

family reunification. Lives are going to be measured in how we are going to deal with diversity in the visa program. We are not going to measure lives that way.

I don't think it is a good deal. I think it is a terrible deal. I think it is an atrocity when you offer me the lives of people, but in exchange, I have got to give you \$25 billion, and I have got to change family reunification such that it is not as we know it today, and I have got to guarantee you that you are not going to have to worry about diversity as it relates to persons coming into the country.

I don't think it is a good deal. Someone today said that the President offered a good deal and we ought to accept it. It is not a good deal for me, not a good deal for the people that I represent. I don't like it. I wouldn't negotiate it.

The fact of the matter is, it is not a negotiation. They are asking for a capitulation: either take it or leave it. That is not negotiation. But I still say that we ought not negotiate with the lives of people.

Mr. Speaker, I close with this.

We, who have been charged with the awesome responsibility of representing the many in our society, have got to remember that the greatness of our country is not going to be measured by how we treat those who live in the suites of life, how we treat those who have millions, how we treat those who can buy their way into the country, how we treat those who have done well. It is not going to be measured by how we treat the well-off, the well-heeled, and the well-to-do.

The greatness of our votes and what we do will be measured by how we treat those that Speaker PELOSI—currently minority leader, Speaker PELOSI—spoke of in the Book of Matthew, how we treat the least among us—the least, the last, and the lost. That is really how the greatness of a country is going to be measured. The greatness of America will be measured this way.

And we can play all the games that we want, but in the final analysis, when we have to give that final judgment and receive that judgment, it won't be about how well we treated millionaires and how many tax breaks we gave them. It is going to be: What did you do for those who are not in a position to do for themselves?

Mr. Speaker, I pray that we will live up to the expectations that we pledge allegiance to in the flag: liberty and justice for all.

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

#### LEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FASO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank the

minority leader, Ms. PELOSI, for her plea on behalf of the DACA recipients. She certainly showed great passion and stamina.

I do wonder, however, why she is so concerned now. This is not a new problem. All of these people who qualify for DACA today had to be here by the year 2007. They were here illegally in the United States during those 2 years when Ms. PELOSI served as Speaker of the House and Harry Reid was the leader of a supermajority of Democrats in the Senate and Barack Obama was President, yet she took no action then.

They could have passed a law, rather than having President Obama sign an illegal executive order, and given the DACA kids a pathway to citizenship, but I guess it wasn't a priority then.

Last month, my home county, Horry County, South Carolina, settled a claim brought by the United States Department of Justice. It seems the Department determined that Horry County wasn't doing enough to accommodate students who couldn't speak English.

One would think that wouldn't be much of a problem in South Carolina. We are a long way from our southern border. But as it turns out, according to the Horry County independent newspapers, 5,511 out of the 44,700 students in Horry County Schools spoke English as a second language only. That is 13 percent of the student body in Horry County, South Carolina.

So the school system agreed to pay a claim by paying \$600,000 to accommodate those students who couldn't speak English. My constituents back home certainly have sympathy for all children—including the DACA children—but before they resolve this DACA issue, they have one condition. They want the flow of illegal immigrants stopped first, and so do I.

Thirty years ago, we gave amnesty to millions of illegal aliens on the promise that we would stop the flow of illegal immigration. Yet here we sit again. Well, fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me.

I am willing to try to find a solution for the DACA folks, but first we have to stop the flow. President Trump has made an offer to resolve the DACA issue. I think it is quite reasonable. He has laid out a good framework: number one, secure the border; number two, end chain migration; number three, end the visa lottery.

Personally, I want to add to that list a legal obligation on employers to check the immigration status of the people they hire. This system called E-Verify is already required in many States, including South Carolina. If E-Verify is required and enforced, it will end the practice of coming here illegally for a job.

In return, under the President's proposal, 1.8 million DACA recipients—which is almost three times what President Obama had proposed—would be granted legal status, but no special pathway to citizenship. They would go

to the back of the line like everyone else. DACA recipients are illegal immigrants. Presumably, they were brought here as children by their family members who, presumably, were also here illegally.

But I would like to focus here for a few minutes on legal immigration. You have to differentiate, and people confuse the two. You see, our legal immigration system is quite complex, and most Americans are unaware of the details. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out a few things that are really important for the American public to understand about our legal immigration system.

We accept 1.1 million legal immigrants per year. I would like to refer to this chart for a minute, which I know is hard to see on TV, but as recent as the year 1970, we were accepting 200,000 legal immigrants per year. That number passed 400,000 in about 1980. You can see this big spike. That is when President Reagan promised us that, if we would make the people who were here illegally legal, we would secure this border and we wouldn't have a problem again.

But you see what has happened now, this is legal immigration. It has gone up and up and up to the point now where we are accepting almost 1.2 million legal immigrants per year. If you add on top of that the hundreds of thousands of illegal immigrants coming in that number is much higher than this. This is only legal immigration.

Mr. Speaker, at 1.1 million legal immigrants, there are people who stand up here and say that we are hard-hearted if we don't accept every illegal immigrant who gets across our border. But the numbers say otherwise. The numbers don't lie.

We are very open to immigration. We still go by the motto on the Statue of Liberty. We accept people from all over the world, 1.2 legal immigrants a year. And look at this slide, Mr. Speaker. This is a representation of the top 10 countries in the world that accept legal immigrants.

You will notice on the far side, here is the United States. This is as of the year 2015. We accepted 1.051 million legal immigrants. The next closest was Germany at 686,000. We are almost twice as much as the next one. And if you add the next five together, we are still more than they are.

So anybody who tells you that our immigration system is hard-hearted is simply ignoring the facts. It is baloney. We have the most open system of legal immigration in the world, by far.

Most countries base their immigration system on merit. Ours, on the other hand, two-thirds of our legal immigrants come in based on chain migration. The criteria is extended family, so we end up importing a lot of people that have low education and low skill sets.

Most countries say, look, we want to use our immigration system to become

more competitive, to make our economy thrive, to lift not only the immigrants, but the people who live here. So what they say is, if you have a skill set or an educational background that we need, then you move to the front of the line. It makes perfect sense. It makes sense for the immigrant. It makes sense for the economy of the country. It makes sense for the people who live there.

Ours, on the other hand, is based on chain migration. So does that make us more competitive or less competitive?

Mr. Speaker, look at this slide. The top slide here—this is from the Center on Immigration Studies—shows that immigrants, our legal immigrant families, families headed by a legal immigrant in the United States, 51 percent of them get some type of social safety net benefit; 51 percent, as compared to 30 percent for the average family. The head of household is a native-born American. Fifty-one percent of the people that we are bringing into our country under chain migration end up relying on our social safety net.

Mr. Speaker, I have to ask you, it is only common sense. Do you think that makes us more competitive or less competitive? Don't you think that drives up our deficit, Mr. Speaker? Don't you think it takes resources away from people in this country already that need it?

The bottom of this slide represents the amount of dollars from our social safety net that are taken by immigrant families versus Native American families. You can see the average immigrant family getting benefits gets an average of \$6,200 a year in benefits, while the average family headed by somebody who was born in America gets \$4,400 in benefits.

So it is very easy to see, Mr. Speaker. It is common sense that using chain migration in the visa lottery to determine two-thirds, 65 percent of our immigrants, 800,000 people, the result is that we bring in people with a low education, a low skill set that end up relying on our social safety net and, in fact, make our country less competitive and take resources away from folks at the bottom end of the scale here in America that need these resources.

□ 2015

I believe our immigration system is broken. The President believes so too. He has said:

I want a bighearted deal for the DACA kids.

Leader Pelosi is also very concerned about the DACA kids obviously. So we have areas of agreement, and I am glad we do. I look forward to an agreement that takes care of the DREAMers, secures our borders, and moves us to a modern, merit-based immigration system like every other developed country has that lifts our economy and at the same time lifts opportunity for all Americans.

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

## BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on February 6, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 4708. To amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance and develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 8, 2018, at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3896. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Orchids in Growing Media From Taiwan [Docket No.: APHIS-2016-0005] (RIN: 0579-AE28) received January 31, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3897. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, Homeland Defense and Global Security, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on assistance provided by the Department of Defense for certain sporting events for calendar year 2017, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2564(e); Public Law 104-201, Sec. 367(a); (110 Stat. 2496); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3898. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting certification that for calendar year 2017, the legitimate commercial activities and interests of chemical, biotechnology, and pharmaceutical firms in the United States were not significantly harmed by the limitations of the Convention on access to, and production of, those chemicals and toxins listed in Schedule 1 of the Annex on Chemicals, consistent with the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling, and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, adopted by the Senate of the United States on April 24, 1997, and Executive Order 13346; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3899. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Entities; Removal of Certain Entities; and Revisions of Entries on the Entity List [Docket No.: 170804727-7727-01] (RIN: 0694-AH43) received January 29, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3900. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting notification that the Secretary of State will convene an Accountability Review Board to examine the circumstances surrounding the unexplained incidence of medical conditions consistent with mild traumatic brain injury in some U.S. government personnel and their accompanying dependents in Havana, Cuba, pursuant to Sec. 301 of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3901. A letter from the Associate General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting three (3) notifications of a nomination, and an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3902. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting four (4) notifications of action on nomination, and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3903. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Freedom of Information Act Implementation [RIN: 2590-AA86] received February 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3904. A letter from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting two (2) notifications of designation of acting officer, and an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3905. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 1.80(b) of the Commission's Rules; Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties to Reflect Inflation received January 31, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3906. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Division Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0719; Product Identifier 2017-NE-22-AD; Amendment 39-19163; AD 2018-02-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3907. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0826; Product Identifier 2016-SW-084-AD; Amendment 39-19153; AD 2018-01-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3908. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Restricted Category Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0894; Product Identifier 2017-SW-044-AD; Amendment 39-19160; AD 2018-02-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.