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?

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 descendants 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.