

value of what these senior citizens put in the bank. It is a form of legalized theft.

Now, what morality is it that allows a government to steal from senior citizens, steal future opportunities from the next generation?

I call that immorality. Theft is immorality. You don't steal from your grandparents. You don't steal from your parents. You certainly don't steal from your children. But yet that's what we're doing.

And then when we add in this consequential issue that will structurally change America forever, and we're telling ourselves that we have an obligation to grant amnesty to tens of millions of illegal aliens?

Let's talk for a second about that bill in the Senate. The bill that the Senate passed is perpetual amnesty. It would never again allow for the Federal Government to meaningfully be able to deport any illegal alien ever again.

It almost works like magic. An illegal alien gets into the United States, all they have to do is say the magic words to the ICE agents who may pick them up, and they say, I want to apply for political asylum. Once they say that—this may shock some of the people who are watching tonight—once an illegal alien says to an ICE agent, I want to apply for political asylum, they would be granted, at taxpayer expense, a lawyer, and that lawyer would help them to gain their U.S. citizenship. What a deal.

So you come into the United States, you eventually are on your "path to citizenship," at taxpayer expense. And what form of benefits would be available to you?

Well, under the Senate bill, you can immediately get a Social Security card, and you can immediately get access to a driver's license.

If you have a Social Security card, Mr. Speaker, and if you have access to a driver's license, there's an awful lot of advantages that you could have very quick. You can apply for a lot of public subsidized benefits that can be yours, and you've got an identity, and you're on your way.

What I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, is that in this country we're generous. We're extremely generous. Every year we allow 1 million people who are not American citizens, who are foreigners, we welcome with open arms 1 million people a year as new U.S. citizens into this country. That's amazing.

We've got something over 300 million people, and we say come in, a million every year.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at all the countries in the world, there's over, what, 120 countries, more than that in the world. If you add up every country in the world, Mr. Speaker, and a lot of countries have a lot more population than we have, if you add up all those countries combined, they don't allow as many new immigrants into their countries, in all the countries of the world, as the United States of America does in 1 year.

We are amazing in our generosity. Plus there are 4 million people on a waiting list every year waiting to get into the United States. We have a system of immigration. We have a system that's worked for years.

The problem is, we have a lot of people that don't want to wait for that system to work. Four million people are waiting, are on the waiting list now. One million people got in this year, legally.

Why is it, again, that we are tripping over ourselves to help the people who have broken our laws, who are in this country?

Why is it that we aren't saying to those people, we have a waiting list; you need to go and apply and get on the waiting list and wait your turn, and then you can come into the country too.

Why are we trying to figure out a way to fast-track the illegal people?

Shouldn't we be apologizing to the people then, the 4 million people who are on that waiting list?

I also wonder—people ask me, Mr. Speaker—I also wonder why that's our top priority. Why wouldn't our top priority, Mr. Speaker, be the 22 million people who are American citizens who are looking for full-time employment right now?

Shouldn't that be our top priority, trying to figure out how we can find them a job?

You know, it's really interesting to me, in the survey that came out today from the Chamber of Commerce, they found that of all the small businesses in America, only 17 percent, fewer than one out of five small businesses hired anybody in the last 2 years.

I'm going to say that again. The Chamber of Commerce found in a survey that of all the small businesses in America, less than 17 percent, less than one out of five small businesses, and they're the engine of this economy, hired anybody on a full-time basis in the last 2 years.

That's a very sad commentary. There's not a lot of hiring. That's why I say America first, jobs first, wages for Americans first, benefits for Americans first. That's how sad this "jobless recovery" has been, which is no recovery at all.

Here's what's even worse. Less than 20 percent of small businesses say that in the next 2 years do they have any plans at all to hire.

If we know that only 17 percent of small businesses have hired in the last 2 years, and less than 20 percent will hire in the next 2 years, I don't think that we should be giving amnesty to tens of millions of illegal aliens.

Let's focus, Mr. Speaker, on America first. Let's focus on finding jobs for those 22 million who are looking for full-time jobs. Let's focus on increasing the wages for American workers first, and let's focus on increasing the benefit packages for Americans first. That's what we need to do, Mr. Speaker.

And I thank the American people for this opportunity to be a Representative and stand in the greatest well that there is in the world.

I yield back the balance of my time.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for the remainder of the time until 10 p.m.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to say, first it's a privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

And it's also interesting and engaging to listen to the gentlelady from Minnesota as she delivered her presentation here tonight with typical vigor and precision.

I looked at that poster, and it was very interesting to me. And so I see that \$400 million in 3 hours, and I divide that out, multiply it times 24, then multiply that times 56 days, and I come up with a number that's \$179.2 billion increased national debt in the period of time that none is registered.

And so putting this in perspective, it's just another example of an administration that hasn't been straight with us.

So, I come here, Mr. Speaker, to address this situation of immigration, as the gentlelady from Minnesota has. It's something that's important for all of us to understand the big picture, the full picture. And it is about economics, it's about culture, it's about civilization, it's about balancing our budget, it's about the vitality of the United States of America, and we have to be weighing all of these factors.

The immigration issue is the most complex and the most far-reaching topic that we ever deal with here in the United States Congress. And we think that ObamaCare is complicated. It is. It's a lot of pages of legislation. But also the bad things that are flowing from it were predicted here from this spot by many of us on our side of the aisle. It was understandable for us.

But because it's somewhat objective to be able to look at the formulas and see what's going to happen and know what insurance policies do, the immigration issue goes deeper. And it's the multiplication of current demographics and how they blend with future demographics, and what we might do, and all of the things that flow from it.

So as the gentlelady from Minnesota said, the net cost on the Senate's Gang of Eight bill turns out to be \$6.33 trillion, \$6.3 trillion, Mr. Speaker. And that's what that group will generate. Let's see—the net cost, \$6.3 trillion, they will pay, there's \$9.4 trillion all together dealing with this. There will be \$3.1 trillion in taxes paid. The benefits, \$9.4 trillion in benefits drawn down by the group of people who would be given amnesty under the Senate version of the bill.

They would pay \$3.1 trillion in taxes over their lifetime, and the net figure

would be \$6.3 trillion that would come out of the pockets of the taxpayers to add on to that nearly \$17 trillion in national debt that we have today.

And the study that was done by Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, I saw a little piece on the Internet here a couple of nights ago where someone described it as "the much maligned study." Well, I'm occasionally the much maligned Member of Congress, but I don't notice that that makes me any less accurate or any less factual in the positions that I take. They are soundly based, and so were the analyses and the study done by Robert Rector in his study to show us the net cost of the amnesty act that's passed out of the Senate today, and not yet messaged to the House, but passed out of the Senate.

And that's just the economic cost. And he showed, by formula, there are always exceptions to this. When you're dealing with human beings, there are always exceptions.

But by formula, the newly arriving, those that are here illegally, those that would come in the next waves or two, as Mrs. BACHMANN said, there'd be an average of about a tenth-grade education. People who are high school dropouts or high school graduates, on average, cannot sustain themselves in this society without welfare benefits.

We are a cradle-to-grave welfare state. We have at least 80 different means-tested welfare programs in the United States.

□ 2145

They range from the food stamp program to temporary assistance to needy families to the WIC program. And it goes on and on. The heat subsidies, rent subsidies. No one has them all memorialized, Mr. Speaker, which means no one can figure out how they interrelate with each other, how they interact with each other, or how people react on that interaction of those 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs.

But we know this. At a certain point, if you pile on more and more welfare, even those who are quite ambitious are eventually going to be living better than those that are working hard and smart. And so what it does is in a way it bribes people to leave the workforce and go on the welfare roles or transition from the workforce into the welfare roles. That's going on all over America. That's one of the reasons why, in this country of about 316 million people in this country, we have so many people that are on the welfare system and this workforce that Mrs. BACHMANN talked about of 22 million who are looking for a full-time job.

Here's some other data from the Department of Labor's Web site. You go and look at the numbers there of those who are simply not in the workforce. They might have retired early on their own money, they might be on SSI disability, they might be on anything, all but unemployment. Those folks might

be homemakers. They might be in school. They might be doing nothing. But when you add all of them up that are simply not in the workforce, of working age, that number comes to over 88 million people. And when you add the official unemployed to that, some number approaching 13 million people, it's clear that for the last 5 to 6 years we have had over 100 million people in this country who are simply not in the workforce but are of working age.

Now, I don't conclude that every one of them can go to work or are suitable for work, but I would say this. If we need more workforce, Mr. Speaker, why in the world would we grant amnesty, a path to citizenship, and full access to those 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs for 11 million or 22 million or 33 million people that are in the United States illegally? Why would we give them American jobs when we have Americans here who are not in the workforce?

One of the jobs we should do in this Congress is constantly be thinking and pushing and promoting legislation that increases the average annual individual productivity of the people in our country. And I watched as some of the libertarian CATO economists will tell us, well, we have to open our borders and bring in 11 million or 22 million or 33 million or 44 million or 55 million people because that's how we grow our economy, and we can't grow our economy unless we do that. Some even say that the fertility rate is higher with newly arriving immigrants, especially illegal immigrants. I think that that's drawing a conclusion that's not necessarily supportable by the data that's out there. It might just be by observation.

But to bring people in and give them jobs while Americans are looking for jobs is the wrong thing to do. And just because somebody increases the GDP doesn't mean they're a net contributor to our economy or our society. Say there's someone 50 years old and never worked a day in their life and never lifted a finger. It's completely possible in this society today. That person hasn't contributed to the GDP by anything they've produced, perhaps by what they've consumed, but at best they can be break even. They can't be a net increase.

But if that individual goes out and does an hour's worth of work and receives an hour's worth of pay and produces an hour's worth of product, good, or service that has marketable value here or abroad, they've contributed to the gross domestic product by the value of that hour's work that they've contributed.

So, by that theory, CATO economists say all the people that we would legalize in amnesty that are illegal today, presuming that they will work, they will help grow our economy. Sure, they would, but they also would contribute to the necessary loss to the taxpayers because they can't sustain themselves.

That doesn't mean that there aren't good, smart, productive legal immigrants that can contribute and can be a net increase to our economy. There are quite a number of them, if you count them. But statistically, by a wide margin, the lower and undereducated cannot contribute. They cannot be a net contributor to this society. That's proven clearly by the Heritage Foundation study done by Robert Rector. It's something the American people need to look at. It's not been effectively rebutted by the people that disagree. They have another agenda.

So I have put this argument out in this way, Mr. Speaker. I used to take the position that there was nothing in the Senate Gang of Eight amnesty bill that was good for the American people. Why would Americans do this? Why? Mark Steyn wrote an op-ed about 3 or 4 months ago. He laid out some of the data, and the last sentence was one word, a question, "Why?" Why would America do this? Why would we bring in the equivalent of the population of Canada and throw in New Zealand's population while we're at it, if I remember his statement correctly. Why?

Well, not because it contributes to the social, economic, or cultural well-being of the United States of America. That wouldn't be why. That is what kind of an immigration policy we need, yes. But it's because it isn't true that no Americans benefit from this. If you look at narrow self-interests, there are three categories of Americans that benefit from the illegal immigration that they would like to see legalized and they would like to see the perpetual flow of new illegal immigration coming in so there are people lining up for the next amnesty. There are three classes of people, three categories of people.

One is the elitists that believe that somehow they've got a birthright to live in gated communities and have cheap labor to clean their houses and mow their lawns and weed their flower gardens and maybe wash their car and make sure their lives are as smooth as they'd like to have them be. That's an elitist attitude if they think they want to have discounted labor to do that.

I had a meeting with a group of elitists in the great Northeast and one of them said to me, I went down to the day labor parking place and I needed somebody to come up and weed my garden and clean up around the place. I offered him \$15 an hour, and nobody would take the money. You've got to pass an immigration bill. I don't have enough access to people that can take care of my lawn and my garden and my yard. He thought \$15 an hour should have hired anybody, but I'm really certain that it's been a lot of years since he's worked for \$15 an hour.

So I said to him, If you can't hire somebody to mow your lawn and if you don't have time to do that yourself, maybe you should get an apartment down in the big city and sell your house to somebody that can either pay

the wages necessary or do it themselves. That's how the economy has to work. It's supply and demand. And the value of a commodity in the marketplace is determined by supply and demand, Mr. Speaker. Whether it's corn or beans or gold or oil or labor, it's supply and demand.

And people say, well, there's work that Americans won't do. I completely reject that theory. It's offensive to me to hear from elitists that there's work that Americans won't do. I don't know if you can find work that my family hasn't done. I'm pretty confident you can't find work we've refused to do. But we try to be, I often say, hard-working Americans.

Well, we also have to be smart-working Americans. Smart and hardworking Americans. It's not good enough in this society to just work hard anymore. You've got to work smart at the same time.

So, when we do that, we market our wages to the point where we can sustain ourselves in this society. Or, if you can't get that done, you supplement it by some of the 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs. But when you think that there's work that Americans won't do, when people say that, I would argue, no, I think that you can hire an American to do anything, anything that's decent and just and right and moral.

There's honor and dignity in all work. You just have to bid up the price until you get the people to do the work. I've had to do that in most of my business life.

I started a construction company in 1975. And, yes, I had to hire people, and I was proud of the work we did. We put some long, hard hours in in difficult conditions. But in order to have people show up for work the next day, you had to pay them an adequate wage for the day before. And when I found that I couldn't hire the right people for the wages I was paying, I raised the wages and I increased the benefit package, and we hired the people we needed and we kept the people that we needed. That seems to be beyond the realm of the way of thinking of a lot of elitists' attitudes here that say there's work that Americans won't do.

So I just say, okay, I'll prove it to you. Somebody is going to have to front the money to do this. But I'd say this. I can hire Bill Clinton to mow my lawn. I might have to pay him a million dollars, but I could hire him to mow my lawn. I might have to pay him \$2 million or \$10 million, depending how much I might want to tease this situation.

But you understand my point, Mr. Speaker. You have to bid it up. At some point, somebody's going to take the bid. Just like when you're waiting to get on an airplane and somebody has to get bumped from a seat and they start to auction that off and say, I'll give you a \$400 ticket to fly someplace else. Somebody decides to take that. If not, they up the ante again and again.

Up the ante, up the ante, and somebody will take the bid. You auction this off in a way until somebody steps up to do the work.

Americans will always do the work, Mr. Speaker. We have always done the work. And we need to keep the work here at home and we need to make sure that the people in this country that have the skills and have the desire are going to work. If they don't have the desire, it might just be that the safety net that is our 80 different means-tested welfare programs has turned into a hammock and they've gotten lazy on us. If that happens, you need to dial that down a little bit so the hammock is no longer so much a hammock as it is a safety net. When that happens, some of those folks will decide, I'm going to climb out of this safety net and I'm going to go to work, and I'm going to contribute to the GDP and I'm going to earn enough that I can sustain myself and my family.

There was a time not that long ago—25 years ago, maybe now 30 years ago—when a young man could grow up and graduate from high school and look over to the beef plant and decide, I want to get a job there and go punch that time clock and make good wages and make my living in there processing meat. And you need that if you are going to eat it, anyway. So they would aspire to do so and go punch that time clock and work there every day, and they would work there for 40, 45 years. And they would be making, each year, about the same amount of money as a teacher does with a college degree. And that went on until they started bringing illegal labor in to drive the wages down in the packing plant.

Today, teachers are making about twice as much as that guy that's working in the packing plant. And that young man—especially young men, and young women also. But that young man now that decides that he doesn't have a future ahead in college, he can no longer go in and punch the time clock and make a living and pay for a modest house over a lifetime and maybe provide an opportunity for his kids that want to go to college. That opportunity isn't there anymore.

So they drift off onto the welfare programs, and some of them drift off into drugs and some of them leave the community because they're being underbid by people who will work cheaper, that are more mobile, that aren't lawfully present in the United States, that came here to live in the shadows. And my colleagues will say, well, we have to bring the 11 million out of the shadows because it's the right thing to do. Well, is it? What's our moral obligation for those folks?

I believe in the dignity of every human person. I think we owe them that respect and that dignity. But to solve a problem that they created by their own action by sacrificing the rule of law and rewarding people who broke the law with a path to citizenship, American jobs, the right to vote as a

reward for breaking the law, do you think, Mr. Speaker, they're going to raise their children then to respect the rule of law if they're the beneficiaries of breaking it by the tens of millions—11 million, 22 million, 33 million, maybe 44 million people? It changes the culture in the United States of America when you inject millions of people in who are rewarded for breaking the law.

My friends down in the Senate side and some here in the House will say, But they have to go to the back of the line. It's not amnesty. They're going to have to pay a fine. They're going to have to pay back taxes. It's an onerous road to get to citizenship under the plan of the Gang of Eight.

Well, is it as onerous as maybe living in the shadows? They're not living in the shadows, Mr. Speaker. They come into my office. They plug their Obama phones in to charge them, which is about the height of an entitlement attitude. They're not living in the shadows. They're out in the open lobbying Congress as open and blatant as can be with disrespect for the rule of law. They erode the rule of law.

By the way, for the 11-plus million people, outside this country there are at least 5 million who respect the law, who are lined up in their home country the right way to come into America the legal way. And what do we say to them? We're going to take 11 million or 22 million or 33 million people and we're going to make them go to what we define as the back of the line? But if it's in the United States, it's not the back of the line. The line is outside the United States, 5 million long. So are they going to say, Go to the back of line; go back to your home country and get in the back of the line?

Have you ever, Mr. Speaker, stood in a line and thought, Well, I'm almost there. It's been a long wait. I want to get into the movie theater. Maybe I've got to visit the men's room, and the line gets longer on you instead of shorter. What's more frustrating than having respect for rules and the rule of law and having to back up because somebody else cut in front? And how long are you going to have patience with that?

I oppose amnesty. I oppose perpetual and retroactive amnesty, and I support the rule of law. I'm going to continue to defend this rule of law and defend this country so that we can send to our children the promise that came from our Founding Fathers: the future of an American destiny above and beyond the Shining City on the Hill.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HORSFORD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medical mandated recovery.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.