

surface of the Moon, but around our Nation. Our generation is tasked with recapturing the American spirit that put a man on the Moon by saying “yes” to American ingenuity in the 21st century. In that vein, Mr. Speaker, we as lawmakers must enact legislation that makes that goal a reality—things like enacting commonsense laws like the Made in America Act, which fosters a new era for American manufacturing and protects American jobs, or, once and for all, declaring energy independence for our Nation.

Now is our moment to honor the accomplishment and legacy of the Moon landing by ensuring continued success and independence of America for generations to come.

TRAYVON MARTIN

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. As a mother and an American, I am well aware that this Nation is a nation of laws. And our system of justice speaks, and the reason why we are a democracy is because we adhere to that. But I'm proud of my constituents and others in Houston, Texas, who saw the need to petition and to be able to join the family of Trayvon Martin in praying to petition their Federal Government. That is America, Mr. Speaker—that all Americans have a right to come and petition their government.

Thank you for being peaceful. Thank you for being prayerful. Thank you for being ready to speak in tones seeking justice, but doing it in a way that is respectful of our system, and ready to be able to achieve what your desires are through continuing to pray and be peaceful. In Houston, Texas, that is what occurred. And I want to say thank you for that peace and that respect of the dignity and democracy that America is, and the respect for Trayvon Martin's family.

TRAYVON MARTIN

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Trayvon Martin, a young constituent of mine that lived only blocks away from me, was brutally murdered in Sanford, Florida.

I know within my heart and will always know that things should have been different. But I accept the law. I was one of the loudest voices calling for a fair trial for Trayvon after he was profiled racially. He was followed, he was harassed, and he was shot in the heart.

On Sunday, in Miami-Dade County, all of the churches held prayer services. All of the churches prayed for the Martin and Fulton families. All of us are so saddened because we have lost our son, our son Trayvon, who was only

16 years old. He had only been 17 for 2 weeks.

God bless our justice system, that they will see that it should not end here. We must make sure that justice prevails for Trayvon Martin.

□ 1930

WE ALL ARE ONE

(Mrs. BACHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I am a mother of five biological children and of 23 wonderful foster children. My heart is broken, as my colleague's heart is broken, over any teenager whose life is taken away from them.

But I believe without a shadow of a doubt that it doesn't matter the color of a person's skin in the United States when it comes to justice. Lady Justice has a blindfold over her eyes because justice is colorblind. Justice shouldn't look at the color of our skin or our ethnicity or our financial background.

Facts have to be recognized as facts. Law has to be recognized as law. No matter if we are White or Black or Hispanic or Asian, whatever our background, justice must be served. That's why we need to stand up and stand up for justice in this country, not have justice that is separate for Blacks or separate for Hispanics or separate for Whites. We all need to be one under our law.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we are here to talk about something that is a rather important subject. Immigration has helped make us the greatest Nation in the world, and we want that to continue. We do not ever want our borders closed; we want them secured.

Here to help in this conversation is my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA), to whom I yield such time as he may consume.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I believe the problem is simple: we need to secure our borders first. You wouldn't replace your carpet at home if you still had a hole in the roof.

When you take that position, the question you are usually asked by people who support open borders is: Well, what do you want to do about the 11 million people who are here illegally?

I usually answer that question with another question: What do you want to do with the 22 million Americans who couldn't find work this morning when they woke up? What do you want to do about the legal immigrants who came to America for an opportunity, with the opportunity that America promises

for those who come here for a better life? What do you want to do about the high school dropout who has to wash dishes and may lose their job? Where do they go? What do you want to do about the single mom who works three jobs just to put food on the table so she could feed her family? What happens to her?

Why when we talk about immigration reform is it always about the 11 million illegal immigrants who came here knowingly breaking America's laws? What about the legal Americans? What about the American workers? Where is their voice in this debate? Who's speaking for them?

When it comes down to immigration reform, I believe the answer is simple: let's secure America's borders first and protect America's workers.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend from Pennsylvania's comments.

It is interesting, and it really is heartbreaking, when you see so many people, like all of the masses that were here in Washington, to protest over the ObamaCare bill. Anyway, it is rather dramatic. The unions are now coming out. Of course union leaders were all for ObamaCare. Many of us said back at the time: Do you know what, when the union members find out what the union leaders have done to them in supporting ObamaCare, they are going to be exceedingly upset.

Now when you look at the results of ObamaCare forcing so many people to part-time work—as my friend from Pennsylvania was alluding to, people now have been relegated to part-time work—they may lose that. When you combine the devastation of ObamaCare and people that are losing their jobs and are being forced to part-time work and now having to do more than one part-time job with less benefits, and then you add on it the Senate bill, especially for African Americans here, it is absolutely devastating. It is a devastating one-two punch to the gut of America when you look at the Senate bill and how many Americans will be really troubled to find employment.

We have other people that are here that also wish to be heard. I yield such time as he may consume to my friend from Louisiana, Dr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. I want to thank my friend, LOUIE GOHMERT—Judge Gohmert—for having this hour together speaking on this important subject. My friend also is my neighbor. Our districts neighbor one another.

We have constituents who see this issue, I think, very consistently, that is, that when we poll them, when we talk to our constituents, they are very clear on the issue of immigration. They say first and foremost, Congressman FLEMING, whatever you do, do what Congress and the Presidents have not been willing to do, and that is secure the border and put internal security in that will prevent the visa overstays that are 40 percent of those.

We have two lingering questions on the whole issue of immigration:

One is, is immigration good for America? I would suggest to you that immigration has been good for America. All of our Forefathers, they were immigrants. They came here with the idea that they would receive religious liberty, they would receive opportunity when it comes to the economy, and they were quite willing and happy to contribute to that.

But do you know what, there was no safety net. You had to dig it out of the land yourself. Over the years, particularly by the mid-60s, this Nation began to develop a very, very steep safety net program, now 80 different welfare programs.

This has been looked at very closely by the Heritage Foundation. What they tell us is that by having open borders, such as what we have now and will have in the future if we were to pass something like the Senate amnesty bill, that the cost to Americans would go up. One study I recently read said that for every household that receives amnesty, it is going to cost the hard-working taxpayers of America \$12,433.

So I would suggest to you that immigration can be a good thing for the economy—not open-border immigration, not illegal immigration, but legal immigration. What do I mean by that? That means that we allow a guest-worker program where people can come in and work our farms, work our trees. I have a lot of that in my district. But also the high end, the STEM workers—the scientists, technology people, engineering, math—where they can contribute so much to our country. Physicians coming from Asia, so many of those can do many good things.

The other thing is trust. We have a trust deficit in this country right now. I've spoken about it before. We have the Dodd-Frank Act, which is barely implemented even after 3 years. Much of it probably will never be implemented. We have ObamaCare, which is about 3 years old. Much of it can't be implemented. We have a President who couldn't get Cap and Trade passed, so he's trying to pass regulations to do that. We have a President who couldn't get the DREAM Act passed, so he rolled out a regulation to make it occur as an end run around Congress. We have a President who has tried to convert the NLRB from a very balanced board to really manage labor unions and their relationship with management to a very pro-union political tool for government.

So when we have a situation like that, what we really have is a President that picks and chooses the laws that he wants to enforce and he wants to obey and he wants to acknowledge and ignore the rest. By passing all of these massive comprehensive bills that Senators and Members of Congress don't even read before they are passed, all we are doing is offering a smorgasbord to the President that he can pluck just the parts that he wants, and he could add some more if he chooses to do that.

Well, that makes him no longer a President. That makes him a ruler, and that is not the kind of government we have. We have a balance between three branches of government. That's the way our Founding Fathers determined it to be, and that's the way it should be today.

I join my colleagues, I think, in this understanding, and that is that such legislation that passes from this House, or from the Senate for that matter, if in fact it creates an open border, a porous border, or in any way creates amnesty or a pathway to citizenship and we have not dealt with and certified, made verifiable borders that are under secure control by our government, a sovereign government, and that we handle the visa overstay problems that we monitor and protect from that, if we have not done that, then we have not done our constitutional duties as Members of the House of Representatives.

I thank my friend so much. And my other friends—we are filled with Members here who are ready to talk on this issue passionately—I think you are going to hear a lot more from this group that's here tonight as we talk more about this issue.

I would just say, lastly, that we need to decide what is important for America first. We should determine what is good for the American citizens and the taxpayers. We certainly want to handle anybody who is here illegally in a humane way; but on the other hand, our first and most important responsibility is to the American citizens who are hardworking taxpayers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that it is not in order to engage in personalities toward the President.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I appreciate very much my friend from Louisiana. We do border at our State lines there. We can be just the best of friends and never worry about somebody being moved into the other person's district for redistricting purposes. But I appreciate so much the perspective. As a person who spent his professional life and his training all geared toward helping others, administering to others, and addressing their needs, I appreciate that perspective of an excellent physician here.

At this time, I would also like to yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas for pulling this together and for yielding.

I recognize the admonishment from the Speaker. I don't think, though, that we are constrained from raising objection when the President of the United States willfully violates his oath of office. It is not a personality issue; it is a constitutional issue.

I would direct, Mr. Speaker, the attention to article II, section 3, in the United States Constitution that says that the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

I have pointed out to folks of less education than anybody in this room that that doesn't mean you execute the law in a fashion you give it the death penalty. What it really means instead is that you carry it out, you enforce the law.

I know that the President has taken an oath to do that, and he understands it. He gave a speech at a high school here in Washington, D.C. on March 28, 2011. When they asked him: Why don't you enact the DREAM Act by executive order, he said: I know you want me to do that, but I don't have the constitutional authority to do that. You've been studying the Constitution in high school and you know this: that the legislature, that's Congress, passes the laws; the President's job in the executive branch is to enforce the laws, and the judicial branch is to interpret the laws.

Well, that is pretty clean and concise, and it is appropriate to be coming from a former adjunct professor of law at the University of Chicago; but he forgot his own lesson, and he forgot his own lesson a number of times, not only with immigration, but No Child Left Behind—waived it. It is just a directive from the United States Congress signed by a previous President, and he waived No Child Left Behind.

How about welfare-to-work, that long battle that lasted about 2 years here and resulted in who-knows-how-many vetoes by Bill Clinton, but he finally signed it. There was not room in there for the President to waive the work side of welfare, but he did it anyway.

□ 1945

When it comes to the immigration law, the directive there is that, when law enforcement encounters people who are unlawfully present in the United States, they are compelled to place them in removal proceedings. They shall be placed. That's the law. It doesn't say "may." We have had to now mount litigation against the President of the United States, in the name now of Janet Napolitano, to compel him by pleading to the court to keep his own oath of office.

All of this is about expanding the dependency class in America. This is about making government bigger. It is about what the end result is—higher taxes. It's about borrowing more money from the Chinese and the Saudis to run our government. The President got to the point where he didn't like his own law, ObamaCare, and announced in this pretty-hard-to-figure-out way—I wasn't actually watching the Web site of the second in command of the U.S. Treasurer when the announcement came out—that we're going to extend ObamaCare and the mandate on employers by another year. He has no constitutional authority to do that either. The ObamaCare legislation says that the employer mandate shall be enacted each month after December 31, 2013. It doesn't say "may." It says "shall." The only way

the President gets any of this authority that I've mentioned is by coming back to Congress and asking us to approve it.

Now, when you see the rule of law undermined, Mr. Speaker, and when you see that the lines between article I, the legislative branch, and article II, the executive branch, are willfully blurred by the President of the United States, it eventually brings out a constitutional crisis. In the middle of all this constitutional crisis, we have, according to the people who want to grant amnesty, 11 million people who are unlawfully present in the United States. The law refers to them as "illegal aliens." The President has said, I will not enforce the law against them unless they have committed a felony or three mysterious misdemeanors.

They have pushed legislation in the United States Senate that says, really, this: other than those exceptions that I've mentioned—those who have committed felonies and have been caught at it, and I suppose if they would admit to it that would be another category in which they'd be disqualified—and other than those who have committed those mysterious misdemeanors, setting that aside, everybody who came to America before December 31, 2011, gets legalized, however they got here. Of course, especially if they arrived here illegally and if they overstayed their visas, they get legalized under the Senate Gang of Eight bill. Then, for those who would arrive after December 31, 2011, there is an implied promise that they have as much moral standing as the people who would receive the amnesty in the act of the law, so the implication powerfully is they also would receive their amnesty in their due time.

So that is the definition, Mr. Speaker, of perpetual amnesty—amnesty that goes on forever. We are still working on restoring the rule of law since Ronald Reagan's 1986 amnesty act. We are working to restore it. If this Gang of Eight bill is passed or if legalization passes this Congress, what that says is all of those years of seeking to restore immigration law after the '86 amnesty act are all wasted. All of that labor, all of that effort, all of that preaching on principle and going back to the constitutional core is all wasted if we legalize people here. It's also retroactive amnesty. Anybody who is here or anybody who could ever get here, other than those exceptions that I mentioned, gets the path to citizenship. Whether you make it one more step or one less step, it's the same thing. It's a path to citizenship.

"Amnesty." We should understand what it is. To grant amnesty is to pardon immigration lawbreakers and to reward them with the objective of their violations. That's "amnesty." I will debate anyone at any time on amnesty. I'm ready to do that any time myself, and I've defined "amnesty" for a long time. The American people understand what it is even if they don't articulate it exactly the way that I suggested.

Not only is it perpetual amnesty for anybody who is here and for anybody who would come here, it's also retroactive amnesty, which means, of those folks who were deported in the past, the bill actually sends an invitation through the language in the law that says we didn't really mean it. We really didn't mean it. It's retroactive. Why don't you reapply and come to the United States. We'll put you in the same path as those other folks who jumped in ahead of the line and violated the law—committed the crime of crossing the border if they crossed it illegally or overstayed their visas—committed a violation of a civil misdemeanor, which is still serious. Then of those who worked here, most all of them, if they were unlawfully present in the United States and if they lawfully could not work in the United States, committed document fraud in order to pull that off. The bill also grants amnesty for those who committed document fraud, and it grants amnesty for those who knowingly and willfully hired people who are unlawfully present in the United States and legally can't work. That's the situation we're dealing with.

Mr. Speaker, we're dealing with the destruction of the rule of law at least with regard to immigration law. If we can't reconstruct respect for the rule of law in the years since 1986, how in the world would anybody think we could reconstruct the rule of law in the years since 2013? How could anybody think that because they want enforcement in the future that they have to sacrifice the rule of law today? How could they think that sacrificing the rule of law today doesn't mean that you've sacrificed the rule of law for the duration of the life of this Nation at least with regard to immigration? If you can make the argument that the rule of law can be set aside forever with regard to immigration, how then do you make the argument that there isn't some other sector of the law that has as much merit as those folks whom they're trying to get legalized now?

There isn't anybody under the bill in the Senate or under the amnesty provisions that have been proposed here in the House who isn't going to be put in front of the line of those people who are in a foreign country politely and respectfully waiting their turns. There are at least 5 million people in various visa categories who have respected American law, and they're waiting in their home countries for the opportunity to come into the United States. We need to respect them. We need to respect the millions of legal immigrants who have followed the law to come into the United States lawfully and to follow the path of citizenship lawfully.

I will give you an example, Mr. Speaker, of just last Friday when I was invited to speak before the State convention of the American Legion. They held it in Sioux City, Iowa. I was privileged to be there, and I gave a speech

and talked about history and patriotism and those things that one would find in that scenario. At the conclusion of this speech, I presented the medals to an American veteran who had not received the medals that he had earned. The certifications were not in order, and we had put those certifications back in order and had acquired all of his medals that he had had coming. We put them on a framework, and I presented them to this man. The man's name is—it's in the press in Sioux City now, I'm sure—Raul Macias.

He came into the United States from Mexico at age 22. He married an American and was nationalized as an American citizen. He joined the Army at age 31 and was deployed over into Germany as a cold warrior when we were lined up against the Soviet Union. At one point, he wandered across the border into East Germany and was picked up by those folks wearing those uniforms. Thankfully, they released him and let him come back. He served our country, and he served our country proudly and honorably.

After all of the words that I said on Friday and after I presented him the medals, I also presented him the microphone and said, This is your opportunity to speak. He said three words in his acceptance speech: "Thank you, America."

That's a man who did it the right way—the kind of people we need to respect by the millions in this country who did it the right way.

It's no respect to them if we destroy the rule of law. Legalization is destruction of the rule of law, and legalization is a path to citizenship. We must preserve, protect, defend, restore, and refurbish the rule of law with our immigration policy in the House. We are the last stop. We are the defense. We are the redoubt for the rule of law right here. I'm glad to count a lot of people in this Congress my friends. I'm glad to count those who stand for the rule of law as my closest friends.

I appreciate the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. I appreciate those observations so much, and it brings to mind our colleague from down in central Texas who is also a former district judge. He and I share that, but he was a district judge twice as long as I was.

So many people say, Well, you've got to have compassion. Despite the allegations from friends on the other side, we have compassionate Republicans, and our hearts break for people. For one thing, there are all of those people who are out of work who really want to work now, and we haven't created that environment—through ObamaCare, through the welfare state, through the problems with not respecting and adhering to the law when it comes to securing the border. The government has the obligation, from both a Biblical perspective and a secular perspective, of enforcing the law and of making sure the people within its boundaries

are protected who are lawfully there. That is the obligation.

Sometimes defendants would come before me as they'd come before Judge CARTER, from central Texas, during his days on the bench. They'd know you were a Christian, and they'd bring a big Bible and try to play on your senses—well, you've got to have compassion. I've got a big Bible here, and God has worked in my life, so now don't sentence me harshly. Judge CARTER had one gentleman come before him who said, Judge, I know you're a Christian, so you've got to have forgiveness, and you've got to forgive me. Judge CARTER replied, Sir, individually, I do forgive you, but the State of Texas sentences you to 20 years in prison.

There is a difference. Individually, you can have that compassion and should, but when you're acting as the government, people expect you to have respect for the law, adherence to the law, so that there is a country in which people can come and feel safe, at least reasonably so, and understand that the law is going to be applied across the board.

We have also been joined by our friend from Alabama. I am proud to have had him join Congress back 2½ years ago in the great sweep, so I yield to my friend Mr. BROOKS from Alabama.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Thank you, Mr. GOHMERT.

I have a firm belief that, if the people understand the truth, then they'll make the right decision. There have been a number of arguments advanced by the other side on this immigration-illegal alien debate that are misleading at best, and I'm going to touch on a couple of them with your permission.

First and foremost, there is the argument advanced that our economy is going to do better, and, hence, Americans will do better. Half of that is right. Bear in mind that the Senate Gang of Eight bill legalizes, at a minimum, 11 million illegal aliens who are now present in the United States of America. Also bear in mind that, over the next decade, according to the Department of Homeland Security report, the Senate Gang of Eight bill will bring into America lawfully, roughly, 33 million foreigners who are not here presently. Now put those numbers together—11 million legalized plus 33 million to come in lawfully. That totals 44 million lawful workers added to the American workforce. That is out of 144 million total number of people who are employed in the United States economy, according to the June—last month—of 2013 Bureau of Labor Statistics.

If you look at these numbers—if you bring in 44 million people—of course America's gross national product and gross domestic product are going to increase, but the misleading part of it is this: that does not necessarily translate into a higher standard of living for Americans and foreigners who are lawfully in America. Let me explain.

The key is not the total GNP or GDP for our country. The key is the total GNP and GDP per capita. If our gross domestic product goes up a little bit but the population goes up a great amount, then we, individually—American families, individually—are now living under lower economic conditions. Stated differently, our standard of living has declined; and, in that vein, rather than just making an argument, I want to share some data that buttresses that argument.

The Congressional Budget Office, which has been rather kind in my judgment to its evaluation of the Senate Gang of Eight legislation, issued a report called “The Economic Impact of S. 744.”

□ 2000

This report was issued just last month in June of 2013. I'm going to quote for the record parts of that report:

S. 744 would lower per capita gross national product by seven-tenths of 1 percent in 2023.

So over the next 10-year period of time, rather than our GNP growing per capita and America doing better individually, it declines under this bill. It's not just stagnant, the kind of stagnation that we have suffered for the last 5 or 6 years or so. There is a decline in GNP per capita, which means that the amount of money each American household has to spend to take care of their daily needs goes down because of the Senate Gang of Eight bill, because it is both legalizing and admitting into our country a total of 44 million foreigners who are going to be seeking jobs that Americans already have or that Americans want.

Further in the report:

Average wages for the entire labor force would be one-tenth of 1 percent lower in 2023” because of Senate bill 744. By 2016, just 3 years from now, that would be four-tenths of a percent lower, where our wages again are going down.

Also notably, in another admission, S. 744 will “slightly raise the unemployment rate through 2020.”

So not only do we have a suppression because of this amnesty, because of this open-borders nature of the Senate Gang of Eight bill of individual incomes, we also have more Americans who are unemployed, according to the Congressional Budget Office

I think that their numbers, quite frankly, are rather kind to the Gang of Eight bill. I think it's going to be much worse. In that vein, let me share some other data points. According to The Heritage Foundation report that was issued a few months ago:

Unlawful immigration appears to depress the wages of low-skill U.S. born and lawful immigrant workers by 10 percent, or \$2,300 per year. Unlawful immigration also drives many of our most vulnerable U.S. foreign workers out of the labor force entirely.

That's a big number, a drop in wages of \$2,300 per year for low-skill American born and lawful immigrant workers.

Here's another study, a 2009 study by the Pew Hispanic Center that concluded that there were 7.8 million illegal aliens who were holding jobs in America. Okay? Stated differently, that's 7.8 million job opportunities that Americans have lost. Why? Well, quite frankly, because illegal aliens are often willing to work under the table, get paid under the table; because illegal aliens are often willing to work for less than Americans are; quite frankly, because illegal aliens are often willing to look the other way with respect to the worker safety laws that we have imposed in order to protect our American workers from bodily harm. There were 7.8 million job opportunities that were lost. The Federation for American Immigration Reform thinks that number is low. They have it at 8.5 million job opportunities lost to American citizens, and that's today before the Gang of Eight bill gets implemented.

Harvard professor George Borjas found in a study released in April of 2013, again just a few months ago:

Illegal immigration reduces the wage of native workers by an estimated \$99- to \$118 billion a year.

Let me read that again:

Illegal immigration reduces the wage of native workers by an estimated \$99- to \$118 billion per year and generates a gain for businesses and other users of immigrants of \$107- to \$128 billion per year.

Is it any wonder the United States Chamber of Commerce is spending millions of dollars to try to induce America to go with the Gang of Eight bill that will legalize 11 million foreigners and add another 33 million foreigners over the next decade? They see profits coming from this increase in the size of the workforce, which in turn will decrease the wages that they pay not only to illegal aliens, but also to lawful immigrants, and also to American citizens. So that's where the United States Chamber of Commerce is coming from. They certainly have a financial interest.

Now I want to emphasize something. We should not be debating bringing in these mass numbers of foreigners into the American workforce in this kind of context. America currently suffers a 7.6 percent unemployment rate. Asian Americans suffer a 5 percent unemployment rate. White Americans suffer a 6.6 percent unemployment rate. Even worse, Hispanic Americans suffer a 9.1 percent unemployment rate. Even worse, African Americans suffer a 13.7 percent unemployment rate. And even worse, American teenagers suffer a 24 percent unemployment rate.

Does it make sense to anybody that when we have unemployment in so many different segments of our economy so high that we should legalize another 11 million workers and bring in an additional 33 million workers over the next decade to compete for jobs when Americans are having such a difficult time in this economy not only getting jobs, but getting quality jobs?

That having been said, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that it is a myth that the

economy is going to become better because of this large importation and legalization of immigrants. Sure, America's GDP will go up, but that's not the issue. The issue is whether the quality of life for individual Americans goes up, and under this legislation, virtually every study I have seen, in fact, says that it goes down. That's one of the reasons why we have to stop this.

I've got one other myth that I would like to talk about. The whole premise of this immigration law debate is that the laws need dramatic changing, they aren't working. I would submit that that's not the case at all. The problem is not so much with our immigration laws. Sure, there's some tweaking that can be done in order to make sure that we admit into our country those individuals who have particular skill sets or educational levels or wealth that will enhance our economy. Sure, we can do that kind of tweaking. But it's a myth to say that we have 11 million illegal aliens in America because of our laws. That's not the case at all. We have 11 million illegal aliens in America, quite frankly, because the White House, the executive branch of our government, has absolutely refused to enforce the laws that are on the books. And I'm not talking about just this administration. I'm talking about 20 years of neglect by the White House and the executive branch.

Let me share some numbers with you on that point, and then I'll defer back to my good colleague, Mr. GOHMERT.

In 2011, the number of Border Patrol returns plus illegal aliens deported by court order was 715,495 individuals. That's an important point to note. Okay?

You've heard the myth that this administration deports more than any administration in history, or words to that effect. That's kind of true, but it's misleading because that's only half of the number that you need to look at. It's not just the deportations by order that you look at. It is also how many times has our Border Patrol caught individuals and returned them. So in 2011, we have roughly 715,000 Border Patrol returns plus deported by court order.

Let's go back to 2008, the last President before the current President. During that year, you put those two numbers together, and it was 1.1 million that the Border Patrol returned plus deported by court order. That's a big number—64 percent more returned than in 2011, the most recent year for which I have information.

A decade ago, it was again 1.1 million Border Patrol returns plus deported by court order—62 percent more than this administration in 2011. In 1993, two decades ago, 1,285,952 illegal aliens were returned pursuant to Border Patrol returns or deported by court order—80 percent more than in 2011. In 1983, it was 950,000—33 percent more than 2011. In 1973, four decades ago, it was 585,000. And in 1963, it was 77,000 Border Patrol returns plus deported by court order.

And I want to note something about the gap between 1963 and 1973. You'll remember these welfare programs that got passed as a part of the Great Society program where America started paying foreigners to come into our country where they start accessing welfare benefits? I would submit that that is a huge incentive for why these individuals have come to America who previously would not have come here under illegal terms. But because we've got laws in place that pay and incentivize illegals to come here, that is, in fact, a major reason why they're here.

Nonetheless, the myth that the laws are the problem, is not it. It's a lack of enforcement of the laws on hand. And the myth that this administration has been really good at returning illegals, that's true only if you look at half of the problem. If you look at the whole problem, then, quite frankly, this administration in 2011 was doing far worse than previous administrations have done or as has been done in 2003, one decade ago, two decades ago, three decades ago, and four decades ago.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentleman from Alabama. Those were really amazing numbers that you provided, and we'll talk about those further.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield to my friend from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) for such time as she may consume.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas, Representative LOUIS GOHMERT, and I also thank my colleagues who preceded me and all the marvelous comments they have given: Mr. BROOKS from Alabama and the statistics that he has just given and all the other stories.

I look at the context of this issue, Mr. Speaker, and the issue of dealing with the whole strata of illegal immigration. What are we talking about? There are so many aspects. One of those aspects, of course, is the issue of why in the world isn't America's border secure today? This is something that is incomprehensible to the American people because there is something that the American people should demand and that they have a right to expect, and it is that their country has a secure border at every level. Not only just at the point of entry, but for people who come into the United States on a lawful, legal visa. The American people have a right to expect that those people also will stay for the time that we have granted those people and that they will not overstay.

The one thing that we've learned, Mr. Speaker, is that 40 percent of the problem of illegal immigration, 40 percent—4 out of 10—people are overstaying their visas. That included some of the terrorists that were involved in the 9/11 bombing. That's why this is so important.

We aren't talking just about an academic exercise, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about a national security issue. We're also talking about an economic

security issue. Because for those of us who are here on the floor this evening having this conversation, we were elected by the American people. We were elected by American citizens who have the privilege to vote in this country. We are elected by Americans, and we are here representing the interests of American citizens. And it is American citizens, Mr. Speaker, who have the obligation to pay for all of the programs that we fund here in this Chamber because our Constitution provides that all of the spending begins right here in the House of Representatives.

Spending is something we're pretty good at. We spend a lot in this House. As a matter of fact, it wasn't too long ago I was sworn in. I took the oath of office right here in this Chamber, and America was \$8.67 trillion in debt, Mr. Speaker, on that January in 2007 when I took my oath of office.

We were horrified. How were we ever going to pay off \$8.67 trillion in debt? 2007. Today that number has been running, and officially, according to our Treasury Department, it is something under \$17 trillion. But that's kind of unusual because that number has actually stayed exactly the same, according to our Treasury Department, for about 56 days running.

□ 2015

Of course we know that isn't true. We overspend by billions of dollars every day. The number is actually something pretty close to \$17 trillion. So let's think about that: \$8.67 trillion and, today, \$17 trillion in debt. Why do I bring that up? Who cares about these numbers? They're so big, we can't even comprehend them. Well, I care. I'm a mother. I have five great children and 23 foster children, and parents across America are scared to death about the kind of America their children will inherit, because any fair-minded person realizes you can't spend more money than you take in, otherwise you go to the poor house and you declare bankruptcy. And we don't want our children in that position where they declare bankruptcy.

Maybe that explains part of the reason why we have 22 million people in this country today who are looking for full-time work, and they can't find it. Twenty-two million people looking for full-time work, and what are we doing here in Congress? The Senate can't wait to give amnesty to illegal aliens, so we'll have a minimum of 11 million immediately who'd have legalization status in this country; and we would have, as Mr. BROOKS said, up to 44 million people before long in this country.

So now what are those 22 million Americans supposed to do? Mr. Speaker, I say it is America first, and the interests of the American people first. The American people need jobs. They deserve jobs. It's Americans first that we need to think about. So we have unemployed. We have a terrible debt that's growing, and we have less than anemic economic growth.

One thing Mr. BROOKS mentioned, when President Obama took office in 2008, the average household income was somewhere around \$55,000 a year. It was shocking to learn after 4 years in office, the average household is now looking at something like \$50,000 a year. That's a tremendous loss in income for the average American. As Mr. BROOKS told us earlier, Mr. Speaker, about \$1,300 a year is attributable in lost income strictly because wages are depressed because illegal aliens are working for less than the American people.

I say, Mr. Speaker, it's the American people first. It is American wages first. It is American benefit packages first. What in the world are we doing, Mr. Speaker, if we aren't thinking about how we can create more jobs for the American people first. And higher wages for the American people first. And more benefits for the American people first.

Why did the President 2 weeks ago have to unilaterally have a press conference, or release a press statement—that's apparently the way he governs these days—and say that his employer mandate for big businesses will have to be delayed a year? Why did he have to do that? Because he knows it simply doesn't work.

And yet if we have legalization for illegal aliens in the United States, we will see that very quickly we will have literally tens of millions of new people who'll have access to all of these benefits because it's not cheap, you see. Amnesty costs a fortune, you see. Because this year alone, Mr. Speaker, we're looking at \$54 billion a year. Do illegal aliens pay taxes? Yes, they do. They pay sales taxes, gas taxes, various forms of taxes. But when you take what illegal aliens are paying into the U.S. Treasury versus the benefits that they take out, that means that American citizens have to cough up an extra \$56 billion a year. It is a net drawdown on the U.S. Treasury. You see, it has consequences, Mr. Speaker, not only for the Treasury but for the American people, for my children, for Representative GOHMERT's children, and I dare say for your children as well, Mr. Speaker.

This is something we have to realize, that by year 13 of the bill that's already being considered in the United States Senate, it won't be \$56 billion a year that illegal aliens are costing the U.S. Treasury. It will be over \$100 billion a year. And when those illegal aliens come into retirement age, because you see the average age of an illegal alien is 34 years of age with less than a 10th grade education, by the time those illegal aliens come into their retirement years, it's not \$56 billion a year that it will cost the taxpayers. It is adjusted for inflation, \$150 billion a year because we're talking very expensive retirement packages.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, at the worst possible time when baby boomers like myself are getting to the point of draw-

ing down the Social Security benefits that we earned and the Medicare benefits that we earned and accessing whether it's ObamaCare or the 80-other means-tested welfare programs, at the worst possible time, Mr. Speaker, this Chamber is looking at adding over 40 million new illegal aliens into the system to redistribute wealth from American citizens who worked hard and earned that money, to redistribute it to illegal aliens that we have given legalization status so that they can have Social Security and Medicare and ObamaCare and 80 different means-tested welfare programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you this: When we go from \$8.6 trillion in debt to nearly \$17 trillion in debt, we've doubled it in about 6, 7 years' time, and then you add in 40-some million new illegal aliens, you up the benefit package from ObamaCare, all while we're seeing increased levels of unemployment, we're seeing lower rates of increases in GDP, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how compassionate is that to American children that are born in this country? How compassionate is it when their wages have gone, the average household, has gone from \$55,000 down to \$50,000? How compassionate will it be, Mr. Speaker, when our children can't even afford to have a savings account anymore because they're scraping by and their wages are lowered and their benefits are lowered and the jobs are fewer and inflation is going sky high? How is that compassionate?

Because, you see, I remember, Mr. Speaker, that my parents left me a country that was better than the one that they inherited from their parents. And my grandparents, Mr. Speaker, inherited a better country than my great grandparents left for them, and so on and so forth going back in time.

You see, I can't fathom, Mr. Speaker, nor can I fathom that Mr. GOHMERT also would do anything that would leave less than a better country for the next generation because, you see, that's what this is about. We were sent here by the American people to be about America first and, Mr. Speaker, about our children first, and whether this America that they inherit will be a better America.

And that's why this discussion that Mr. GOHMERT brought to the country tonight is so vitally important, and we can't stand by and watch our country change forever and watch our children shortchanged. And so I'm going to yield back to the gentleman from Texas because he has profoundly put in front of the American people the issue that will structurally change our country forever. You see, Mr. Speaker, there's no going back once we go down this road. And I know I've heard the gentleman from Texas speak on this many times so eloquently. I thank the gentleman for all he has done.

Mr. GOHMERT. Those are wonderful points, and it brings back to mind what someone has said before. The example of being on an airplane, the instruction

we're all given when you get on an airplane is if there's a loss of cabin pressure, you lose oxygen, then you must put your own mask on before you help others. Let's face it, America is struggling right now in a number of ways, but particularly economically. This is the worst recovery from any recession we've ever had, the longest, the poorest recovery from any recession. We're still struggling, having millions and millions of Americans out of work; and it's not because of a lack of compassion that we say we need to follow the law, we need to respect the law. It is out of respect for the rule of law, for this country. We're in a position as government, we have got to make sure that we follow our oath, that we do the best we can to make this country as strong as possible because we know there is no other country in the world that has as many people wanting to come visit or live in this country. This is number one in the world for people wanting to come visit or live.

But if we do not keep it viable, keep it strong, get the mask on, get the oxygen flowing again, get the patient strong again, then this is not going to be a place that others in the world are going to want to flee to as a refuge. It is very critical what we do here.

My friend from Minnesota brings up the point about taxes being paid. Congress some years back passed—and there are a couple of different kinds of child tax credits where actually if you're an American that's authorized to file income tax and you have a Social Security number, then you can claim those child tax credits. So we have people who are getting more money back because of the tax credit than they actually paid in, and Congress made clear you have to have a Social Security number in order to do that. But as I understand it, there were some people at the IRS who in between line dancing sessions had determined that, you know what, there's a lot of money out there by people who don't have Social Security numbers that if we got them to pay taxes, even though they're not legally here, if we got them to pay taxes, think about all the extra money that'll flow into the Treasury.

So why don't we, as a regulatory body, and we know Congress didn't authorize it, but why don't we just give them a tax ID number, even if they're illegally here, so they can be paying in all of the taxes to help the country. And an analysis earlier this year by different groups indicated that we may be, because the IRS authorized people to pay taxes into the system with tax ID numbers rather than Social Security numbers, we're probably paying out between \$1 billion and \$4 billion to people who are claiming child tax credits that are not authorized to claim those because they're illegally here.

We had newspaper reporters go out, people in the media, go out and do their own investigations and find a house here or a house there where a whole bunch of different people are

claiming that they live and that children are living there by the scores that aren't actually living there. And so it comes back and raises the issue, like Mr. BROOKS was pointing out and my friend, Mrs. BACHMANN, was pointing out that it doesn't necessarily follow that just because you give people legal status, all of a sudden you're going to be flooded with new tax dollars coming in.

I also want to point out there's this issue that keeps coming up about compassion. There is no more compassionate people in the world than the American people as a group. You'll find individuals extremely compassionate around the world. I've been in places where I'm deeply moved by how wonderful they are; but as a Nation of people, this is the most compassionate Nation in the history of the world. And individually, people in this Nation have done more to assist those suffering around the world, and it would seem to be the healthiest thing to do as a Nation, to make sure there is respect for our law, adherence to our important laws, and then make the country healthy.

Capital, we know—money, that is—investment money comes in. It flows, as the saying goes, capital is a coward. It flows into countries where it feels the safest. Make this country a strong country again economically so then we are able to go, as so many churches have, to Latin American countries, to countries around the world, and reach in and help them not by giving them a fish, as the old adage goes, but by teaching them to fish and providing them a means to have food and to make a living. That's a compassionate kind of thing.

There is no reason that Mexico should not be one of the top 10 or even top five economies in the world; and if we were the proper kind of neighbor, we would lure the hardest working Mexicans into America. We would help them have a strong, vibrant economy. But that will never happen until they have respect for and adherence to the law, and that means ending corruption. So it is critically important we live up to our oaths here. Some of us have even paid parking tickets we didn't owe because we had a Park policeman that didn't know the law.

□ 2030

It doesn't matter. The law is important to respect and to follow, and we cannot become a healthy Nation until we have that out of the Government of the United States.

We have a couple of minutes left, and I'd like to yield to my friend, Mrs. BACHMANN, to finish our time.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

I wanted to add on to the child care tax credits that you were speaking of.

There's also another redistribution of wealth item in the Tax Code. It's called the earned income tax credit. It's one of the largest redistribution of wealth

programs that we have in the United States. We give away to people who are virtually paying no taxes under the Income Tax Code, income taxes, \$70 billion a year. So people who aren't paying into the system now for income tax, they're receiving \$70 billion a year. The estimate is that, after amnesty, once we grant amnesty to illegal aliens, we'll raise that to \$80 billion a year. So we're going to increase the cost.

So what we're seeing happening, by granting amnesty to illegal aliens, we're importing a group of individuals who are tax consumers, revenue consumers out of the Treasury. And one thing that we need in this country are more people who are paying into the system, not people who are taking out of the system.

But bottom line, we need to have a country where America comes first, where the American people know that our borders are secured, that our laws will be upheld, and that the American people will come first.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2668, FAIRNESS FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2667, AUTHORITY FOR MANDATE DELAY ACT

Mr. BURGESS (during the Special Order of Mr. GOHMERT), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-157) on the resolution (H. Res. 300) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2668) to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2667) to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to discuss this evening jobs, putting Americans back to work, building our foundation for economic growth.

For many, many days now, in fact, for more than 2 years, the Democrats in the House have been discussing a project which we call Make It In America. These are strategies that we're putting forth to develop more jobs in America, to rebuild our manufacturing industry, and to bring wealth back to the United States.

I would love to comment on the issues that I've heard earlier with just

my colleagues on immigration, but I'll let that go. I would just say one thing. The last comment that was made about the earned income tax credit, I would remind my colleagues that that was a Ronald Reagan program. Take that for what you might.

Back to Make It In America. These are the basic issues. We talk about trade policy, fair trade policy, not giving away our opportunities; tax policy, to encourage manufacturing and jobs here in United States; energy policy, how we're going to renew our energy system, become energy independent, the role of clean fuels, the role of renewable fuels and gas; the labor market, education.

Perhaps the most important of all of these is a well-educated workforce. If we have that, many of these other issues would fall into place—the role of research in creating tomorrow's economy, tomorrow's businesses, the things that need to be made in the future.

But tonight we want to talk about, not the least on this, it just happens to be the lowest on this list, and that is infrastructure. It's one of those critical investments. It's the foundation upon which the economy grows or not. If we have a solid infrastructure—transportation systems, water systems, sanitation systems, communication systems, research facilities, educational facilities, that's all part of the infrastructure. Some of it is private; much of it is public investment. But this is one of the fundamental investments, along with these other issues here, that our economy has traditionally made over the years. And unfortunately, in the current situation, we seem to be falling off the power curve that created the foundation for the American economy upon which to grow.

So today, we're going to really focus on this infrastructure issue, not a new issue. Actually, George Washington, I think he was our first President, told his Cabinet Secretary, Treasury Secretary, to develop a plan to grow the economy, called, A Plan for Manufactures.

Alexander Hamilton came back to Washington with a plan. One of the many points that he raised and suggestions that Alexander Hamilton made was to create infrastructure. He said the Federal Government ought to build canals, ports, and roads, fundamental infrastructure upon which the American economy would grow. And those things were done right back at the very beginning of this country. So from the very earliest days, the Federal Government has been involved in building infrastructure.

Now, tonight, joining me are two of my colleagues, Mr. DELANEY from the great State of Maryland and Mr. CASTRO from Texas. They're going to talk about infrastructure. And I'd like now to turn to Mr. DELANEY, who has a proposal that, actually, the President of the United States suggested in his American Jobs Act program, a program that he put forth more than a year ago