

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 pre-existing 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