

would understand what is being done to their health care system.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, let me add that it is not just the veterans of this country that we think should be rightfully outraged about this insult to veterans. It is also those of us who have our liberty because of veterans.

I did something a little unusual for me; I actually watched the Super Bowl this year. It turned out to be a good game. It was very, very unique in Super Bowl history. I think the wrong team won, but still a good game. And the most telling commercial to me, which they always talk a lot about, the Super Bowl commercials, was the scene where you are like in a train station waiting room or an airport waiting room and you see people milling about, and then they all of a sudden somebody started clapping. You cannot see what they are clapping at, at first. Then the clapping rolls and pretty soon everybody in the room is clapping. Then you see these troops coming by, we assume coming back from Iraq or Afghanistan, and pretty soon the whole group is clapping.

I think that commercial really did encapsulate how Americans feel about our sons and daughters and husbands and wives who serve there. This is really deep and touching and it is good for America.

During Vietnam, there were a lot of disagreements. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) and I had enormous disagreements with the President about Iraq, and a lot of my constituents, a big majority of my constituents had a lot of disagreements. But to a person they felt the same way about our GIs coming home; the Marines, soldiers and sailors. That commercial showed people wanting to applaud them as they came home.

That is the spirit of America, yet this administration draws a budget that reduces the protection that these folks ought to have after coming home from the front line. That is just totally out of touch.

The veterans are a very uncomplaining group. I find veterans to be the least demanding group, perhaps, of any people I work with. It is just not in touch with the spirit of America of wanting to embrace these people.

It is denigrating their contribution. It is not understanding how deep people feel about the sacrifices that these folks have made in Iraq and Afghanistan. That is why we will have a very vigorous effort to restore this funding.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would tell my colleague from Washington that a gentleman by the name of J.P. Brown, who has a weekly radio show where he talks about veterans' issues, had me as a guest on that show recently. I talked about what happened to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and what was going on with VA health care funding. Mr. BROWN has said that he has gotten more calls from

listeners than he has ever received before.

I suspect that what we are talking about here tonight will be changed, because I do believe the veterans of this country and those who care about them are going to speak up and speak out.

I shared part of a press release from the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I would like to share a few more comments from that press release. This press release from the Veterans of Foreign Wars says, "This budget will cause veterans' health care to be delayed and may result in the return of 6-month-long waiting periods. That is especially shameful during a time of war."

Then it continues: "The VFW national commander is now calling on all 2.4 million members of the VFW and its auxiliaries, as well as all service members and their families, to urge their congressional Members to correct the shortfalls in this budget."

Then the press release concludes with this statement. "Without the American soldier, there would not have been a United States of America, and I shudder to imagine the rest of the world. Our Nation must honor its commitment to care for those who are ultimately responsible for every liberty we enjoy today."

So my sense is that the leadership of the various veterans' organizations in this country are going to mobilize their members to descend upon this Capitol, at least through e-mails and letters and phone calls, faxes, and so on, to demand of their Representatives, our colleagues in this Chamber, that this shameful budget, especially the parts that deal specifically with veterans' health care, be rejected by this Congress, and that we do what we should do, which is to provide adequate funding so that those who are in need of health care, those who have served the country and are in need of health care, have the ability to receive it in a timely manner.

Mr. INSLEE. If my colleague will yield once again, it seems to me our goal ought to be a policy that we can be proud of. This is not a budget to be proud of on behalf of our veterans.

I just want to reiterate, and continuing along the same vein that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) has, I want to read from what Mr. Thomas Cadmus, Director of the American Legion, said in questioning this budget. He said, "Is the goal of these legislative initiatives to drive those veterans paying for their health care away from the system designed to serve veterans? The President is asking Congress to make health care poaching legal in the world's largest health care delivery system."

□ 2245

Health care poaching, instead of assisting the veterans, is not a budget America can be proud of. That is why we are going to continue this effort, and we hope others will join us to

make sure that the sacrifices of our men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan are honored with a budget that America can be proud of and can stand up and defend. This President's budget falls way short and it must be changed.

#### THE BUDGET AND IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOUSTANY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I address the House tonight in regard to an issue that of course I have brought to the attention of my colleagues many times in the past. I continue to offer my observations about the issue of immigration and immigration reform.

I would, however, like to preface those remarks with some observations dealing with the issue of the President's budget and the general state of affairs of the Nation in terms of our deficit and the health of the economy.

Certainly I do so as a result of listening to my colleagues and their colleagues preceding them tonight attacking the budget for being so sparse, I suppose. A \$2.5 trillion budget, not meeting the expectations of many of the Members who have come to the floor tonight, and hoping a political advantage can be gained in their attempts to characterize this thing as a disaster.

But the real disaster it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that we have a budgeting system here and a budget in and of itself which is out of control, record deficits even in light of the sparse and lean budget that was presented by the President. It still has a \$425 billion figure attached to it in terms of a deficit. I imagine since it is in the President's budget, he does not account for the supplemental that he is going to request in a short time, \$80-some billion, we are not sure exactly how much, or the transition costs for Social Security. And if we add those, the deficit would be dramatically higher.

So I have concerns myself about the budget. I have concerns not that it is providing too little to run the government, but in some ways not being accurate in ways it defines the problem or the solution because the problem is horrendous. We have a budget that is a reflection of course of the needs, wants, and desires of Members and their constituents; and that is as the process, I suppose, should be. If we recognize what that budget does in terms of what our role here is, and after all of the rhetoric about the veterans who will not be receiving health care and the children who will be dying because they do not receive nourishment, all of these incredibly bombastic statements which have been made by the folks on the other side of the aisle about this budget, the fact is if you just do this, and I am not going to dwell on it a long

time because there is another issue I want to address, but it does make one think about what the Founding Fathers would have thought about a budget of this nature and how they would have tried to rationalize the Federal Government spending the money it spends in all of the areas in which it operates, and wondering about the extent to which any of these things are required by the Constitution.

The Constitution actually is the blueprint for the Federal Government, what it is we are supposed to do. The 10th amendment makes it clear if the power is not given to us in that document, it rests with the States and the people. Actually we can look far and wide. You can scrutinize the Constitution with a microscope, and you will not find any reference to education being a responsibility of the Federal Government. It is not. It is not there. Yet 50 to \$60 billion, I have forgotten the exact number being proposed, but many billions of Federal dollars being proposed for educational services, and that is not even in the broader areas of higher education, just in K-12, and Health and Human Services and highways, all of things that we do here which are extraneous to our task. The task is to protect and defend. That is really the role we have at the Federal level. States cannot raise armies and provide for the general defense of the Nation and the common defense; and so, therefore, the Federal Government must do that. That is our role.

Every year we do more and more other things; and unfortunately we do not spend as much time, energy, and resources on the things required of us under the Constitution. So once you establish this incredibly generous activity on the part of the Federal Government and Federal taxpayers to fund all of the myriad of things in that budget, agricultural subsidies, educational subsidies, highway subsidies, Amtrak, I can go on and on, all of the things that are not our responsibility but have become such as a result of the years of indulgence, essentially. If you can just take all of that away and look at what our primary responsibility is and how we should be funding that, we could do it easily and we would have money left over for tax cuts, but we are told that the world is coming to an end, civilization is at an end, blood will run in the streets if we pass a budget of only \$2.5 trillion, with really close to a \$500 billion deficit.

I know that many people in America look at the budget and say it is rotten, how can they spend so much money, but do not care about the thing that I care about the most. I support the President's efforts to try and reduce the size of the budget. Unfortunately, it does not go nearly far enough. We still have an increase in the budget of somewhere around 8 percent as far as I can calculate it, and it is true that the most significant increases are going to defense and homeland security, which of course are appropriate. But we still

do as far as I am concerned far too much in other areas that are extraneous to our constitutional responsibility.

So when we hear folks on the other side of the aisle argue and harangue about these cuts, it is important to remember that for the last several years, certainly the last year I was on the Budget Committee, we waited in vain to ever see a budget from the other side. It is true that the minority has the responsibility of being the sort of watchdog of the majority. That is fine.

But one of the things we would expect is if they say here is what is wrong with the President's budget, here is what is wrong with the budget that the Congress has produced because it will be produced primarily by the majority party, but if history is any judge, we will not see a minority budget. They will not provide a plan because if they do, they would have to do one of two things: they would have to cut spending or raise taxes. That is it. That is it. And neither of those two things are they too crazy about doing.

They would argue that we should not continue the tax cuts or make the tax cuts permanent. But, frankly, even if you follow their suggestion and allow tax rates to go back up to levels they were prior to the President's tax cuts, it would do little to actually change the entire picture. They would have to do substantially more. They would have to cut spending or increase taxes. That is it. If you increase taxes, of course, you begin to take a toll on the economy. Although initially there will be an increase in revenue, you eventually get to the point where taxes begin to reduce the number of jobs, the economy becomes much more stagnant, and therefore revenues begin to drop.

So they are in a dilemma. They are in a dilemma. Therefore, the only thing they can do is say these tax cuts are no good. These tax cuts are terrible. So where would they cut then? If you have a \$425 billion to \$500 billion deficit, where will you cut? They will not show that because the cutting job is tough. The President is to be commended for laying out a budget that does include significant cuts, not nearly enough. And by the way, no one thinks for a moment they will survive this place. Even the administration does not think that. Some of these things they put in knowing they will be replaced by Congress, but they can take the high road by offering the cuts.

Nonetheless, the cuts will not survive. We will increase the budget more than even the 8 percent that the President has planned, the deficit will increase, and all because we are afraid of angering these constituencies that feel they are entitled to some part of this.

In the entire debate that is the thing that most rankles me, the idea that all of these people receiving this largess and the share of someone else's labor, we are transferring wealth from one person to another through our tax system, everyone on the receiving end

thinks it is okay, they are entitled to it.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fascinating thing. In that roughly \$2.5 trillion budget which has been put forward, the greatest amount, certainly somewhere near 80 percent of that budget, is in fact wrapped up in these entitlement programs. That word implies an inability on the part of Congress or anybody else to do anything about it. That is like it is there, it was handed down by God that these programs be in existence, and we cannot do anything about it. That is Social Security, Medicare, some veterans programs. That is where all of the money is. We could eliminate all of the discretionary spending in the budget, the Department of Defense, for instance, Department of Health and Human Services, we could eliminate the entire discretionary budget and still only save \$750 to \$800 billion of that roughly \$2.5 trillion budget. That would take care of the deficit, but we could end every program except Social Security, Medicare, and some veterans benefits. That is not going to happen, and we all know that, unless we actually address the issue of Social Security.

Now, the President has offered that proposal also, which of course the other side of the aisle demagogues the heck out of, and suggests if the President's plan were to pass, that old age pensioners, the Social Security recipients, would essentially be dead in their home within a short time, all having starved to death as a result of having their Social Security benefits cut by this heartless President. Of course these things are untrue. No one is suggesting a cut for the people presently on Social Security. That is not part of anybody's plan. Yet that is the way they present it. That is the demagoguing that goes on on these issues. Again, it is the idea of entitlement.

Mr. Speaker, let me say as clearly as I can that as far as I am concerned, the only thing to which I am entitled as an American is liberty.

□ 2300

That is it. That is what I want from my government. That is what I deserve. That is what the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence speak to. That is what I am entitled to, liberty. I am not entitled to a pension. I am not entitled to having my child educated at government expense. I am not even entitled to the Federal Government building any highways in my district. I am not entitled to any particular benefit to help me take care of my wife, who may be pregnant, and to provide for prenatal care.

I mean, all these things are good. I am not in any way suggesting that they are not good for society and that people banding together would not provide them for themselves. But I am just suggesting that nobody is entitled to these things, nobody, no American. I am not, and I do not think anyone is.

So I wish we could stop using the word "entitlement." I wish we could begin thinking about what are the things that we are actually responsible for as the Federal Government. That is what I would like to fund. What does the Constitution tell me is my role? What does it lay out as my role, and what am I supposed to do as a Member of this body to fulfill that role through the appropriations process.

And believe me, we could get out of here in about a month if we just concentrated on something like that. We would be done. Start in January and be done by March because the role is relatively limited. All the rest of this stuff is extraneous and is not an entitlement. No one, I repeat, no one is entitled to sharing the wealth of anyone else.

Anyway, I know these observations certainly will not carry the day. At the end of the debate on the budget bill, we will not have reduced expenditures. Most of the programs that the President has proposed being cut will not be cut; they will be plussed up. Some will get cut, I hope, and it is a start, and I am sure that the President saw it that way too when he sent us the budget. Personally, I am sure, although I have not had a chance to go through every single one, there are still greater cuts we could achieve, and I plan to be offering amendments throughout the process to try to achieve them.

But I do hope we will just always consider the fact that this idea of entitlements is a relatively new concept to this government, to the people of this country, and I wish that we could think about it again. I wish that we could devise a plan and devise a set of spending priorities that were not based on anything called entitlements but just simply what our responsibility is as a Congress, although I recognize that that day is perhaps not only a long way off but maybe nothing I will ever see in my lifetime, but nonetheless we will have to hope for the possibility.

And in hoping for possibility, I must say that this brings me to the other topic that I wanted to address tonight, and that is the issue of immigration and immigration reform. And as I have done many times on the floor of this House, I have brought to the attention of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, the concerns I have had about the situation we face in the United States as a result of massive immigration across our borders, both legal and illegal. The numbers are astounding, and sometimes I am even taken aback at them. We are now interdicting at our borders about a million and quarter people a year. Three to five people get by the border guards for every person that they actually do interdict. So we do not know for sure. Maybe upwards of 5 or more million people coming into the country every year illegally. That amounts to, let us see, a lot of people every single day certainly, 20,000 maybe, 15 to 20,000 people every day if we are going to the

highest number that is possible coming in under those circumstances.

These are astronomical numbers, and they are things that are certainly disconcerting just on the numbers' side of things, what happens to us as a result of this massive increase in the population. An organization called Numbers USA has done excellent work on this, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Members go to their Web site if they are interested in this kind of thing, at NumbersUSA.com, and look at what they project to be the population of the country by mid-century if we do nothing to curb immigration because almost all of the population growth in the Nation at the present time is a result of immigration, both legal and illegal; and the numbers do have consequences.

The numbers of people coming in have consequences on a lot of things. Our health care system certainly is one. Our educational system is certainly another. The fact is that we are providing services for millions upon millions of people who are working here illegally or not working. Regardless, they are here, and some are here of course legally, but we end up spending far more in the provision of services than we ever are able to obtain from these folks in terms of the taxes that they pay. So there are implications on the numbers' side of things.

The environment. We hear people talking about the concerns of the environment, but those concerns are fairly narrow when we talk to them about the impact of immigration. We have a bill, Mr. Speaker, I will be introducing very soon that will require the EPA to do an impact study on immigration. What is the impact? What is the result of massive immigration into the country on our resources and on the country as a whole? I would love to see something like that. Of course, I hasten to add it probably will never pass because no one really wants to see that. But I would like an environmental impact study done on the immigration. What is the environmental impact of this phenomenon? And I assure Members that they will find it is significant.

The Speaker probably knows the situation on the border. I have been down to the border of the United States and Mexico many times, up to the northern border with Canada many times, and what we see is really fascinating and certainly a depressing view of the landscape, especially on the southern border where people have come through by the hundreds of thousands, in fact, of course, by the millions; and as a result of just the human traffic, the actual foot paths that are created through desert, the roads that people create as a result of driving their vehicles just off of the highway and through the deserts sneaking into this country.

The amount of trash that is deposited all along that border, the pickup sites where literally thousands of illegal aliens will gather after they have walked across the border and will gath-

er to be picked up by vehicles and taken on into the interior of the country. And these sites I have seen have turned into simply huge dumps, refuse dumps, with papers strewn everywhere and clothing and human feces and diapers and syringes and plastic bags by the thousands and thousands and hundreds of thousands of other things littering the place in just like maybe a 20- or 30-acre parcel of land.

Of course, the cattle eat some of the plastic. The cattle die. The human feces gets washed into the water system in the few times it does rain, but when it rains it washes this stuff away. The land becomes polluted by the human traffic moving across. But, of course, we hear nothing from our friends in the Sierra Club about the environmental degradation to the land caused by literally millions of people coming across it unhindered. And then of course just, again, the numbers, the impact on the quality of life in cities all over this country by the massive number.

We just got a report not too long ago from the Transportation Department about the fact that 70 or 80 percent of all the traffic congestion we have in this country is a result of, of course, immigration. The numbers just tell the tale. And so when people are waiting in a traffic jam wherever they are throughout the country, just think about the fact that that traffic jam they are waiting in, the smog that is being produced, the time being lost is a result of the fact that we cannot catch up, we have not been able to catch up with the numbers.

□ 2310

The numbers overwhelm us. They are far greater in terms of the actual numbers of people coming into this country than ever before in the Nation's history and we just cannot keep up. That is the one aspect of it, the environment.

Then there is, of course, the issue of our economy and what kind of expenses we incur, what kind of expenses are incurred by the citizens of this country who are paying the infrastructure costs to support massive immigration, both legal and illegal. It is enormous. It is enormous.

We hear all the time about hospitals on the verge of closing. Some have actually closed, some have actually closed certain of their departments, neonatal, as a result of having hundreds of thousands of people coming who are unable to pay, but coming across the border oftentimes just to have children in the United States in those border hospitals. They are inundated. And it does not stop there. It goes throughout the country.

I returned recently from Idaho. I gave an award, there is a political action committee with which I am affiliated, actually I was a founder and do certainly support in many ways their actions, but have no formal tie with it anymore. But that was a different award.

I gave an award up in Idaho, the Eggle's Award. This is an award that we established a couple of years ago to memorialize and honor a gentleman by the name of Chris Eggle's, who was a young individual who worked for the Park Service down in Arizona, Organ Pipe Cactus National Park, and he was killed. He was killed by illegal aliens as they came into the country, escaping from Mexico where they had committed four murders just a short time before that. He gave his life in service to the country.

We wanted to have something that recognized that, and we created the Chris Eggle's Award. We give it to public officials every year who we think are doing an outstanding job in trying to actually deal with the issue of immigration reform.

It was in that context that I was in Idaho. I traveled up there just a short time ago to give this award to a gentleman by the name of Robert Vasquez. Mr. Vasquez is a county commissioner in a county just north of Boise, Idaho.

Mr. Vasquez in this small county in central Idaho is inundated with illegal aliens. His county eventually came to the conclusion that they had to draw some attention to the fact that they were incurring all kinds of costs, especially for health care and incarceration, of illegal aliens, so Mr. Vasquez sent a bill to the Mexican government for \$2 million asking them to help pay for the costs of incarcerating Mexican aliens who were in this country illegally and in his county in Idaho. This is not a State that you would think would be "affected" by illegal immigration, but every State is affected, every State.

He recently, by the way, asked the Governor of the State of Idaho to declare his county a disaster area because of what has happened because of the impact that illegal immigration has had on his small county.

I just got back from a little place called New Ipswich, New Hampshire, and that is where I was when we gave the award that I was discussing earlier. This is an award given by an organization called Team America. It is likewise given to public officials who have done an outstanding job in trying to deal with and cope with this issue of massive illegal immigration into the country.

We gave the award to the police chief in New Ipswich, Chief Chamberlain. This town of New Ipswich has 5,000 people, in New Hampshire, mind you. He confronted, stopped a van in his little town, which had 10 illegal immigrants in the van. He called the Immigration and Customs Enforcement and they would not come out. They told him, "Oh, well, ten, let them go. Forget about it." He said, "No, they are here illegally, and I don't want them in my community. You should come and get them."

They simply kept telling him, "No, never mind, it is not a big enough deal." So he took a picture of these

folks sitting in custody while he held them in custody, and took another picture as he let them go. He sent both of these pictures out. He said here is what I did. I tried to detain them. Here is what happened when I talked to the immigration and customs officials. They walk away. They were here illegally. Everybody knows it. He knows it, they know it, the government knows it, and they let them walk.

This created quite a stir all over the country. It got a lot of attention, a lot of press attention to this.

A short time thereafter, here is another group of illegal aliens in his community, New Ipswich, New Hampshire, mind you, right? He gathers them all up, calls the immigration patrol and enforcement. They are out there in like 20 minutes. They gather them up, they send them all up. They do not like the publicity that accrued as a result of their unwillingness to do their job the first time around.

These things are happening everywhere throughout the Nation. In Colorado, and this is one of the most horrible things, and, again, unfortunately, incidents like the one I am going to describe to you are happening all over the country, because we hear from people by the hundreds, by the thousands, who have been victimized by people here illegally.

In Colorado a short time ago there was an accident caused by an illegal alien. The person in the other vehicle was killed. As it turns out, this illegal alien had had many confrontations with the law, had been picked up several times, but never had been reported to immigration control. Never. As a result, of course, he was allowed to stay in the country.

If you get convicted of a crime in the United States, you are supposed to be deported immediately. But he was never reported to them because Denver, among other reasons, but Denver, where we believe he was picked up, has this "sanctuary city" policy, where they will not report anything to the Federal Government about people who are in the community illegally.

As a result, we have had many instances where illegal aliens were in fact arrested for some sort of crime, are either out on bail, served some time, again are out on the street, never having that violation ever reported to immigration control and enforcement, and, therefore, of course, still are able to perform other crimes, to do other crimes, which happens all too often, again in this case in Colorado, or he is alleged to have done this, I should say. Anyway, we get calls like this all the time.

There was a sheriff, a deputy sheriff in California, Deputy Sheriff March, pulled over a guy, walked up to the car, the guy in the car shoots the deputy sheriff in the stomach. As he goes down, the guy gets out of the car, puts two more bullets in his head.

We know exactly who this person is that did this. He is back in Mexico

now. He will not be extradited by the Mexican government to the United States because he faces the death penalty and/or life imprisonment, which the Mexican government now calls cruel and unusual punishment. But that is only one side of the story, because there are over 1,000 people now just from California, over 1,000 murder warrants out for people in California alone who have fled to Mexico to avoid extradition to the United States.

The saddest part about this is a dead officer, but the most infuriating part about this is that this guy had been picked up twice before, or three times, I cannot remember now, and it was for very serious crimes. I think one was attempted murder. He should not have been, of course, in the United States. He had actually been asked to leave the country. I do not remember if they forced him out, I think they did. He then, of course, came back, because there is no security at the border. He should not have been in the country.

Approximately 25 percent of those who are presently incarcerated in our Federal prisons, 25 percent of the people presently incarcerated in our Federal prisons are non-citizens. We do not know the exact numbers for the States, but I think in many States it is very similar to that.

If the Federal Government were doing its job, of course, these people would not be in the United States. They could not have come here illegally. If they did come here illegally and did something wrong, we would have either put them in prison for a longer time, or, of course, deported them.

□ 2320

But we do not. We do not pay much attention to it because, of course, there are a lot of pressures that try to push us away from actually enforcing the law in this country.

These pressures come from a variety of places. They come from political parties like the Democratic Party that sees massive immigration as a source of voters. They come from the Republican Party who sees massive immigration, both legal and illegal, as a source of cheap labor. We get pressures from a lot of folks here on the Hill to not look carefully at the issue of immigration and immigration reform.

There will be a battle in this House tomorrow, on the Floor of this House tomorrow, over a bill that is designed to do a couple of things that desperately need to be done. It is referred to as the Sensenbrenner bill. I certainly hope that it will pass, and I think that it will, but the opposition will be vocal and we will see whether we can get through the whole process.

This is simply to say that there should be a standard applied for giving driver's licenses to people, and if States want to give driver's licenses to people who are in this country illegally, that is fine, we cannot stop them, but we can say that they will not

be valid for any Federal purpose like getting on an airplane, interstate travel, commerce, or going into Federal buildings or applying for any sort of benefit that Federal dollars are attached to. We can do that and we should do that.

Also, of course, the other thing that the bill does is to plug up some of the loopholes in our statutes, in our laws, with regard to people who are here as refugees, claiming refugee status. Many of these people have taken advantage of the loopholes. Some of them are terrorists or are potential terrorists, and they have a record; and they get here and they claim a certain status, and we have to essentially keep them. And if we can stop some of them, if they are terrorists in the country of origin and we know it there, we can deny access still. But once they get here, under the present law, if they get here, somehow we can not deport them. We can stop them from coming here because they are terrorists, but if they get here somehow, we cannot send them back under the present law. This bill is designed to address these issues.

There will be a huge fight tomorrow, and the debate will be lengthy and it will be vitriolic and very bitter on this kind of an issue.

I do hope, of course, as I say, that we pass it. But this is the first time since I have been in this Congress now, and this will be my seventh year, that I have actually seen a bill come to the floor with the potential of passage anyway, and this bill, having a true reform aspect to it. So I am encouraged by that, but I know a lot of work yet has to be done in the area of immigration reform.

Some of our opponents in this area keep putting bills forward that they say are true remedies and they are bills that are designed to develop some sort of guest worker program, but all of them with a component that I think is unacceptable to a majority of at least the Republicans in this House, I know to a majority of Americans it is unacceptable, and that component is this thing called "amnesty."

There was a Member on the Floor not too long ago, a proponent of this particular kind of plan who kept saying that we should not call these things "amnesty." He is trying to emulate Bill Clinton, when President Clinton at the time kept redefining terms in order to suit his own agenda. We all remember it all depends on what the definition of "is" is, that famous line. The same thing here.

Well, what is it? We are going to do this, but we do not want to call it "amnesty," and we should not say "amnesty," because people do not like amnesty, so we will not call it "amnesty." Now, it is amnesty if you tell people who are here illegally that if they just come and tell us who they are, they can stay, that is amnesty. That is what amnesty is. That is the definition of amnesty.

Now, there are a whole bunch of things, other things that the President

throws into this periodically. He says, I am not for amnesty, because I am not for giving anybody immediate citizenship. Well, good, I am glad. I am very happy to hear that, Mr. President, but that is about 5 or 10 steps past amnesty. That is not amnesty in and of itself. So do not set up these definitions, create the definition, and then you say, I am against that.

We cannot tell anyone who is here illegally that they can stay, because if we do, then that is amnesty, and if you give amnesty, all you do is encourage lots of folks, of course, to come here to this country, break the law, because they get rewarded for it. It is as simple as that. It is a terrible policy to give people amnesty, to reward people for breaking the law.

Now, the other side does not like us to use the word because they know Americans do not like it. So they keep trying to figure out how to obfuscate, to pretend that it is not part of their legislation when, of course, it is. We will point it out time after time after time, no matter where they want to run or where they want to hide or how many dictionaries they want to try to rewrite. It is amnesty, and we will point it out every single time they bring it up. What they say is that we do not have a plan, because we say we do not want to do mass deportation and we do not want amnesty, that it is the status quo on our side.

Well, let me tell my colleagues right now that I would deport anyone who is here illegally. I want that understood clearly. If someone is in this country illegally, the penalty for that is deportation, and I would, in fact, deport anyone who is here illegally.

Let me also hasten to say that our plans include provisions that, in fact, would make that task relatively easy because most of the people who are here illegally, if we did what our side is proposing, which is to say secure the border, number one; and number two, go after the employer who is creating the demand in the first place.

Actually enforce the law. That is all our side says, enforce the law.

There is a law against coming into this country illegally. We do not enforce it. There is a law against people hiring people who come into this country illegally. We do not enforce it. But if we did, if we did this weird, wild, wonderful, strange concept of enforcing the laws we have on the books, we would see a significant reduction in the number of people who are here illegally, because they would not have jobs, hopefully they would not get benefits and hopefully they would return to their countries of origin. And then you can establish some sort of guest worker program perhaps to allow people into this country in an orderly fashion to end, as the President says, the chaos on the border.

But it is idiotic to suggest that we could have a guest worker program if we do not secure the border on one end and go after the employer on the other.

That is the demand and supply side of this problem.

So I absolutely am in favor of deportation for anyone who is here illegally. And I know all of the sad sob stories we would hear, that they have been here for ages, a long time, they have kids in school. Well, I am sorry about that, but the fact is, if they have broken the law to come in, then the penalty is deportation. And if we can make it easier by simply not giving them jobs on the one hand and making it harder for them to cross that border on the other, if we can make it easier for people to return to their country of origin and if we do not have to go through "mass deportations," fine. But anybody who is still here after we put those two things in place needs to be deported.

Why are we so afraid of saying that? That is the law.

Now, if we do not want that law, then I think that the gentleman from the other side of the aisle who proposes his plan for guest workers should also propose that we stop deporting people who are here illegally, just take that away, repeal the law. But if he has the law on the books, then I suggest that the gentleman and anyone else who stands on this floor, who has taken the oath of office to enforce the law, should enforce the law. If they do not like the law, repeal the law, but do not keep ignoring the law. It is the worst possible thing to do.

We have put forth measures time and again on this floor that are truly comprehensive in nature. We will be introducing a bill of a similar nature in the very near future. It is a very comprehensive plan, and it deals with the issue of enforcement of our borders, and it also deals with the enforcement of our laws against people hiring folks who are here illegally, and it also creates a guest worker plan. But that can never happen in the absence of the other two things, never. It is a sham.

Any plan that just establishes a guest worker program without border security is a sham. No one thinks anything like that could work. I will not impugn their motives, because who knows why. A lot of folks have different reasons for pushing this concept of amnesty and ignoring the 20 million people who are here illegally.

□ 2330

But we cannot do it. It is not good public policy, and there are ways to address the issue. What is encouraging, Mr. Speaker, is that I have determined a shift in attitude on the part of this House, especially members of the Republican side who have for whatever reason seen the light and are now much more enthusiastic in terms of their willingness to do something about this issue. Maybe it is because Members of the other side in even the other body, in this case particularly HILLARY CLINTON not too long ago stated her adamant opposition to illegal immigrants coming into this country, wanted those borders defended.

There is a bit of humor there because I cannot for a minute believe that it is, I do not know how deep seated the feeling is. It does not matter. When HILLARY CLINTON says that, it sends a message pretty loud and clear to the rest of us that, politically speaking, we are on the right side of this issue.

The American public wants and demands immigration reform. They want an end to illegal immigration. They want a reduction of the number of illegal immigrants into the country, and we better start understanding that that is the mood of the country and respond to it. That is the nature of the system. That is exactly what we are supposed to be doing here, and it is happening. I have certainly seen it, and I am glad of it.

I think perhaps the most significant event of which I am aware in terms of its impact on this debate was the passage of Proposition 200 in Arizona. Mr. Speaker, this was a fascinating sort of exercise in democracy. The people of the State of Arizona recognized that the Federal Government has essentially left them high and dry. The borders are undefended. They are the funnel, Arizona had become the funnel through which hundreds of thousands of people, in fact, millions of people, a year were coming across the borders of Mexico and the United States into this country. Their social services were being depleted. Hospitals, schools, all the things I talked about, the rates of crime committed by people, illegal aliens was rising dramatically. Incarceration rates were therefore up.

So the people finally got a belly full of it, and they could get no satisfaction from the Federal Government. They could get no satisfaction from the State government. Most of the people there were afraid to touch this thing, and the people in government were afraid to touch it. In fact, every Member of the Congress, everybody from the Arizona delegation opposed it, Republican and Democrat. The two Senators opposed it.

I should back up and say, as a result of being so frustrated, the people of Arizona put an initiative on the ballot. It said a number of things. One was that if you are not here in this country legally, you cannot get social service benefits in the State of Arizona. It also said that you are going to have to prove you are a citizen if you are going to vote in Arizona.

These are pretty radical ideas. Ideas that everybody wanted to run away from, the establishment wanted to run away from for fear, among other things, that anybody connected with it would be seen as a racist. Well, they go ahead and put the issue on the ballot. And, I mean, all the newspapers came out against it; both parties came out against it. The proponents were outspent, I think, 2½ to 1 by the opponents.

Mr. Speaker, I have put issues on the ballot in Colorado in the past. I know how hard it is. It is a very difficult

thing to do to pass them, especially when you have that kind of opposition, the entire political establishment opposed to you. But the measure passed. It passed with 56 percent of the vote. But even more important, more amazingly, more shocking to many people here, although it was not surprising to me, 47 percent of those who voted for the amendment were Hispanic. So all those old canards, those things we hear, if you do this no Hispanic American would ever vote for you if you do things like this. If you do things like what? Enforce the law?

Do Hispanics not want the law enforced in this country? How many of them have come here illegally? Many in my State have been here many generations before my grandparents got here in the late 1890's. They have a stake in the Nation. They have a part of the Nation. They are Americans first. They want secure borders. They want the ability for American citizens, Hispanics, yes, Hispanic by ethnicity to be able to compete in the marketplace for jobs. They know that people who are coming across these borders create competition at the lowest level, the lowest rung of the economic ladder for low-paid, low-skilled jobs. So Americans with few skills find it harder and harder to ever work their way out of poverty.

When people talk about being compassionate when you look at this issue, I ask them to be compassionate about American citizens. I mention that the people in New Ipswich, the 10 that were taken into custody by Chief Chamberlain, I neglected to tell you they worked for a roofing company, according to the police chief, and they were paid \$18 a day for their labor.

Now, I often hear that people are only coming for jobs that no American wants. Well, for \$18 a day, yeah, it is hard to get an American to take a job like that. That is true. But for those who say, as the President does and others on the floor, that we just have to match every willing worker for every willing employer, I say think that through. Do you mean that?

Willing worker. You have willing workers for \$18 a day. Are you willing to bring them here and allow them to compete against an American worker? How about the guy who is willing to work for 16, 15, 14, 13? You will find somebody in the world willing to come here and work for less than the guy who is presently employed here. The Federal Government has no role in this, I ask? No role in trying to control those borders and thereby, yes, prop up wages.

Yes, it is true, propping up wages is a result of controlling your borders. That is true. But this is the difficulty we face here.

But as I say, Mr. Speaker, I think things are changing. I think Prop 200 sent a message that was heard by many people who are politically astute, HILLARY CLINTON being one, of course, many others now who I see standing up

and talking about this and going on television about it. It is great. I am happy to have the support of every single one of them. I will happily turn over the role of immigration reform leader to those who have positions of authority in this body which I do not have and probably never will.

I like to see a committee chairman on our side. I like to see people as prominent as Mrs. CLINTON on the other side on this issue. It is fine with me because what it tells the rest of us is that it is politically acceptable now to move in the direction of immigration reform. And we will be moving that way I think tomorrow. We should have to keep our eyes on it.

The opponents will not simply walk away from the battle, but they know they are on the defensive, and they are becoming very concerned about that, as well they should because the tide is turning. And we will be, I think, able to say by the end of this legislative session that we have actually won some battles, that we have actually brought the issue to the fore and been successful in many different ways.

So I just want to say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that every night when I do a Special Order and I go back, usually the fax machines are going and the e-mails are coming in and the phones are ringing from people who have felt strongly about this for a long time; and they come from all over the country, they come from every area of the country, north, south, east and west, small towns, large towns and from people with Hispanic surnames, because it is just so true that this issue does in fact touch a nerve Americans. It touches a nerve with Americans.

□ 2340

They want to keep America a place in which they can be proud, and they want to keep our borders secure, and they want to be able to pass on a bit of America to their children and grandchildren, and of course, in that endeavor, I wish them and us all the best.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ESHOO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness in the family.

Mr. ETHERIDGE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. HINCHEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mr. SNYDER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mr. STUPAK (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. LOBIONDO (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of attending the memorial service of a constituent who was killed in the line of service in Iraq.