

while fighting on the front lines of President Biden's border crisis.

To my knowledge, the President still hasn't said one word about this young soldier's tragic death. The President's silence is deafening and disappointing.

Keep in mind, it only took the President a matter of hours to accuse Border Patrol agents on horseback of misconduct when dealing with a rush of Haitian illegals just a few months ago.

Simply put, the President's lack of interest and empathy reveals the sinister, but undeniable, fact that the chaos at our southern border is intentional. Since stepping foot into the White House, Joe Biden has eagerly destroyed our border security, putting Border Patrol agents at risk and threatening every community across the country with an invasion of illegal aliens.

From illegally defying a Federal court order to reinstate the remain in Mexico policy, to fighting to terminate title 42 next month, the Biden administration has egregiously worked to undermine President Trump's successful solutions that protected our southern border.

Biden's border crisis also represents a significant economic burden on the American people.

According to a recent study written by the Federation for American Immigration Reform, or FAIR, the number of illegal aliens living in the United States increased by one million in President Biden's first year in office, bringing the estimated total of illegal aliens in the country to 15.5 million.

Additionally, FAIR's fiscal analysis finds that the millions of illegal aliens currently residing in our great Nation are imposing a net fiscal burden of at least \$143 billion, an increase of almost \$10 billion since Joe Biden took office.

Keep in mind, this comes at a time when American taxpayers are footing the bill for Democrats' senseless spending and battling the consequences of 40-year high inflation.

The bottom line is that President Biden's radical open-border agenda is illegal, intentional, and disastrous for our economy. It is no wonder over 60 percent of Americans disapprove of Biden's handling of immigration. Americans simply know the truth: President Biden puts illegal aliens first and Americans last, and the Biden administration is actively working to cover up that truth.

Today, we learned that Biden's Department of Homeland Security is creating a Disinformation Governance Board which will be led by political hack Nina Jankowicz. This is nothing more than a blatant attempt to install a ministry of truth in order to push Biden's propaganda, lies, and radical agenda while concealing and censoring the truth about what is really happening at the southern border.

Mr. Speaker, this is seriously dangerous and wholly unconstitutional, which is why I am demanding that Congress immediately investigate

President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas' Disinformation Governance Board.

We need answers now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his clear voice and clarion call for competence and common sense.

Mr. Speaker, what my colleagues have articulated tonight is our view, the American people's view on the debacle that is the unified government by the Democrats of the Congress and the White House.

We have crippling inflation. We have sky high, illegal immigration. We have unprecedented incompetence at every level. It has yielded us, as you heard tonight, an energy crisis, a crime crisis, a foreign policy crisis, and an agenda that seems almost intentional in its design to put the American people last instead of first.

This is the opposite of what was pursued under the previous administration, the opposite of the strides, the incredible achievements that we had accomplished in the first 2 years of the Trump administration with Republicans in charge of this House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I think the American people have had enough of this wildly progressive America last agenda. I think that they are going to let their voices be heard in this upcoming election. And it is our prayer that we can survive between now and November, and in January when we take control again.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleagues for participating and joining me on the floor this evening, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President and to address their remarks to the Chair.

#### THE SOUTHERN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Well, Mr. Speaker, while we were on break for the last 2 weeks, I spent some time at the southern border in three sectors, the San Diego sector, the El Centro sector, and the Yuma sector. And I think it is important that we try to educate the Chair of what is going down there.

I will start off by just talking about raw numbers that were recently released. And so our listeners understand, when you talk about the border, there are two groups: There are people who want to find the Border Patrol and check in and get a future date for a hearing as they ask for asylum; and there are people who sneak across, which we refer to as gotaways.

For certain reasons that I will soon address, the number of gotaways recently went up dramatically. And the

number of gotaways is always an estimate because we don't catch them, we don't interview them. They are people who got away into the interior of the United States.

But we believe right now, or the Border Patrol believes, that in March, there were 62,000 gotaways; people who were not interviewed; people who we don't know who they are, who snuck in the country.

We also believe in March there were 90,000 people let in the country by the Border Patrol, usually asking for an asylum claim.

When we combine these two numbers—and by the way, there are other people who are turned around, and that is why you sometimes hear people say there were 220,000 contacts in March, which is true, but not all of those people were let in the country.

We do believe 152,000 people were let in the country. At least in the last 3 years, and as far as I know, forever, that is the highest number of people who have been let in the United States in 1 month. By way of comparison, a year ago, in March, we were at 63,000. So we went up from 63,000 to 153,000.

And if you go before March 2021, March 2020, coincidentally, a different President, we were at 11,000. So we have gone from 11,000 in March of 2020, to 63,000, to 152,000. That is a crisis by any standard.

Now, you might say, why are there so many more gotaways? Because when so many people are turning themselves in at the border—and by the way, there are about 10,000 unaccompanied minors who were let in this March as well, and it takes the Border Patrol a longer period of time to process the minors.

When there are so many people that have to be processed, the Border Patrol spends all their time doing paperwork and not guarding the border. There was a time when the Border Patrol reported to work and they guarded the border. Now, we were told in the sectors that I was at that 70 percent of the Border Patrol, when they show up at work, start doing paperwork. By the time their shift is over, 90 percent of the Border Patrol is doing paperwork, which is one of the reasons why so many more people are sneaking across the border.

By the way, if you wanted to take illegal drugs into the country, how would do you it? Would you turn yourself into the Border Patrol or would you try to sneak across? Which is why, right now, we believe, there are many more illegal drugs, including fentanyl, coming into the country now than there were in the past.

There are less drugs being confiscated, way less drugs being confiscated, and for the same reason. If the Border Patrol is not guarding the border, more people sneak across with the drugs and less people are caught.

So, in any event, that by itself is enough that should just alarm the people of this body, as well as the American public is saying, what is going on,

from 11,000 2 years ago to 63,000 a year ago, to 153,000 today.

We also want to talk, like I did, about the number of drugs. When I got this job, which seems just like yesterday, but it was 7 years ago, there were about 47,000 Americans who died every year of illegal drugs, and that was a big number.

All of us politicians were supposed to say something and have a plan because what are we going to do? 47,000 Americans dying every year of illegal drugs. And we passed more money, and we passed things out for treatment.

And 7 years later, we have gone from 47,000—by way of comparison, 57,000 Americans died in the Vietnam war—we are now at 110,000, 110,000 people. For people my age, that is twice as many as the number of people, combat troops, that died Vietnam in a 12-year period. That was 57,000; protests in the street. We have got to stop this. 57,000 Americans have died.

Now, every year, 110,000 Americans are dying of illegal drug overdoses. What should we be doing?

We could use more technology, so when people do come in and try to sneak in drugs, where the Border Patrol is monitoring things, they are more likely to catch the drugs.

I personally love the dogs. The dogs do a tremendous job at the border when people try to sneak across the San Diego sector and put fentanyl or drugs in a truck or a car, those are things that should be unquestionably in the budget. And if we would do that sort of thing, maybe it would put a little bit of brakes on the illegal drugs.

Another thing we learned down at the border is the increasing variety of countries that are coming here. You have to ask yourselves why that is.

Two Monday nights ago, I was at the border and we saw two groups of people in a relatively short period of time come into Yuma; groups of 70 or 80 people. Where are they from?

I think the average American thinks Cuba, Guatemala. No, from Peru, Colombia, Venezuela, Cuba, Bangladesh, India, Uzbekistan. Okay, from all around the globe.

Now, you might say why are people coming here from all around the globe? Well, first of all, why would anybody not like to be an American?

But secondly, because the Mexican drug cartels, I am told, and have been told by every Border Patrol agent in every sector over the last year and a half, the Mexican drug cartels are right now making more money smuggling people across the border than drugs across the border.

□ 1915

That is because, depending upon where you are coming from, \$8,000, \$9,000, \$15,000—I am told, from Asia, \$20,000—to get somebody in here. When you are making that kind of money, it is not surprising that they would be educating the whole world that now is the time to come into the United States.

They have pointed out to me that these are not necessarily poor, desperate people, by the standards of their home countries. In fact, some of them appear to the Border Patrol to be relatively well-off. They do not look poorly fed. The Border Patrol estimates 90 to 95 percent of them have a cell phone. There was a time in the not-too-distant past that that meant you were well-off.

I am not good at judging clothes, but we are told that the shoes or the purses or whatever, the Border Patrol can tell, are a sign that these are not necessarily poor people. They are just people who realize they are better off in the United States than in their home country.

There are a lot of Cubans coming across. A lot of these Cubans, even though they are saying they want asylum from Cuba, they have thrown away their identification from Chile or Colombia or wherever. They had fled Cuba to Chile, and now the word is out: Now is the time to come to the United States.

They aren't fleeing oppression in Chile. They are just coming to the United States because it is better off. Why wouldn't they?

But we have to realize that if we are going to continue with the current policy, an unlimited number of people would come here. Look around the globe. China, Indonesia, Brazil, large countries, almost everybody would be better off in America, which is why tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands from some of these countries, are going to continue to flow here unless we begin to put the brakes on the current policies.

One other thing of interest we found. When these got-aways sneak across the southern border in Arizona, they will pay young people, kids, over \$1,000 to come up and get them at the border and drive them to Phoenix, which is kind of interesting, isn't it?

Another thing for people back home to remember, if they think the current hodgepodge system is humanitarian, is the day we were in the San Diego sector, where you have a wall that goes, I am guessing, maybe a hundred yards into the Pacific Ocean, they found two people on the American side had drowned trying to get around there.

I guess the ocean is a lot more difficult to get around than people think. They look out a hundred yards, and they figure that they can swim out there, that they can get around. They can't get around, or they get in a boat that is not as seaworthy as they think it is. So, many people drown in the ocean trying to come here.

The Mexican Government tells us that more people wind up washing up on the Mexican shore than on the American shore because their boats sink before they even get around to the American side.

Of course, it is not just in the ocean that you see people die coming here. In the Arizona sector, it is not unusual to have people dehydrate to death in the

summer sun. Americans, good-natured as we are, sometimes put out gallons of water in the desert, hoping that people who are dehydrating to death find the gallons of water. But frequently, they don't.

As you get further down the border, in the past, when I have been on the Rio Grande border, it is, again, not unusual to have people drown in the Rio Grande. It looks like a shallow river, and they don't realize the undertow and that sort of thing, and they wind up dying.

Women who try to come across, particularly women who try to be with groups that are got-aways and sneak across, the sheriff of one of the counties—and this is another number I find hard to believe, but it is the sheriff. He tells me, one of the sheriffs in Arizona, that he believes 80 percent of the women who are part of these groups that try to be got-aways and sneak across without checking at the Border Patrol, 80 percent are raped. Isn't that kind of a horrible thing?

But the word is out around the world: Now is the time to come across. And that is what happens.

In any event, I encourage the American public and encourage people of all parties here, and especially the Biden administration, to get them going a little, to realize, right now, it is 150,000 people a month. If they change the policy in June like they are talking, the Border Patrol believes that you are going to be working your way up to, like, 400,000, 500,000 a month, which, again, I find hard to believe, but you have to figure the Border Patrol are the experts on this sort of thing.

It shouldn't be that difficult to find a good system, and no other country would stand for this. I made the point about a year ago, and it may be tardy now, but I do think to allow unlimited people to come here makes the American Government and the current administration look weak.

I think as far as what happened to Ukraine and what may happen someday in Taiwan, when they look at the United States and say we have a President who is allowing 150,000 people a month to come here and doing nothing about it, I just think it screams America is no longer the leader in the world.

In any event, I hope steps are taken. Hire more Border Patrol, hire more dogs, complete the wall, which would be a big step in the right direction as well, and go back to the policy of allowing people to be held on the Mexican side of the border prior to coming across here because people are not going to pay the Mexican drug cartels \$10,000 or \$15,000 to sit on the Mexican side of the border and hope that the hearing goes their way.

Again, to emphasize the number, 2 years ago, 11,000 a month; now, 152,000 a month. People shrug their shoulders and say: What could we do? Well, we could adopt the policies we had when we were at 11,000 a month. That would be a good start. In any event, this is

what we learned on the border 2 weeks ago.

Earlier today, we addressed the Ukraine situation, and I am continually disappointed in the media in this country for not addressing the Ukrainian famine of 90 years ago. I don't know how you can report on this war between Ukraine and Russia and not talk about, depending on who is doing the counting, the 5 to 10 million Ukrainians who were starved to death by the Communist governments in 1932.

Even, at the time, the American press was shameless. We were in a situation in which a reporter for The New York Times, Walter Duranty, hid this great starvation from the American public and the Western world.

As a result, without the West being able to weigh in or the world being able to weigh in, about 5 to 15 million people, I am guessing more like 5 or 6 million, starved to death.

When we talk about why the Ukrainians are fighting so hard, how can you talk about that without talking about the history between the then-Communist Government of Russia and also the communists, quite frankly, who ran Ukraine at the time and the civilians who wound up starving to death?

You read first-person accounts of all the people dying. You realize how, 90 years later, that must still be something that everybody learns about in that country.

Like I said, one of the great disappointments is the mainstream media has not talked about it. Why don't they talk about it?

Is it because they didn't talk about it in 1932 because their reporters were so left of left, they apparently didn't want to embarrass the Soviet Union with what was going on? Is it because our reporters today are so left of left and so in love with leftwing governments that they don't want to embarrass them by pointing out the mass murder that they were responsible for 90 years ago?

In any event, I encourage all Americans to Google the Ukrainian famine and read some first-person accounts of what was going on down there. I encourage any members of the media who sometimes, I think, spend time on nonissues to educate the American public a little bit on what was going on between Russia and Ukraine 90 years ago this year.

Now, the final issue which we have to talk about, and I think is the most important issue of America under normal circumstances when our country is not being overrun at the southern border and when we are not facing world war in Ukraine, and that is the continuous policy, encouraged more by the Biden administration in their Build Back Better bill, another thing he is doing, to have a means-tested welfare program that discourages work and encourages the breakdown of the family.

Understand the qualifications, and there are over 80 means-tested programs, some of them more well-known.

One is food stamps; TANF, which is a cash grant; public housing; earned income tax credit; Pell grants. All of these programs are based on whether or not you are considered to be in poverty.

If you have a married couple in which both are working or one has a somewhat middle-class job, you will not be considered in poverty, and you are not eligible for these programs. But if you have a single parent who is not working or working a little bit, the government considers you in poverty.

Once you are in poverty, food stamps, TANF, public housing, which is a big one—I think they underestimate the draw that public housing has, and I can talk about that in a second. The earned income tax credit can easily be a check of \$6,000, \$7,000, or \$8,000 coming in every tax season. Pell grants, the opportunity for almost free college, something else that the average person doesn't get, but if you adopt that lifestyle, you get it.

It is not surprising that we have had, going back 70 years, such a shift in the way we raise children in this country, a shift from almost uniformly a mom and dad at home to a much higher percentage all the time without a dad.

I realize there are a few people out there who don't want a dad at home. I will mention one more time Black Lives Matter. On their website, when they were riding high about a year and a half ago, they were against the traditional nuclear family. Of course, the Marxists, Karl Marx himself, did not like the traditional family.

People sometimes think this has been a coincidence in which we have had a breakdown of the traditional family. In part, we have to remember that there are people who outright don't like the family.

In any event, I encourage this body, before they pass any more significant legislation, and I encourage the Republicans, if they ever get back in the majority again, to look at these programs and see, in a country in which we try to treat everybody equally, why we have these programs that, in essence, take money from the traditional family and send it to the nonnuclear family.

I have been approached by women a few times in my district wondering why their children have to take out big student loans and go 30 or 40 grand in debt, or maybe they had a sister without a husband in the house, and they get free college. I really can't understand why we are so prejudiced against the nuclear family.

But that is what we are in America today, and there is a lot of talk about equity or equality. We should talk about the degree to which we discriminate against nuclear families in this society and see what we can do about trying to put people more on an equitable basis.

That would be a good thing for the Republican Party to work on if they ever do get the majority back, and I hope they do. I think they will.

In any event, I would also hope our conservative think tanks, our conservative groups, do more to publicize the prejudice that is going on in this society against the nuclear family.

Mr. Speaker, I believe some fine Congressmen behind me are anxious to speak. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1930

#### CRISIS AT OUR SOUTHERN BORDER CONTINUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am joined here this evening by some of the other members of the Freedom Caucus to talk about what everybody is talking about or one of the things everybody is talking about, which is the unmitigated disaster, the calamity, the crisis at the United States southern border.

Today, Secretary Mayorkas was here on the Hill, and I think the term he used was that the border was effectively managed. Effectively managed, Mr. Speaker. I think maybe we are asking the wrong question because effectively managed seems very different in the minds of many Americans than apparently it does to the good Secretary.

It seems to me that just looking at the numbers—and I think we often-times talk too much in numbers—the toll is in real human lives, but we do need to talk about the numbers a little bit just to emphasize the scale.

Effectively managed. For us, for Americans, we think we should have a sovereign country that has a border where the United States of America determines who gets to walk across the border and what the process is. Of course, that is obliterated right now. That is totally gone.

I think when the Secretary says that it is being effectively managed, I think that is in terms of the new left's version of the border of America, which is to allow it to be as open as possible, to be violated as many times as possible, and to make as efficient as possible those violations on a daily basis.

In other words, let's move across as many people as we can, legally or illegally, without regard to the safety of the country, without regard to the health of the country, without regard to the financial circumstances of the country. All of that stuff is out, quite honestly, without regard to the sentiment of the American people whom we all serve—our bosses.

In his mind, apparently, it is effectively being managed. Every time we allocate more money, the charge is it is to more effectively manage or secure our border. Ladies and gentlemen and Mr. Speaker, what that means under President Biden and Secretary Mayorkas and the left's reign across