

per person. This has increased 9,000 percent to almost \$50 a person under the coalition provisional authority.

Just as striking, a member of the first marine expeditionary force told me a story about having gone into a medical library, he is a registered nurse, Lieutenant Colonel Keller was his name. He had gone into a medical library in Iraq and not one textbook had a copyright date later than 1984. Clearly, this is a country that has suffered massively as far as its infrastructure is concerned.

But, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to relate to my colleagues the good news. I wanted to relate to my colleagues what General Ricardo Sanchez told us while we were there. He talked to us about 90 days of progress that has been made in the country of Iraq. He pointed out that schools have concluded their school year and have conducted testing. They are beginning a new school year this month. Mr. Speaker, 90 percent of the major cities and towns have functioning town councils, and over 50 Iraqis are contributing to their own security in their Army independent of those who are already in the police force. Their prisons are on the verge of reopening. Their judicial system is functioning. Food distribution is occurring. There was no humanitarian crisis in Iraq. Their hospitals are functioning, below standards, but far better than they were before; and, most importantly, 4¼ million children were immunized. General Sanchez pointed out, and this is very important, Mr. Speaker, all of these things have happened within 90 days in Iraq. None of these things had happened within a year after our arrival in Kosovo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her 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. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EMANUEL 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHUSTER 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 North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ETHERIDGE 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 Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. OXLEY 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 Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BEREUTER 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 gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. HARRIS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BLUMENAUER 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 Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

IMMIGRATION POLICY

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 as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, although there are some signs that the Federal government is beginning to show some attention to, and there are some signs of progress actually in our efforts to reform the immigration system and to, in fact, increase the degree of security that we have on our borders after 9-11 and, I should say that these are very small steps, but they are steps that have been taken, and we should recognize them. The fact is that we are in the process of improving the technology that we can use to make sure that the people coming into the country as visitors are who they say they are. There is both software and hardware that have to be in place now, but at least we are moving in that direc-

tion. Recently I found that we are building some barriers on the southern border, especially in and around the Douglas, Arizona area. Hopefully, these barriers will be there to protect the national parks from being inundated as they have been for some time now by hundreds of thousands of people crossing that border, and coming into the United States illegally.

There was a terrorism conference not too long ago in, I believe it was in El Paso, Texas, and several members of the administration actually recognized, actually stated, that there were problems with our immigration policy, especially as they reflected upon the security implications of this country after 9-11. That in and of itself is a very good sign, a very good sign. Somebody is at least willing to talk about the security of our borders. I think, in fact, the phrase used at the security conference down in Texas and the phrase used by a representative of the administration was that the borders are "our first lines of defense." Now, of course, we have stated that on many, many occasions. Those of us who are concerned about this issue have used those same words now for several years. But it is indeed heartening that we are hearing them being repeated now by members of the administration.

Recently I had an opportunity to visit the southern border. I went down during our August recess, I went down to Brownsville, Texas and spent some time down there looking at our border operation, actually going out on patrol with members of the Border Patrol. We went down the Rio Grande River in the evening and watched as we implemented Operation Gatekeeper and other similar types of endeavors that are designed to tighten up border security on the southern border. And I must tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I was encouraged by what I saw. I saw a lot of dedicated people working very, very hard to make sure that the borders of this country are maintained, defended, and enforced. I had the great opportunity to speak to maybe 100 or so Border Patrol agents who were about ready to go out on muster, ride after muster, I should say, and wished them well and encouraged them in their efforts and, to a person, they encouraged me to continue the efforts here in the House of Representatives to encourage my colleagues to pay attention to this issue, to become involved regardless of how unpleasant we may find it to be when we get involved in this issue.

There are a lot of people, of course, who shy away from it because of the political ramifications that they fear. But there are ramifications to the country that are far more severe and far more serious than the political ramifications to someone's career here in this House.

So I was encouraged, and I have been encouraged by a few things I have seen. Now, we are a long, long way from saying that things are good and that the

momentum has shifted away from open borders, away from a position that essentially is everybody who can get here can get in. I should say that we are a long way from touchdown. There are a lot of things that need to happen at the Federal level. But what is now becoming even more disconcerting, what is now becoming a focal point and should be a focal point for a lot of our attention here in this House, is the situation that is developing throughout the States and in some localities throughout the country.

There is a publication that has been put out recently by the Federation for American Immigration Reform called the State of Insecurity, how State and local immigration policies are undermining homeland security, and I will be quoting from it liberally this evening, because I think it needs to be brought to the attention of our colleagues and to the Nation.

What we are seeing is that even though the Federal Government is inching forward toward trying to reform the immigration process in this country, and toward trying to gain a certain slight degree of security on our borders, we are watching States and localities go in just the opposite direction.

And there are, of course, certain well-known and well-documented stories and situations that we have heard about recently that I will be talking about in just a minute or two. But I will reflect upon these things and what is happening at the State level, and first we should talk about these things called sanctuary policies.

Sanctuary is a term that has been now applied to cities throughout the country that have adopted certain regulations and passed certain ordinances, all of which were designed to essentially protect the immigrant, the illegal immigrant population of their city or surrounding areas. This is happening, and there were cities that have done this in the past, College Park, Maryland and a couple of others on the eastern coast who call themselves sanctuary cities and actually passed legislation prohibiting their local police and law enforcement agencies from helping INS enforce the law. They have gone farther than that. Some cities have actually gone to the point of saying that if you are simply a resident of the city, you can vote in municipal elections.

Now, being a resident of the city, that is all that is required in some of these sanctuary cities. All you have to do is show that you have a utility bill, for instance, proving your residence and you will be able to vote. That is part of the problem, certainly, these cities that are doing things like this. New York City had something like this on the books for some time. They passed it back in 1989. Actually, it was a mayoral decree and it was specifically designed to obstruct Federal immigration law enforcement.

Now, it is amazing that even after 9-11 and New York City being Ground

Zero essentially for the terrorists, there was still a reluctance on the part of the city to repeal that particular order. It got to the point where eventually, the U.S. Supreme Court refused to overturn an appeals court ruling against the city's noncooperation policy that Mayor Bloomberg reluctantly rescinded the policy. However, a bill was submitted to the city council in New York in July of 2003 which seeks to resurrect the sanctuary policy by providing a provision banning city employees from reporting illegal aliens to local police and Federal authorities.

This comes at a time when we even know that several of the hijackers, several of the terrorists, the 9-11 terrorists were, at one time, in fact, stopped for, it turned out to be, motor vehicle violations, traffic violations, and because there was no database against which they could be checked, because some of these people were actually on terrorist watch lists; but because there was no cooperation, we were unable to detain these people, even though some of them actually, as I say, were on a terrorist watch list, but nobody knew about it when they stopped them. The police in the local area stopped them for running a red light or whatever it was for, but did not know that they were also on a terrorist watch list.

□ 2215

When you recognize that this kind of problem exists, when there is no communication among law enforcement agencies, when you also understand that there are national security implications to these sanctuary laws, there are implications certainly to laws which say that local police will not help enforce immigration policies, will not cooperate with the Federal Government.

Here in Washington, D.C., another ground zero, Police Chief Ramsey took pains to reassure the Latino Lawyers Association that the police were not backing away from a 1984 executive order that prohibits D.C. government employees from getting involved in immigration matters. Washington, D.C. is another sanctuary city. We actually have passed laws, Federal laws. In 1996 a provision was added to an appropriations bill which specifically dealt with this and said that no city or State would be allowed to impede the flow of information to the INS or restrict the flow of information from the INS. That is a law on the books today. Of course, there is no enforcement mechanism and, as a result, cities ignore it. Cities all over this country simply thumb their nose at the law because they know that there is nothing that the Federal Government can, under the present statutes, do about it.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that I introduced an amendment to an appropriations bill, to the appropriations bill that we were passing for Homeland Security and another one later for the Department of Justice. Both of my amendments were designed to put some

teeth into the law that is already on the books and say that if you violate the law that we already have on the books, if a city does that, if it stops the flow of information to the INS or restricts the flow of information from the INS to their local police officers, that they could not apply for Homeland Security grants or grants from the Department of Justice. We got about 120 votes for that for those two amendments.

And there was a lot of hand-wringing and consternation expressed by Members of the body over the fact that we were talking about this, and we should probably not be because it is like many immigration issues, and who wants to talk about an immigration issue when we know that there is all this great amount of emotion tied up in the discussion itself. So the amendment went down. But it is amazing to me that we do have, in fact, laws on the books which we choose in this body not to enforce.

I am sure that many people went home and said, well, I voted for the law that says they cannot do that. I voted for the law that says you cannot stop that kind of information, but they did not want to do anything that would actually make that law be able to be enforced.

Next we come to the issue of driver's licenses or as they are referred to, "the keys to the kingdom." Two years after 19 people used State-issued driver's licenses to board four airplanes and turn them into weapons of mass destruction, it is still possible in many States for anyone to acquire these documents, regardless of immigration status. Even though Virginia, New Jersey, and Florida have tightened up on it a little bit since 9-11, many other States still have very lax laws regarding who can obtain a driver's license from their State.

In the absence of a uniform Federal document, State-issued driver's licenses serve the function of providing identity. In addition to granting permission to operate a motor vehicle, the licenses are used for banking, for check cashing, for boarding airplanes, for demonstrating proof of employment eligibility, and many other purposes. They are also accepted by immigration inspectors for letting U.S. travelers return to this country after traveling to Canada, Mexico or a Caribbean destination that does not require a U.S. passport for entry. Thus, it is crucial that States recognize the vital national security role that these documents have come to play. Hence we call them, as I say, "the keys to the kingdom."

If there was any question about this, the 9-11 attacks should have put it to rest. All 19 of the 9-11 terrorists possessed one or more of State driver's licenses which they used to blend in, rent apartments, open bank accounts, and ultimately to board airplanes that they intended to crash. Yet, not only are driver's licenses still available to illegal aliens in some States, several

States are loosening restrictions on obtaining driver's licenses, and even explicitly spelling out that they will permit illegal aliens to receive them.

Of course, on Friday last, at 6 o'clock Pacific Standard Time, the Governor of the State of California signed a bill allowing illegal residents of California, illegal aliens who reside in California, and there are three to four million right now, allowing them to have driver's licenses. He did so on Friday late in the day, and the original notice of the fact that he was going to do this, a press advisory went out only to the Spanish-speaking media. Apparently, he wanted to avoid having to confront this from the standpoint of what the rest of the States would have to say about it in the hopes that he would be able to encourage and obtain votes to essentially stop the recall in California and to support him in his effort to stay in office.

Now, these are things, these are actions that are being taken by States that I believe should not go uncontested.

Mr. Speaker, I am essentially a States' rights person. I believe the States have great sovereignty. I have fought for it for all of my career in politics. I believe the Federal Government often usurps a lot of States' rights, and I would not in any way support that kind of arbitrary activity on the part of the Federal Government. But the actions taken by these States, and some of these cities, in allowing illegal immigrants the access to documents that then allow them into our society and allow them to do things that, if they have the intent to do harm to the United States, can certainly make it easy.

And, therefore, this is not just a States' issue. This is a Federal issue. We should be concerned about this at our level here. We should take some action to try to assure that in the absence of any sort of Federal identification process, that the next best thing, which is the driver's license, a State driver's license is, number one, a valid document and, number two, is not a document that can be given to people who are residing here illegally.

Now, there are not a lot of ways that the Federal Government can force States to do this. Because if we could pass a law saying States should not do it, as we have seen with the 1996 bill, States and localities will do it if there is no penalty. So we have to look at the penalty side of things. The penalty side of things almost always comes down to money.

So I have introduced today a bill that will begin restricting the availability of funds, of Federal highway funds to States that, in fact, allow illegal aliens in their State to obtain drivers' licenses. I will also be looking at other ways of dealing with this, maybe trying to restrict grants under the Homeland Security Act. There are a couple of other things we can do, but, again, it usually turns to the use of funds to get States to do the right thing.

This all, this whole issue of the drivers' licenses is coming on the heels of another sort of peculiar document that is being accepted by a lot of States in the Nation and local governments and some private corporations and private banking institutions. It is something called the matricula consular. It is a foreign government's ID that they give to their nationals who reside outside of countries of their own. The matricula consular is the card that the Mexican Government distributes to its nationals living in the United States and other countries. Of course, they have the absolute right to do that. No one is suggesting that a country does not have the right to hand out whatever kind of identification they want to their nationals. But what they have done, beyond that, is to begin a process of lobbying State and local governments in the United States to get them to accept the card. And they have gone, as I say, to the banking industry and other private entities to get them to do the same thing, and many banks have done it. Many banks have agreed to accept the matricula ID as a form of identification when somebody opens up a bank account.

Now, we have an enormous amount of problems with identity theft. We have an enormous amount of problems with people who use the banks to launder money, to launder drug money, to do a whole bunch of things, and trying to keep track of them is difficult. When you now allow people to obtain a card, which is by the way easily obtained, there are actually, Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting little aspect of this, but there are machines in Los Angeles and Chicago, machines similar to ATM's, I think most of them are by Mexican Consulates, but you can go up to this machine, you punch in some information and it will produce for you your Mexican birth certificate, which you then bring to the consulate and they will give you your matricula consular which you then take and, once again, start the process of entering into American society.

It is all too easy for people to do this. And for people to do this, especially people who have ill intent, people who have designs, people who have the desire to do very bad things to the United States. People who have the desire to change their own identity. Felons who are here, even American citizens who are felons can use this process and have, in fact, used this process to change their own identity and make them, when they get stopped by the police and the police are told by their city council that they have to accept the matricula consular as a legitimate form of ID, this person is, of course, allowed to go free.

We have arrested people coming into the country illegally. We have arrested them and on their person found many matricula consular cards. Recently we found an Iranian coming in with a Mexican matricula consular card. These are easily obtained. People are

actually going around door-to-door and selling them in Los Angeles. The Mexican Consulates are distributing them through vans that they send out in the streets of Chicago and other places. They are in no way, these cards are in no way valid forms of ID and should never be thought of as such, and the Government of the United States and certain departments, the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, have said the same thing. They have said you cannot and should not use these things. They have told the Federal Government that we should not do it. We are still wrestling with the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury who are not so sure about this thing. But the departments who have been charged with the security of this Nation are sure that these are not valid documents and should not be used by any government agencies, by any State or local agency and certainly should not be used by banks for the purposes of identifying people who are opening up accounts.

In California, the bill that was just signed by the Governor says that one of the things that you can use to get your driver's license in California, because up to this point in time California required that you have a Social Security number to get a driver's license. Well, although not perfect, it was a fairly good way to make sure that the people you are talking to are the people that they say they are and that they are here legally. Not always, but for the most part that is one form of identification that helps us make that determination.

□ 2230

Twice before, bills of the same nature were passed by the legislature in California; and twice they were vetoed by the same Governor, with this reasoning. He said there were not enough security measures in the bill so as to make sure that they could avoid the problem of misidentifying people who are then obtaining drivers' licenses and getting them fraudulently.

The bill that he recently signed had that in there for a little bit, had some security provisions in there; but they were all stripped out because of the pressure from the immigration lobby, and so the bill he got simply says this, that in order to get a driver's license in California, you can use your Social Security number, or a variety of other things including the matricula consular. You can now obtain a driver's license in California by getting a card from the Mexican consulate that says you are who you say you are.

By the way, Mexico is not the only government that does this. It has become very successful. This is a way of getting around the fact that we have not given amnesty to illegal aliens in the United States, and so the other countries are now naturally following suit. We have got several countries, mostly Latin American, South and

Central American countries that are also handing out matricula consular and using them for exactly the same purpose.

Not too long ago, we got, I believe it was the embassy in Managua if I am not mistaken, sent a memo to the Secretary of State and said, by the way, the government here is looking at how to implement a matricula consular, and we want to sort of help them out; and they were looking for a guidance from the Secretary of State here as to how they should help them because in that particular country, country that they were in and was going to give this matricula, the way that someone proves their identity is to have two other people swear that is who he says he is. I am Joe Blow and you get people to say, yeah, that is right, that is proof of identity; and, therefore, you can get a matricula consular. In California, you can then use that card to get your driver's license, and from a driver's license we know what happens. From a driver's license, I mean, this is the passport into American society.

So in all of our efforts to try and actually do something about the porous borders that we have, do something about the fact that there are enormous national security issues revolving around the fact that we have people coming across our borders without our permission and we do not know who they are, even though we are trying to do something about that, these little steps I mentioned earlier on, we are seeing States like California and others do just the opposite, making it 10 times more difficult for the Department of Justice, for the Department of Homeland Security to do their job; and what they are really doing, Mr. Speaker, is running their own immigration systems.

What we have got here is a situation where it is not just the Federal Government determining the policy of who comes in and for how long and for what purpose and exactly who they are, but now every State in the Nation is developing their own immigration policy or certainly could follow the lead of the States that are doing it, and cities throughout the Nation are doing the same thing. They are adopting immigration policies. How many are we going to have? How many are going to be enforced? It makes a sham of the entire immigration system, or perhaps I should say lack thereof.

There are, I think, Mr. Speaker, obvious implications to lax border enforcement and confused immigration policy. After 9/11, we should be enormously concerned about it. Even those people who have been reluctant to support immigration reform in the past should be willing to support the national security agenda that includes a tightening up of immigration policy.

So I really hope and believe that it is the responsibility of this Congress to take some action, to help really pull back, if you will, the immigration policy decisions into this body and into

where they belong and restrict States and local governments from setting their own immigration policies and their own course. That is probably next if this kind of thing goes on.

Tomorrow and the next day, of course, there will be many things here around the Nation's capital to mark the second anniversary of the 9/11 tragedy; and along those lines, we will be having a press conference at 11 o'clock here on the Capitol grounds, and it will be primarily to look at the fact that 9/11 and the tragedy of 9/11 did have some immigration-related issues that we should look at; and there is a gentleman by the name of Peter Gadiel who is head of a group of survivors of 9/11, people who lost family members in the tragedy in New York City, who will be speaking and who will be talking about the danger our porous borders creates, especially in terms of our ability to try and maintain some level of national security. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that there will be a good attendance there and also that we will get some national attention drawn to this issue because I think it certainly does merit that kind of attention.

IRAQ WATCH CONTINUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, we come to the floor again this evening as part of the Iraq Watch. For the last 2 months or so, four of us have been coming here the first evening that the House is in session each week to talk about Iraq, to talk about the policies that we think are flawed, to suggest new policies that the Nation might pursue, to ask questions about our policies and involvement in Iraq that we believe the American people need to know about and that Congress needs to know about.

The four of us who have done this week after week include the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL). We have been joined each week by several others, and we look forward to the discussion this evening and to continuing this each week until our involvement in Iraq has been clarified and stabilized and until we get answers to some of the questions that we think Congress is entitled to and the American people are entitled to.

Mr. Speaker, this past week the President has announced his budget request for our occupation in Iraq for next year totaling \$87 billion, a much higher figure than anticipated, on top of the \$79 billion appropriated by Congress just this past April for the 2003 budget year. This requested \$87 billion for 2004 would make our national investment over about a year-and-a-half

period of time \$166 billion, and every Member of Congress wants to make sure that we do right by the brave soldiers that are stationed in Iraq today. Every Member of Congress is determined to do right by the troops in the field, to make sure they get the support that they need, the resources they need, the equipment, the reinforcements, the supplies, everything they need to fulfill their mission as safely as possible.

So the debate that Congress will have over the next 2 or 3 weeks regarding the President's request for \$87 billion will not be about supporting the troops in the field, because we all want to do that; and we are all prepared to do that. What we will ask questions about is the President's vision for Iraq. He wants \$87 billion. I believe Congress is entitled to the benefit of his thinking to know what he plans and what his administration plans to accomplish in Iraq and how he is going to do it.

We owe those questions and deserve those answers, not just to Congress, but to the American people. It is their tax dollars being spent. It is their sons and daughters who are fighting in Iraq; and in a very tragic sense, their sons and daughters who are dying in Iraq, and this Congress needs to know some of the answers.

Fundamentally, we need to know what the plan is. We need to know what the exit strategy is. How long will we be in Iraq? What are we trying to achieve? How will we know when we have achieved it? What standards can we set for ourselves? What are we trying to accomplish? What yardsticks can we use to determine whether or not we are succeeding, whether or not more troops will be needed, whether or not more money will be needed down the road?

So I would suggest four areas before I turn to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT). Let me suggest four areas that I would like to see the President give information to the Congress.

The first would be regarding the military operations and occupation in Iraq, how long does the President believe that our troops will be needed, how much money will be needed, not just next year but in the foreseeable future to support those troops and how many more troops will be needed to fulfill the mission. I should point out that the civilian leadership of the Pentagon last spring estimated by this time, by September of 2003, we would only need 40,000 American troops in Iraq. Right now we have 130,000 American troops in Iraq; and clearly, that is not enough. So we need a better plan. We need to know how many troops, how long will they be here, and how much will it cost to support them.

Secondly, we need to ask the same questions and get the same answers about the reconstruction of Iraq. How long will it take to get the lights back on? How long will it take to get clean water to the villages and the cities of