

What happens when title 42 goes away? An extra million people come into the country illegally, remembering that when all of those folks come into the country, apparently, the Biden administration also has no plan to deport them.

Where are we right now with the number of people that have illegally crossed our border, and where are they from? Let me give you a quick map.

This is a map of all the countries in the past year—just in the past year—who have illegally crossed our border. In the white there is the United States. In the red are the countries that we have seen people illegally cross our border. If you want to squint at that map, let me just give you shorthand for it. It is every country in the world.

Last year, we had individuals from literally every country in the world illegally cross our southern border. Yes, that includes China; that includes North Korea; that includes Iran. It includes them all.

Interestingly enough, just in the last—well, not the last 3 months but the last 4 months that we have had records on it—that would be October, November, December, and January—just in those last 4 months that we have those records, we have 6,400 Russian citizens who illegally crossed our southern border. Just in the last 4 months we have records, there were 6,400 Russian citizens.

We have people from all over the world who are illegally crossing our southern border because people know, if you get across the border, you are in. When title 42 goes away, this accelerates even more. It is an open invitation because 56 percent of the people were turned around, 44 percent of the people were released into the country—by the way, that is over a million so far—that goes away. Then they all get in.

What happens at that point? Those individuals are told that they can make a request for asylum, even though our statistics show 91 percent of the people who request asylum are actually coming for economic reasons, not actually true asylum—91 percent.

Those individuals are released into the country. They are told to be able to sign up for a hearing date, and they can do their hearing anywhere they want in the United States. They are given a hearing date, currently, 6 years in the future—6 years. So they will be traveling in our country anywhere they want to go for the next 6 years waiting on their hearing.

By the way, if they don't show up for their hearing, apparently there is no plan to be able to actually go get them, if they don't show up for their hearing, because, right now, ICE is not removing people. So they are just released, and when they are released into the country, they can immediately text friends back home and say: I am in. Here is what I said. Here is where I crossed. Here is the cartel member whom I paid on the southern border to be able to get me through. I am in. Fol-

low my same path; you will have the same result.

What can be done about this? Well, let me just highlight a couple of things, and then I want to talk about this more.

First things first—don't end title 42. We still have a worldwide pandemic. Until there is a plan of what is actually going to occur next on our southern border, don't end title 42.

This is the time for the President and Ali Mayorkas and all the leadership to put up a pause and to say: The chaos that happened last year was only 44 percent of the people crossing our southern border. We do not have, physically, the capability to be able to handle that many people. Do not cancel title 42.

The second thing is the "Remain in Mexico" policy. The "Remain in Mexico" policy that actually started under President Trump, President Biden set aside, and Federal courts stepped back in and told this administration: You have to put back in place the "Remain in Mexico" policy. So they chose to do it.

I have talked to this body before about what they did. The Biden administration said: OK. We will follow the court order. We will reinstate the "Remain in Mexico" policy.

They have reinstated that policy the last 3 months. They have put up three different facilities. Actually, now there are four total facilities. I visited one of them in Brownsville, TX. That facility has six courtrooms. Each courtroom is set up to handle 22 people at a time, plus their attorneys, plus all the ancillary services. Six of those they have got set up. They have individual meeting spaces set up for 120 people to meet individually with their attorney. So 120 rooms, 6 courtrooms that are all set up, and all the ancillary everything around it as well, and we have now got 4 different locations for that.

Of the half a million people who have illegally crossed our border in the time that they have set up the new MPP courtrooms—of the half a million people who have crossed illegally during that time period, so far, the Biden administration has pulled out 1,569 of them to evaluate if they would go into the "Remain in Mexico" policy. Of those, 893 they actually put in the system. Of those, they have actually had 494 of those who at some point came back and said: We have changed our mind. We talked to attorneys. We have a new way to be able to get out of it.

We are trying to get the actual number of people who have actually gone through the "Remain in Mexico" policy and who have actually qualified for it, while we have 4 different locations, each of them with 6 courtrooms, 120 meeting spaces. But what we are finding is, really, a handful of people actually have "qualified" for the "Remain in Mexico" policy out of half a million people during that time period.

The simple answer is that the Biden administration is spending millions

and millions of taxpayer dollars setting up the MPP Program that the court has required them to do, but they have made so many exceptions to it, no one actually qualifies. So they are trying to please the court by saying "We are following your order," waste American tax dollars, while we continue to see record numbers of people crossing the border. That is a waste.

If we are going to stop this, keep title 42 in place until you have a response to what you are going to do instead. Actually run the MPP Program as the court has instructed you to do rather than playing games with American tax dollars and with the system here.

I would also encourage you to put the "Safe Third Country" policy back in place. The previous administration had actually created a relationship with multiple other countries so that as individuals traveled through other countries to get to the United States, they could make asylum requests in those locations, because we understand—because we know the law in this body—the law is very clear on the international standards on this.

If you are going to request asylum, you go to the next safe country, and you request asylum. If they are traveling through five countries or they are traveling literally across the globe to get to the United States from everywhere else so they can request asylum, that is not asylum; that is economic opportunity.

By the way, don't blame them for coming to the greatest country in the world to get economic opportunity—except that is not asylum, and we all know it. So why don't we actually treat it exactly as we all see it?

If you would like to come to the greatest country in the world, wonderful. Go through the legal process of that. We allow a million people a year to legally become citizens of the United States, going through the legal process. Do that. But for the billions of people who wake up every day wishing they were in the United States, I don't blame you. But we welcome people when they come through legally in this process, and we do with open arms welcome people who come through legally.

There are ways to be able to address this, but my first concern today is to be able to speak to this administration and to be able to say: The title 42 piece is essential to maintain. Do not let go of this until you have a solution to what is happening at the border, or the chaos at the border will be even worse this summer than it was last summer, and it is on you for not enforcing the border.

I want to keep this conversation going in the days ahead, but as of now, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

SUNSHINE WEEK

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I come to the floor today to celebrate what we say annually is Sunshine

Week, a very important week in our system of self-government. For the last 17 years, advocacy groups, good-government watchdogs, media organizations, and many Members of this body have joined forces to observe the importance of transparency in government and freedom of information. As a longtime champion for open, accessible government, I speak today in support of what we all ought to consider enduring principles.

Sunshine Week coincides each year with March 16. That is the day one of our Nation's Founding Fathers and fourth President of the United States James Madison was born. Madison is widely known as the father of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. From his writings, particularly in the *Federalist Papers*, you might say he was the architect who framed our system of checks and balances. Madison believed all powers of the government are derived of, by, and for the people, and that is what brings me to the floor today.

The public has a right to know what their government is doing and how it is spending tax dollars. There are very few things in government that should be kept secret: national security, so we don't tell our enemies what we are going to do; the privacy of American citizens; and some intelligence-gathering information. I will bet that is 1 percent of everything the government is involved in. Yet there are some people who think that a lot more ought to be classified or secret, *et cetera*, *et cetera*.

So we have the Freedom of Information Act that is to protect the public's right to know. Through Freedom of Information Act requests, everyday Americans can ask a Federal Agency for information. Unfortunately, now—and it is a growing problem—Federal Agencies seem to have the unstated goal of releasing as little information as possible to the public.

Agencies rely on exemptions to FOIA, the Freedom of Information Act, to withhold information. A 2021 Government Accountability Office study found this: that Federal Agencies use FOIA exemptions to avoid disclosing documents. That problem has doubled between 2012 and 2019.

Most Americans may not be familiar with the section of the code that we call the (b)(3) FOIA exemption, and, of course, they don't have to be aware of this, but they should know that it is the most used justification by the Federal Government to withhold information from the public.

The increase in the use of this FOIA exemption to withhold information from the public is unacceptable to me, and it ought to be unacceptable to anybody who believes that we should not have secrecy in government.

In another recent report, the Government Accountability Office found that FOIA request backlogs increased by nearly 20 percent in just the 1 year of 2019 to 2020. In fact, backlogged FOIA

requests are up 97 percent since 2012. Sixteen Federal Agencies had more than 1,000 backlogged FOIA requests. They account for 94 percent of backlogged requests across the entire government.

Federal Agencies ought to do better—must do better—and we must all work to ensure that they are responding appropriately and within a reasonable time for FOIA requests.

Congressional oversight is part of our constitutional assignment: to protect the power of the purse and ensure laws are faithfully enforced.

Finally, we must acknowledge the important role that citizens play who bravely come forward, often at great professional risk, to report wrongdoing in our efforts to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse. I have often said that whistleblowers are the best line of defense against government waste. No one shines a brighter light on waste, fraud, and abuse than whistleblowers. And why might that be? Because they are down in the bowels of the government where maybe the heads of the Agencies don't know something wrong is going on, and they are able to point it out—the whistleblowers are.

That is why I introduced legislation this Congress to strengthen the False Claims Act. I got the False Claims Act passed in 1986. Since then, that act has helped government recover \$70 billion in fraud.

Last year, I asked the Department of Veterans Affairs about allegations that VA employees leaked potentially market-sensitive information, and then do you know what they did? They retaliated against these whistleblowers. Nearly 1 year later, I haven't received any answers, and I assume I am not going to receive any answers because it is an embarrassment to the VA.

As a cofounder and cochairman of the Whistleblower Protection Caucus, I lead efforts from Capitol Hill to strengthen protections and raise awareness for what often is an uphill battle for whistleblowers.

I want you to know how I feel whistleblowers are treated by their very own government, how they are treated just because they want the government to do what the government is supposed to be doing under the laws, and they want the money spent the way Congress intends for the money to be spent. These whistleblowers who point out that wrongdoing are treated by the bureaucracy like skunks at a picnic.

This U.S. Senator will continue shining spotlight on waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon, and I am going to do it elsewhere, as well. I will continue advocating for whistleblowers with every tool at my disposal.

And as an Iowa farmer, I know why farmers make hay when the sun shines, and that is a good lesson for good government. Sunshine helps hold government accountable to the people.

Let me repeat that again: Transparency brings accountability.

EB-5 REFORM AND INTEGRITY ACT OF 2022

Madam President, I have another point I would like to make. We were able to pass something with the Omnibus appropriations bill that I have been working on in a bipartisan way for years. It was a program that was abused, and we finally got together—Senator LEAHY and I—to finally win what we have been trying to do for years.

So I am here to speak about reforms to the EB-5 investor visa program that were included in last week's Omnibus bill. I also addressed this issue before the vote, but I would like to follow up on that statement with some brief remarks about how important this is after years of fighting to get it done.

First, this wouldn't have been done without working with my friend and colleague Senator LEAHY. So I thank him. He worked with me for several years on reforming this EB-5 program. Senator LEAHY, as well as his staff, have put in a great deal of time and work on a number of legislative efforts to reform the EB-5 program. I appreciate the partnership that we had on this issue for those many years.

As I mentioned in my previous statement on the day the bill passed, Congress originally authorized the EB-5 Regional Center Program in 1992 as a pilot program and as an outgrowth of the EB-5 investor visa that was created by Congress 2 years before that, in 1990.

When the EB-5 visa and regional center programs were established, Congress intended for them to spur investment in, No. 1, rural areas, and, No. 2, in economically depressed areas. I emphasize rural and economically depressed areas because this whole program, over a period of the next 20 years, evolved into a program far removed from the original goals. Senator LEAHY and I recognized that 5 or 6 years ago. But to get around all of the interest groups that have something to do with the EB-5 program, and particularly those who are enriching themselves from it, it is hard to get changes made here in the Congress of the United States.

Thank God we were fortunate not to get the EB-5 program extended from year to year because that is what happened for 4 or 5 years as we were working on these reforms. You just extended it and let the fraud and abuse of the law go on. But, finally, about a year ago, we kept that program from being extended year to year and forced people to sit down and talk to us in a responsible way to get to where we are today.

It is unfortunate that the EB-5 Regional Center Program, in particular, has been plagued with all this fraud and abuse. Rampant and abusive gerrymandering of the EB-5 program's targeted employment areas also undermined congressional intent that lower investment thresholds be a tool for channeling investment into areas that truly need it. Those are the rural areas and the economically depressed areas