emergency doles for the poor.

"This plan, in the form of a budget resolution tied a firm tax cut mandate, is moving forward," et cetera. I will enter this editorial piece from *The New York Times* on March 25 entitled "Budgetary Shock and Awe" into the RECORD at this time.

BUDGETARY SHOCK AND AWE

The American public transfixed by the unfolding invasion of Iraq may someday look

up and discover too late what the Republican Congress did while the world's attention was elsewhere. Led by the Bush administration, the House and Senate are about to march under the public's radar screen and lead the country into a decade of budgetary disaster.

The country is facing plenty of financial problems: the economy, the cost of the war on terrorism and the war in Iraq. Stuningly, Congress is preparing to make things far, far worse with more than \$500 billion in tax cuts for the upper 1 percent of taxpayers. To finance these spoils for the wealthiest Americans, House leaders—who have taken the lead in hammering a budget together—plan deep cuts of \$475 billion in vital programs for the bottom 99 percent. These direct hits will range from Medicaid to child care, education to food stamps, environmental protection to emergency doles for the poor.

This plan, in the form of a budget resolution tied to a firm tax-cut mandate, is moving forward on Capitol Hill even as lawmakers' boilerplate speeches resound with calls for shared wartime sacrifice by all Americans. How an average \$90,000 tax cut for each millionaire counts as sacrifice is only one of many unexplained mysteries as Republican leaders fiercely protect President Bush's second wave of tax cuts. The gallant troops in Iraq who are being invoked daily in speeches by members of Congress might be interested to know that the array of cuts includes an estimated \$14 billion reduction in military veterans' programs.

Last week, Senate moderates failed to pass what amounted to an embarrassment-reduction plan to halve President Bush's \$726 billion tax cut. Now they talk of a last-ditch attempt to revive that half-loaf approach this week, before the tax cuts are written in parliamentary stone. But a few key liberals are so far refusing, furious at approving any new tax cuts that will increase the deficits of postwar America. We sadly urge reviving the half-loaf strategy, if only as a symbolic protest of the Republicans' shameful use of the fog of war in their budget scheming. As for shared sacrifice, tell it to the Marines.

Mr. Speaker, the process that they talk about there is still moving forward. The House has passed a tax cut of \$550 billion. The Senate is debating still, maybe they have passed it today, or they will pass it probably before the week ends, a tax cut bill. Thank God for the more sensible, commonsense advocates in the Senate who at least want to cut it back. At a time during the war in Iraq, there were some who said look, we have to make some sacrifices. Instead of going for the full \$550 billion, why do we not cut it down to \$300 billion, or \$350 billion. That makes sense.

So probably what the Senate passes is going to have to go into conference in the House, and we should tell our constituents out there that here is the time for them to rise up and let it be known that they know America is not broke, not bankrupt and they would like to see a more reasonable, commonsense approach taken, because every dollar we give in our tax cut will have to be borrowed. It is borrowed. It is part of the deficit financing, which is the least productive part of it.

If we were borrowing money to create jobs directly through a stimulus package which built bridges and schools and renovated hospitals and gave jobs to people, then we would be feeding a

process whereby the money returns to the economy. But what we are doing is giving the money to the richest people under the banner that they are going to invest. What are they going to invest in? Why are you going to invest more in the creation of products when there are no consumers to buy your products? Why are you going to invest more in services when there are no consumers who can afford your services?

The simple law that Henry Ford understood, you first have to have somebody with money before your product becomes profitable, is not understood by the decisionmakers in the majority party here. We have to put aside our partisan blinders. Let us not have any more conferences with just Republicans or just Democrats. Let us put aside our partisan blinders for the good of the African American community, for the good of working families. After all, I cannot stress too much the fact that working families out there are on the front line in every respect. When it comes to homeland defense, it is going to be working families. They were there at the World Trade Center by the thousands. They are the ones who came in to do the rescue work. They are the ones who came in to do the wrecking and the clearing and so forth. The workers were there. The workers were there when we needed them on the front lines in Iraq, Afghanistan, and, if necessary, North Korea. There will be people from working families. We cannot abandon those families with these myopic policies that only benefit the rich in America.

The rich in America are rich because an order is maintained. A law and order society is maintained. And the Armed Forces protects them. If you get rid of what the working families provide, the rich certainly could not exist. So no rich person should assume that the money belongs to me and, therefore, I have no stake in trying to make certain that this economy works. I am not concerned about the emergence of America. I am not concerned about education. I am not concerned about the need to create more jobs. That is the most blind approach to their own self-interests. But we are not going to sit still and wait for their own self-interests.

The important thing is that this is a democracy, and I still have faith that if the facts are out there, if we continue to pound away at the commonsense, ridiculous position that the tax cut places us in, if we continue to insist that our cities and our States deserve to get some money back from the Federal Government in the form of revenue-sharing to pay for the needs that are there because, after all, it is the people's money. It came from the cities, it came from the States. Now that they need it back immediately, let us take care of what really is a man-made disaster.

In the past we have not hesitated to rise to the occasion if a city was wiped out by a tornado or if there was a hurricane that caused great damage or if

there was an earthquake. We always rise to the occasion in Congress and go to the aid of places that are affected. Well, now we have a man-made disaster in terms of the economy; and in New York, it is even worse because of the recession on top of the recession when we had the attack on the World Trade Center, which dislocated a major part of our economy. The Federal Government should come to the aid of New York, not only in the same way it comes to all parts of the country with respect to the recession, but we still need help in building back what was taken away as a result of an act of war against the United States.

Osama bin Laden and the terrorists did not attack New York City because it is New York City. They attacked it because it was a target in the United States. It was an act of war against the United States, and we deserve to have more help from the United States Government in the rebuilding of New York, just as we went to the aid of San Francisco and Oakland when they had a super earthquake. Billions of dollars went there. We have gone to the aid of islands who have had floods and natural disasters all over the country. Now is the time to go to the aid of our big cities suffering most from this recession in every way.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d, clause 10 of rule 1, and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, in addition to Mr. HOUGHTON of New York, chairman, appointed on March 13, 2003:

Mr. OBERSTAR of Minnesota,
Mr. DREIER of California,
Mr. SHAW of Florida,
Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York,
Mr. STEARNS of Florida,
Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota,
Mr. MANZULLO of Illinois,
Mr. SMITH of Michigan,
Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania,
and Mr. SOUDER of Indiana.

MORE HOMELAND HEROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, as I do on several occasions, I attempt to bring to the attention of the body and the people of this country a group of people who I have referred to as homeland heroes. These are people whose efforts in defense of the homeland go unheralded, unfortunately, but who, in

every way imaginable, are living in situations that we can only describe as war-like. They are living on a war front, and I refer specifically to our borders where an invasion is occurring. And these folks, the folks that I refer to as homeland heroes, represent to me, anyway, the sort of first line of defense, and they look to their government to help them defend their country, their lives, their homes. Unfortunately, the Government of the United States looks the other way.

Tonight I wanted to bring to the attention of the body the newest member of this group of homeland heroes. His name is Gary McBride. He is a 59-year-old rancher in Cochise County. He has lived in Arizona all of his life. He manages a ranch of over 22,000 acres in Rucker's Canyon, which is 30 miles off the U.S.-Mexico border just northeast of Douglas.

I met Gary McBride on one of my most recent visits to Arizona, and I visited the Rucker Canyon area on a beautiful Sunday morning. Mr. McBride is a frustrated man, I should tell my colleagues. He cannot understand why his own government cannot curtail the flow of illegal aliens across the rangeland he manages. This is a good question. It was one I could not give him a good answer to.

Mr. McBride is the manager of a ranch with 30 bulls, 300 cows and their offspring. His job is to see to it that the care and feeding of these cattle goes on. Anything that affects the cattle or increases the cost of raising cattle has a direct impact on his life.

A few things are basic to raising cattle and bringing them to market. These things include water, feed, and fences. Let us concentrate on just water for a little bit. Water is, of course, an enormously valuable commodity, as it is in Arizona and throughout the West. I am sure one can understand how wasted water and damaged water lines can be a big headache for ranchers. All of the ranchers I spoke to along the border region have experienced continual problems with their water lines because of illegal alien trespassers.

□ 1800

The illegals stream across their land in very large numbers. Anyone walking many miles across open range will need water. If the trespasser only drank the water and did not damage the water lines, the water troughs, water pumps and other equipment, that would be one thing. It would not impact the ranch so much, and it would not add that much to the cost of raising cattle. Unfortunately, the illegal aliens coming across the land in large numbers do not merely drink water from spigots or troughs. They break a float or fix it so it will not shut off, or they turn a valve so the tank is drained completely dry and the water wasted.

A typical storage tank holds 10,000 gallons of water. In the last year alone these tanks have been drained three times, the tanks owned by Mr.

McBride. This is a lot of water to waste in time of drought. Not only are the cattle affected, but local wildlife is also affected.

Often the generator for the water pump is damaged or vandalized. The cost of replacing a generator, anywhere between \$3,000 and \$5,000. I will stress that these are new situations for people living on the border, for Mr. McBride who has lived there all his life. It is not new to have illegal trespassers coming across their land. It is completely new to have them come across in numbers of hundreds, even thousands. It is also new to have this phenomenon where they are so intent on vandalizing the property. They confront property owners in very aggressive ways.

There is a difference today, they will tell you. Anyone on the border will tell you there is a big difference today in the people coming across the border and the people that used to come across three or four at a time looking for a job, that oftentimes the ranchers would provide, give them some food, send them on their way. But today it is different.

Fences. Let us go into that part of what it takes to be a rancher in this area. A central part of ranch management is having good fences. Keeping fences repaired is a big problem for all of the ranchers on the border region. One or two people crossing the land might easily crawl under or over a cattle fence, but groups of 20 or 50 or 1,000, usually headed by what is called a coyote, and the coyote cares nothing for the fences.

This is not the four-legged animal we are talking about. Coyote is the term used for the individual who is leading the group of illegal immigrants across the country. So as I say, he does not care a thing about your fences. And in order to facilitate the movement of the people quickly, which is what he is trying to accomplish, they will cut the fences or trample them down. On one recent evening, trespassers destroyed five gates and six fences in one 15-mile stretch involving four different property owners. Think about the cost in supplies and time to repair those gates and fences. On another night the trespassers destroyed two gates and two fences that took Mr. McBride \$170 to fix.

When a fence is down, cattle move across and wander into adjacent ranch property. It typically takes over 100 manhours each month to sort the cattle out and move them back where they belong. Sometimes the coyotes create a new problem that never existed before. Mr. McBride told me about this fence that serves no purpose but to stop illegal traffic. Mr. McBride had to build a strong fence on a quarter-mile stretch of road to prevent vehicles from using a back road to transport drugs across his land. It was the only way to stop the almost nightly flow of trucks across his land. It cost him \$1,033.25.