

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has approximately 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I thank the Representative from New Jersey for making it clear that all children in this country deserve the opportunity to be part of a pipeline toward progress and prosperity, even though some, unfortunately, have been subjected to circumstances that often lead to a pipeline from the schoolhouse to the jailhouse. That's not how things should be anywhere in America. And that's why we believe a robust investment in education is the right way to go in this country.

I'm going to ask the distinguished gentleman from the Silver State for his observations on this chart. The chart illustrates that education pays. If you invest in education, increase the level of degree of attainment, what it does is increase the capacity for Americans to earn a better living.

And so, for example, for Americans who have less than a high school diploma, their average weekly earning is \$451. But someone with a high school diploma earns, on average, \$638 per week. And someone with a bachelor's degree earns, on average, \$1,053 per week. If you give an American an advanced degree, their average earnings per week increase to in excess of \$1,600.

Investing in education pays for the American people.

I yield to my distinguished colleague from Nevada.

Mr. HORSFORD. Just to elaborate further on this point, education attainment is an economic imperative. Not only is it the investment in the individual that proves great dividends and a return on investment, but the failure to invest, based on the bottom line in red, for someone with less than a high school diploma the likelihood of them being unemployed is 14 percent. For those with a high school diploma who are unemployed, it's 9.4 percent. If you have a bachelor's degree, the unemployment rate drops in half, to 4.9 percent. And if you have a professional degree, the unemployment rate is 2.4 percent.

So the correlation is clear that with education attainment come economic prosperity, opportunity, and a return on investment that is good for that individual, their ability to provide for themselves and their family, and for our entire country.

And so, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about investment, we're not talking about investments in programs or systems. We're talking about investments in people. When we talk about Head Start, we're talking about 3- and 4-year-old children. When we talk about title 1 funding, we're talking about schools and children that are identified as having low-income needs and the disadvantaged. When we talk about funding for IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, we're talk-

ing about individuals. And the more that we can invest in the individuals in America, the greater return we will have in the productivity of that individual, their family, the community they live in. And that will make for a stronger America for all of us. That is what we are aspiring to accomplish in this 113th Congress.

We want to work with our colleagues on the other side. Where they can meet us in the middle to find solutions to make these investments, we look forward to working with them. But one thing we will not do is to slash, defund, or freeze the investment of the American children and the American family.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the gentleman from Nevada. We will not, as he indicated, support any budget that balances itself on the backs of children or young people or college students in America. Unfortunately, that is the budget that has been put forth by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We support a balanced approach to dealing with the economic problems that we have in this country that involves the investment in education. That is what we stand for. That's what is good for America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it has been over 60 years since the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* desegregated our schools. Yet an achievement and opportunity gap remains among our minority and low-income students.

As Members of Congress who represent communities of color, the purpose of today's special order is to highlight an economic and social crisis America faces if this problem is not confronted and significant measures are not taken. Particularly, we must focus our efforts on closing the gap in the STEM disciplines. As the First Female and First African American Ranking Member of the House Science, Space and Technology Committee, this is an issue that is very serious to me and has been one of the pillars of my legislative agenda in the United States Congress for over 20 years.

Ensuring minorities are proficient in STEM is more than just a question of equity. We have a vast, untapped pool of talent in America, and this pool is continuing to grow. It is estimated that, by 2050, 52 percent of the U.S. population will be from underrepresented minority groups. Our "Nation's Report Card," by the National Assessments of Educational Progress, shows that students from underrepresented minorities are falling behind in math and science as early as 4th grade.

At the Post Secondary level, even though students from underrepresented minorities made up about 33 percent of the college age population in 2009, they only made up: 19 percent of students who received an undergraduate STEM degrees Less than 9 percent of students enrolled in science and engineering graduate programs, and; Barely 8 percent of students who received PhDs in STEM fields. Frankly, all of these numbers are much too low.

I also must underscore the important role that community colleges play in providing to STEM degrees for minority students. 50 per-

cent of African Americans, 55 percent of Hispanics, and 64 percent of Native Americans who hold bachelor's or master's degrees in science or engineering attended a community college at some point. We cannot afford to ignore the role of community colleges.

We have to drastically increase the number of African American students from these groups receiving degrees in STEM disciplines, or we will undoubtedly relinquish our global leadership in innovation and job creation. We know school administrators, teachers, community leaders, public-private partnerships and parents all play a critical role in addressing this issue. No one person or organization can do it alone. We must all work together to leverage our respective strengths and resources to tackle this challenge.

For example, the corporate community was highly involved supporting a bill I co-authored, the America COMPETES Act. As many of you are aware, I recently introduced the STEM Opportunities Act of 2013 this March. The STEM Opportunities Act of 2013 will help address many of the challenges faced by women and underrepresented minorities pursuing science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) research careers by:

Requiring the National Science Foundation (NSF) to collect more comprehensive demographic data on the recipients of federal research awards and on STEM faculty at U.S. universities (while protecting individuals' privacy); Promoting data-driven research on the participation and trajectories of women and underrepresented minorities in STEM so that policy makers can design more effective policies and practices to reduce barriers; And developing, through the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), consistent federal policies, such as no-cost extensions and flexibility in timing for the initiation of the award, for recipients of federal research awards who have caregiving responsibilities, including care for a newborn or newly adopted child and care for an immediate family member who is sick.

We're all in this together, and working together I know we can achieve great success.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 527, RESPONSIBLE HELIUM ADMINISTRATION AND STEWARDSHIP ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah (during the Special Order of Mr. JEFFRIES), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-47) on the resolution (H. Res. 178) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 527) to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1730

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I've listened to the dialogue over the last, oh, 30 to 60 minutes and I'm a little bit surprised that some of the advocates for the comprehensive immigration reform bill wouldn't simply look at the impact on a lot of their friends and neighbors. We see the highest unemployment in the African American community. That's the direct competition that comes in if they grant amnesty on the Senate side. I ask the gentleman to reconsider that. The best thing that would be would be more jobs for people that are here that are Americans.

I see the gentleman from Texas has arrived. Generally, there is a pretty good narrative that comes forth from the gentleman from the Beaumont area, so I would be very pleased to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

PROFESSOR RICHARD FALK IS IN FANTASY LAND

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding some time. I want to address the House on a different issue tonight, but I do appreciate the time and letting me be off the subject that he was going to, and will, talk about momentarily.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, there are people in Boston—and really around the world, and in the United States especially—trying to recover from the terrorist attack that took place in Boston. The Richard family laid their 8-year-old boy to rest, as did other families. As a father of 4 and a grandfather of 10, no parent or grandparent ever wants to see a child die in their youth, especially being murdered the way this young lad was.

But meanwhile, in the halls of academia, Richard Falk, a professor and an official with the United Nations Human Rights Council, he blamed the terrorist attack on what he claims is American global domination—and on the country of Israel, of all things. What an absurd comment for this so-called “intellectual” to make. The vile comments come only 2 years after he personally was reprimanded by the United Nations for promoting fantasy-like 9/11 conspiracy theories.

Mr. Speaker, why is Richard Falks still employed by the United Nations Human Rights Council?

Can someone please explain why the United States also continues to be the largest funder of the United Nations, which gives radical wingbats like Falk a platform to spew their hate and anti-American rhetoric? I don't think the United States should be bankrolling the United Nations Human Rights Council. Let them find somebody else to foot the bill for this international institute of ingratitude.

It's time for the elitist, uninformed like Mr. Falk to go, and it's certainly time for the United States to stop

funding the Human Rights Council. We don't need to pay people like Professor Falk to hate America. People like him will do it for free.

Meanwhile, let's try the Boston terrorists for their crimes against America; hold them accountable for murder. And don't try to blame America for the murder of America's children. Blame the killers.

And that's just the way it is.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his message. It's one that I hope, Mr. Speaker, is well heard across America: You don't have to pay them to hate us. They hate us for free. They hate us for our ideology and for our success, for all of those reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I came here to the floor tonight to talk about the immigration issue here in the United States Congress, primarily that has emerged in the United States Senate out of the Gang of Eight.

We know that there are some of these policies that are being worked through in meetings behind closed doors in the House of Representatives. They seem to admit to those meetings, but they're not very public and we don't know very much about what they're talking about. I just get nervous when I see bills written in secret.

The Gang of Eight wrote their bill in secret and popped it out last week or so, a little more, and we began to look through 844 pages. Surprise. Well, shortly after the bill was dropped, then the chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the Senate calls hearings and begins to do the fastest process that they can legitimately get done to try to move an immigration amnesty bill out of the Senate before it gets so many holes poked in it that it sinks of its own weight.

I take you back, Mr. Speaker, to: How did we get here? What was the scenario? What's the path of immigration? I will go through the fast-forward version, backing this up to 1986.

In 1986, it became a political issue that we had too many people in the United States illegally. There was an effort made to resolve the issue and the effort was this:

Part of the people in the argument said they wanted better border security and they wanted better immigration enforcement. The other side of the argument said we've got to do something to legalize people that are here that—I don't know if they used the language then if they were in the shadows or not. Those two arguments came together here in this Congress. And with Ronald Reagan sitting in the White House, he received significant pressure from the people around him that urged him to sign the 1986 Amnesty Act. Now, that was one of only two times that Ronald Reagan let me down in 8 years. But he accepted the arguments that the only way to get agreement on enforcement and to be able to respect and restore the rule of law was to make the people that were here illegally legal.

The tradeoff was amnesty in exchange for enforcement.

So, Mr. Speaker, the projection originally was 800,000 people in this country illegally that would get instantaneous legalization status, and then that number of course grew to 1 million. Roughly, that was the projected amount at the time that the bill was debated in Congress. We know that, instead, there wasn't 1 million people. It was 3 million people that ended up receiving amnesty from the deliberations in this Congress, the tug-of-war that came together, and it's a product of compromise. I would point out that compromise isn't always a good thing. This would be one of those examples.

The compromise was, in exchange for the promise of future enforcement, Ronald Reagan would sign the bill to instantaneously start the process to legalize the people that were illegally in the United States. Sounds familiar. Well, he signed the bill in '86. What we got was instantaneous legalization of the people that were here—triple the number that was projected—and the effort to get law enforcement was undermined continually. It was undermined in a number of ways: through litigation, through lack of will. As it ground forward, the respect for the rule of law, especially with regard to immigration law, diminished in each year.

As we've seen, the enforcement of our immigration laws has diminished in each administration, from Ronald Reagan through Bush 41, to Bill Clinton, to Bush 43, and now to Barack Obama. That's the path that has taken place.

Just a year ago, the debate was: Would Congress pass the DREAM Act, the DREAM Act being the legislation that I'll say the chief advocate for it in the Senate has been Senator DURBIN of Illinois. He has identified with it more than anyone else. But the DREAM Act is: those kids that came here, say, before their 18th birthday—and that goes up and down to 16, or on up to a little older than that. Those that came here when they were relatively young, maybe due to no fault of their own—theoretically, someone who was born 5 minutes before in a foreign country that was brought in by their parents as a little baby would get a legal status. And, by the way, in-State tuition discounts so they can go to college, get legal status, and be able to work in the country.

In other words, it was amnesty for those young people who presumably came into this country not of their own will or perhaps not of their own knowledge that it was against the law to enter the United States illegally, or those that might have been brought into the country under a visa of one kind or another, overstayed their visa and didn't have a legal status anymore. In any case, the younger people given a path to a legal status and a legal green card here in the United States, that's the DREAM Act.

A year ago, Mr. Speaker, it was not something that could pass the United

States Congress. They long wanted to get the DREAM Act passed, but they could not because we stood on the rule of law and we said we are not going to reward people who break the law with, let's just say, a de facto scholarship to a university—and in California, it would be a free ride. I made the argument that how can you legalize people that are here illegally, refuse to enforce the law, the clear directive of the law, and have people sitting in a classroom in, say, California with a free ride while someone who has lost their husband or wife in battle in Iraq or Afghanistan, who finds themselves the sole breadwinner for their family, wants to go to California—I'll use as the example—and have to pay out-of-State tuition in a California institution, who is a widow or a widower of someone who has given their life for our country, they're sitting there next to someone who is in the United States illegally that gets a free ride because they've been declared a California resident.

□ 1740

I could never reconcile the huge inequity, the injustice of that idea, and neither could a majority of Americans or a majority of the United States Congress. That's why the DREAM Act wasn't passed. Just a year ago that couldn't be done.

The President said on March 28 of 2010, when he was speaking to a high school group here in the Washington, D.C. area, they asked him: Why don't you just pass the DREAM Act by executive order, implement that? And the President's answer was: No, I don't have the constitutional authority to do so. That is a legislative branch activity. And he said: You're smart, you're educated, you know that in the three branches of government Congress' job is to pass the laws, my job as President, the head of the executive branch, is to carry those laws out and see to it that they are enacted and enforced, and the judicial branch is to rule on their constitutionality to tell us what the laws are understood to mean.

That was the description that the President gave March 28, 2010. He said he didn't have the authority to implement a DREAM Act by executive authority. Congress wouldn't pass it a year ago; the President said he couldn't do such a thing constitutionally, March 28, 2010. And here we've come so far that in June or July—and I don't have those dates in front of me, nor committed to memory, Mr. Speaker—the President went back on his own advice, word, oath of office and counsel when they issued an executive memorandum.

He held a press conference at the White House within a couple hours of the executive memorandum and said: We are going to legalize all of these people that are here within these age groups that fit the definition of the DREAM Act—an executive edict, not exactly an executive order, because it

was only a memorandum between the Department of Homeland Security that they put out—and that they would follow this guideline. They created four classes of people that were defined by age and by status, but four separate classes of people created in this memorandum.

And the President manufactured a work permit out of thin air, Mr. Speaker, just simply made it up. All of the visas that exist in law, of course, are a product of Congress. And it's our exclusive authority to define immigration law. It's the President's job to enforce the laws that are on the books.

Now, the previous President had the opportunity to veto immigration law. It's all signed into law and it is the law of the land. The Constitution is the supreme law of the land. The President violated the Constitution and his own definition of congressional executive and judicial authority when he issued this executive memorandum that granted this legal status under the DREAM Act principles. That happened, I would say, June or July of last year.

Now we've come a quantum leap. As we go forward, we put together a meeting and organized the effort to take the President to court on that issue. You cannot have a President that's going to legislate by executive edict. But he did do that; and that case, Mr. Speaker, has worked its way through the courts. And I'm here to announce in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results.

The name of the case is *Crane v. Napolitano*. This references the lead plaintiff as Christopher Crane, who is the president of the ICE union, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement union. He has been a stellar individual on this. He stood boldly and strongly, and he's taken the threats and the buffeting that comes from all sides of this argument. He's testified before Congress. He has stood at a press conference and asked to be recognized to ask questions of Senators over on the Senate side. And he has flawlessly walked his way down through this thing by standing for the rule of law and for the Constitution and his own oath to uphold the law, as we have taken that oath here in this Congress to uphold the Constitution.

This decision that came down yesterday from a Federal District Court in Houston in the case of *Crane v. Napolitano*, there were 10 points that were made in this litigation, Mr. Speaker. Nine of the 10, the judge found clearly down on the side of those who support the Constitution and the rule of law and rejected the executive branch's argument that they had prosecutorial discretion to decide who to prosecute and who not to prosecute.

Time after time the judge wrote: When Congress writes in statute the word "shall," shall means shall. It doesn't mean may; it means shall. That means that when an ICE officer picks someone up and identifies them as likely to be in violation of immigration laws, they shall be placed in de-

portation proceedings. That's a "shall" that's in the law that was upheld by the Court yesterday in their decision on this multiple-page decision. So nine of the 10 components of the argument, several of which I made early on after that issuing of the executive edict last year, nine of 10 were upheld.

The 10th argument was one that the President sent it back to the executive branch and said: your argument is so illogical and baseless and convoluted and tied to footnotes, go back and rewrite your argument. But the implication or the tone of that is once that's rewritten, he's probably going to find it. I guess I don't want to put words in a judge's mouth. I'm optimistic about how that final component of the ruling will be.

In any case, it's almost a 100 percent resounding decision that says: Barack Obama and his appointees cannot write immigration law out of thin air. They can't do so by executive memorandum, they cannot do so by edict, they cannot do so by executive order. Congress writes immigration laws, Mr. Speaker, and the President's job is to take care that those laws be faithfully executed. He has not done that. He's defied his own oath of office. The Federal Court has ruled on the side of article I, legislative branch of Congress. We will see the impact of this decision.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that now it's time for the Gang of Eight to reassess as a result of this lawsuit. It's time for the open-border advocates in this Congress to reassess as a result of this lawsuit. They had concluded, the people on my side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, appear to have concluded that Republicans didn't win the elections they anticipated winning last November. On the morning after the election, some of our otherwise wise folks on our side of the aisle concluded that Mitt Romney would have been President-elect if he just hadn't said two words, "self-deport," and so now there has to be an effort to try to, let's say, start the conversation with select groups of people across the country that would require that amnesty be passed to "start the conversation."

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of those to reassess the situation and think about this. They were seeking to conform to the President's edict on his DREAM Act life. They were seeking to adjust U.S. law under the premise that the President refused to enforce existing law, and the only way that we could get law enforcement would be to conform to the President's wishes and rewrite the law and conform it to the President's political agenda.

I thought from the beginning it was a ludicrous position to take, to accept an idea that the President can, first, write a law by executive edict; and, second, Congress has to conform. Now, I've seen it happen and participated in it in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, when we have a piece of legislation and it finds its way over to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court comes down with a

ruling, and then Congress takes a look at the language of that Supreme Court's ruling, and we will bring a piece of legislation to conform with a directive from the Supreme Court. I think that's an appropriate thing for us to do, provided we agree with the Supreme Court's decision and it's clear, logical legal analysis. When we have done that, I've agreed.

An example would be the language on partial-birth abortion that banned it. The first time it went to the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court ruled that the definition of "partial-birth abortion" was too vague. So we went back and fine-tuned that language, passed it out of the Judiciary Committee, passed it out of the House and the Senate, President Bush signed it, and it was upheld when it found its way back again before the Supreme Court.

□ 1750

That's okay, and it's an appropriate and proper thing for this Congress to do—to conform our legislation to a Supreme Court decision when it's a proper one. But when the President defies the law and the policy established by the United States Congress and makes up his own as he goes along by executive edict and press conference and for Congress to accept the idea that the President of the United States directs us, either implied or literally, to conform the law to the President's wishes, I would remind all of those people who happen to think that, Mr. Speaker, that we each have our own franchise.

Our oath is to uphold the Constitution. It's not to conform to the President's whims or wishes. It's to represent the best decisions for this country and to represent the people in the districts that we represent. We owe them our best judgment and our best effort, but we don't owe anybody an obligation to conform to the President's wishes, will, or whim. That has to only conform with our best judgment, individual best judgment, collectively measured here in this Congress—House and Senate.

So I think that a Congress that would be willing to give up its legislative authority and let that power go over to the executive branch by conforming the idea of amnesty that the President has brought forward in his edict I think our Founding Fathers did not imagine. They did not imagine that this branch of government would be so willing to give up this power. Our Founding Fathers imagined that each branch of government would jealously guard the power that's granted it within the Constitution in the three separate branches of government. They expected that Congress would assert its authority in competition with and in a static tension with the President and with the courts. The courts, by the way, were designed to be the weakest of the three branches of government. That's a longer discussion.

The Gang of Eight, though, brought their bill out. What is it, Mr. Speaker? It is this:

It is amnesty first. It instantaneously legalizes everybody that's in the country illegally with a few tiny, little exceptions, and that's if we run across them randomly and if they happen to have committed a felony or three misdemeanors. Other than that, it instantaneously legalizes everybody who's here illegally whether they committed a crime of illegally crossing the border or whether they overstayed their visa or whether they committed the crime of document fraud. Those kinds of things are just simply not enforced by this administration. They are treating immigration law as if it's a secondary crime.

An example of that would be, if you've got States that say that you can't pull somebody over for not wearing their seatbelt, but if they're speeding and if it happens to be they're not wearing their seatbelt, you can write the ticket for that. That's kind of the equivalent of what's going on here.

The President essentially issued this edict that, if somebody is guilty of a felony and if they're unlawfully in the United States, then we will go ahead and deport them; but otherwise they would get similar treatment as, oh, let's say, the President's aunt, who was adjudicated for deportation and who lived in the country illegally for years after that. Finally, she surfaced again, and they granted her asylum status. If they'd sent her back to Kenya, she would have apparently been subject to kidnap and ransom, so they gave her asylum. I guess it's an undecided case with the President's Uncle Omar, who was picked up for drunken driving. He had already been adjudicated for deportation. We would know if he were anywhere other than still in the United States of America.

The law didn't apply to the President's relations, and I guess in order to conform with that, the President would like to exempt everybody from the same law that his family has been exempted from. I disagree. Congress writes the laws, and the President's job is to carry them out.

In this Gang of Eight's legislation, it's instantaneous amnesty for almost everybody, and that is breathtaking in the magnitude of it. They say 11 million. I say 11 million, 12 million, more likely 20 million. Here is what I would guarantee you, Mr. Speaker: if they move legislation out of the Senate and if it does come to the House, along the way, if any of us introduce an amendment that would cap the legalization number at their estimated number, they will never support such an amendment because they know it's a lot more than 11 million people. It's instantaneous amnesty for 11 to 20-or-more million people, but that's not good enough for them.

They also had to write into the bill that, if you have previously been deported and if you find yourself waking up in a country that you're legal to live in, we still send an invitation through this bill that you should apply

to come back into the United States because we really didn't mean it, Mr. Speaker. We didn't really mean it, the idea that people were deported for violating immigration law. If they'd like to reapply, unless they have a felony conviction or three misdemeanor convictions, they're going to give them a path to come back to the United States. So this isn't just amnesty for those who are here now. This is amnesty for those who have been sent home as well—an absolute open-door policy.

And the trade off is—what?—amnesty first for the promise of enforcement. It's the same thing that came along in 1986 and multiple times since then—amnesty for the promise of enforcement.

The promise of enforcement is that Janet Napolitano is to produce within 5 years a plan to get 90 percent operational control of the critical sectors of the border that she designates, the 90 percent of those that we see, of course, because you can't count those that you can't see. So they want to be able to catch 90 percent of those that you can see. We don't know if they're going to turn their eyes the other way, but here is what I know: we are never going to see the enforcement side of this. It's amnesty first, a promise of enforcement second. That has never worked.

If they were serious, they would go to work and secure the border, shut off the jobs magnet, restore the respect for the rule of law. We would know in this country if there were respect for the rule of law restored, and at that point, I'm ready to sit down and talk. I'm ready to have that conversation but not absent the reestablishment of the rule of law, and that means border control, serious border control. We've got the resources to do it, Mr. Speaker. It's not that we don't have it.

We're spending over \$6 million a mile on the southern border. You can build a four-lane interstate across Iowa cornfields for \$4 million a mile. You can buy the right-of-way; you can engineer it; you can design it; you can do the archeological and the environmental; you can grade it; you can put the drainage in; you can pave it; you can paint it; you can shoulder it; you can seed it; and you can put fences on it—all of that for \$4 million a mile through Iowa cornfields. You cannot convince me that we couldn't take about a third of that \$6 million a mile and in a few years build the finest, most sophisticated barrier along our southern border.

We can take some lessons from the Israelis, for example, who get a 99.9 percent efficiency rate at their border barrier. They do that because their lives depend on it. So do ours in a lot of ways, Mr. Speaker. It's not that hard to build infrastructure and add to that infrastructure the sensory devices so that we can actually get the warning signals when people do get across such a barrier. We can do all of that. We can

do it with the resources that we have. We can do it well up into the 90-some percentile of efficiency with the money that we have, and we can shut off the jobs magnet.

All we need to do is pass the New IDEA Act. IDEA, the Illegal Deduction Elimination Act. It clarifies that wages and benefits paid to illegals are not tax deductible. It lets the IRS come in. Under their normal auditing process, they would run the employees through E-Verify. When they'd run the employees through E-Verify, then we would give the employer safe harbor if they'd use E-Verify. That's a nice, comforting thing. Each employer would want to have that. If the IRS concludes that you've knowingly, willingly, or neglectfully been employing illegals, they would rule that wages and benefits paid to them are not a business expense. That means, out of your Schedule C, that money comes out and goes over into the gross receipts again and shows up in the bottom line as taxable income, and your \$10-an-hour illegal employee turns into a \$16-an-hour illegal employee, and it becomes a prudent business decision on the part of the employer to use E-Verify to clean up his workforce.

So there are two simple things, Mr. Speaker:

We can provide that border security with the resources that we have by adding infrastructure, by adding and utilizing technology in addition to—and I have not said 2,000 miles of border fence—a fence, a wall and a fence. We just build it according to the directives of the Secure Fence Act and keep building it until they stop going around the end. We shut off the jobs magnet and restore the rule of law. Then let's have a conversation, Mr. Speaker; but until then, I'm going to stand on defending the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1800

AMERICA'S DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the most important issue of our time in this country, and really the world.

We are nearly \$17 trillion in debt and \$100 trillion in debt in unfunded promises to our children and grandchildren that they stand to inherit if we fail to act. This is an issue that my colleagues and I on the Budget Committee take very seriously, and I know that most Members of this body take very seriously.

To that end, we view our role as not only legislators, but educators. And in our great State of Indiana, I talk about this issue almost in a nauseating fashion to some, but I think it's very im-

portant that we as people, as Americans, Mr. Speaker, understand what the situation really is because at the end of the day, I am very optimistic that when given the facts, the people of this country, as President Reagan observed several years ago, will right the ship, will do the right thing. We'll start to live within our means again, and they will take control of the situation.

I don't think ultimately, Mr. Speaker, that the reform that is needed to solve this problem will actually start or come from this floor or the floor of our colleagues that we have on the other side of the rotunda. The reform and the solution to this problem will come from Main Street, will come from the farm fields and the businesses and the kitchen tables of the great patriots across this land.

So it's in that vein, Mr. Speaker, that I want to make a presentation here on the floor of the House. I also make this presentation because of the current situation that we're in with regard to our budgeting process.

As I speak with you here on the floor tonight, Mr. Speaker, we have a budget that passed the House of Representatives, we have a budget that passed the United States Senate, and after 2 months of being late, as it has been nearly every year that this current President has been in office, we finally have a budget from our President.

The main difference—well, there are several differences—but the main difference I want to point out tonight between these budgets is that the budget that came out of this House is the only one that balances. Why is that important? It's important because if you never present and pass a budget that balances—and let me remind you that a balanced approach isn't a balanced budget. Someone's opinion of a balanced approach, like our President's, doesn't mean that the budget balances, no matter how many times he or House Democrats say that.

The reason it's so important that a budget balances is because it shows your intent; it shows your intent to finally start paying off the debt. Because like everyone knows, you can't possibly start paying nearly \$17 trillion in debt until you get to a balanced budget so that you have a surplus, hopefully, and then, in fact, use that surplus to pay down the debt.

So if you present and pass a budget that never balances, you intend by what you're saying and doing there to never pay off the debt. And I would submit that when you do that, you can't call it debt any more because what you're doing is stealing. You're stealing from future Americans. You're stealing from the children of tomorrow, children that don't exist yet and therefore have no voice in the matter because they can't vote. What an easy target they are.

So when you pass and you vote for budgets that never balance, that's what you're doing, you're stealing. Let's call it what it is, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I want to be clear, this isn't a partisan set of remarks because it's not a partisan issue. In fact, it's very bipartisan, and this chart here shows that.

Going from beyond Kennedy—but I just started tracking from President Kennedy on—every one of our presidents, who represented both parties since the 1960s, have accrued increasing levels of debt. Even Mr. Clinton, with the help of this Republican House who had technically balanced budgets, I think, four times in his 8 years, still overall ran up a very slight debt.

I want to be clear that our debt problems did not start on January 20, 2009, with the inauguration of President Obama. But as this chart also shows, our debt problems have been increasingly and drastically exacerbated since that time, and we need to get this under control.

Let's take a look at exactly how much we're borrowing and what's causing this debt. And I'm grateful tonight for the help of my staff member, Zach Zagar, who is on the floor with me to help get me through these slides a little bit quicker.

We are borrowing 31 cents of every dollar the Federal Government is spending. Now, I'll admit to you, Mr. Speaker, that has actually improved. When I started making this presentation about a year and a half ago, 2 years ago, we were borrowing 42 cents of every dollar we spend. But thanks to some good revenue forecasts and especially leadership right here in the House of Representatives, we've already been able to make some sensible cuts and rein in spending that has decreased some of that spending. But again, until we stop borrowing, we cannot begin to start paying down this debt: 31 cents of every dollar, Mr. Speaker.

Let's also be honest. We've been in debt before as a country, and the question then arises, why should we worry so much now. Well, we should worry now. Let me explain why we should worry by going back to the last time that this country was in this kind of debt, when our debt level, if you include the Social Security trust fund, reached nearly and over 100 percent of gross domestic product. That time was right at the end of World War II.

So what makes our situation so different now than the last time we were in so much debt? Well, number one, the cause of our debt back at the end of World War II was much different than now. The cause of our debt back then was, in fact, the war, and it was a one-time event. One way or another, even back then, we knew it was going to end. If it ended well for us, if we won, which we did, we would have a good economy coming out of that war, we would become creditor to the world and we would begin paying down that debt. In fact, that's exactly what happened. If we had lost World War II, I guess it wouldn't really matter how much debt