

Let us remember and praise all of the immigrants that have saved American lives and continue to do so today.

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

MAINSTREAM MEDIA ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, let's address some problems that ought to be covered by our mainstream media, but I don't feel are adequately being covered. One more time, I would like to review what is going on at the border.

So the American citizens know, our fiscal year ends on September 30. Sometime in the next 2 months as information keeps flowing out from the administration on the number of people crossing our southern border, we are going to hit the all-time high in the number of immigrants who are coming here, what I believe to be the all-time high.

Right now, at the end of June, we have let in, in our current year, over 2.1 million immigrants. When the prior administration left, in his final year, we were probably around about 120,000. The American citizens ought to know, when we hit the all-time record, it was 20 times as many people who had crossed the southern border as who crossed the southern border in fiscal year 2020.

Of course, in addition to the skyrocketing high number, you have the huge cost of immigrants. Immediately when they come in, they are given school at probably 12 or 13 or \$15,000 a year. They are housed sometimes in hotels. They are fed. They are given free medical care or largely free medical care, as President Biden promised he would do when he ran for President 4 years ago.

I hope that when these final figures are released—they might be released in the middle of September, they might be released in the middle of October—the American public is immediately given time to digest the numbers.

This is also a humanitarian problem, in addition to a huge fiscal problem. It is a humanitarian problem in that along with this group, it appears as though we are going to approach—probably won't get there—but approach 90,000 unaccompanied minors.

Can you imagine a 10-year-old, a 12-year-old child, without either parent there, being let into the United States? They will try to find a foster parent, and maybe it will be a relative, maybe it won't be, although the Biden administration no longer does DNA tests to make sure if somebody claims to be an uncle or a parent that they really are.

There was a time we were upset about tiny numbers of people when their parents broke the law and they were separated from their parents for a

week, 10 days, or something. Here we have a situation in which we are going to have almost 90,000 unaccompanied minors separated from their parents for life. Talk about a humanitarian problem.

I should also point out that when we have an open border, people die making the dangerous trip—I have been at the border eight or nine times—be it drowning in the Rio Grande, be it drowning in the Pacific Ocean, or be it dehydrating in the Arizona heat.

Every year, people are dying because they think they can come to this country because President Biden has created the expectation that people can come in this country without concern.

I also want to point out, and I hate to be too tough on President Biden here because, of course, soon after he took office, he named KAMALA the border czar. I would have thought at the time she would be so grateful for the responsibility.

President Biden had rescued her from political oblivion after her Presidential run in 2020 came to naught, but when she was given this responsibility and opportunity to shine—and even if she didn't want the responsibility, Joe Biden gave it to her.

Our boss doesn't always assign us responsibilities we want to have, but it was interesting that for over 3 years, nothing at all was done with the responsibility. It looks like then Joe Biden had to step in and do a little bit of something.

It is something that as we go through our lives and the full impact of letting over 2 million people in this country every year hits this country, we remember the tandem of President Biden, and even more, Vice President HARRIS, who he assigned to solve this problem, what they did and the permanent crisis that we have.

I should also point out because sometimes when people talk about the border, they say, oh, people just have to get here, and we have always been a country of immigrants.

People should remember that if you look in 4-year increments, as far as I can tell, we are now hitting all-time records of legal immigrants coming in this country.

We have legal immigrants coming in at about 850,000 people a year. I don't think we talk about that as much as we should. We have 850,000 new citizens a year.

The other thing while I am talking about the number of new citizens coming here, I would like to touch on where the people are coming from. I touch on it because there are people who like to tear down America, you know, Eurocentric, that sort of thing.

I dug up where our new immigrants are coming from, and kind of from—it may be surprising to the people who like to run down America and talk about being racist, that sort of thing. In the most recent year that I could find, 2022, immigrants from Mexico are coming to the U.S. and being natural-

ized the most, then India, then Philippines, then Cuba, Dominican, Vietnam, China, Jamaica, El Salvador, Colombia, Pakistan, Haiti, Iran, South Korea, Nigeria, Bangladesh, and Brazil.

□ 1315

Those are the top 17.

Madam Speaker, do you notice anything about those 17 countries that are the leading countries in sending us immigrants?

None of them have a primarily European population. You have to get down to Britain where you come in at 18. The 17 countries that our new citizens are coming from the most are from all around the globe. None of them are from a primarily European country. I think that is something that we should tell our children and should be taught in class to counteract the people who like to run down America and scream racism, racism.

In any event, to summarize, I hope that when we hit the all-time record of people coming across the southern border, which is going to happen sometime in September or October, it is the banner headline in this country as well it should be.

The next issue that still has not been taken up but ought to be taken up is the large number of people in this country who are born into families in which they won't have a dad at home. Sometimes that is inevitable. However, it has changed America from a time when the Great Society kicked in until today.

There are over 70 programs in this country in which it is much easier to get government benefits if one is a parent not married to the other parent.

This is because we give out various things, food, medical care, and housing, if someone is perceived to be "in poverty." If they are married to somebody with an income, then they are not in poverty. There are over 70 programs that you are eligible for that if you are married and the other parent has an income, then you would lose that program.

You have a very generous earned income tax credit program that can get you \$7,000 or \$8,000; you have the food share program; you have, as I mentioned, the healthcare that you could lose if you married somebody with a decent income; and you have the rental assistance which can give you a benefit of over \$10,000 a year.

I don't know why politicians don't talk about it. I think it ought to be a subject for debate. There have always been people in this country who do not want children to be raised in what we call the old-fashioned nuclear family going back to Karl Marx and his disciples in the 1960s. His disciples are part of Black Lives Matter. It is not as if this decline in both parents at home happened in a vacuum. It happened I think because of government policies and the fact that there is a small but powerful group of Americans who wanted it to happen.

We should have an open discussion on these programs. It hasn't been done I think because the press does not adequately describe for the public the generosity that will be given somebody if they stack these programs on top of one another. Obviously, nobody takes advantage of all 70 programs, but there are a whole lot of people who take advantage of six or seven of these programs and put themselves in a position in which financially they do not want to live in a two-parent household.

In any event, these are a couple of the issues that I think have not been adequately covered in the newspapers. I hope they are in the future.

To summarize, again, I would like to see a banner headline when sometime in September or October we have numbers released when we hit the all-time high number of what we will call illegal immigrants coming in this country. I would like to see the newspapers do a better job of covering the fact that our current, what else to call them, welfare programs appear designed to discourage Americans from having children raised by a married couple.

I would like to have a little more information because when I ask people at random back home, they don't know the answer to these questions. I would like to have a little bit more publicity as to where the immigrants who are naturalized in this country are coming from because I think it would perhaps be a surprise to those people who like to educate our young people what a racist country we have when, in fact, the top 17 countries in which we get immigrants from are non-European countries.

I hope the press follows up on these what I think are vital issues.

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

SAVING SAN FRANCISCO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KILEY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KILEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today with an update on the condition of San Francisco, a city whose fate has been largely shaped by several politicians of prominence here in Washington, D.C. Foremost among them are Vice President KAMALA HARRIS and Speaker Emerita NANCY PELOSI.

I think it is important for all Americans to understand the tragedy of San Francisco and what has happened to one of America's most beautiful cities because the same radical failed policies that have caused San Francisco's decline and collapse are gaining increasing traction in Washington, D.C.

I want to go over just a few of the reasons why it is that as the San Francisco Chronicle put it last year, this city is "on the verge of collapse."

Indeed, in many ways, my entire State of California offers a preview of where our country has been headed, but

San Francisco offers an even starker warning. It is the part of our State where failed policies, radical politics, and public corruption are in their most advanced stage and where residents are most rapidly fleeing.

In an article headlined "San Francisco Falls Into the Abyss," UCLA economics professor Lee Ohanian writes: "No major American city has failed at the same level as Detroit, whose population dropped from 1.85 million people in 1950 to about 630,000 today. Move over Detroit, here comes San Francisco, which lost 6.3 percent of its population between 2019 and 2021, a rate of decline larger than any 2-year period in Detroit's history and unprecedented among any major U.S. city."

The city is declining faster than any major U.S. city in the history of our country. The reasons they are not a misery, foremost among them are crime, drug addiction, homelessness, waste, unaffordability, and failing schools, all a result of failed governance.

Let's just start with the crime situation in San Francisco, which is a city that has had a progression of self-described progressive prosecutors starting with now-Vice President HARRIS who has used that term to describe herself, progressive prosecutor, followed by others in her mold, George Gascon and then Chesa Boudin, who was ultimately recalled from office by voters.

On a State level, California law has essentially legalized many forms of crime, making theft of merchandise below \$950 a misdemeanor, as well as the possession of even class A drugs.

In practice, this means offenders are rarely, if ever, prosecuted, and, in many cases, businesses have stopped even reporting losses.

San Francisco's anti-law enforcement policies have compounded these problems. For example, a few years ago in 2020, San Francisco defunded the police shifting \$120 million away from law enforcement. If you park your car while in the city, the advice is just to leave the doors open and make sure there are no valuables inside. That will at least spare you the cost of replacing your windshield.

Last year, the Castro Merchants Association, representing 125 businesses wrote a scathing letter regarding the city's failure to address the lawlessness around them. One said: We are just seeing constant vandalism, constant drug use in public, people passed out on the sidewalk, people having psychotic breakdowns, it is just not something a small business owner should have to deal with.

On top of these general problems relating to crime, retail theft, and car thefts is the issue of drug use. Walking through San Francisco you will see open drug use and drug dealing with an open-air drug market scene that is so rampant that even last year Governor Gavin Newsom sent in the National Guard ostensibly to get it under control.

While California has among the highest rates of illegal drug use in the country. San Francisco is well above the national average with 22 percent of the population in the San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont area using an illegal drug in the last year. Tragically, the number of overdose deaths has skyrocketed from 222 to now 647 in a given year.

Things only got worse during the COVID shutdowns as far more people in the city died from overdoses than from COVID. Facing one of the most punishing lockdowns in the country, emergency room mental health visits increased substantially, especially for young people.

It certainly doesn't help matters that the supply of drugs is abundant thanks to the crisis at our border, largely overseen by this administration's border czar, Vice President KAMALA HARRIS.

It should be noted that San Francisco declared itself a sanctuary city long before California became a sanctuary State.

On that note, the current Vice President also played a starring role when she was district attorney abiding by the city's sanctuary policies. Then when she was the State's attorney general, she actually paved the way for California to become a sanctuary State by opposing a Federal law meant to stop sanctuary jurisdictions.

A third issue that one will confront immediately in San Francisco is the explosion of homelessness. This is very much connected to the crisis of crime, drug use, and mental health.

Once again, while California leads the Nation in homelessness, San Francisco is worst of all. Between 2005 and 2020, the number of homeless increased from 5,404 to 8,124. During that same period, homelessness declined significantly nationwide. Within a 3-year span, complaints of homeless encampments to the city's 311 line increased from 2 to 62 each and every day. Meanwhile, the share of the homeless population that is unsheltered has also gone up in recent years.

Fourthly is the waste situation. Between 2014 and 2018 in San Francisco, calls about human feces doubled to 20,933. \$100 million was spent on street cleaning in 2019 alone. In a 3-year span, the city replaced 300 lampposts corroded by urine. The overall condition in many areas is something that no American should ever have to experience, especially kids walking to school.

Speaking of kids, the San Francisco Unified School District has the second widest achievement gap of any school district in California with over 5,000 students. A CalMatters investigation from 2017 found that San Francisco had the worst Black student achievement rate of any county in California. Just 19 percent of Black students in San Francisco passed the State's reading test compared with 31 percent Statewide. This was before COVID. While California was last in the Nation in