

As winter approaches and deadlines for all displaced residents from Louisiana and Mississippi living in hotel rooms to be moved into temporary housing quickly approaching, this process must be streamlined. It is unacceptable for American citizens who lost their homes and everything they owned in the hurricane to still be sleeping in tents when FEMA has thousands of brand-new empty manufactured homes for occupancy.

Take a look here, Mr. Speaker. This is not in Hope, Arkansas. In fact, this is in my hometown of Prescott, Arkansas, some 16 miles away.

□ 2315

Here is what is going on. They deliver the homes to this staging area in Hope, Arkansas, 450 miles from the gulf coast. And as they deliver them down the interstate, they have got a banner on the back that says, Urgent, FEMA delivery. Urgent for what? To deliver it to a cow pasture?

And a shingle blows off in transit. If one shingle is missing, they will not accept it at the FEMA staging area in Hope, Arkansas. So they turn around, drive back to my home town of Prescott, and they are leasing, literally leasing cow pastures, as you can see here, to store these homes until they can be repaired, while at the same time we have got families, we have got families, as Christmas approaches, as the holidays approach, sleeping in tents in Louisiana and Mississippi.

Dennis Ramsey, the Mayor of Hope, Arkansas, was quoted in the *Texarkana Gazette*, December 15, saying FEMA estimated that 12,000 mobile homes would be staged at the Hope site while FEMA leases the land at \$25,000 a month for the next 2 years.

The Associated Press said a FEMA spokesman said last week that 5,840 mobile homes and 80 travel trailers are at Hope and the Texarkana sites along with more than 4,400 mobile homes and 4,200 travel trailers at the other staging areas.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking this body, I am asking the acting director of FEMA: Please come to my home town, get these mobile homes and get them moved 450 miles down the road to the families who are living in tents and who so desperately need them in Mississippi and Louisiana.

TEXAS ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, a National Guard unit is coming back to Texas, because tomorrow, Saturday, December 17, the First Battalion, 133rd field artillery will be welcomed back to Beaumont, Texas, after serving the past year in Iraq.

In August 2004, the Texas Army National Guard deployed the 56th Brigade

Combat Team of the 36th Infantry Division to go to Iraq. They trained for 4 months in Ft. Hood, Texas, and got to Iraq in December of 2004. The 133rd Field Artillery has a longstanding history in this country. This was the first and famous Texas Army National Guard that served in France in World War I.

General John J. Pershing, the commander-in-chief of the American Expeditionary Forces in World War I made this comment about those Texans in World War I: He said, the bearing of the division in this its very first experience in battle showed the mettle of the officers and men and gave promise of what it would become. Members of this division who returned home can be proud of the record of their services.

Mr. Speaker, this was the first American combat unit to land in Europe in World War II. They landed on the beaches of Italy during World War II. They liberated Rome, then they went and landed on the beaches of France, went on to free the hostages of the concentration camps of Dachau, Germany.

Probably the most famous member of the 36th Texas is a person by the name of Audie Murphy. You may remember him, Mr. Speaker; he is from Hunt, Texas. And when he was a youngster, he joined the Army, the Army National Guard of Texas and became the first decorated soldier in the history of the American Army, winning among many other things the Congressional Medal of Honor.

And yet, the Texas 36th has continued that longstanding tradition in Iraq where they conducted offensive operations, deny and destroy operations, combat logistic patrols and civil military affair operations.

They built schools and hospitals and won the hearts of the Iraqi kids that they met along the way. They operated in the Sunni Triangle, Tikrit, Tillal, on the Jordanian border and in Bagdad. It is my pleasure to welcome them back when they come back home tomorrow.

I would like to extend a sincere thank you to all of the members of the 133rd, the men and women of the United States Armed Forces. They honor us with their commitment to Texas and the Nation, and the citizens of America and Iraq owe them a debt of gratitude. They are America's best. They are the sons and daughters of liberty. They are freedom fighters, and they make us proud.

I join the citizens of Texas Congressional District number two in paying the utmost respect for the 1st Battalion, 133rd Field Artillery. Through their service, Iraq has become a free democracy, and America remains the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Mr. Speaker, I had the chance in January of this year to go to Iraq to visit the very first elections, and I, with our military, and saw firsthand the accomplishments in their fight for freedom. You know, Mr. Speaker, freedom does have a price. Our troops are paying

that sacrificial price for the Iraqi people and for world freedom. Unfortunately, the 133rd lost six members during their fight for freedom, and I extend my prayers and our condolences to the family and friends. They were making a difference in the world when they gave their lives.

Their bravery and dedication and patriotism shall not be forgotten. That success is evident with the successful election of a new government in Iraq yesterday. President John Kennedy once said: The cost of freedom is always high. But Americans have always paid it. And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender or submission.

Mr. Speaker, we have chosen the right path. The hard path. The freedom path. We will persevere with the freedom-loving people of Iraq until the journey down this path is successfully completed.

The citizen soldiers of America, the Texas Army National Guard, have been warriors on the long hard sacrificial path of liberty. The world should never underestimate the resolve of America, the resolve and determination and will of the American soldier. Regardless of their mission for freedom, they always get it done. That is just the way it is.

AMERICA'S IMMIGRATION POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago, Mr. Speaker, President John F. Kennedy, himself the grandson of Irish immigrants, summed up this blend of the old and the new when he called America a society of immigrants, each of whom had begun life anew on an equal footing.

This is the secret of America, a Nation of people with a fresh memory of old traditions who dare to explore new frontiers. He further said: Everywhere immigrants have enriched and strengthened the fabric of American life.

And then Franklin Delano Roosevelt reminded us, remember, remember always, that all of us are descended from immigrants. I had hoped as we began our journey on a very important task, as reflected in the work we have done over the last 2 days, on border security and immigration reform, that we would have returned to our values, recognizing that this Nation is a Nation of immigrants as well as a Nation of laws.

I would have hoped that we would have constructed a piece of legislation that garnered the very essence of the instructions of the 9/11 Commission; that we would have taken this time to move from the Ds and Fs of which this Nation was graded some 10 days by the 9/11 Commission and actually incurred the appreciation of the Nation by doing real border security, real border enforcement and real immigration reform.

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 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.