

her reach will be unparalleled anywhere in history. Should we sign off on that? Should anybody in this Chamber agree to a world court system like this? This thing almost became a reality until the action taken this week by the President.

Let me go down here, a search jurisdiction over citizens of states that have not ratified the treaty that threatens U.S. sovereignty.

The United Nations claims under the World Heritage site, they have authority over what goes on at Yellowstone National Park or that under worldwide environmental laws that the United Nations has come up with, that they should have the authority to reach into the sovereignty of the United States. They can say whatever they want. The fact is that they have no authority. The United States does not recognize it. The United States has not ceded any of its authority to the United Nations; but if we sign onto a world court, we sign it away forever. That is the danger of this world court. That is the danger of that treaty.

It is built on a flawed foundation, this world court. These flaws leave it open for exploitation and politically motivated prosecutions. If we had a world court in place in the last 6 weeks, what do Members think, how many charges would have been filed by now against the country of Israel or against Yasir Arafat, who is a known terrorist, a lifelong terrorist? It would be so lopsided. Regardless of which side of the issue Members are on, it is very clear that the propaganda machine in the last month has been anti-Israel. Everything is Israel's fault. It has been completely ignorant of Arafat's history or the homicide bombers on Passover.

Mr. Speaker, that is my concern about this world court. The prosecutor and the judges of the world court, they have no supreme court that sits above them. They have no checks and balances that determine whether or not the course of action that they have chosen is an appropriate course of action, is a course of action that could be supported by the rule of law. They are not subject to anyone. They answer to no one.

Accountability in our judicial system is what gives the foundation of the judiciary its strength. If there are no checks and balances, no accountability, that is defined as a dictatorship; and the prosecutor would come as close to a judicial dictator as any we have ever seen in the history of the judicial system in a free country, in countries of democracy.

Let me just review a few key points about my comments this evening. The world court, the President of the United States in the last few days has issued a directive, which he has the authority to do, that the United States will not participate, will not be a participant in the world court. The world court is a new entity that is being formed, being primarily driven by the European Union. This court would be

given unparalleled jurisdiction over the territories of all countries in the world, purportedly even over the United States, even though the United States will not cede any of its sovereignty. They can say anything they want, but they will not have any jurisdiction unless we give it to them, and the President chose not to give them that authority. The President chose not to give up our sovereignty.

How did we get here? The reason is President Clinton in the last minutes he held office signed a sheet of paper that said we will go ahead with this treaty, sounds good to him. It is not good. The United States of America should maintain its own judicial system, a judicial system that cedes authority and power to no one but the people of the United States of America. The United States of America, our borders and our territories, should be ruled by the rule of law that our Constitution provides, that our Constitution, which gives rights to defendants and rights to the victims, which assures that somebody accused of a crime can face their accuser, which assures that somebody who is tried for a crime can have a trial by a jury of their own peers.

Those kinds of rights are fundamental in our Constitution, and they are fundamental for the judicial system being so successful, relatively speaking, to any other system known in world history over this last 100 years.

The United States does not belong in a world court. The President was correct, and the President and the administration should get a strong voice of support from every Congressman, keeping us out of a world court and keeping that authority within the borders of the United States. This is not partisan. The fact is, it is American. Americans should keep what they have. What they have is the greatest judicial system known in the history of the world.

Let me make my final summary. I began this evening talking with my respected colleagues from the Blue Dogs, and I listened with interest to their comments given over an hour period of time. Some of their comments had some validity, but I felt the remarks were so partisan and such a strong attack on the majority party, the Republicans, and such an attack on the administration and our President, but it was never pointed out by the Blue Dogs, they identified themselves as Blue Dogs. I think it is important to point out while they may belong to an organization called Blue Dogs, the fact is that they are all Democrats. There are no Republicans in the organization. It is a Democratic organization, and it is an election year, and the purpose of one party is to try to gain advantage over the other party in an election year.

Keep in mind that those Members in that 1 hour of attacking the budget and the majority and the administration, one, is not responsible for coming up

with a budget; two, is not in the majority; and, three, is doing it for partisan purposes, in my opinion.

The next thing I want to make very clear, I think if one were to stand up here and talk about how terrible it is that the majority has pork projects and how terrible that we cannot balance our budget, how we need to stand up and worry about the future of our kids, as if any Member of Congress does not care about the future of kids, and how senior citizens are being abandoned by Social Security, as if any Member thinks that we should abandon senior citizens, that is the tool of fear.

The fact is that one ought to vote as they speak. It would seem to me that someone who is talking about a balanced budget, who is talking about stopping the pork programs, about moving that money into education and where the money really helps us the most, should be amongst the most vocal opponents of the farm bill. The farm bill has some magic to it because it is called the farm bill. Take a look at the budget-busting numbers of that bill.

I thought it was very ironic that these three gifted speakers, very dynamic in their focus on controlling the budget and controlling spending, when we look at the voting record, each Member voted yes, yes, yes, on the biggest budget-busting bill we have had in a long time up here. That is the kind of transparency that we should have.

Mr. Speaker, look at this world court. I hope each and every Member can support the President in the President's move to pull the United States from participation in this so-called court. Keep in mind it is countries like Cuba, and any other country has the same authority that the United States does, that the prosecution has no oversight, there is no Bill of Rights, there are no constitutional rights. This would be the most powerful system, the most powerful political organization known to the world once it gets up and going.

□ 2115

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to talk about an issue of great concern to me. I hope it is of great concern to my colleagues. I know it is of great concern to a majority of Americans out there. I know that because I receive thousands and thousands of communications from people all over this country about immigration, about their concerns with regard to immigration. And I have certainly taken this floor many nights to discuss my observations, to express my concern, my own personal concerns about massive immigration into the United States and the effects thereof.

Recently I had the great opportunity to travel to Arizona, specifically to a site known as the Coronado National Forest. The Coronado National Forest is a beautiful and wild region of southern Arizona that has been a national forest since the early 1900s. It is undergoing a dramatic transformation. It is being transformed from a national forest of great pristine beauty into a forest that resembles more of a trash heap, frankly, than a forest. The environmental degradation of that forest is great, with the thousands and thousands and thousands, hundreds of thousands, actually, of people who come through there every year, and I am not talking about campers and hikers and bikers and picnickers, I am talking about illegal aliens. Because, as it turns out, Mr. Speaker, that particular part of the Nation has become the thoroughfare for the movement of illegal drugs and illegal immigrants into the United States. Like every other phenomenon of this kind, this has happened because we have put pressure on various parts of the border and it has essentially moved more and more people into this corridor. They see it as a very valuable piece of real estate from their point of view because it is rugged, it is difficult to be detected, and so it now has become the point through which a majority of the people coming into this country and a great amount of the illegal narcotics coming into this country will flow. As a result of this traffic, as a result of the sheer volume, we find that the forest, the Coronado National Forest, is under siege. Perhaps 60,000, maybe by now as we speak 70,000 acres have been burned this year so far. Fires start in this forest because UDAs, as they are referred to, as the folks coming through there illegally are referred to by the Forest Service and Border Patrol, that stands for undocumented alien, UDAs have started these fires. They start campfires in the evenings to stay warm and then they simply move on and let the fires burn and much of the forest has been destroyed as a result of it. On their way through the forest both now, as we are talking about both people coming through just seeking jobs and people coming through carrying drugs on their shoulders, this traffic has begun to wear into the land so that if you fly over it, which I did the weekend before last, I spent one day, Saturday, on horseback there and Sunday in a helicopter going over the forest. As you fly over the forest in a helicopter, you look down, what you are looking at is simply a spider's web of trails. These are not Forest Service trails. These are trails that are worn into the land by the thousands and thousands of people entering the country illegally. The trash that is left behind by these folks makes the place look essentially like a landfill more than it does a national forest; thousands and thousands of plastic bottles, trash from the backpacks that are homemade. These are the backpacks that are used to carry the drugs.

This is a picture of someone, and it is hard to perhaps identify him clearly here, but this is a picture of an individual carrying all of this, and that is closer to 75 pounds of narcotics. This one here looks like it is marijuana. But they will create these homemade backpacks. This gentleman is coming through on his own. Oftentimes they come through in larger numbers, 20 and 30 at a time, preceded by someone with an M16 guarding them and being followed by someone with an M16. A lot of times these folks will run into campers and hikers and bikers and people just there to enjoy the national forest. They are confronted by illegals coming through. It is a dangerous situation, to say the least.

But I want to just focus for a little while longer on the environmental aspect of this thing because that is what I went down there to see, Mr. Speaker. I went down to the Coronado National Forest because I had been told that the problems that the Forest Service was facing with UDAs, or undocumented aliens, in this particular area were so great that the forest was actually in jeopardy. So I thought to myself, what an interesting situation. I have been on this floor many, many evenings and certainly I have been in committee meetings and I have been on radio programs and television programs to talk about the problems with massive immigration into the United States. They are many. There are political consequences to massive immigration. There are economic consequences to massive immigration. There are social ramifications, cultural and national security issues that arise as a result of having essentially open borders. All of these things warrant our concern in this body. All of these things warrant the concern of the Nation. But another dimension of this whole problem is, of course, this environmental tragedy that is occurring not just in the Coronado National Forest, I should tell you, but in many areas on the southern border. It is an environmental problem, along with all of the other ones I mentioned.

On our side of the border down there, we have operated a range management program that has successfully brought back many thousands of acres of native grasses, has kept the land from being overgrazed. Maybe I should have put all of that, by the way, in past tense. Because over the last several years, livestock fences are routinely cut or knocked over by undocumented alien individuals trafficking through there. Consequently, livestock from the Mexican side comes into the United States side and begins grazing on the rangeland. This results in the overgrazing of carefully managed public lands. It results in erosion, a shortage of forage for U.S. ranchers who hold valid permits to the land.

These people also utilize and damage livestock water tanks. They break into Forest Service corrals and private buildings. You can see where the live-

stock have come across and where the land has been essentially denuded, looking very similar to land on the other side of the fence in Mexico, where, of course, there is no range management program. That is the ravages on the land just stemming from overgrazing.

Then, of course, there is the fire issue I brought up. So far this year, over 53 fires have broken out in the Coronado. People on the ground tell us that UDAs and the smugglers starting unauthorized warming fires in the forest likely cause 70 to 90 percent of all the fires. Fires have consumed over 5,000 acres in the tinderbox Coronado, not including the 35,000-acre fire that started the day that we left there, the Ryan fire. It is burning near the communities of Sonita and Huachuca City. We do not know, but now it could be closer to 50 or 60,000 acres. We are not sure.

Not only do we have the problem with these fires being ignited by careless activity as a result of these people coming through the forest but their presence in such large numbers in this forest actually prevents our people from being able to fight the fires effectively. During one fire that was referred to as the Oversight fire earlier this year, which consumed over 2,000 acres, the Forest Service was forced to suspend evening firefighting efforts after a, quote, pack train of 70 to 100 emboldened and potentially armed smugglers walked through a firefighters' camp in the vicinity of the fire. Air tanker fire retardant drops also had to be delayed and coordinated to account for the presence of illegal aliens in this area. So we could not fight the fires they started. We could not do it effectively for fear of harming somebody on the ground because there are so many people in this area. These are not the folks from the United States and other countries who have come there legally, who have paid their fees to come into the forest and who have, in fact, tried to enjoy that forest. These are undocumented aliens in the area. Millions and millions of dollars have been expended to try to fight these fires. As I say, they have to fight them with one hand tied behind them, essentially, because of the presence of so many people.

When these fires start and when they are finally put out, we still have horrendous problems that develop. Erosion, caused by the fact that we have lost the ability for trees and shrubs to actually hold the ground in the area where they have been burned, erosion becomes a horrendous problem.

□ 2130

It is a problem that is not easily remedied or rectified. Along those same lines, the thousands of people, as I mentioned, create these foot paths, these trails, and everywhere we go, we see them. The Forest Service people tell us those are not Forest Service trails, those are UDA trails. And because the undocumented aliens coming

in are fearful of having sensors placed in certain areas detecting their presence, they will use a path for a certain amount of time and then they move over to the side and start another one. So now, they have worn literally thousands of trails into the mountainside of the Coronado.

It is an ugly sight from the air. When one is on the ground, that ugly sight is compounded by the litter. Hundreds of thousands of one-gallon plastic jugs mark the trail that these people take. We can see here that this gentleman is carrying, as I say, several packages of narcotics through the forest, and it is not easy to distinguish on this picture, but they have created their own homemade sort of backpacking materials, which are really just kind of nylon ropes and some sort of nylon material that wraps around it.

Well, when they get to the place where they are going to stop and unload this and subsequently load it into trucks, trucks that come in, by the way, on roads that are not Forest Service roads, but that are carved into the mountain as a result of so much traffic, to come and pick up the drugs that again, they are everywhere. One can see them everywhere. When they get to one of those roads where they can unload this into trucks, they just take all of this stuff off and dump it there.

So periodically, we will see these large, large stacks of trash, trash; just their drug accoutrement trash, I guess I will call it.

This forest and our Nation are under siege. This forest is a microcosm, in a way, of what is happening in America because, of course, there are environmental consequences to massive immigration. Hundreds of thousands and now up to 11 million people we think presently are in the country illegally, plus the massive numbers of people that we allow into the country legally, create enormous problems for us from an environmental standpoint. If one doubts this, go to East L.A. and take a look at what has happened to that part of the city. Take a look at what has happened to many cities where the infrastructure cannot keep up with the number of people coming in, and sprawl is the result, and people move out and move to other areas of the country, like my State.

I happen to represent a district now that includes a county called Douglas County. Douglas County is the fastest growing county in the Nation for the second year in a row. Now, Douglas County is being impacted by immigration and impacted by people who are coming here directly, coming to this county and others in Colorado, directly from other countries, but also people who are coming from cities like Los Angeles and cities in Texas and cities in Arizona that have been impacted by immigration.

So it is a process by which massive immigration comes in at certain points, it causes people to leave the area because of a variety of reasons

dealing specifically with quality of life issues, and they go somewhere, and they are coming to Colorado. Our task is to try to keep up with it, to build the infrastructure necessary to provide services and schools, hospitals, roads and all the rest. It is a very expensive undertaking and it is environmentally challenging, to say the least. I have lived in Colorado all of my life, and I must admit to my colleagues that asphalt and concrete are not nearly as appealing as trees and grass, but asphalt and concrete are what are expanding in Colorado, not trees and grass. And that is happening all over the Nation, of course. And the reason is, as I say, immigration, massive immigration in numbers that we have never before witnessed in this Nation.

Presently we bring in about a million people a year legally; add to that about another quarter of a million that we identify as refugees, and about another million or so that we net gain every year from illegal immigration. That 2 to 2.5 million people a year number is about 10 times the number of immigrants that came into this Nation at the height of immigration into the United States, the heyday of immigration in the past century and the previous century to that. Around the early 1900s, 1902 or so, we received about a quarter of a million people a year.

Now, admittedly, the population of the Nation was smaller and so the percentage of immigrants was higher. But I still say that it is becoming more and more difficult to deal with the issue of immigration. It is more difficult now because this is a different country, for one thing. It is a country that will encourage people to come here and not disassociate from the country of their birth; it encourages them to keep their own language. We tell them that their children will be taught in their native language in the schools. We do not force them into English language proficiency which, of course, creates a number of problems educationally. We are creating an impoverished class as a result of refusing to teach children in a language, in this case English, that is the language of commerce, industry, and business and is the language that one must speak somewhat fluently in order to be successful in this country. We are stealing that away from them.

And why? All because we worship at the altar of multiculturalism and we believe and we teach children that whatever culture that was prevalent in the land from which they came is a culture that is better than the one to which they have arrived, the one they are living in today. We teach them that any culture is better than the United States, that any country is better, that any society is better, that all we are as a Nation are people with a heritage that is not worthy of great merit or praise.

Not only that, we provide welfare. When our grandparents came here, great-grandparents, however long ago the bulk of America's ancestors came

to the United States, there was no such thing as welfare. People had to work, or they starved. So they got jobs, and menial jobs at first. But then, in order to move up the ladder, they had to learn English in order to improve themselves, to get better jobs. And the combination of the lack of welfare and the lack of this bizarre multiculturalist philosophy, we had people who integrated into American society. Most of them wanted to. Most of them came here for that purpose. They came with a desire to disconnect from their culture, their history, their heritage, to a large extent.

Still, certainly everyone is proud of their heritage and can hang on to certain aspects of it but, for the most part, people came to be Americans. That meant learning English, that meant melting into and becoming part of an American mosaic.

That is changing today, so that we have a different kind of America to which people are coming and a different group of people who are coming. Many coming today do not wish to be part of that mosaic. They wish to remain separate. They want to celebrate not only the achievements of their own societies, of their own culture and history of the past, but they want to supplant that here in the United States.

We have about 6 million people in the United States today that claim dual citizenship. This is new. This is different. We never, ever had anything like that in the past. When people came here, for the most part they wanted to become Americans. That meant giving up their citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, when one takes an oath to become an American citizen, one says they disavow all the rest, they disavow any allegiance to any foreign government, potentate, and there is a whole large thing one goes through to describe their task. Well, people take that oath, but they do not live up to it, because they will retain their citizenship and retain voting rights in other countries, and they are encouraged to by other countries.

We are creating a nation that Samuel Huntington in his book "A Clash of Civilizations" warns us will be our own destruction. He calls it a "cleft society," one cut into. Two sets of principles, two sets of ideas, two cultures, two languages, at the minimum.

Of course, there are places where many more languages and cultures and everything are maintained in the country. This is the Balkanization of America. It is different today than it was in the past. Certainly from our Nation's beginning, there has been a debate over how many immigrants should come in, from what country, for what purpose. And many of these debates, unfortunately, were based upon the basis of emotions, fear, racism, xenophobia.

So therefore, today to talk about immigration in a way that is a negative or to make any sort of critical remarks about it, all of those old stereotypes are brought out by the opponents of

people who want education reform. And therefore, it is fearful to stand up and talk about this issue in a public forum. But it must be talked about, and it certainly should be talked about here in this body.

Mr. Speaker, this supposedly is the marketplace of ideas, this place, where we should never shrink from bringing to the attention of the Nation and our colleagues issues of great importance to our own future and, certainly massive immigration is something that is incredibly significant when we are talking about the future of the Nation, and it should be discussed. We should determine as a Nation, as a Nation we should determine how much immigration we want, for what purpose, for how long, all of these things a sovereign nation does.

There are people, Mr. Speaker, who wish to abandon the concept of a sovereign nation. There are many people who believe that borders are no longer relevant, that they are anachronistic, as a matter of fact; that they are impediments to the free flow of goods and services, and that we should abandon them for all intents and purposes, and that in the United States, we should adopt a model similar to the model prevalent in Europe today referred to as the European Union: Common currency, the essential elimination of borders, and the amalgamation of a lot of people into one sort of quasi-governmental entity.

Well, okay. That is a point of view. It is a point of view I do not share, I do not believe in, but it is a point of view, and it should be debated openly. But my concern is, Mr. Speaker, that we will reach that point in a relatively short period of time and we will turn back and say, how did this occur? How did it happen that we lost essentially our own sovereignty as a Nation? And we will be surprised by the fact that America is a different place than it was a short time ago.

Now, as I say, if we make that decision in this body, if we make that decision in a democratic fashion, a bill is introduced to abandon the borders, it passes, the President signs it, okay, fine. But if we make this decision in a de facto way, that is what is disconcerting. Because I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a majority of Americans today do not want that, yet that is where we are going. That is actually the direction that this government is taking, our administration, and even this Congress. Some are doing it purposely. Some want that end result that I have just described.

□ 2145

Some are doing it for other reasons. Massive immigration into the United States is beneficial to us, to certain people, to certain groups, and is a very politically sensitive topic. Let us be candid about it.

The reality is that massive immigration into the United States is supported by one party, in this case, the

Democrats, because they know that massive immigration will accrue to their benefit politically. For the most part, immigrants going into the United States will, as they become citizens, and sometimes, unfortunately, even before they become citizens, cast votes. When they cast votes, they will do so for the Democratic party. That has been historically the case.

On our side of the aisle, on the Republican side of the aisle, we are hesitant to try to stop immigration, or reduce it, I should say, to manageable levels because we hear from our constituents in the business community who say, we need cheap labor. There are many jobs that we have available that Americans will not take. I hear that all the time.

The H-1B is an interesting example of that. This is a category of visa, the H-1B visa, that we now give out to people to come into the United States who have certain talents in the area of high-tech, especially. We are told that there are not enough Americans to fill the jobs in the high-tech community.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is happening in others' States, but I will tell the Members that in mine there are plenty of workers available, because thousands and thousands have been laid off in that particular industry. Yet, we still bring in 195,000 H-1B visa recipients every year to take the jobs of Americans who have been laid off. But this is an example of the kind of pressure that our side of the aisle is under, to not do anything about immigration.

Then also on our side there are people with a libertarian perspective and libertarian philosophy. That is what I described earlier: Borders are anachronisms. They really are unnecessary. We should eliminate them. People should move from country to country at their whim, get jobs as they are available, and we should not be actually trying to determine who are coming across these borders.

Now, I mean, that sounds bizarre to some people, but I guarantee that this is a strong sentiment among many of my colleagues. It is certainly a sentiment among some of the think tanks in this Nation, the Cato Institute being the foremost of them, espousing this libertarian philosophy. Certainly the editorial page of *The Wall Street Journal* pushes the same kind of philosophy.

So it is not something that I am telling the Members here that is coming about in some sort of sub rosa fashion. These are people who believe in this, who push this concept. Now, they were set back a little after September 11. They could not talk about open borders after that as willingly as they had in the past because people would say, what are you, out of your mind? Open borders? Are you crazy? The people who came in here to do such damage to this country, the people who came in here and hijacked these planes and drove them into buildings, they all

came in here on visas. Or some of them, of course, had overstayed their visa, and some were here illegally, but they were all immigrants. They were all noncitizens of the United States. Are you suggesting in your right mind that we should simply ignore people who come across these borders?

So because the sentiment of the American people was so quickly riveted here against open borders, we do not hear much about it. But I guarantee that the sentiment is not gone and the desire to move in that direction has not dissipated. It is simply going dormant for a while. It is going through their quiet period, if you will. They do not want to talk about it, but I assure Members, that is what they want to accomplish.

So we move in that direction in a variety of ways. We refuse to do anything to significantly change the nature of the immigration service. We have passed a bill out of here that everybody touted a few a few weeks ago, or excuse me, last week. We passed a bill out of here that was touted as the reform of the INS, the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Do I not wish, do I not wish it was the reform of the INS.

But it is so like us in this building, in this body, to create an illusion because we know there is great public sentiment out there for reform, so we pass something that we call INS reform. But is it reform? Not at all. Is it better than what we have today? Yes.

I often liken it to giving the Titanic an extra lifeboat. Before it left, if we knew what we know now and somebody said, do you think we should put another lifeboat on, we would say, well, yes, sure. That is better. But it is not the solution. But the person goes, that is all we are going to do right now. We will call it the salvation of the Titanic. Of course it is not. Of course it is not.

I assure the Members that simply dividing the INS into two parts and keeping it in Justice, the Department of Justice, and keeping, for the most part, the same people as the administrators of that agency, the same people who are completely incompetent and incapable today of administering that agency will be the people who will be unable to administer the new agency that we are creating in the Department of Justice.

What are we doing about all of the other parts of border control that are under other agencies, and making it a confusing mish-mash of responsibilities: Customs, Agriculture? All these agencies have different responsibilities for border control. We are doing nothing about that. There will still be confusion, overlapping authority, indirect lines of communication, inability to communicate among all the various groups that have some sort of responsibility.

All that will be there. It will still be on the border, each one honoring points being run by a different agency, so that the people who want to come into the country illegally or to ship

drugs in will be able to look through binoculars, as they do today, sitting on a hill overlooking the port of entry, and see which agency is handling which drive lane. Then they radio down and say, if they are smuggling drugs, they will want to go through this lane because that is being handled by this agency and they are less concerned about that; and if they are smuggling people, it is over here. That is what happens today. That will not change.

We will still have an agency managed by incompetent people, having been shown their incompetence, or unwillingness. In some cases, they are competent individuals, but they are completely unwilling to actually uphold the law of the land when it comes to immigration control, Border Patrol. They do not believe in it. Even the present head of the INS has said he does not like that part of his job. He does not like being a policeman.

This gentleman, who should have been, of course, dismissed, if not when we recognized the failures of the INS after 9/11 then certainly when we, 6 months subsequent to 9/11, sent a couple of the hijackers their visas, although they were dead.

But he is still there. In fact, Mr. Speaker, not one single person in this great debacle we call the INS, and all of the things that we know that have happened that have been documented over and over again, the failures of the system, not one person has been dismissed, not one. What makes us think for a moment that just changing the nameplate on the door will change the way people act?

But we have people on the ground who are trying, who are working as hard as they can, people in the Forest Service, people in the Border Patrol who face this day in and day out, this particularly in the Coronado National Forest, but, of course, it is like this in many, many places on our borders.

This is a couple of pictures I took of a fence, a barbed wire fence. This has a cattle guard that goes through it here, and this has a regular gate over here. There is nothing else here, nothing else for miles and miles except a rather well-used road.

This road is not on any map, and neither is this one, because this road is a road that is used by illegals, primarily by illegals to come into the country; yes, to come across the border. That fence is the border between the United States and Mexico. That cattle guard is the port of entry, if you will.

Up here, there is a sign on our side of the border. I have to get it a little closer to me to see this and read it. It says here: "All persons and vehicles must enter the United States at a designated port of entry only." By the way, this is facing the United States side. "All persons and vehicles must enter the United States at a designated port of entry only. This is not," underlined, "this is not a designated port of entry. Any violation is," blah blah, and then here it is printed in Spanish.

We had the same sign over here on this side of the border, the same signs telling American citizens or anybody else that this is not a port of entry, but certain people on the Mexican side would come across every night, steal the signs and tear them down.

They put them up on our side. We welded them up on two metal posts. They came one night with a torch and took them down, cut them down, all because this happens to be an area that is heavily trafficked also by hikers and people visiting, tourists. Sometimes they will wander across into Mexico. When they do, they are grabbed by the Mexican police, taken to jail, and essentially extorted of all of their money. What I mean by that is they are held because they are told, well, you are here in Mexico illegally and it is going to cost you so much to get out. It is blackmail. That is all there is to it. They take down the signs on our side so as to hopefully track people coming across from our side to theirs.

But this is the border. Now, I am told that the administration has come out with something they call a "smart border" program. "Smart borders," I do not know exactly what that means, of course, but I have an idea that there is going to be a lot more technology and that sort of thing. I am all for it.

It will be interesting to see how long these gates remain, because, by the way, they were made into gates because they simply trampled down the fence so many times that they gave up putting it back up. They just left it and said, I cannot stop it anymore.

This is an example, perhaps, of smart border. It is an example of what the people on the border have to put up with constantly.

There are a total of four U.S. Forest Service personnel to guard 60 miles of border along that Coronado forest. They do so with the help of I am not sure how many Border Patrol people, but they do a great job. I want to tell the Members right now that I want to wish every one of them the very best. I understand what they are up against.

I want to mention John McGee, who is the forest supervisor for the Coronado forest; Rocky Stone, who works for the Arizona High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Area; Dan Bauer, the National Forest Service Drug Enforcement Program coordinator. These are some of the folks I went down there with. There is Richard Padilla and Greg Zelo of the Forest Service, special agents.

All these people were immensely helpful in getting us a good, clear picture of what is going on on this border.

□ 2200

Let me tell you one of the most peculiar and interesting aspects of the trip I took down there. It was not just to see, I mean, I was surprised by and certainly distressed by the amount of environmental degradation that is occurring in this forest as a result of the thousands of people coming through there illegally.

But there is another aspect of this thing that was fascinating. During a briefing that we had the first day by Mr. Stone with the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area folks, they explained to us a project they are working on and a process called "cobija," which is Spanish for blanket and it just means essentially that they are trying to get the various agencies, Customs and Border Patrol and Forest Service all of the agencies that have responsibility for border protection to sort of bring together all of the information that they have, they have accumulated over the course of the last couple of months since they last met and so they can plot out where best to deploy their resources. Because, of course, during certain periods of time you recognize that you are having more traffic of a certain nature through certain parts of the border, more heavy drug trafficking coming through here, more heavily in the area of people coming through smuggling over here, smuggling of guns. In this case from north to south is a huge problem.

So they try and figure out where they can deploy their resources the best, and they try to do that by getting all the information from all the agencies together. This is one of the slides that we saw during this briefing. And I had to stop them because I said, What do you mean here? It says here UDAs by border patrol sectors, and this one here is a major drug trafficking organization. But over here this one is talking about the number of people that were actually arrested or that they got in the last year or so, 400,000. It was not the last year. I am sorry. That was during the last period of time that they met, 403,000 through that Tucson area, which is where we met. It is a huge number.

We got to talking about this, and they showed me another slide that said incursions of the Mexican Government into the United States territory in the year 2001. And I was taken aback by that and I said, What do you mean incursions into the United States? They said, That is just it. We have 23 times in the year 2001. We confirmed incursions of the Mexican military or members of the federal police in Mexico who came into the United States. And we confronted them at some point. We met them. That is how we knew they were here. And sometimes it became a very tense situation with guns drawn on both sides. And in most cases the members of the military withdrew; the members of police withdrew but in some cases shots were fired, and it became a very difficult thing to deal with.

I just was surprised by that because I had never heard of that. I mean, I guess I ask you, Mr. Speaker, have you ever heard of, did you know that just last year foreign troops, in this case Mexican government troops and/or members of the foreign police establishments, came into the United States without our permission? You have to ask yourself, of course, why.

We have found out, by the way. I should say we found out this was not unique to 2001, that over the course of the last 7 years or so we have had over 100 documented incursions. And you have to say, well, why? And I asked that question. What do you mean? Why were they coming? And they could only speculate. And I said, Well, could it be that they were lost? And they found that quite humorous, the folks I was talking to, and laughed and said, Everybody down here knows where the border is. No, the people who came down here knew they were on our side.

What were they doing on our side? And the speculation was it was in conjunction with some drug trafficking activities, that perhaps members of the military or the police down there were protecting a cartel moving some product through the area, or perhaps they were creating a diversion so that this drew our border people away while it did move through another area. We are not sure yet. We are not sure. But I wrote a letter to the Mexican President Vicente Fox, and I asked him to explain to me what he knew about it, and, more importantly, what he was doing to stop it. Although I did not receive a letter from him, I received a letter from the Mexican ambassador to the United States that told me essentially that he did not like the tone of my letter and that these issues were handled satisfactorily, that in each case some explanation was made and everybody is happy about it.

Well, I know that not to be true. I know when I talked to the State Department they were concerned about this. They told me of a time around Nogales, Arizona, just a short time ago, told me of an incident that occurred just a short time ago, where a group of maybe 100 illegals were coming into the United States. They were hiding in a culvert in and around Nogales. They were all carrying large amounts of drugs in, smuggling drugs into the United States; but we got them. We arrested them, and about half of them were members of the Mexican military.

Now, I do not know if these guys were on leave or something; but I do know that the problem of corruption in the Mexican military and the police is endemic. We all know that. There is not a soul in here that does not understand that corruption in Mexico is debilitating for the government. And I do believe that Vicente Fox is going to try to do something about that, to try and produce a better situation down there. But I want to know what they are going to do, and I want to know now. I want to know how they are planning to stop these incursions, because, Mr. Speaker, this is a very dangerous situation.

Not only do I believe that these incursions are a result of drug trafficking into the United States, and that these people are participants in that in some way or other, but I also believe that it is a very dangerous situation. At some

point in time someone will be killed here in the confrontation because these people are heavily armed, and they are coming up against our folks who are armed. And one of these days something very ugly is going to occur.

I want to know what the Mexican Government is doing to stop this; and do not tell me they were lost. Do not tell me these people came wandering across the border heavily armed, re-treated only when they came across some part of the American Forest Service or Border Patrol, and do not tell me they were lost. That is not true. They were here for a reason. I want to know what it is, and I want an answer; and I will not stop discussing this until I get one.

I know it is embarrassing to the Government of Mexico. It may be embarrassing to our own government that does not want these issues to be dealt with openly. Even the State Department told me, look, we are trying to deal with this at the highest levels. We are trying to negotiate. Well, it has not worked. It has been 7 years as it turns out. I was surprised when I heard about it. Twenty-three incidents in 2001. It turns out it was not unique. This was not an aberration, the year 2001. It has been happening a lot. It is starting to increase. Talk to the people down there at the border. They will tell you the problems they face. They will tell you these people are not lost. They will tell you that they are armed. They are dangerous. They are worried about what is going to happen when they confront hikers and bikers and campers in the national forest. This is a dangerous situation.

What are we going to do about it? There is a wall that is built. There is a wall that separates the countries that goes through Nogales for 3 or 4 miles. It is about 15 feet high or so. I suggest that that wall should be continued at least along that forest border. And, yes, it will simply move people around it. I know that is true, but at least we can start to protect that forest in that area. Because if you are an environmentalist, Mr. Speaker, if anyone in this body has the slightest concern about the environment, they should go to the Coronado National Forest. They should begin doing all the things they do so effectively in any other part of the United States when they believe that the environment is being jeopardized: chain themselves to trees and start protests and demand action on the part of the government, and start a letter-writing campaign and boycott certain industries, or I do not know. Do whatever you want to do as environmental activists, but do it for the sake of this forest.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, I ask you, why is it that we have not heard a word out of the Sierra Club or Friends of the Environment or any of the myriad of organizations that call themselves environmentally sensitive? Why have we not heard a word about the Coronado Forest? I will tell you why. It is be-

cause they do not want to say anything that would be thought to be derogative of immigration. Well, you cannot have it both ways. In this case, immigration, massive immigration through this forest, massive illegal immigration through this forest is causing the problem. We have to do something about it. If it is a wall, it is a wall. If it is more border patrol, that is what we need. If it is an agreement with Mexico to actually clean up their act, then that is what we need.

But I do not know that we will get it, Mr. Speaker. I do not hold any illusions here about the degree to which we will press this issue for fear that we will lose votes among Hispanics here in the United States, for fear that Mexico will take affront at this. But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, when we become concerned enough about our national security to recognize that it is not just drug traffickers, not just people looking for jobs in Tucson who are coming across this border or who could come across this cattle guard, but it is the next Mohammed Atta.

Today they are crossing through these gates and over this fence carrying literally tons among the accumulated mass of narcotics coming across, literally tons of narcotics being carried on shoulders into the United States. What is to say that tomorrow or yesterday somebody did not come across this border with 50 pounds of something much more dangerous on his shoulders?

Smart border? I do not think so. This is a national security problem. It is an environmental problem. It is a cultural problem. It is an economic problem. It is a political problem. It is all of those things. To ignore it is an act of incredible idiocy. These things have implications for us, for who we are today, and who we will be tomorrow as a Nation.

If Mexico is our friend and ally, as I often hear them referred to, I would ask again, What are you going to do about this? How are you going to help us stop this? How are you going to help us stop people coming into the United States? Why do you not stop pressuring us to give amnesty to those people who are here illegally? Why is it so important to you in Mexico, I would say, Mr. Speaker, why is it so important to you to have us give amnesty to people who are here illegally, especially from Mexico? What does that matter? How come that is a major foreign policy issue?

Now, these questions are questions for every American citizen. They have to ask themselves if, by the year 2100, they want a Nation of a little over a billion people, because that is exactly where we are headed now if we keep the population growth at the present level. And 90 percent of that population growth by the year of 2100 when we hit a billion will be as a result of immigration. Is that okay? Is that where we want to go? Some do. It turns into political hay for them, political benefit. Others do. It turns into cheap labor and the bottom line, the immediate bottom line.

But I ask all of my colleagues to think beyond the immediate. Think about the Nation. Think about the implications of massive uncontrolled immigration into this country. Think about September 11. How many of those days do you want to relive?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a death in the family.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of her primary election.

Mr. KIND (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and May 8 on account of official business.

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

Mr. CRANE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and May 8 on account of personal reasons.

Mr. OSE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, May 8.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4156. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that the parsonage allowance exclusion is limited to the fair rental value of the property.

□ 2215

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 8, 2002, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6643. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Sodium Starch Glycolate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2002-0018; FRL-6833-9] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received April 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6644. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans For Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Rhode Island; Negative Declarations [RI 044-6991a; FRL-7170-1] received April 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6645. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [MO 151-1151; FRL-7170-6] received April 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6646. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Illinois [IL207-1a; FRL-7159-9] received April 9, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6647. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [MO 155-1155a; FRL-7175-3] received April 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6648. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District [CA 247-0322a; FRL-7158-4] received April 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6649. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541; (H. Doc. No. 107-210); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

6650. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Pascagoula River, Mississippi [CGD08-02-005] received May 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6651. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Long Island, New York Inland Waterway from East Rockaway Inlet to Shinnecock Canal, NY [CGD01-02-038] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received May 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6652. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation

Regulations; Florida East Coast Railroad Bridge, St. Johns River, Jacksonville, Florida [CGD07-02-032] received May 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6653. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Great Egg Harbor Bay, New Jersey [CGD05-02-006] received May 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6654. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations: New Rochelle Harbor, NY [CGD01-02-036] received May 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6655. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Fore River, Me [CGD01-02-040] received May 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6656. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Long Island Sound, Thames River, Great South Bay, Shinnecock Bay, Connecticut River and the Atlantic Ocean Seventeen Annual Fireworks Displays [CGD01-01-077] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6657. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zones; Ports of Houston and Galveston, Texas [COTP Houston-Galveston-02-006] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6658. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; California and Arizona Border on the Colorado River [COTP San Diego 02-009] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6659. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Anchorage and Security Zones; Oahu, Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai, HI [COTP Honolulu 02-001] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6660. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA—Groupe AEROSPATIALE Models MS 892A-150, MS 892E-150, MS 893A, MS 893E, MS 894A, MS 894E, Rallye 150T, and Rallye 150ST Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-CE-41-AD; Amendment 39-12672; AD 2002-05-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6661. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC-12 and PC-12/45 Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-CE-07-AD; Amendment 39-12687; AD 2002-06-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 16,