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But, unfortunately, the legislative initiative that has just passed, the Border Protection Act, really does not answer the question of the need for immigration reform.

In fact, unlike the words of President John F. Kennedy where we recognize that immigration can enrich this country and where we recognize the contributions of immigrants, we seek now to shut the door for a pathway of earned access to legalization. We ignore the fact that immigrants who are working at a variety of jobs building homes and pay taxes, have children in school, and have the hopes and dreams of the immigrants of yesteryear.

I think it is important that we turn back the clock and start immigration reform again; that we remember that we cannot demonize or make criminal every single undocumented immigrant, that we must provide our border patrol resources what they need, the helicopters, power boats, laptop computers, night goggles in order to enforce the border.

We must enforce the laws that are already on the books. For example, it is a criminal act to enter the country without inspection. We have to have the means to enforce those laws. But it does not make sense to deny those individuals within our borders due process.

And then I would have hoped that a real immigration reform bill would have had a singular piece of protecting American jobs, realizing that the heart of this country’s economy and the heart of America is in America’s working people.

And we could have taken this particular legislation and provided, as the Save America Comprehensive Legislation H.R. 2002, a vehicle to garner the fees that are paid by immigrants and invest them in the educational training of America and the protecting of American jobs and the securing of American jobs, I believe there should be employer sanctions, but there cannot be effective employer sanctions unless we develop a singular database that is integrated, consistent and accurate.

Many of the amendments would suggest that an employer verify who he or she hired. That is the right thing to do. In fact, I voted for the Gonzalez amendment which would fine certain employers $50,000 so that those dollars could be used to reinvest in our community hospitals and schools to pay for some of the services that are used by those that may not be in status.

But, frankly, we cannot have that verification system without an even database. And so it is important to note that, if we do border enforcement or immigration reform, we must have the dollars and the commitment, and that is not here in the present administration and the present structure that we are in.

The legislation is, I think, falling on its own weight. As it makes its way to the United States Senate, it is clear that other body is not moving on such legislation at this time. And, in fact, there is great conflict between a pathway to legalization and the question of enforcement. We believe in enforcement, but not enforcement only.

And you can ask any American who looks at the question of immigration, Mr. Speaker, want comprehensive immigration reform that understands that there are immigrants who come here for economic reasons, but we must keep those out that come here to do us harm.

And that is the distinction that we need to draw the line with. And I take us back to where would be if we went back even 10 years, but say go back 25 years, in a time when we did not have very much illegal immigration. It was a smaller percentage of our overall population; it was smaller in numbers, smaller in percentage, and it was not a very significant problem. It was something that was somewhat manageable back then.

And back in that period of time, if we had been able to control our borders and watched as we needed more employees in certain sectors of the economy, we would have seen a number of things happen that would have resolved this need that we keep hearing from businesses.

They say that if we deported all of the illegals, our economy would collapse, and we cannot get along without them when perhaps 4 percent of our workforce in America is an illegal workforce. And if we lose 4 percent and retain 96 percent, I cannot believe that this resilient country could not find a way to bounce back from that and accommodate the difference.

Again, I take us back a number of years and ask, what would we do if we respected the rule of law? What would we do if we had borders that were controlled? How would we adjust to demands in a growing economy if illegal labor, cheap labor that pours in from overseas just work in the phrase that they used to describe the rule of law, what would we do if we had such a policy that they had up until 1971. Actually, they did not have a very good name for it. They called it White Australia, and some would be embarrassed about the name for that now. But that was the phrase that was used to describe their immigration policy, which is they were advancing the idea of European descendants populating the continent of Australia.

And I graduated from high school in 1967, and I remember during those years that I was in college, I saw advertisements come from Australia saying this is a great place to move to. We really need you to come down here. There is a wealth of opportunity in Australia. And I thought about it. And so that advertisement that there was was because they needed people to grow their economy.

In 1971, they gave up on this mission to some degree, and they changed their policy to allow immigrants to come in from Southeast Asia. Now, how does this work politically? We can learn from these lessons here in the United States of America, and that is that it was big business that wanted the labor to come in, and it was labor unions that wanted to keep the labor out because they understood something in Australia as far back as 1971 that there was a law of supply and demand.

That law of supply and demand seems to be missing from the rationale of the people who oppose enforcement of our rule of law with regard to immigration. They do not seem to understand that when we have an oversupply of labor, that drives the price down and that labor is a commodity, like where I come from, cattle, beans or cattle.
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So the island, or I should call it the large continent, and it actually is, the large continent of Australia did not have that option of being able to run open borders and let millions come in to drive their wage price down. They actually had to fight the policies out inside Australia and adopt a policy that brought in immigrants from Southeast Asia and other parts of the world to fill their labor supply. The pressure got great enough that they came to a solution. We called it a migration policy.

Well, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in the United States of America, had we respected the rule of law, had we controlled our borders, the pressure would have been reflected in the political values of the three most marginalized groups in our society, African-American, Hispanic and Asian-American, and the other non-white groups, and we would have had a political pressure to adopt the immigration policy that we have.

The people had come up from the South, from the gulf coast, from southern Mississippi, Alabama, down in that region, moved up there for those good jobs. They went up to access the good jobs in the breweries and other types of industries that we have up north in Milwaukee; and they raised their families there and then, in a matter of a generation or two, found themselves laid off, and their children or their children's children could not get jobs in the breweries the same way that they had. So they sat in the back room and did not go anywhere to find a job.

We know why that is. And that is in one of the better States with regard to welfare reform. But it is because the safety net of welfare had become a hammock for everyone in that entire 36-block area. They totally missed the point, though, that the same people's predecessors, that this was the progeny of their predecessor who had transferred themselves all the way from the gulf coast to Wisconsin for what? For a job, Mr. Speaker.

And now we look at this economy in the United States as if labor cannot be transferred from one region to another to fill the demand. So there is a de facto and formal transfer of welfare workers out in the oil fields in Wyoming, in that area, that I happened to read an article on just yesterday; and we have got 15 to 18 million workforce sitting there unemployed in the United States of America, I believe, the guest worker amnesty plan for 11 million illegals in this country. What country in their right mind would pay 15 to 18 million people not to work and then bring in 11 million, or I would say closer to 22 million, people who want to work at a cheap rate? That does not make economic sense, Mr. Speaker. And that is one of the supply and demand rationales that I would like to point out with regard to the immigration policy.

So I think were a rational Nation, if we were a Nation that did not have this convenience of opening up our borders and allowing the illegals to come in, we would have done these things: we would have transferred labor from one part of the country to another; we would have squeezed down the welfare so that some of the people, and, in fact, I would like it if most of the people, would get up and go to work. That would be a victory for the nation.

And the third thing we would have done is what Singapore is doing right now. They are advertising to their people, saying have more babies. What is wrong with a fertility plan? That is a natural way to replace labor. Those three things would have happened within our borders, and then within our borders we would have been under political pressure to negotiate a rational immigration policy that was legal.

And, Mr. Speaker, I object to the idea that the author of the third-class peo- ple, People who come to America, I want them to have a path to citizenship. I want them to access the Amer-
opportunity here to support their mission in Iraq, to stand with them. This Congress voted to support their mission before the President ever ordered them into battle, and yet they still seek to pull down this effort.

Also, a number of Members in that debate on the House floor, Mr. Speaker, and the President will not define victory. All they want is a deadline, a date certain, by which American troops will be out of Iraq, and accused the Republican side of the aisle of not being willing to define victory.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would submit this: the other side of this argument dare not define victory because if they do, then they will lose their ability to raise the bar and make it harder and harder and harder to meet their standards.

So I will stand here and define victory this evening. And this is a victory that will fit this war and it will fit every war throughout history, every one we know and every one that we will see and every one that our posterity will see. The definition of victory, Mr. Speaker, is when the losing side realizes and acknowledges that they have lost. That is what this effort is about. And I could have seen Saddam Hussein to stare into the barrels of a few tanks and decided that he had lost, that would have been the end of the war. We would not have had to send troops into Iraq. But they had to be convinced that they were losing, Mr. Speaker, and that is why we sent troops there to convince the other side that they had lost.

Yet we have people over on this side of the ocean standing here on the floor of the United States Congress, seeking to convince our enemies that we cannot win and that the enemies cannot lose. That is, Mr. Speaker, undermining our effort and undermining our troops. And yet some of the same people come to this floor and say, I honor and support our troops and request an open debate on the Iraq war on the House floor.

We had an open debate. They voted against the resolution. And I will tell you, you cannot have it both ways. You cannot honor the troops and defy their mission. They go together. You must honor the troops and the mission together. They are integral and they are one and the same.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma (during the Special Order of Mr. KING of Iowa). Mr. Speaker, late tonight I discovered there is a problem with my voting card. After returning home, I became aware that my vote was not recorded on roll call votes 661, 659, and 651.

On each of these votes, I am sure I voted “yes.” Indeed, I checked my vote on the card receptacle. It clearly shows that I had voted. I will work with the Parliamentarian to resolve this issue with my voting card at the earliest possible time.