

My goal is, over the next few months, every week, every other week to come behind this podium, and we are going to start to get more granular in how the policies would work and what drives them.

So my point, once again, is understanding it is mandatory spending. It is substantially, remember, 91 percent, delivered by our demographics, and demographics isn't political. It is just what we are as a society. So what do we do?

Last bit, because I skipped it, and I want to come back to it. Immigration; designing an immigration system that substantially promotes a talent-based model. Why? If everything we do policy-wise has a fixation on economic expansion, on economic growth, so we actually have the resources to keep our promise as a society, you actually have to think about, even immigration, and a model within that both looks at population stability—because you saw what was happening to our birth rates—but a talent-based system so you get the maximum multiplier effect of economic growth.

When we do the math in our office, we see a way to stabilize the debt. It doesn't go away. It keeps growing, but the economy grows so that percentage of debt to GDP actually keeps us so our interest rates don't explode off the charts because no one will take the risk on our debt, but think of the number of policy decisions I am asking this body to make.

There is a path. It is going to be hard. We are going to have to explain a lot of very difficult mechanics of why we need to do what we are going to do, but it is the path that saves our country.

I have a 3-year-old little girl, best little girl ever. I want her to have the same opportunities I have had. And the way our demographics pile up our debt over the next 30 years, she won't have the same opportunities I have had, and that just isn't fair. That is not fair to anyone. We have got to find a way to keep our promises and have the next couple of generations also have the same opportunities.

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

NECESSARY BORDER WALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have another weekend gone by and another speech of our President on the issue of illegal immigration and what to do with the wall on the southern border.

I take this opportunity, after spending the weekend talking to several constituents of the Sixth Congressional District, to deal with some misconceptions in this debate.

The first misconception I would like to talk about is whether Donald Trump

can compromise, because there are some people out there who feel that the delay in opening the government was because this, admittedly, type A individual could not compromise.

The shutdown was caused because we had not passed an appropriation bill that both, I can say, sides, both the pro-wall and anti-wall people could agree with. President Trump previously—this is his third year—signed two appropriation bills funding the Department of Homeland Security and the rest of the government without getting a wall. It was not until the third time that President Trump and Congress could not reach an agreement on the Homeland Security bill. And I will point out that was largely because Congress couldn't get along, not President Trump.

After a delay of over 30 days, President Trump has, one more time, compromised. He compromised to allow 3 more weeks of the government to be open on the promise, or the implied promise, of the Speaker that she will, in good faith, negotiate about a wall.

President Trump, during this time, also agreed to an extension, a DACA extension, which the border patrol, quite frankly, would disagree with, because they feel it will encourage more people to be optimistic and come here illegally across the border. He also extended temporary protected status, another thing which may or may not be right, but was a further olive branch towards people, who, so far, would refuse to vote for a budget with the funding of a wall.

In any event, I think, if you look at the past, President Trump has been more than willing to compromise, signing bill after bill in his first 2 years, despite not making due on his number one campaign promise, extending temporary protected status, a DACA extension, and now a 3-week extension.

You can say a lot of things about Donald Trump, but you cannot say he is not willing to compromise. I think very, very many people feel he has compromised more than enough.

The next question is: Do we need a wall? Is a wall necessary? And the fact is it is. We need a wall because we need secure borders.

First of all, as has been pointed out, 70 percent of the heroin in this country, which has caused tens of thousands of deaths, comes across our southern border. Some of that heroin comes across points of entry, and at the points of entry, it is not unusual to catch people sneaking in heroin. Some people have made something of the fact that not a lot of heroin is caught in the 60 percent of the southern border that has no barrier at all up.

That is because there is no barrier. We have no idea how much heroin is coming across there, but common sense will tell you, if you wanted to sneak illegal drugs in this country and have a choice between going across a regular point of entry with perhaps dogs and border control agents or somebody out

in the middle of nowhere, you would go somewhere out in the middle of nowhere. It is hard to tell me that anyone cares about the heroin crisis in this country if they do not want a wall.

The next thing to look for is all the people sneaking into the country. The border patrol itself will tell you they have no idea how many people are coming across the border. We can say, at a minimum, we have 11 or 12 million people in this country illegally, but for all I know, talking with somebody from the border patrol today, it could be 20 million.

And the question is, if we are going to let more people in this country, are we going to let people in this country who are sneaking across the border or people who are coming here legally?

Another problem with people coming here legally, I would argue, is they may be more likely to use welfare or that sort of thing when they come to the country. Talking to the customs agents, I have found evidence, when they looked at people's purses, when they looked at people's wallets, of evidence of people using EBT cards or Medicaid cards, taking free goods from the American taxpayer.

People are committing crime. One can see when more walls are built on the southern border; crime goes down on the other side of the wall. A large percentage of people who are in Federal prisons are illegal immigrants, which is not surprising, given that they broke the law to come here.

It is a dangerous way to get in. Thousands of people have been found dead trying to sneak across areas not at a point of entry. And having been down in the desert in Arizona, I can easily see why that would happen. People are giving children to other people to come across the border, knowing it is easier to stay here if you come with children.

Obviously, that is a dangerous thing. As President Trump says, it is a humanitarian crisis not to shut off the flow of people who are coming across the desert hoping to get to America.

Finally, it is a huge cost to the American taxpayer. Something is said about the almost \$6 billion President Trump is asking for a wall. A variety of different organizations make different guesses as to the cost of illegal immigration every year. It is probably more than \$50 billion. It is not surprising when you take into effect the free healthcare, the free education, the welfare given out, and the cost to our criminal justice system.

In any event, do we need a wall? If we care about heroin, we need a wall. If we care about the cost to government, we need a wall. If we care about people who are hurt by criminals who come across the border, we need a wall. And I should point out that, right now, that border is controlled by the drug cartels in Mexico. We need a wall.

The third issue I would like to address is there are some people who feel that Donald Trump is anti-immigrant or America is becoming nativist by requiring a wall. That is not true. Every

year, in this country, over 700,000 people are sworn in legally to become citizens in this country. Almost 4 million people are given work visas to come into this country. Another close to 2 million people come into this country hoping to be students or to become students in this country.

All we are asking, if people want to sneak across the border, is do it legally. Get in line to be one of the 700,000 people who are going to be sworn in legally. Get in line to be one of the almost 4 million people who get work-type visas to come here.

I think compared to other countries, quite frankly, there is no comparison. You look at other countries—Mexico, Germany, countries like that—you will find the number of people that they are allowing to naturalize into their country is percentage-wise much less than the United States of America.

□ 2015

It is incredibly open-minded, and with open arms, that the United States continues to let these large numbers of people come into this country to naturalize, to become students, or to work in this country, and nobody is talking about reducing those very large numbers. All we are saying is: Don't skip in line.

The next issue I hear people talk about is: Do walls work? If you build a wall, will it prevent people from coming across the border?

We can look at the southern border already, and we can look at walls around the world.

Look at the southern border. In the 1990s, we built a border wall between San Diego and Tijuana. People crossing at that point dropped 92 percent, an incredible success.

We have built other walls, walls near El Paso, walls near Tucson, walls near Yuma. All of these walls currently built have reduced illegal immigration by over 90 percent.

Look around the world in other countries building walls. Israel built a well-known wall around 2010 between themselves and Egypt. Before they built the wall, they were having about 1,500 people come across their border illegally. After they built the wall, bit by bit, that number has dropped all the way down to nothing. That is a pretty good success rate, going from 1,500 a week to nothing.

You don't hear those people saying: Oh, people are sneaking across. They're going over the wall or going under the wall.

No, a well-done wall reduces immigration almost entirely.

Right now, 10 EU nations in Europe, countries similar to ours, have walls. Hungary built a wall on its border with Syria and had a 90 percent drop in the number of people crossing the border, another example of a very successful wall.

The other thing I will point out, having spent last week down on our southern border, the Border Patrol, every

one of them who I talked to, says they want a wall. They live with it every day. The Border Patrol would not want a wall if it was not effective.

The next thing I would like to point out is the cost of a wall. President Trump is asking for \$5.7 billion. \$5.7 billion is a lot of money. But now we have to put it in context with what we are spending in other parts of our budget.

What President Trump is asking for is one-seventh the cost of foreign aid that we spend year after year after year, and all the people who are keeping the government closed because they refuse to vote for a wall, they have no qualms—or almost all of them have no qualms—about voting for seven times as much every year on foreign aid.

It is about one-twelfth the increase in defense spending under President Trump, one-twelfth just the increase. For the protection of our country in the future, I can think of few things that are more important than stopping the invasion from south of our Nation.

It is about 0.1 percent—one-tenth of 1 percent—of our overall Federal budget, and about four-tenths of 1 percent of what we refer to as the discretionary part of our budget.

So while \$5.7 billion is a lot of money, when you look compared to the other money that Congress appropriates again and again, year after year after year, they usually don't object to the money being spent on other things.

Now, you hear it said that walls are immoral. I will point out that I think this is a new and rather silly argument. I think keeping heroin out of this country; I think keeping a potential criminal class out of this country; I think making sure that our future immigrants are people who stand in line coming here are not considered immoral. But I will detect a little bit of hypocrisy of people who make that argument.

I mentioned a second ago the wall between Tijuana and San Diego, which was built during the term of Bill Clinton. I am sure, if you go back and check the papers of the time, when Bill Clinton felt it was necessary to build a wall between San Diego and Tijuana, nobody said it was immoral.

Later on, more of the wall right now was built on an appropriation passed when President Bush was President. Some of that wall, or improvements in the wall, were built when President Obama was President.

I have a feeling, if we go back, we won't find anybody saying the wall was immoral when it was built by President Clinton or President Bush or President Obama.

So one of two things is going on here. Either we have partisanship rearing its ugly head, and people are perfectly happy to vote for a wall under other Presidents, or some people, both Republicans and primarily Democrats, are becoming a lot more radical since parts of the wall were built in the 1990s or the zeros or the teens.

The next thing I would like to deal with is that you sometimes hear it said by people who have kept the government closed by their refusal to build a wall that everybody wants border security. Sadly, that is not true.

You would feel any citizen with common sense would want to enforce our borders, but if you look, the Governor of California has said that he wants illegal immigrants to be given free medical care in his State. The mayor of New York has said much the same thing.

There are over 500 sanctuary cities in the United States of America. A sanctuary city is a city where the local mayor or city council has said that we are not going to ask citizens in our jurisdiction whether or not they are here illegally.

Look, if you have a city, or a county, or a whole State like California that has become a sanctuary city, those governors or mayors or legislators or city councils of course do not want immigration laws taken seriously.

In the last 2 years, a bill was brought forth to try to end sanctuary cities. A few Republicans voted against the bill, and all but three Democrats voted against the bill.

I try to put in my mind, what would cause someone, if they really cared about enforcing the border, to say we have no problem with counties or cities, in essence, putting up a sign to say: We are not going to ask people whether they are here illegally.

The point is that, obviously, there are a lot of people out there who don't care about border security. We have several Congressmen getting elected on the platform of saying that they don't want to fund ICE, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency.

Why would somebody not want to enforce the immigration and customs authority and, at the same time, want to have our borders taken seriously?

The answer is, they don't want our borders taken seriously. There are a lot of people who believe, as the Minnesota Attorney General and former Congressman KEITH ELLISON say, that national borders themselves are an injustice. They want the idea of a separate United States of America, I guess, to permanently change.

You may think it is ridiculous to say that the idea that we shouldn't have national borders is a disgrace, but this has become, sadly, mainstream among the left wing segment of the political class.

The Oakland mayor recently sent an alarm, telling people, including particularly people with a criminal background in Oakland, that ICE was going to make a sweep and try to pick up criminals. Why would she do that if she wanted our immigration laws enforced?

The answer is, more and more people are getting elected in this country who do not want immigration laws enforced.

Now, I have a few more suggestions for President Trump. I think it is unfortunate that we have not built the

wall yet, but having talked to some members of the Border Patrol, perhaps, in some ways, it is a blessing in disguise.

The \$5.7 billion that President Trump wants will be nowhere near enough to secure the entire border. It will secure more of the border than now, and it will be a big step in the right direction. That is true. But I think perhaps President Trump, now that they have kind of bit his hand after he has compromised and compromised and compromised, rather than build for just \$5.7 billion, should try to increase the size of the wall, so that we are covering all of the easy entry points on the southern border, which would take about \$8 billion. I do feel it is important enough to secure our borders that that would be an appropriate thing to do.

There are other things that, having been at the border, are suggested. We are right now not making anywhere near a good enough effort to see if cash is going from the cartels back from north of the border to south of the border. I would ask President Trump to include cash-sniffing dogs that can detect this cash. If people try to sneak across the border without declaring that cash, that cash can be taken, and it can be very devastating for the cartels.

We could use more density meters for cars, in which you can detect whether there are drugs within cars. That is another thing that would help our Border Patrol become more effective.

Finally, he can try to engage people, if there are any people out there who care about our borders, about the ridiculous asylum laws. I don't know if everybody is aware out there—not enough Americans are aware—that anybody who comes to the southern border can say they are fleeing from violence or religious persecution and, after being detained briefly, they eventually will be let go for a court date, which might be years in the future. As long as that law continues in effect, we will continue to have millions of people stream across the border.

I want to look here at some of the walls that we already have, walls that were built by other Presidents and proved to be very effective.

Here we have a wall in San Diego built by President Clinton. It is not an immoral wall. It is a very effective wall that has decreased illegal border crossings in the San Diego-Tijuana area by over 90 percent.

We have another wall here that ends in Nogales, in the Arizona area. I think this wall was built under President Bush. It might have been somewhat improved under President Obama, another very moral wall that is protecting people on the north side of the border.

I want to point out another reason why we need the wall. I talked to some ranchers in the area. They came across the Salvadoran gangs that we know are so brutal, and they fed them. They weren't harmed. But can you imagine

living near the border where we have people crossing the border, either south to north or north to south, who are members of the violent El Salvador gangs?

Here is another picture and a wall near Sasabe and another point where the wall ends. This is an area in which, even if President Trump gets the wall he wants, they will not be funding an extension of this wall. It is one of the reasons why we should ask for a little bit more than \$5.7 million for this wall.

I will point out that the new walls they build will be better than walls in the past. We can make walls higher than this, and we can make walls in which we have sensors designed to track people coming up, and walls in which we have flat areas on top of the wall that would be very difficult to climb over. It will be very difficult to get over these new high-tech walls.

In any event, here is another picture of a wonderful wall in Sasabe. We just wish the wall was a little bit bigger.

Here we are going to look at another couple walls that countries feel are effective.

Here we have a picture of where a wall is in Jordan. The feeling is that the United States may have built part of that wall to protect the poor Jordanians from terrorists coming across. I don't remember anybody objecting to that wall.

Here we have the wall in Israel that was built and has cut illegal immigration coming across the border from Egypt down to literally zero.

Now, looking at these walls, these effective walls in the past that have been built by other Presidents, and thinking that I do not want to have another shutdown in 3 weeks, the tremendous inconvenience for the government workers, the inconvenience for people who are relying on the government for inspections and that sort of thing, I will ask my colleagues who refused to vote for a border wall during the last shutdown to just imagine, stop and think for a minute, and pretend that, instead of President Trump, we have a President Clinton, or a President Bush, or a President Obama, and maybe, to help you pretend, you can pretend that the border wall is not there to protect the residents of Texas, or New Mexico, or Arizona, but it is there to protect the residents of Jordan.

Just like in the past, when you voted for bills to protect the residents of Jordan, or voted for Presidents to build walls other than President Trump, just sit back, close your eyes, and pretend we are building a wall to protect another country, or building a wall at another time, and just vote "yes," so that we don't have to go through another shutdown, and so that we can protect American citizens from drug lords and protect them from people coming across the border out of line, to be fair to those people who are coming to this country legally.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of travel delay due to weather.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 28. Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 29, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 56, the Financial Technology Protection Act, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, a letter from the Assistant Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Secretary (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Veterans' Group Life Insurance Increased Coverage (RIN: 2900-AQ12) received January 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 804. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs to assist at-risk middle school students with the transition from middle school