

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

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

(Mr. CULBERSON 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 New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE TARGETS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD targets for the elimination of waste, fraud and abuse in Government programs under the authority of Section 301 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004 (H. Rept. 108-71).

Section 301 of the budget resolution requires House and Senate authorizing committees to submit findings to the Committees on the Budget that provide for the elimination of waste, fraud and abuse in programs under

their jurisdiction. The level of savings to be achieved by each committee was left unspecified in the budget resolution; the Chairmen of the Committees on the Budget were directed to submit those levels of savings for publication in the RECORD subsequent to adoption of the budget resolution.

The following savings targets, which are consistent with the level of savings expected from Senate authorizing committees, represent the minimum expectations for cost reductions derived from the improvement of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of programs within the jurisdiction of each House committee. The publication of these targets does not represent a level of programmatic reductions ("cuts") mandated by the Committees on the Budget, but rather a recommendation that the committees of jurisdiction find efficiencies equal to 1 percent of the net cost of the programs within their jurisdiction through the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse.

TARGETS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD AND ABUSE UNDER SECTION 301 OF THE BUDGET RESOLUTION BY HOUSE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE

[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

	2004	2004-08	2004-13	Total mandatory spending in budget resolution
Agriculture:				
BA	-0.495	-2.572	-5.254	525.250
Outlays	-0.455	-2.396	-4.945	494.464
Armed Services:				
BA	-0.779	-4.202	-9.179	918.038
Outlays	-0.777	-4.195	-9.165	916.462
Education and the Workforce:				
BA	-0.205	-1.144	-2.513	251.767
Outlays	-0.197	-1.103	-2.431	243.590
Energy and Commerce:				
BA	-1.802	-10.583	-26.512	2,649.002
Outlays	-1.815	-10.594	-26.523	2,650.184
Financial Services:				
BA	-0.072	-0.380	-0.751	75.044
Outlays	-0.018	-0.061	-0.095	2.817
Government Reform:				
BA	-0.827	-4.496	-9.998	999.817
Outlays	0.812	-4.423	-9.859	985.880
House Administration:				
BA	-0.002	-0.010	-0.020	2.112
Outlays	-0.004	-0.012	-0.024	2.334
International Relations:				
BA	-0.100	-0.599	-1.289	128.893
Outlays	-0.119	-0.563	-1.181	118.132
Judiciary:				
BA	-0.072	-0.319	-0.652	65.225
Outlays	-0.065	-0.319	-0.644	64.444
Resources:				
BA	-0.033	-0.158	-0.314	32.724
Outlays	-0.030	-0.149	-0.297	30.646
Science:				
BA	—	—	—	0.341
Outlays	-0.001	-0.003	-0.003	0.513
Small Business:				
BA	—	—	—	0.006
Outlays	—	—	—	n.a.
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
BA	-0.491	-2.689	-5.484	640.539
Outlays	-0.143	-0.763	-1.578	157.850
Veterans' Affairs:				
BA	-0.342	-1.833	-3.864	386.551
Outlays	-0.340	-1.825	-3.850	384.941
Ways and Means:				
BA	-5.495	-30.411	-71.339	7,616.989
Outlays	-5.517	-30.467	-71.428	7,625.699
Total:				
BA	-10.715	-59.396	-137.169	14,292.298
Outlays	-10.293	-56.873	-132.023	13,677.880

Note.—Section 301(c) of H. Con. Res. 95 does not include the House Select Committee on Intelligence. "—" means less than \$500,000.

I look forward to working with House committees in the future development of legislative initiatives to ensure the delivery of Government programs in the most cost-effective manner.

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

(Mr. LIPINSKI 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO 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 California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHERMAN 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 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 gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR 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 California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. RODRIGUEZ 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.)

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

(Mr. BALLANCE 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 Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will

appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IMMIGRATION AND AMNESTY

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, I rise tonight to discuss a topic not unfamiliar to those who know that I have a passion for and an interest in the issue of immigration and immigration reform. Tonight, I wanted to specifically refer to a proposal that has made its way forward and that has a number of interesting aspects.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, over the last couple of years anyway, there have been attempts on the floor of the House here where many people have tried to advance the cause and idea of amnesty for people who are living here in the United States illegally. It is something we have done before, something we did in the mid-1980s, and it has proven to be disastrous from a variety of standpoints.

You may recall that as a result of amnesty for millions of people living here illegally, millions more people came illegally. Of course, this is only logical. It is not surprising whatsoever that if you tell someone that they can enter the United States without going through the legal process, without going through the expense and waiting in line, and that if they do that they will be rewarded for that activity; that we will provide you with all of the benefits of those people who did wait in line, well, then, of course, people will not wait in line. It is pretty logical.

Nobody really, I think, is too surprised by the fact that when I do travel to the border and I talk to the border patrol, they always say, I hope you guys up there will stop using the word "amnesty." Because every time you even utter the word, the flood I am trying to stop down here, with the sieve that you have given me, turns into a tidal wave. And, of course, it would always do so.

Now, we have been successful, those of us who have been opposed to the continuation, or an expansion, of this concept of amnesty, expansion of what is bureaucratically and legalistically referred to as 245(i), those opposed to 245(i) expansion have been successful in stopping it from actually occurring. It came through the House here, and it did pass the House by one vote but failed in the Senate. Actually, it failed because Senator BYRD put a hold on the bill and it did not come up.

There is little sentiment in the Congress of the United States for this concept. The President has pushed it, but there is little sentiment for it here. And, frankly, I doubt that there is going to be a major effort to push it again through this Congress. There may be, but I think that we would be able to stop it.

So what has happened as a result of the fact that those people who want open borders, those people who want to reward people for having come into the United States illegally? I mean, what do they do next, I guess is the question. Well, what they do next is to try to attain the same goal only in a different venue. Instead of coming through the Congress with a bill to create an amnesty for people who are living here illegally and rewarding people for violating our law, a new strategy has been hit upon.

Now, this strategy is a strategy that has been employed by other governments, but in this case specifically, the government of Mexico, and maybe I should say other coconspirators in the United States, people who are in league with them, who believe that we should abandon our borders and provide no barrier whatsoever to the movement of people, ideas, goods and services. But the Mexican Government has decided to use something to achieve the same goal that they could not achieve by coming through the Congress, and that is the use of a card, an ID. It is referred to as the matricula consular.

The matricula consular is an identification card that is given to nationals of any country by their own government. It is not unique to Mexico, and Mexico has actually been using them for a long, long, long time. What has changed in the last year and a half or so is that Mexico has decided to go big time into this particular kind of endeavor, that is to say, to distribute as many of these Mexican identification cards as possible to Mexican nationals living in the United States.

Now, again, my colleagues might say, well, so what? What has that got to do with amnesty? Well, here is the deal. Everyone realizes, everyone realizes, that there is only one purpose for this card. There is really only one reason why someone would need this card in the United States, and that is if you are here illegally. It is a passport for illegal aliens. We know there are between 13 and 20 million people living in this country illegally, the vast majority being Mexican nationals. So the Mexican Government has already distributed, by their own count, about 1.4 million of these ID cards in the United States.

Now, as I say, they have the right to do that. No one is suggesting that Mexico cannot give an ID card to their nationals living anywhere. But what is peculiar about this whole thing is that they then went to their consular offices throughout the United States and they said, your job, if you are a Mexican consular official, is to go out into the States for which you have some responsibility and begin to lobby those States and begin to lobby the cities, the counties, the police departments to get those entities to accept this card from anyone who presents it for a valid form of identification.

And this has been enormously successful. They have been successful in