We welcome the good news that we have received recently. We want more good news. I think it will come, but there will be bad patches as well.

As we face the debate tomorrow, I think it is important for all Americans to read the text first before they have a strong reaction to it one way or the other, so they can read and see whether the whereas and resolved clauses are offensive, or whether they find them as I do, largely praise for two central objectives that I think all Americans can agree with: praise for our troops and praise for the valor of the Iraqi people.

We will prevail in this conflict, Mr. Speaker. It is not easy to mark out today a path to victory, but I trust our men and women in uniform. I trust our troops on the ground and our military experts, not our civilian experts, to get us through this because we have the finest fighting force in the history of the world and that will keep America strong.

IRAQ AND IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the privilege and the honor to address you and address the House of Representatives and the American people who are viewing these proceedings that take place in these Chambers continually as we deliberate and debate.

I came here to take up another subject matter, but as I listened to the gentleman from Tennessee, he raised a number of points that I am compelled to respond to. I will just say I am glad I have a more optimistic viewpoint about the history of this country, about the current events, about the most recent current events and especially about the last 3½ years within Iraq. Further and longer ago than that, our operations within Afghanistan, about how this Nation has conducted its foreign policy, about how the Commander in Chief has made his decisions on foreign policy, and the direction for the future.

I would just back up to this. I would say that the gentleman from Tennessee, when he states that we are the greatest Nation, I do agree with him. We are the greatest Nation. We are the unchallenged greatest Nation in the history of the world. Often folks on the other side of the aisle disagree with that statement, so I am very refreshed to hear someone on that side of the aisle say we are a great Nation. In fact, I look forward to us becoming an even greater Nation going into the future, and we can't do that if we are going to wallow in guilt and self-pity and pessimism. We have a positive track record. Did we think we could go to war and not face adversity?

Some of the criticism is that Vice President CHENEY and Secretary Rumsfeld and others said we would be greeted as liberators, according to the gentleman. He contends we were not.

I was one of the first Members of Congress to arrive in Iraq after Iraq was liberated, and I recall and I have videotape of traveling down through a Sunni section of Baghdad, where we would be the most hated, according to national news media and the minority party; people that you would think would be throwing grenades and shooting at you, and perhaps throwing stones and making all kinds of vile gestures at American conquerors. In fact, we were liberators. As we rode down through on that convoy on those narrow streets in Baghdad several months after the liberation of Iraq, I looked out the window at military-age Iraqi men, and they looked into the window of my vehicle at me. I couldn't discern what they were thinking. They didn't know who I was. They just knew it was not your normal transportation going through there.

So I did like we do in Iowa. We meet them on the road. We are uncomfortable with silence and without acknowledging someone we see, so I began to wave to these military-age Iraqi men, men between the ages of 16 years up to 45, standing along the sides of the street in groups of two to three, groups up to 18, and they may be 10 to 15 feet away from my vehicle. The instant I did that, they waved back at me. They waved back and smiled with a gleeful smile and gave me thumbs up.

Here is an American in Iraq, a Representative, and just by the fact of the identification of being an American was all they needed, not necessarily a Representative of Congress, there to be part of that city, to see that country that now was for the first time liberated in the history of the world.

No, we were greeted as liberators. We were greeted as liberators in a country that had not been liberated in their history. Of course, there have been difficulties since that period of time. It is odd to me that the gentleman from Tennessee takes issue with the decisions and strategy that were made. In closing, he said he trusts our military experts, not our civilian experts. The experts who put together the strategy to liberate Iraq were essentially the same people that put together the military planning and operational strategy to liberate Afghanistan.

And the criticism of the Iraq operation is essentially the same criticism that we heard of the Afghanistan operation. The difference is that in Afghanistan it was over so quickly and over so successfully, and people there went to the polls and voted and elected themselves new leaders and directed their national destiny and live in freedom for the first time on that spot of the globe for the first time ever in their history. That all took place in Afghanistan, even though the debate over here on this side of the aisle, the debate on the part of the liberal pundits, was it's another Vietnam. You will never succeed in Afghanistan. No Nation has ever been able to go in and invade and occupy Afghanistan and get out of there with their military intact. That is a hostile area that can never be occupied and conquered, and history has proven that. That is the statement with Afghanistan over and over and over again. Afghanistan, another Vietnam.

But, you know, military success, political success and economic success has a tendency to muzzle the critics. And the critics have been flat muzzled on Afghanistan. And yet they draw the same criticism towards Iraq. Afghanistan, 25 million people, liberated. Hostile terrain, couldn't be invaded. We didn't invade them, we liberated them. We worked with the Northern Alliance and we worked with the people in Afghanistan and gave them an opportunity at freedom.

Their struggles are going on yet today. In fact, there has been a reignition of some of the opposition there. But we are not hearing criticism. We are not hearing the other side of the aisle say we never should have gone there because we knew that al Qaeda was operating in Afghanistan. We knew we needed to go in and knock out the Taliban. We knew that was a base of operations for terrorists who were sending people to come to this country to kill us because they believe that their path to salvation is killing people not like them, and we are one of their preferred targets.

So all of this criticism of Afghanistan, 25 million people, mountains and difficult terrain and difficult transportation routes, has been muted by the resounding success in Afghanistan. And the same people gave the same advice on a country with the same population and different terrain, easier terrain but a different location, and different people, different countries surrounding Iraq, and we ended up with being greeted as liberators. And in the aftermath of the greetings as liberators, there was an insurgency that rose up; an insurgency that was founded and supported by a lot of cash dollars, billions in cash dollars that were spirited out of Iraq, American dollars out of the banks of Iraq by Saddam Hussein, his regime, into other countries where that money was used again to pay for terrorists to come back into Iraq and blow themselves up. To detonate and build, and make and set and detonate improvised explosive devices.

Seldom do we see them come out of the shadows and attack our military troops straight up front. But the insurgency, what I call a terrorist-organized operation, as it grew in Iraq, then so did the criticism grow. While this is going on, the lust for power for the White House, the people on the other side of the aisle are willing to put our military men and women at risk so they can achieve their political gain, which would be to win back the White House and seek to take over the majority in the House of Representatives and

convince the American people that they know what's best.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not hearing a positive agenda. I am hearing this agenda that says pull out. Pull out to the horizon. Sit and wait until there is a problem and then move in. Somehow this same message that keeps coming from the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee would be one, conflicting with the same message that comes out of sometimes the same mouths that, well, we will pull out to the horizon in a country we should have more troops in, or maybe should have had more troops in, and never mind that we are up now to 267,000 Iraqis in uniform defending Iraqis that are trained, uniformed, equipped, and in these operations and initiating operations as we speak today in that country over there and performing very well.

For the first time Iraq does have a sovereign government that represents a sovereign people and a Nation where they can begin now to build their future. They have a Prime Minister who has named a full Cabinet. And this Cabinet can now resolve many of the sectarian differences that are there within Iraq itself and move them forward since now they have a Secretary of Defense and a Secretary of the Interior, a strong Prime Minister with some vision that has taken a role to lead. It takes time to put these pieces in place, and we have to let the Iraqi people make these decisions and do that, and it is taking place.

So this criticism, why is it brought up now? Why do I hear the question, why did the National Guard have to scrounge around for metal to weld or bolt onto their equipment to protect them from IEDs?

□ 2145

This issue raised by the gentleman from Tennessee, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld said, appropriately and accurately, you go to war with the Army that you have. And it implies you go to war with the equipment that you have, and then when the unforeseen happens, and it was unforeseen that Humvees would be used as military vehicles in that kind of a combat environment. No war in the past had seen improvised explosive devices. No war in the past had seen suicide bombers that would run into a crowd of soldiers and blow themselves up or a crowd of women or children, school children. No war had seen terrorists or the likes of Zarqawi. But yet, even though no one had ever seen these circumstances before, somehow the people on the other side of the aisle believe the President, the Secretary of Defense and these civilian leaders that are labeled to be so wrong, should have been able to anticipate something that had never happened before, that there is no pattern for and no indication for, and they want to claim that they were right, but I don't think any one of them are on record predicting we ought to watch out for improvised explosive devices and I don't think any one of them were on the record saying we are going to have suicide bombers in Iraq. And I don't think any one of them are on record saying that these suicide bombers were going to come from any place other than Iraq, coming in from all over the Arab world, places like Jordan or Egypt or Saudi Arabia or Afghanistan or Pakistan. All those countries have supplied suicide bombers to come into Iraq that detonated themselves because they have been trained in those countries to give up their lives in the idea that somehow their path to salvation is in seeking to kill those who are not like them, and that means us.

The civilian leadership that led us into Iraq is the same civilian leadership that led us into Afghanistan. The military leadership that led us into Afghanistan is the same military leadership that led us into Iraq. If we are going to be critical of the judgment, the decisions and the tactics that were used in Iraq, and the people that made the decisions, then let's hear it from the other side. Let's hear their criticism for the same people, for the same decisions, for similar tactics that were utilized in Afghanistan. And the reason we don't hear that is because of the distinction between the easy results as opposed to a distinction between a philosophical or a judgment disagreement.

This is Monday morning quarterbacking, Mr. Speaker, and nothing else, and it is done for political opportunism and no other reason. And while we hear that, however much is said about supporting our military, that language, that talk, Mr. Speaker, undermines our military, weakens their ability to be effective, and they have got to try all the harder. They have got to bolster their spirit all the harder, and they do. And I go over there and I meet them and visit them, and their spirit is strong and their morale is strong. And they did pick up metal and bolt and weld it onto their machines because that is what Americans do. We make do with what we have and we go scrounge and find what we need and we get things in the pipeline as fast as we can to get things up-armored and we did. And today, and for a long time in Iraq there hasn't been any equipment leave the wire that is not fully armored. And it has been a long, long time since anybody left the wire without a bulletproof vest and the right kind of equipment to protect them from the flying bullets and shrapnel that takes place over there. And our medics and our medical corps, all of the people that are taking care of our wounded are doing a better job, far better job than ever in the history of the world and warfare. They have transferred, the last time I checked this number, and it is a little bit dated now, Mr. Speaker, but the last number that I had as I stood as we loaded a C–17 with wounded out of Landstuhl Hospital there in Germany to come over here to land at Andrews Air Force Base, and some of those wounded soldiers would go to Walter Reed, some would go to Bethesda. But as I stood there and lent a small hand in helping load some of those wounded as that plane was loaded, one of the officers there told me that they had transferred 36,000 sick and wounded, those that needed medical care out of that theater in Iraq from Iraq to Ramstein Air Force Base and from Ramstein over to Landstuhl hospital, from there back to the United States. And in those transfers, 36,000 transfers, and some of those people would have been transferred, I think, counted twice, however that worked out, they lost one, one soldier en route. And that one that they lost was due to cardiac arrest that was they believe unrelated to the injuries. It is an astonishing accomplishment. It is something that I can't imagine how one could even dream to have that kind of success. And they are, they are dedicated.

The statement that our Republican leadership must feel insecure or wouldn't bring up this bill and not allow amendments, why would any leadership that was insecure bring up this bill, this resolution that supports and defends our efforts in Iraq? Why would they bring it up at all if they felt insecure, Mr. Speaker? I will tell you that we are very secure in this, very confident in this. The difference is we are not getting this message out to the people. This debate is so the American people can hear the truth about what is going on in this global war on terror, and in particular, the battlefield of Iraq. That is the mission that we are on here tomorrow, to uncover and speak truthfully and illuminate the good things that are happening, the progress that is being made. And I intend to engage in that debate and help with that cause and lend a hand, because every voice that stands on the side of our military is a voice that accelerates the end of the war and every voice that undermines or degrades or is detrimental towards the effort and erodes the credibility of our Commander in Chief, our Secretary of Defense, our General, our Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Peter Pace, all of our officers, any voice that weakens their credibility delays a successful end to this war. And delaying a successful end to this war doesn't just put our troops at risk, Mr. Speaker. It costs their lives. So I am proud of the work that is being done. I am proud of the character of the people that are serving there. I stand with them every step of the way. I have never met a more honorable people. And I believe in the history of America, in the history of the world, there has never been a better military go off to war than this current crop that we have. Our Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines, our Reserve personnel, and our National Guard personnel. And I don't say that to disparage the efforts of any previous war or any previous engagements or

any previous peace time service. But I will just, I say it to build on the honorable record that was built in all of those previous conflicts. And I say this because we have, first of all, an all volunteer military. There is no one over there in that theater that was drafted to go to this war. They all volunteered. And, in fact, everyone that is over there now has re-upped in this same climate of this war. So it wasn't that they happened to be a National Guard soldier that thought they would just train 1 weekend a month and get their 6-week active duty in and pretty much take life easy and cash the check. Those people had a chance to drop out. But they are re-upping in greater numbers than we ever anticipated. That is not a demoralized military. That is a high morale military that is reupping on these tasks, because they believe in this mission, as I believe in their mission. And we have an all volunteer military, and they are getting the best training there is in the world, build upon the culture of efficiency and proud combat, and we add to that the equipment that they have, the modern technology that they have, which eclipses that of anybody anywhere in the world today, let alone in the previous half a decade or more. They have the best equipment, the best training, the best personnel, they are all volunteers. And our active duty personnel are supplemented by our reserve troops and our National Guard troops. And those people bring with them the skills of their professional lives to supplement the skills of the training of their military lives, and that is a great combination for a highly technical military that we have today, and that is how we could have the technical ability to put a laser on a safe house.

Now there is an oxymoron. I bet you that is what Zarqawi is saying in the next life. It is really an oxymoron. There I thought I was in a safe house. Well, it wasn't such a safe house for those people. But to lay a cross-hairs of a laser beam on a, quote, safe house, Mr. Speaker, and seconds later have that safe house just simply detonated by a 500-pound bomb, and then to be sure, just drop a second 500-pound bomb in there.

It puts me in mind of something that Rush Limbaugh said before Desert Storm back in 1991. He said, Mr. Saddam Hussein, I have got some good news and some bad news for you. Now, here's the bad news. Or actually, no, I tell you, here's the good news. He said we have a weapon, at the time he was talking about cruise missiles rather than J–DAMs. We have a weapon, and the bad news is, let's see. I am going to get this right. The good news is for us, we can take this weapon and we can fire it from wherever we choose into the country we choose, and we can fire it into the city within the country, and we can put it in the block within the city, and we can put it within the building within the block, and we can put it through the window of the building within the block within the city within the country that we choose and you know, the good news for you is we just shot off a half a dozen of those missiles and every one of them missed its target. The bad news is the most any of them missed by was an inch and a half, Mr. Saddam Hussein. And that was the way Desert Storm was. And we are more accurate today with the weapons that we have. And it saves lives. And it brings the close of this war closer, and it convinces the enemy that they can not win, and in fact, that they have lost and it is a matter of time, until they resolve to accept the reality.

That is the object of war, after all, Mr. Speaker. And von Klauswitz wrote a book on war. And in that he said, the object of war is to destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war. Destroy their will and their ability. You could be sitting there with ranks of tanks and all kinds of missiles and Air Force and Navy, and AK–47s, you can have all of this equipment. You can have an Army with 2 million people, all trained and ready. But if you don't have the will to conduct the war, all of the ability doesn't count because you can't unleash, you can't mobilize that effort. So Klauswitz saw, if you destroyed some of the ability, destroy some tanks, destroy some missiles, destroy some Air Force, take away the ability to provide fuel and food, that would destroy some of the ability, but also would deplete the will. If you could destroy the will to conduct the war, you have destroyed the ability to conduct the war. That was the philosophy of Klauswitz. And for years, since 1832, that has been the definition of war. Object of war, destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war.

STEVE KING's definition comes like this. A war is never over till the losing side realizes they have lost. You have to convince them that they have lost. That is all you have to do. And if you can simply send them a letter or go down here on the floor and give a speech, put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and they would read that and say oh, boy, I guess we can't win against these people. I am going to surrender. Maybe Ahmadinejad would just come to that conclusion, because you know we are not going to give up on that. We are not going to let that man have his nuclear ability. But if we could just simply send a letter and convince them that they will lose the war, then they wouldn't engage in the war, but seldom will they give up quite so easy. And so that means that we have to turn up the pressure, turn up the diplomatic pressure and then maybe do some economic sanctions and then maybe do a blockade and then if things get bad enough, maybe we have to run a little operation in there. But at some point, this deterrent effect that says you are going to have to take us seriously, we will not blink, we are resolved to impose this war, this position of peace on this country, at some point the losing side, in despair, sometimes, but without having hope of coming out of it with any other solution, throws up their hands or as we say in a chess game, tips over their king and says I have lost. I surrender. I am willing to accept the consequences. I gave it my best, but the price is too great. I no longer have the will to conduct war.

That is what we are seeking to do in Iraq. That is what we are seeking to do globally in this global war on terror. And we are a good long ways down that path, and we would be much further down that path and perhaps the battlefield of Iraq would be concluded if the naysayers and the detractors from that side of the aisle hadn't first sent their emissaries over there to surrender before we ever went into Iraq. And we have relentlessly been trying to convince the enemy that we will lose and they will win since that period of time. We will hear some of this debate tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, and I look forward to that and we will knock those arguments down in this chamber. And the American people will understand who supports the military, who doesn't, who supports the Commander in Chief, and who doesn't.

And I would lay another principle out here that is not a negotiable principle, to say you are for the troops and against their mission.

□ 2200

You cannot separate those two. If you are for the troops, you have to ask them will you put your life on the line for the freedom of the people in this country, this great country? And the gentleman from Tennessee and I agree on that. This great country, the United States of America. But you cannot ask someone to put their life on the line for your freedom and tell them ''but you are on the wrong mission.'' You have got to support the mission. You have got to support the troops. And if you separate those two, if you say I am against your mission, it is the wrong mission, you never should have gone, you should not be there, you ought to get out and come home, but if something happens to you, you lost your life and it has been a worthless cause, that is what they are saying over on this side of the aisle. One and the same. You support the mission; you support the troops. You cannot support the troops and not the mission. These things are bound together, and they are bound together because we asked them to risk their lives on a mission that we believe in and we have endorsed that mission.

And so the other morning not that long ago, al-Zarqawi went to meet his maker because of some really good targeting, some good intelligence, some cooperation from some other entities over there, some good work with the coalition forces, good work with the special task force that had been shadowing him and following him for a long time and gathering in all the intelligence and the intelligence tips from

400 a month a year ago to 4,000 a month today. They picked up enough information to track al-Zarqawi and put those bombs right down in on that thing that he thought was a safe house, that we call a safe house, that was not so safe for al-Zarqawi. But you know, blowing up that house made this world a lot safer for the rest of us; so I will call it a safe house by that standard.

And I am pleased and extraordinarily grateful that our military are there doing the job they do with the professionalism that they have, Mr. Speaker. And I am looking forward to this debate tomorrow. It will not go long enough and it will not make enough points to satisfy me. I think we need to do this over an extended period of time. And I will be here to join in that debate.

But I digress. I came to this floor to speak about a different subject matter, Mr. Speaker. And as I listened to the gentleman from Tennessee, I believe that I needed to provide an alternate viewpoint from some of those opinions that came out here. And I do respect the gentleman from Tennessee, and he is one of the more intellectual people that we have in this House Chamber, and his intentions are good and I believe he is a strong patriot. I am just hoping to redirect some of his perspectives and perhaps that of some of the folks that live in that region down there in Tennessee.

But I came here, Mr. Speaker, to talk about another issue, and it is an issue that stands out everywhere most of any of us go in the entire United States of America these days. It is an issue that for perhaps a year has been front and center in all of the discussions that take place in the Fifth District of Iowa that I represent, this western third of Iowa. And certainly wherever else I go around the country, it is a subject that comes up. I see things happen in my office. There might be a group that comes over and they have met and their organization has produced one or two or three or five or maybe six or ten points that they want to discuss with me and their positions of their organization. We all do this on a regular basis. And as I sit down with them, I can see them going through those points kind of quickly, and as they get through those points, they want to reserve some time. And whether it is an issue that seems to be relevant to their organization or whether it is not, they will get down to where there is maybe 15 minutes left in our 30-minute meeting and then they will say, Now some of us want to talk to you about immigration, Congressman, and we have these issues we want to discuss with you and we are concerned a little bit about that. So they begin bringing up the issue. And I engage in those conversations, of course, and sometimes I find a little bit different viewpoint, a little bit different way to solve these problems. But the core of this, middle American knows this and the southern border knows this and even some folks out there on the left coast understand this and some folks over on the right coast also understand this because the American people are great respecters of the rule of law, and we understand that if we did not have the rule of law here in the United States of America, we would not be this great Nation that Mr. COOPER and I agree that we are.

And now I am going on my own judgment here and not representing the gentleman from Tennessee except that we agree it is a great Nation. This Nation was founded upon the philosophy of the Declaration that sits in the back of this book and the Constitution that was written upon the philosophy of the Declaration. And these freedoms that we have and these responsibilities that we have are founded upon these three branches of government, not three coequal branches of government, not separate but equal branches of government, codependent branches of government, not equal. The founders established this country with a constitutional principle, Mr. Speaker, that gives the buck stops here to the legislature because we are the voice of the people.

And so each branch has its own power base. And the executive branch is to carry out and enforce the laws. The legislative branch is to introduce and pass the laws, and here we start all the appropriations and the tax bills and they go over to the Senate where they get processed over there and bounced back here, and then often to the President. But it is our job to initiate the funding, initiate the tax bills, and to establish an immigration policy by a constitutional directive here in this Constitution, Mr. Speaker.

And so the American people respect this rule of law that is built upon this foundation of the rule of law called the Constitution. And when they read that Constitution, they know that the rule of law covers immigration. And they know that we are obligated to establish immigration laws should the will of the people be such. And we have passed that legislation many times throughout the history of this great Nation. But even though we have, I believe, adequate laws to enforce our immigration laws, the American people understand that they have not been enforced. They have not been enforced with anywhere near the vigor required to slow down and stop the flood of humanity that is pouring across our southern border.

As I speak here tonight, I just do a little bit of round number math, and we are in that area of 11,000 illegals a day pouring across our southern border; perhaps 12,000. So that comes down into the area of while I speak here, there will be perhaps 500 people who have illegally crossed the border, just our southern border from Mexico into the United States, while I stand here for this 60-minute period of time, perhaps 500 people. And it does come up, if I remember right, to about one person every 8 seconds coming into the United States.

I have gone down to the border a number of times to get a better feel for what is going on down there. I have been there on what they call the red carpet tour with the Border Patrol. I met with the ICE people. I have flown in the helicopters over that border at night with the giant lamp that they have on some of those choppers, and I have done it also with infrared, infrared optical equipment. I have been to the stations. I have talked to the Border Patrol officers. I have gone back down on my own and slipped in on a surprise trip and arrived at the ports of entry and gone in and talked to our Border Patrol people to get a feel of what it is really like on the ground.

And I have gone down to one of the most dangerous and active crossings on that entire border and sat there at night in the dark for hours, in utter silence, and listened as the cars came up across the desert from Mexico, stopped by a big mesquite tree. They opened the doors, let their people out. You can hear their backpacks hit the ground, pick them back up again. You could hear them infiltrate back through the brush to climb through the fence and come into the United States of America on a night where there was just about a three-quarter moon, not enough to actually be able to tell you exactly what I saw, but I know exactly what I heard. As I would hear those vehicles come down there, there is only one they would come there, and they came on a regular basis about every 20 minutes, shuttling people down, dropping them off, shuttle people down and dropping them off, and there they would come back across the border into the United States.

Some of these people just want to come into the United States, they say, for a better life. And as I listened to that, I imagine that is true with some of them. And it is a fact that there are a fair number that are here that are working, that are raising their families, and are good citizens so far as we can see. And they are our neighbors, and they have actually built a pretty good appreciation and affinity within these communities. They have made themselves useful, and when that happens, they make themselves good neighbors.

But the fact remains that those who came into the United States illegally are criminals. I see the signs in the streets that say ''I am not a criminal.'' Yes. If you violated the Criminal Code of the United States of America, you are a criminal. And if you came into the United States illegally, you are a criminal.

And the penalty for illegal entry into the United States is 6 months in a Federal penitentiary and then forceable deportation. That is what is written into the law. I cannot think of a time when that law has been utilized and the penalty has been imposed. And the time that I have served on the Immigration Subcommittee here in the House Judiciary Committee, not one

that I know of. It may be the case that it actually has been utilized, but I cannot think of a single time.

So people come in and violate our immigration laws. If they get caught, sometimes they get a bus ride down to the border. Sometimes they promise to appear. Sometimes they promise not to come back into the United States, and we know that people who break our Criminal Code probably are not going to keep their promise if it does not suit them to do so.

So we have this border that is 2,000 miles long, 2,000 miles long, with 11,000 people a day pouring across that border, 500 an hour, one every 8 seconds. And where they will go is they will follow the path of least resistance. It is like electricity, just a natural equation.

If you go to San Diego and build a wall there, which we have done and it is not quite finished but we are working on it, if you build that, they will go around the end. If you put some more pressure on there and put Border Patrol there, they go into Arizona and cross the border in the middle of the desert. And they will walk 20 to 25 miles from Mexico to get to the border sometimes. Sometimes they are dropped off very near the border. Sometimes they walk quite a ways. Sometimes they will walk 20, 25 miles up into the United States to get to a highway where there is a predetermined pickup place and they will jump in the back of a truck or in a van or in a vehicle, and as soon as they are on that highway and gone, that is the case. They are gone.

And with the illegal drugs that come into the United States, the difficulty that comes with shutting that off, a lot of pressure says to push those drugs into the United States. So if we are successful in shutting those drugs down at our points of entry, and I am not convinced that we are, but if the odds are a little better to drive a truck across the desert and drive across the border into the United States, they do a lot of that. Stray trucks, sometimes a semi right down the highway even, with a whole load of marijuana in it.

In fact, I was down there not too long ago, within about the last month, and as I was near the border, they picked up a white pickup and it was driven by an individual that was covered with tattoos from his waist to his neck, and he had a ''13'' tattooed on the inside of his forearm right here, and that ''13'' indicates MS–13, Mr. Speaker. And that is the most vile and violent gang this hemisphere has ever seen. And below in a false bed of that pickup truck, when we took the jaws of life and opened it up, there was about a 7-inch thick false floor in there with a false chamber. And in that chamber it was packed full of bags of marijuana, each one weighing a little over ten pounds. So approximately 180 pounds or more of marijuana under the bed of that pickup. And this MS–13 individual, he had gotten into the United States. We were 20 miles inside the United States, but he looked suspicious, drove erratically. And they converged on him, brought the helicopter, chased him around with a Black Hawk, brought the ground people in, and finally corner him and collared him.

Now, why would someone who had 180 pounds of marijuana drive erratically and tip off the officers to go chase him down? Mr. Speaker, I would submit that 180 pounds of marijuana was a decoy, that it was a decoy that was designed to pull the helicopter in, to bring all of the Border Patrol officers in and the enforcement officers in so that when they converged upon that vehicle with that 180 pounds of marijuana, the vehicle with 2,000 pounds of marijuana could shoot on through the gap. It happens all the time. The officers tell me that on a regular basis. Sometimes they are able to catch the decoy and the other load. That is how they know. Sometimes that load goes through and they are unable to catch them.

So those are the circumstances down there. And this border that sometimes is not marked at all, and in much of New Mexico it has a concrete pylon from ridge to ridge, as you can see through an old style transit, put the crosshairs on there. That is how the border is marked.

□ 2215

A vehicle can drive across that border anywhere. How do you control a border like that when you have $65 billion worth of illegal drugs coming across that border? That's billion with a B. $65 billion, a powerful force.

I want to someday look that up and see just how that ranks in the gross domestic product of nations. Just the illegal drugs coming out of Mexico into the United States. Ninety percent of the illegal drugs in America come through the Mexican border. That is $65 billion worth. If you couple that with the $20 billion worth of wages that are earned here, much of it by illegals and wired back down to Mexico, those two things add up to $85 billion.

How much is $85 billion, Mr. Speaker? I don't know. It is beyond my comprehension. But I can tell you, by comparison, the oil revenue from Mexico is $28 billion. Yet they have $65 billion worth of illegal drugs, another $20 billion worth of wages that come out of the gross domestic product of the United States. That is a powerful force.

And so if we shut down some of these illegal drugs that are coming across our ports of entry, shut down some of the illegal people traffic across our ports of entry, then they simply go around, they go out in the desert, they cut through somewhere, and then we do this other thing, this other wise tactic, I will say, and put that in quotes, we build a vehicle barrier along on the border. That consists of some 5-inch square tubing, drill a hole, set it in it, pour concrete in it and take this square steel tubing and set it up and then weld another piece of 5-inch square tubing, oh, about headlight high on a vehicle that runs along there. That is a vehicle barrier. It is not a fence. It keeps out cars and trucks. It is designed to let antelope and snakes and any other animals go back and forth because surely we couldn't upset Mother Nature by defending ourselves from all the illegal drug traffic that is going on. It is designed to let wildlife go through. Of course, if you can't drive a semi through there or a straight truck or a pickup any longer, then you just simply get your human mules there because they can climb through there as easily as an antelope can climb through that vehicle barrier.

So they climb through with their 50-pound pack of marijuana and a human pack train of seven or eight or 10 or 20 or 25 or even, I heard one report, as high as 100 young men each with 50 pounds of marijuana on their back, trekking across the desert, crossing the vehicle barrier by throwing their pack through, go through, put their pack back on and walk across the desert, 25 miles to a highway, where there is a predetermined pickup location, throw their marijuana in the back of a truck, their bags of marijuana, some get in the truck and go on, now they are in the United States to stay if they choose. Some turn around and walk back to Mexico to get another load. This is going on night after night after night, bringing these illegal drugs into the United States of America.

$65 billion worth, 11,000 people a day, 77,000 people a week, 4 million people a year. And we are spending $8 billion a year to protect our southern border. That is $4 million a mile. $4 million a mile, and we can't stop $65 billion worth of illegal drugs? And why not?

And so as I go down there and sit on that border and listen and I talk to the Border Patrol officers and ICE and the other officers down there, I am always asking them that question, how do we get to this point where we're successful? First of all, how do you define success? And how do we set things up so that we can shut off illegal human traffic and shut off the illegal drug traffic? In fact, I believe the illegal drug traffic is more dangerous than the illegal human traffic but they come together in a package, illegals carrying illegal drugs. They come in a package.

And it is sometimes terrorists coming into the United States, people that are from nations of interest. Isn't that a nice politically correct phrase for a terrorist nation, a nation of interest? And we have caught people down on the southern border who come from terrorist nations, nations of interest, whose identification was in the high risk database for the Department of Homeland Security. When that happens, that is the last we hear of that. I don't know how many there are. I know it happens. I know it has happened fairly recently. I know that if we caught some, more got away. Those

that came here to do us ill are going to pay more money to get brought into the United States through the illegal traffic route across our southern border because they have the resources to do that. When they have the resources to do it, and instead of paying a thousand or $1,500, now I hear that the coyote prices have maybe gone up as high as $2,000. Instead of paying a couple of thousand bucks to come in, it is a $30,000 ticket on some of them, which means it is essentially a guarantee that you are going to be here. Once they are here, these are not the people that are carrying in 50 pounds of marijuana. They are the people that are in here to be part of an enclave, to be part of a cell that one day will rise up against us here in this country the way they rose up in France and in Spain and in Great Britain and also just most recently in Canada. It will eventually happen here as we are infiltrated by people who believe again that their path to salvation is in killing us.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the solution to this is not a simple one. It is not a single component solution. But I have an addition to this component that is a very constructive one and an essential component to the solution. That, Mr. Speaker, is the necessity for us to not just build a vehicle barrier, not just build a simple fence, but to build a wall, to build a wall that can actually be utterly effective in keeping illegals out of the United States of America. If we can do that, we can shut down 90 percent of the illegal drugs that come into this country at the same time. We can force all of the traffic to go through our ports of entry. And if it is all coming through the ports of entry, then we can turn many more of our resources on our ports of entry, where now we have thousands of Border Patrol agents that are out there trying to chase people down in the desert that are scattered all over the place, they can patrol this wall that I propose we build, but they can focus a lot more resources on the ports of entry.

I simply put it this way. This cardboard box I have represents the desert floor. The desert floor in a lot of these areas where it will be suitable working conditions. Sometimes we are going to run into rocks, sometimes into mountains. When you hit the rock, you don't have to dig any deeper. They're not going under there. So we will just pour the concrete on the rock and put some pins in there to tie it together and we will be fine.

This represents the desert floor and a trench that I would dig through there to build this concrete wall. This looks at it from the end, a cross-sectional view, I would say. Sock a trencher in and trench this. At the same time we do it, we would pour a footing in here with a slot in it. And I would demonstrate, Mr. Speaker. This would be the footing that I would put in there. This would be a slip form footing, which means that the style that you see here with a slot in it that would receive precast concrete panels, the bottom of this would be 5 feet deep. So it would be a trencher that you would sock in here. You would have some augers here on the side. You would pull that together. As you pull this down, you pump concrete in right behind it.

I would put it this way. I would sock in here, dig this trench, and as this trench moved on, I would be pouring concrete in that trench. Maybe the way to go would be from about this end. Let's just say that we are pouring concrete here and trenching this way. As the trencher comes along, the concrete pours right behind the trencher, and you move along at the pace that you can deliver the concrete to it and dig the trench. This concrete will set up, and you would leave this slot in the middle. The reason for this slot, then, in the middle is so that it can receive the precast panels.

So now I have this concrete footing. Actually the earth would be right to the top of this concrete here on each side. It sets in the ground 5 feet. It has got the stability that is there. It has got the strength. It has got a place to receive these panels.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I would have trucks pulling in within about 2 days of cure time. We would start setting in precast concrete panels. They would be a finished height to 12 feet and about 10 feet wide. They would weigh about, oh, 9,800 pounds or so, 6 inches thick. They would beef them up a little on the bottom, taper them a little on the top. You would just take a crane and drop these in.

I would tell you that our little old construction company would not be bidding this, I don't know if you would call it a conflict of interest or not, we wouldn't be down there bidding in Arizona but it has the kind of work we could do, Mr. Speaker. I would add that we could put together about a mile of this a day, just dropping this in with a crane, swing them in place. Actually they would go together a little better than that. Take these off the bed of the truck, swing them in, drop them in just like that, they drop in the slot, the slot holds them up. It's firm. It's fixed. And it's that easy to put together a 12-foot tall concrete wall, 6 inches thick, precast panels, reinforced, of course, tied together with tongue and groove in this kind of a fashion. And when we are done with this, this is a wall that they are not going to climb through and they are not going to cut through. They may try to climb over and they may try to dig under. It has not going to be that easy to dig under because we are deep, remember, 5 feet deep. Maybe we should go a little bit deeper. I wouldn't disagree with that.

So they don't go over the top, Mr. Speaker. I happen to have this handy dandy little piece of concertina wire that I would put right on top here and install this wire like this. We could have a little bit more concentrated concertina wire so we could put two rolls on here. On top of this concrete we could also put on any kind of optical equipment, vibration sensers, any other kind of surveillance equipment that we so choose. This wall would not go exactly on the border in my mind but it would be back north of the border perhaps 60 to 100 feet so that there is a patrol zone between. I would have a fence right on the border and that would be the fence that thou shalt not cross. In fact, I would hang a sign on the south side in Spanish that says, check this web page, you can go to the U.S. consul and apply to come to the United States legally and that is what you ought to do. I would put that every mile. I would have a nice sign there that would say, You're welcome to apply. We welcome all people to come apply and come to the United States legally, but don't cross this path because you're violating our laws.

Fifty-eight percent of the people in Mexico believe they have a right to come to the United States. And so this wall would have a value to keep out illegals. It would slow dramatically down. I think it would take 90 percent of the human traffic down. I think it would take 90 percent of the drug traffic down. And it sends a message to the south side of the border that says, You don't have a right to come here. We're a sovereign nation and we take our applications at the U.S. consul.

But this would be an effective structure that would free up the Border Patrol. They would still have to patrol. They would drive back and forth. They would cut sign here. They would check for tracks. If they caught anybody out here in no man's land, they would be picked up immediately. And if they got across this wall, it would be rare and we would see the tracks and we would be able to chase them down and I think we could catch nearly every one of them that did that.

Maybe they would want to come with a ladder. Somebody said, well, if you show me a 90-foot wall, I'll show you a 90-foot ladder. It is hard to carry a ladder across one fence and get it to the next one, Mr. Speaker. If so, we have an opportunity to catch them in between. I don't think they are going to carry that many ladders across that many miles of desert. We will know what kind of tactics they are using, we can beef it up, but they are not going to breach this wall easily. They are not going to go underneath this thing in any short period of people. They are not going to go over it easily. They are going to look at it and try to find another way. Some of them will decide, now the transaction cost is too high. I believe I'm just going to stay here in Mexico and maybe go to work and help improve that country, because that country needs its productive people if they are going to have any economic future. You empty a nation out of its vitality and what do you expect is going to happen? I don't know why it is Vicente Fox is willing to see his best people come to the United States, because the solution to what is wrong in

that country is within the people that are leaving, especially the people that are leaving.

They aren't all good folks that are coming here. A lot of them are but they come here for about three reasons. One of them is to come here and go to work, one of them is they are running away from something and maybe they are running away from the law down there, maybe they are running away for some other reason and maybe they are coming up here to do us harm. That is about the only three reasons why people are coming here. I cannot fathom why Vicente Fox would promote the exodus of his own people. In fact, 10 percent of the population of Mexico is here in the United States. That is a number that I believe is probably on the low side. The population of Mexico before the exodus was 104 million. If 10 million of them are here, let's just say that number is inflated a little bit. Let me round this down to 90 million just for the sake of discussion. If there are 90 million people left in Mexico and we pass the Senate version of this immigration that they passed here some weeks ago, and that version according to Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, the lowest number he has is that it brings in 59 million people over the next 20 years.

□ 2230

That is 59 million people, added to at least another 20 million people. So we are up to 79 million people coming into the United States. That is the lowest number.

The highest numbers were pretty astonishing, up there around 200 million, but I think that range falls between 59 million and probably 92 million.

Let us just say 92 million people in the next 20 years, and are 90 million people left in Mexico? Some will come from those other countries down there. But I will say this that everyone who wants to come under the Senate version, everyone who wants to come to the United States will come to the United States under that bill.

It will not be an immigration policy that is designed for the interests of the United States. It will be the immigration policy that is designed for the wants of people who want to come here. We have never had a policy like that in the past, Mr. Speaker. It is not the intent of our founders when they gave us the charge in this Congress to write immigration law.

We are charged by our constituents, by the people in the United States of America, to devise an immigration policy for the economic, social and cultural well-being of the United States of America and nothing else.

We cannot be a safety valve for all of the poverty in the world. For every 1 million people that we could bring in across our southern border, there are another 10 or 12 million people in the same region down there that are born. But for every person, the average citizen of Mexico, their average standard of living, there are still 4.6 billion people on the planet with a lower standard of living than the average citizen of Mexico.

So if it does our heart good to not say no to some of people who are our neighbors, what do we have to say to people that aren't our neighbors who live in much greater poverty. What do we say to the poverty in Bangladesh, and what do we say to the poverty in Africa?

The Senate bill leaves a lot of that open as well. The difference is it is easier to travel here from Mexico than it is from Bangladesh or Africa. So we would get more Mexicans than we would Bangladeshis. But that bill is wide open, and the future of this country, the destiny of this country, hangs in the balance.

As the American people do this debate, we need to come to an agreement. The message needs to get over to the Senate, and it needs to get to the White House, that we are going to stand on the rule of law, Mr. Speaker, and that we are going to have enforcement of our immigration laws in this country, and that we cannot have, we cannot have an immigration policy that is essentially a guest worker, temporary worker, amnesty plan, that is built upon the false promise of enforcement, when we have had 20 years to enforce our immigration laws and over the last 20 years, there has been less and less enforcement and more and more accusation of that.

Of the illegals coming into America, the numbers that were presumably 1 million in 1986 became 3 million by the time the amnesty was done. Now these numbers, we are talking with a straight face, 10- to 12 million people, and saying it is not amnesty.

But in reality, this 10- to 12 million is more like 20 million, 22 million, 27 million, somewhere in that category. The bill that has been passed in the Senate takes us up to 59 million or 70 million or 92 million. The cumulative total for all the immigration legally in the history of America, from the time we began to keep records until the last numbers we could total in, and those numbers would be 1820 to the year 2000, the cumulative total, Mr. Speaker, was 66.1 million people coming into the United States.

That is the immigration total for all of our history. Maybe it is off a couple or 3 million because I can't add those before 1820 and I can't add those after the year 2000. Statistics aren't available. There are 66 million people. The Senate version eclipses the grand cumulative total for the history of America all in one fell swoop. They say it is not amnesty, and it really isn't any big deal. We can do this because we need somebody to trim our lawns and trim our nails and wait on us in our mansions and change our bedding and cook our steaks.

How much of this work is not essential work? How much of this work is convenient because it is cheap? I can use a lot of servants, if they are cheap. So why can't I, you know, that is the attitude. We have this new ruling class in America. They made a lot of money hiring illegal labor, cheap labor.

And they have got this attitude that they ought to be able to hire this cheap labor also to wait on them in their mansions and trim their lawns and wait on them and drive their cars. They want to be able to hire them cheap and make a lot of money, and they want to hire them cheap so when they spend their money they can be well taken care of.

This is what is happening. The middle class is diminishing and shrinking. That strength of America has been a broad powerful middle class, not a shrinking middle class. We have never been an elitist country. We have never been an upper or lower class stratification. But the ruling class and the servant class are all that will be left if we let the open borders crowd rule in this immigration debate in America.

Mr. Speaker, I stand first on enforcement first and enforcement only. If I am able to see a demonstration of that enforcement being effective, and it has to be demonstrated for a number of years before I am going to believe there is a commitment. Then in that case I am willing at some point to have a discussion about what to do with the people that might be left here.

But in the meantime, I want to build this wall, and I want to put this wire on top, and I want to shut off illegal traffic at our border, and I want to shut off illegal drugs at our border. I want to end birthright citizenship, and I want to shut off the jobs magnet, and I want to hold the line on this until we can see that we have been effective.

When that day comes, maybe there is time for another debate. But until that time we have this bleeding patient, and we have got to stop the bleeding. We can worry about what the therapy program is if this patient recovers.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROTHMAN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 12:00 p.m. on account of a family obligation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEFAZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.