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 in a variety of jobs have 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 resources 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. 2092, 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.

This 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, and they 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.

Find a way for pathways to legalization, and find a way to enforce the Nation's borders.

IRAQ AND AMERICA'S IMMIGRATION POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And again, I appreciate the privilege to address you, Mr. Speaker, and in turn, address the House of Representatives.

This has been a huge week here on the floor of the House of Representatives. We processed a lot of legislation this week. Much of it has been legislation that has been in the works for a number of years. And I think what I will try to do is maybe unravel this coming backwards across the way we passed it and work my way back into the legislation a little bit.

But I want to take up first the immigration reform and point out that in this debate that we heard today in this resolution that came forward, which was H. Res. 612, the continuous message from the other side was about being anti-immigrant, anti-immigrant.

But it confuses the difference between an immigrant and an illegal immigrant. In fact, I know of no one in this Congress that is anti-immigrant. I know of many Members of this Congress that are pro the rule of law.

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 business about labor.

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.

So I take us back 25 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 were not available?

What if the United States of America, instead of being a large portion of an entire continent, what if we were an island? What if you drew the line on the 49th parallel on the north and our southern border on the south and envisioned the United States sitting out alone where illegal labor does not flow across our borders just because of the jobs magnet but in fact has to find an expensive way of transportation to get across a broad ocean?

□ 2330

Think, for example, of a country like Australia that finds itself in that kind of a circumstance. I take you back to 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 they used to describe their immigration policy, which is they were advancing the idea of European descendents populating the continent of Australia.

In fact, 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 was there was because they needed more people to grow their economy.

In about 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 as 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, corn and beans or cattle and hogs, or gold or oil if you come from another part of the world, or currency. It fluctuates in the marketplace according to supply and demand.

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 politics 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 up with an economic solution.

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 brought politically to do the things necessary to bring in the amount of labor in a legal and a rational fashion.

We would have done some other things, too. Some of these sectors of the economy would have seen their wages go up, and they would have decided they could not afford to pay those kinds of wages; so they would have gotten innovative and they would have used technology. We use robotics today. We use a lot of different techniques to cut down on the amount of labor we need to produce a product. We would do more of that if labor were higher. We would be more innovative. When labor is lower, we are less innovative. In a country where labor is cheap, they do not have much innovation at all. So the pressure of high wages would drive technology, and that would replace some of the labor, and that labor that could be replaced by more technology would then transfer to places where labor could not be replaced as well by technology.

Another thing that happened, and is a little joke here in Congress the last couple of days, is Southern California ran out of Okies that went there to do that hard work from the Dust Bowl. They did. They went over there and they were willing to do the hard work and work in the fields. They were glad to get in anywhere where they could get a job. But they transferred themselves from Oklahoma to California for the opportunity.

I take you to an article that I read in the Des Moine Register maybe 10 or 12 years ago, and it was about a section in Milwaukee that was six blocks by six blocks, 36 square blocks, and in that section for every single dwelling that was there, there was not a single male head of household that had a job and was working. And as I read through the article, I tuned myself to the ear of the writer, who said that it was too bad that they lost their jobs in the breweries in Milwaukee. The automation that came in so they could make beer with a lot less labor caused the good jobs that were there, some of them, to disappear. That caused people to be laid off. And so they went back to their homes and sat inside their homes, and when they went around to do the interviews and to survey, 36 square blocks, not a single working male head of household.

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 industry that was up there 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 their household and did not go somewhere 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 predecessors who had transferred themselves all the way from the gulf coast to Milwaukee, 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 demand for some 5,000 roughneck 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, and we want to do a 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 do 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 if we 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 two things.

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 we would bring in third-class people. People who come to America, I want them to have a path to citizenship. I want them to access the American Dream. I want them to do it the legal way.

So we have addressed this immigration issue, and I actually did not come to the floor to talk about immigration, but it sparked me when I listened to the gentlewoman from Texas.

I came to the floor to talk about another subject matter, and that is the subject matter of Iraq. We have made significant progress there. This is a day of celebration. The reports are continuing to come in from the aftermath of the closing of the polls of their December 15 election. And the ink is fading on my finger and on the fingers of many of us here on this floor of Congress who have in solidarity dipped our fingers in ink. And it helps me, when I see my finger, to look at that and remember what they have all done, risked their lives to go vote, 11 million strong and more. The most people ever to vote in Iraq, the most purple fingers ever maybe anytime in the world.

So today we brought a resolution to the floor of the House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 612, and that is a resolution to honor the troops, to declare our dedication and our unshaking will to see this through to a final victory in Iraq. And this resolution was written in a clear fashion, in a rational and a logical fashion. And we had a debate on this floor.

And Member after Member from the other side of the aisle came down, and they said, I honor and support our troops and request an open debate on the Iraq war on the House floor. Member after Member after Member: I honor and support our troops and request an open debate on the Iraq war on the House floor. One Member said, In opposition to our policy in Iraq, he also requested an open debate on the House floor.

Well, we had an open debate on the House floor. I do not know why we had 20 or so Members or several more come down and say they honored and respected our troops and requested an open debate on the House floor, because that was what we had scheduled was an open debate on the House floor. We had the debate. The question after I heard that I had was when I saw the vote go up on the board. If I were a soldier in Iraq, if I were in a military uniform, ready to put my life on the line for this country, and I saw this vote, 279 in favor of the resolution dedicated to victory and support of a free Iraqi people, 279 in support; 109, sadly, against, Mr. Speaker. Thirty-four voted present and 12 did not vote at all. So I add those up and come to over 150 who said they did not commit themselves to a full victory in Iraq. For whatever reason, they said they want an honest and open debate. Every of them that came to the microphone said, I honor and support our troops. I wrote the quote down. They were using the same script, I believe.

And I point this out: that you cannot honor and support our troops if you oppose their mission. There was a clear

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 said the Republicans 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 if we could have gotten 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 is 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 showed that I had voted.

I will work with the Parliamentarian to resolve this issue with my voting card at the earliest possible time.

□ 2345

AMERICAN RESPONSE TO GLOBAL WARMING INADEQUATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized until midnight as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, in the last week there has been a collection of relatively extraordinary events in the future of not only our country, but the entire planet, when it comes to our ability to maintain a climate to which we have been accustomed, and in fact that climate is now threatened by global warming, and during the last week some extraordinary things have happened that demand comment here in the House.

I have come here tonight to suggest that the U.S. Congress needs to act with vigor and vision to lead the world in dealing with global warming. What precipitates my comments is a collection of scientific information that has become available to the world in the last week, together with the recently concluded conclave of world leaders in Montreal, Canada, that just concluded without meaningful participation by the executive branch of the United States, which I think is most disappointing to my constituents and I think much of America.

So what I want to do tonight is address some of the new science that has come forward just in the last week about global warming and contrast that with the abject failure, unfortunately, of the executive branch of the United States to fulfill the leadership role of the United States, which has historically been on a bipartisan basis as the technological leader of the world, which this chief executive has abdicated in refusing to lead the world to a resolution of the problem of global warming.

If I can first just briefly summarize some of the things that have happened in the last week regarding global warming.

The Goddard Space Science Center, one of our preeminent scientific institutions, in the next few days will announce that 2005 remains on track to be one, if not the, hottest year in global history since records have been kept, which continues a trend of many of the hottest years in recorded history being in the last decade. British scientists this week announced that their records are similar to the findings of the Goddard Space Laboratory.

We are in an unprecedented period of increases in global temperatures. This is confirmed by a huge majority of the scientific measurements. The Earth is warming, and it is warming faster probably than it has been ever in the last 1,000 years, at least. This is new and appropriately disturbing evidence.

The same week, if we read the Wall Street Journal, a publication not known for its certainly being far out there on environmental issues, reported on December 14 that scientists for the first time have documented multiple deaths of polar bears off Alaska, where they likely drowned after swimming long distances in the ocean amid the melting of the Arctic ice shelf. The bears spend most of the time hunting and raising their young on ice flows, but the problem is the ice flows are disappearing.

That leads to the third bit of information that we have received in the last couple of months, which has found that the Arctic ice shelf has melted to an extent previously never seen before in human history and probably never seen before for thousands of years.

These are an amazing continuation, where one cannot open up a newspaper or a scientific journal in any given week and not see a continued cascade, an avalanche of scientific information, nailing down the coffin of any remaining doubt that we are now facing significant global warming as a result of increased concentrations of carbon dioxide, which we all, Republican and Democrat alike, are putting into the atmosphere. We are experiencing this with our own eyes.

If we take a look at a picture here in Glacier National Park, one of our most treasured jewels of our crown of our national park, we have already lost 30 percent of the glaciers in the last 75 years in Glacier National Park. If we look at the Grinnell Glacier, a picture here in 1938, you will see the glacier coming off this cliff band and extending down into the valley. This is 1938, one lifetime ago. In that one lifetime, the lifetime certainly of my mom and dad, we now see the Grinnell Glacier is probably less than 40 percent of its preexisting size. You see this entire area, it used to be a glacier, is now a lake where the glacier has melted.

The sad fact is that when my mom and dad took me to Glacier National Park in my youth, I got to see these glaciers. If this trend, according to scientific evidence continues, at least my great-grandchildren will not be able to go to Glacier National Park and see glaciers because the glaciers will be gone, extinct, period. I suppose some wag would suggest we will have to rename it as ''the Park Formerly Known as Glacier.''

The fact of the matter is that as we speak, the world and the United States is undergoing a significant change from that which we grew up with. Glaciers, polar bears, fields of wheat that support one of the greatest food baskets in the world, where we are going to have significant change in our ability to produce agriculturally in the Midwest.

With irrigated agriculture, the science shows, we just had a conference of this up in Seattle, Seattle is known for our rain, but in fact we depend on irrigated agriculture for a good part of our agriculture, and that irrigated agriculture depends on snow pack. I just returned from a conference in Seattle