

have gone on. We certainly have a lot more people down there than we had before that. We have 20,000 people, our men and women in the Border Patrol. They work hard and do a good job.

It is an "all of the above" approach. So I wanted to get that off my chest.

Does it make sense to spend \$25 billion to build a wall that we may need less than 100 miles? Probably not. Absolutely not.

The people who are coming across our border with Mexico are not Mexicans. They used to be. There are more Mexicans going back into Mexico from the United States than are coming into the United States from Mexico. The places where a lot of illegal immigration is coming from are three countries: Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador.

Here is why they come. It is because they live lives of desperation. They live lives without economic hope, economic opportunity, murder, mayhem, some of the highest murder rates in the world. I think El Salvador—I don't know if we have the numbers here. They have a number of different routes they take from the three countries of Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador, mostly coming into the United States right here. They don't so much go over to El Paso. They certainly don't head over here on land to get in on the western side of our border. Some try to come by air, but mostly they come by—it used to be by train, now mostly it is by land, and they are dangerous missions. The reason they come is because there is not much hope there.

Frankly, the reason there is not much hope there, in part, is because of us. There used to be a comic strip called "Pogo." The Presiding Officer remembers "Pogo." One of the lines from "Pogo" is, "I found the enemy, and it is me."

We are the enemy. The chairman of the Homeland Security Committee said many times, the root cause of what is going on down there is our addiction to drugs in this country. The drugs are trafficked through here, they come into the United States, are sold, and the money from the drugs goes back there along with guns. When we deport the bad guys, what do we do? We take the bad guys who were selling the drugs, and we put them right back down here. It is a toxic mix of guns, weapons, and bad guys. They make life down here miserable for people.

As it turns out, Colombia, a few years ago, was a miserable place to live too. One time, about 20 years ago, a bunch of gunmen in Colombia rounded up the supreme court justices of the Colombian supreme court, took them into a room and shot them to death—shot them to death.

There was a time when the FARC, the rebel groups, the leftist groups, and the drug gangs were trying to take down the Government of Colombia, and it looked like they could. And some great people in Colombia stood up and

said: Not on my watch. This is not going to happen on my watch. They came up with Plan Colombia in order to make sure this didn't happen. President Clinton and a guy named Joe Biden, who was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, led an effort to—not for us to fully fund Plan Colombia, but they basically said: This is on you. You can do it like at Home Depot. You can do it. We can help. They did the heavy lifting. They did most of the raising of revenues, and we played our role. We continued to play our role for 20 years and Colombia is a different place today.

The same thing can happen to these three countries down here. Joe Biden was playing a significant role as Vice President. I was helpful, as was Jeh Johnson, former Secretary of Homeland Security, and others as well. These folks, along with these three countries, came up with something they called the Alliance for Prosperity. It is really like Plan Colombia—find out what works, do more of that. Plan Colombia worked, and they are trying an approach like this down here. The idea is to restore the rule of law, to focus on infrastructure, to focus on making good government work and be effective, to really tamp down on the corruption they have there, the obstruction that goes on with small businesses. The idea is to create a safer, better place. Most people don't want to leave here. I talked to plenty of them. They want to stay there. Some of them want to come up here and work but then go home. This is their country, and they love their country, like we love ours.

Finally, as we have been joined on the floor by one of my colleagues, I ask him to allow me just maybe another minute or two.

NAFTA

Mr. President, there has been talk about NAFTA. There has been talk—and I don't know if these are alternative facts coming out of the White House or what—that the President is going to pull out of NAFTA.

I would just state this. I met with Robert Lighthizer, who is going to be our Trade Rep—and I understand that he will be a good one. He will succeed Michael Froman, who was an excellent Trade Rep for a number of years. When I met with Mr. Lighthizer in my office a couple of months ago, he talked about renegotiating NAFTA. When we negotiated the Trans-Pacific Partnership with 11 other countries around the world—40 percent of the world's markets—we did that over the last couple of years, we were renegotiating NAFTA. We fixed a lot of things in NAFTA that needed to be fixed, not just in the Mexico part of NAFTA but also Canada.

One of the things that needed to be fixed was in our top market—we raise a lot of chickens in Georgia, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and other places. Our top market for poultry is Mexico. Canada doesn't buy our chickens. They

keep us out. The Trans-Pacific Partnership renegotiated NAFTA, not just for poultry but for a variety of other commodities we want to sell.

So my friendly advice to the President is, before he goes ahead and pulls out of NAFTA, why doesn't he and the administration take a closer look at what we renegotiated in the Trans-Pacific Partnership when we renegotiated NAFTA. I think we will find a lot of what we need to do, want to do, and what we can agree to do.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, I want to talk about healthcare reform. The Republicans came up with a really good idea in 1993. It was introduced by John Chafee, the Senator from Rhode Island, and co-sponsored by 23 Senators. It was an alternative plan to HillaryCare in 1993. The Republicans got the ideas from the Heritage Foundation, and they turned out to be good ideas.

One provision they included was that every State would have an exchange. If people couldn't get healthcare, they could buy their healthcare coverage as a part of a large purchasing pool called an exchange. The Republican idea from Chafee and others not only had exchanges but had sliding-scale tax credits for buying down the healthcare for lower income folks to buy down the cost of coverage for lower income people. When their income reached a certain level, the tax credit went away. That was in 1993, the alternative plan to HillaryCare, with the individual mandate. Basically, many folks had to be covered, and there would be a fine if they didn't get coverage. We can't make people get coverage, but the idea was to get people to get coverage.

The employer mandate was the fourth concept. The fourth concept said employers of a certain size—I think it was employers with 50 to 100 employees—were to provide healthcare to their employees.

The last piece was that insurance companies could not deny coverage to people because of preexisting conditions. That was the 1993 proposal, courtesy of the Heritage Foundation.

When Mitt Romney was Governor of Massachusetts, he took that game plan, lock, stock, and barrel, and established RomneyCare and it worked out pretty well. When we did the Affordable Care Act, we took RomneyCare and built on that.

I will close with this. The piece that needs to be fixed and repaired, not repealed but fixed, out of the original Republican idea is the idea that the insurance companies need a stable insurance pool of healthy people, not just old people and sick people but healthy people and younger people as well. There are some ways we can fix that. It is one of the fixes we need to make. It isn't all that hard. It isn't all that hard, and I will talk about that some other day.

I appreciate my friend from one of those Dakotas—South Dakota—for being patient and waiting. Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROUNDS. Thank you, Mr. President.

My colleague and friend, the Senator from Delaware, is also a former Governor, and it is always enjoyable to listen to the experiences and clearly the understanding about a number of the issues we have in common in terms of things that concern us.

I remember back in 1993, as well when we were looking at healthcare reform in South Dakota, we actually, in our process, adopted the vast majority of what was considered to be the recommendations from the National Association of Insurance Commissioners—guaranteed renewability of policies, guaranteed to be able to move from one group insurance product to another group insurance product, a minimum amount of premium versus maximum amount of premium by any carrier in any single group of policies in one plan. Those provisions actually worked for us for a period up until 2009, when ObamaCare became the law of the land, and at that point we suffered through the same problems most of the rest of America is suffering through right now.

But there are some things that really do bind us together, and one of them is trying to make and produce the best healthcare products for the citizens within our different States that we possibly can. I think in the U.S. Senate there are enough of us who truly believe we can fix, repeal, replace ObamaCare. I think Democrats would like to say we are going to fix it. I think Republicans recognize that we are probably going to do more of a start-over because the basic concept of ObamaCare, which was moving more and more into a single-payer system, will not work.

For those of us who believe in the free market, what we want to do is take away the regulations at the Federal level, give them back to the States, and allow the States to actually experiment and make a more competitive healthcare product. That allows for businesses to be able to insure more individuals to help pay for their costs. It also means, then, you can actually get more individuals to receive the benefits of private healthcare rather than being responsible for or at least expecting that the Federal Government is going to subsidize with Federal taxpayer money their healthcare costs. I think that is part of what we need to be concerned with here today.

REGULATORY REFORM

Mr. President, we all want a strong economy. We want more jobs being made available. One of the reasons I am here on the floor today is to talk about not just the healthcare regulations that impact the ability of employers to hire employees, but we should also be talking about the regulatory environment in the United States.

That is what I really want to talk about today, is this tremendous suc-

cess we are beginning to have in just the first 3 months that President Trump has taken office. We have been successful in undoing a number of the regulatory hurdles that have been hindering job growth and prosperity in the United States.

It has been 3 months now since the President took office, with a Republican-led Congress in place ready to help him advance policies that grow our economy and allow hard-working Americans to keep more of their paycheck each month.

We are going to be talking a lot about tax reform, but we shouldn't forget about regulatory reform as well.

One of the items with tax reform, some folks actually suggested a tax on items being brought into the United States—a border adjustment tax. One of the reasons for that was they thought we would be buying more American goods if we made those goods from other countries more expensive by putting a tax on them, which would be passed on to the consumers. I think that is the wrong approach.

What we should be doing is allowing our consumers the availability of a less expensive American product, and the way you do that is we allow manufacturers in the United States to become more competitive. We do that by reducing their input costs, including a regulatory impact that is huge.

We believe we should be creating an atmosphere in the United States for products to be produced at a cost that is less in the first place. We shouldn't have to increase the cost of other people's products coming into the United States. We should be making it less expensive for our producers to compete with them. The way we accomplish this, first and foremost, is by reducing the regulatory environment in America, which is way too intrusive, duplicative, and overreaching.

If anyone is wondering how bad the regulatory environment is in the United States today, well, regulations cost the American people \$1.9 trillion annually, the bulk of which is handed down to consumers. Businesses don't absorb it, they pass it on.

How are the consumers paying for it? Through higher prices on products and goods produced in the United States. If you are wondering why it is such a big deal, it is because we want our manufacturers, our producers, and our businesses in the United States to be able to compete with our competitors overseas, the ones that don't have the crippling regulatory environment we have here at home. Right now, our businesses and job creators are crippled by Federal regulations that limit their ability to expand and grow, to create more job opportunities, and pay higher wages.

If the \$1.9 trillion we spend annually on regulations were a country, it would be the 10th largest economy in the world, about the size of India or Russia's economy. Get this. We pay more as consumers for the cost of regula-

tions at \$1.9 trillion than we as taxpayers pay in personal income taxes on April 15. On April 15, we pay about \$1.4 trillion in personal income taxes, and yet we pay \$1.9 trillion—one-half trillion more in the costs of regulations.

No other country in the world even comes close to this sort of unhealthy, costly regulatory environment. It is putting us at a competitive disadvantage in the international arena. While there has been a lot of focus this week on reforming our tax policy to get us back to the level of global competitiveness that we need, we must not lose sight of the need to reform our regulatory environment to one that invites growth and innovation. Both are needed. We have to reform our tax policy, and we absolutely have to reform our regulatory policies.

Already in the first 3 months that President Trump has been in office, we have made progress in stopping harmful regulations from taking effect. Under the Congressional Review Act, the Senate has passed 13 resolutions so far this year to undo Obama-era regulations. The Congressional Review Act allows us to disapprove certain regulations that basically were approved by the administration or created by the administration over the last 6 months. The reason we are able to do it is because we can do it with just a majority vote. It is a privileged motion in the U.S. Senate. It is a majority vote in the House and takes a majority vote in the Senate. It doesn't require 60 votes, so we are actually able to, with a majority vote, undo these regulations that were going to be imposed on the American public over the last 6 months. I think that is a step in the right direction. This is a program which in the past has been used only one time since it was created in the 1990s. We have done it 13 times in just these first 3 months. The Congressional Review Act, or CRA, is truly an important oversight tool that allows Congress to undo Federal regulations issued by unelected bureaucrats at Federal agencies by this simple majority vote.

For example, we have been able to reverse the Obama administration's education mandate which would have imposed Federal education standards to assess schools at the State and local level. We think that should be done at the State and local level.

We also stopped an Obama regulation that would have imposed burdensome new restrictions on internet service providers that would do nothing to increase privacy protections for consumers. If you follow some of the misinformation that has been put out there, some people have suggested that we were taking away privacy that had been put in place by the last administration. Not true. Actually, what happened was that the courts had already stopped these provisions before they were ever put into effect.

So, for the people who like the policy protections that are in place today,