

When we are looking at a health care situation and an aging population, our community pharmacists need to be a vital player in that market, making sure that our health and our well-being are taken care of in a kind and caring and compassionate way. The challenges facing independent community pharmacists are great, but the important role they play in our towns and States is even greater still.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership, and I want to thank him for joining me here tonight and for being a part of discussing real solutions and real answers of why a conservative agenda is important to America, because it matters to Main Street, because it matters to real people in everyday life situations.

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

THE RULE OF LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, thank you, and thank you to the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence and to the rules of this body that allow for Members to come down to this well in the most important place where free speech is allowed, and I am extremely grateful for that opportunity to be here tonight.

One subject that I would like to focus on this evening is the issue that is being taken up here in Washington, D.C. It has gotten some attention in recent weeks—certainly with a bill that came through the United States Senate—and that was a bill that granted amnesty to illegal aliens. That bill passed through the United States Senate. Unfortunately, that bill does nothing about the main problem that we deal with in immigration, and that's border security.

Twenty-seven years ago, Ronald Reagan made a deal with the American people, Mr. Speaker. He said this, that we're going to have a onetime deal. We're going to deal with immigration right now.

It kind of sounds like very familiar rhetoric that we're getting today—we're going to deal with this issue once and for all. We're going to take this issue off the table. Then President Reagan said, We're going to secure the borders. We're going to make that happen, but we're also going to grant amnesty to the illegal aliens who are here in the United States. He estimated about 1 million illegal aliens would be here in the United States.

Once the bill was passed, the American people found out it wasn't 1 million illegal aliens. It was 3.6 million illegal aliens who were granted amnesty status. Once that amnesty status was granted, the United States had a policy of dealing with chain migration, and pretty soon that turned into 15 million

foreigners or illegal aliens who were allowed to come into the United States as immigrants.

Now, we're all immigrants. I'm an immigrant. Mr. Speaker, I imagine you're an immigrant. All of us are descended from immigrants. This is a good thing. We're not here bashing immigrants. If we didn't have immigrants, we wouldn't have a country. We love immigrants. What we love also is the rule of law. We believe in the rule of law.

That's what this Chamber is. In fact, this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, is surrounded. There are medallions above every door in this Chamber, and those medallions have the faces of lawmakers over the time of recorded human history. Each one of these is a silhouette, and they contributed to the rule of law by adding to the certainty for mankind—for good rules and a good society that we can live under. In this Chamber, many of the American people may not know that our motto, "In God We Trust," is written above the stand, Mr. Speaker, where you're standing today just above the American flag. Just opposite from "In God We Trust" is a lawmaker unique among all of the lawmakers in this Chamber. That lawmaker is Moses. Moses faces the Speaker, and you'll note, Mr. Speaker, that Moses is the only lawmaker who has a full face.

Why would that be? Why would Moses be given a status different than all of the other lawmakers in this Chamber?

Mr. Speaker, I believe it's for this reason. I believe it is because of the great English jurist Blackstone, who is the mentor to the Founders of this Nation. Blackstone wrote that English common law and all of law in England is based upon the foundation bedrock of the Ten Commandments as given through Moses, and Moses is the full face—the most important lawgiver—because all of the law you see, all of the subsequent lawmakers down throughout the recorded annals of human history rest on the foundation of law and the rule of law as given by Moses and as given by God—according to the holy Torah and to the Bible—to Moses, and all of law descends from there.

Why that history lesson? Why that lesson on talking about law and a lawgiver while we're in the middle of talking about immigration?

It's because, right now, Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill and also the proposed House bill, the so-called DREAM Act, are premised upon the condition that people who came into the United States by breaking the law would receive an unparalleled benefit, much more so than the benefit of those who come into America legally. How many people come into America legally every year? It's shocking. People think we're not allowing people in. A million people a year, Mr. Speaker, are allowed into the United States legally. They go through the process, and they become

American citizens, and we applaud. I have been to naturalization ceremonies, proudly welcoming individuals in.

□ 2130

Today I was in a cab just before I came over here. A man from Pakistan was thrilled to be an American citizen. I shook his hand. I said, I'm so grateful that you're here, and I'm grateful that you came into our Nation legally. I'm grateful. Welcome. We're happy you're here.

I married a family of immigrants. My in-laws came here through the legal process. Why is this important? It's important because we as a Nation of laws must observe those laws. Now we're looking at changing that status by rewarding people who broke laws and putting them at the head of the line in front of people who stood by the law and did everything they could to follow the law to become legal citizens.

If you look at every nation in the world and their immigration policy, and if you look at the numbers of people of every single nation of the world—remember, Mr. Speaker, the United States is not the most populated country—there are more people in China than there are in the United States, and yet the United States is such a generous group of people, we allow more legal immigration in one year than the rest of the world. Every country of the world combined, we allow more legal immigrants, a million people a year.

Yet we still have 4 million people on a waiting list doing everything right, trying to come into the country legally. So why, I ask, Mr. Speaker, would we put to the front of the line lawbreakers, people who decided we're not going to pay attention to the law to the lawgivers of history, to Moses who gave the original Ten Commandments? We're going to break this law in this body where law is made; we're going to break this law. And for some reason this body would choose to benefit those who broke our laws? I say no, because the real problem with immigration, Mr. Speaker, is that we need to keep it legal and make it legal. That's why our very first consideration and only consideration should be complete border security first.

Border security for America first. Why? Because amnesty for illegal aliens is incredibly expensive. The estimate, Mr. Speaker, is \$6 trillion of additional debt for our children, \$6 trillion in redistribution of wealth with amnesty for illegal aliens. Nearly half of that number, Mr. Speaker, shockingly would be for retirement benefits for illegal aliens. So while you and I and millions of Americans have been working and paying in over the decades to Social Security and to Medicare, while we've been paying in and while people who are baby boomers like myself are just about at that time to draw down on our Social Security and our Medicare benefits, now we

would open the door wide, we would benefit and grant citizenship, a legal protected status, and immediate access to Social Security and Medicare, ObamaCare, Medicaid, 80 different means-tested welfare programs. Why would we do this? Is it because we have an abundance of money that's overflowing from our Treasury and we have absolute no idea what to do with it? I don't think so. Just in my brief time in Congress, we have doubled the national debt. That's one bill, essentially full-on amnesty, perpetual amnesty, with no means of deportation ever, with no border security ever. That's the fake bill that is coming out of the Senate.

What is the House of Representatives looking to take up? It is a different bill. It's called the DREAMers bill, and we're all told that what we need to do is get behind this effort to reward instant legalization status to children of illegal aliens. I want to put this on the floor for the American people. The children of illegal aliens very well may make up the largest subset of illegal aliens in the United States, but we need to recognize this is fake, back-door amnesty.

This isn't feeling sorry for kids or trying to deal with people through no fault of their own who are here in the United States illegally. This is what we're talking about. We're talking about millions of individuals who would be given instantaneous legal status. But it isn't just the children, Mr. Speaker. Because they would be given amnesty, they would immediately have the right to apply, and it would be granted, for their parents to have legal permanent status.

We aren't just talking about millions of kids, Mr. Speaker. We're talking about all their parents, too. So take all of the kids, and then double the number for their biological parents. Then, if there is a waiting period—let's say 5 years until they get their full legal status—then the parents can apply for legal status for their parents. And it goes from there. Very likely what we will see is a family reunification, chain migration, and rather than tens of millions of illegal aliens, some have estimated as much as over 100 million additional illegal aliens would be given amnesty in addition to the generosity of every year.

Why is this important? Again, because we hate immigrants? Absolutely, 1,000 percent no. That's not true. Number one, the rule of law. We need to observe the law. Number two, dealing with our debt and with the cost. It costs a fortune to have illegal immigration. Here's the third reason: it's because we will never solve this problem. You see, all we will have done, Mr. Speaker, is made sure that we will increase this problem, and we will have it with us forever because we will have ongoing perpetual amnesty.

I would like to ask to join me right now, my fellow colleague, Representative STEVE KING from Iowa, who has been essentially the leading voice on

this issue in Congress, talking about making sure that we, the American people, recognize what we're going into.

You see, we had the ObamaCare bill. The former Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, said we had to read the bill to know what was in it. It's a travesty. It's bankrupting America. Also, with the so-called DREAM Act, which, let's face it, it is three-quarters of the cost of the terrible fake border security bill in the Senate. So you've got this terrible full-on amnesty bill in the Senate. Mr. Speaker, the DREAMers bill takes you three-quarters of the way to the full-on amnesty bill. So when you take these two bills and you put them in conference committee, you can have either 100 percent amnesty or you can have 75 percent amnesty. When you split the difference on that, where are you? You've got amnesty. That's the problem, Mr. Speaker. It's a fake, no-border security, but it's a total authentic, nearly 100 percent amnesty bill.

I'd like to ask Representative STEVE KING to speak to that now as I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for yielding, and I appreciate the delivery you make and understanding in driving this issue. If a few of us don't stand up and drive this issue and remind, Mr. Speaker, that the American people observe what we do here—and they are thoughtful, they're intelligent, they're analytical, and they understand the history of this country, and they don't want to have somebody feed them a line. They want to know the squared-away truth. That's why I dig down into a bill like S. 744, the Gang of Eight's bill in the Senate, and take it apart and analyze it and put it back together and come down with this conclusion.

From the beginning, I called it the Always is, Always Was, and Always Will Be Amnesty Act. The reason I say that is because you'd have to just kind of have a little bit of license with our grammar. But if you is in America, you get to stay. If you was in America, you get an invitation to come back. And if you ever get here, you always will get to stay here. So it's the Always Is, Always Was, and Always Will Be Amnesty Act.

If that doesn't trip your biblical trigger, then I can describe it this way in more secular terms. It is the Perpetual and Retroactive Amnesty Act, which means it was on forever and it also invites the people who have been deported in the past. It says, We really didn't mean it. If we deported you in the past, it was by a mistake that we didn't realize because our President hadn't been elected yet, and he hadn't decided that he was going to violate his constitutional oath and grant this executive edict that's called the "Morton Memos" that legalizes the people that are here.

I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that we had 400,000 people that were adjudicated for removal in this country,

and the President issued an order and used our precious resources to go back and comb through the records again, and that directive said, Look at them on an individual basis. The reason they do that is because they claim they have prosecutorial discretion. If they deal with individuals, then they cannot enforce the law. But if they have to put it into classes of people, then they know that they don't have prosecutorial discretion from a legal point.

So they use resources to comb through those 400,000 names of people to find ways they can waive the application of the law. That's amnesty by executive edict, and it's using resources to grant that. It didn't matter that they were young or old. If they hadn't committed a felony and been caught at it, or if they didn't commit and been caught at these three mysterious misdemeanors, they were going to get the application of the law, which was removal. They were just waiting for their final removal order, and so the President believed that he had the constitutional authority to grant this amnesty.

Now, this was just the precursor to the balance of the Morton Memos, which are the DREAM Act lite, so to speak, this executive edict for the DREAM Act. And it then sets up four categories of people, generally young people, but now we see, according to the Gang of Eight's bill, age up to 35. If up to age 35, if you want to test that you came to America, say, before your 16th birthday or your 18th birthday, depending on which policy you want to take—now, it really wasn't your fault; it was your parents' decision.

Well, it reminds me of a long shirt-tail relation who found himself in jail on Christmas Eve, and his father decided he would bail him out and bring him home for Christmas Eve, Christmas Day, Christmas dinner, and take him back to the jail where he belonged again. When his father showed up, let me say this uncooperative son was so resentful that he said to his father, It's not my fault, Dad, it's your fault because you controlled everything. You controlled my genes and you controlled my environment. I didn't control either one. I'm a product of nature and nurture, and you are the one who produced the nature and nurture; therefore it's your fault that I'm in jail. I can tell you what his father said: You can stay in jail if you think it's not your responsibility and think it over.

Well, I heard this new theory come in the committee here just yesterday, I guess it was, that young people can't form intent. I wondered about that. That was a bit of a new theory for me. We do prosecute intent in this country and we prosecute intent of juveniles.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, Representative KING had stated that in the committee they were told that young people could not form intent. And my question would be, under the proposed DREAM Act that we have looked at so far,

we're looking at that from age zero to 35. These people would be given automatic amnesty from being an illegal alien. Then, of course, we know their parents would immediately be able to come in as legal permanent residents, as well. So my question would be: Do we consider that you are not legally capable of forming an intent when you're age 35?

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, as that is my point.

We know that young people can form intent. That's why we discipline them at a young age; 2-year-olds get a little discipline because they have intent; 3-year-olds have a little more intent, and they get a little more discipline. By the time they get to be 7 or 8, they are actually disciplined. So I think that's an argument that moves us off the target. Regardless of whether they have intent when they're 1 day old, 1 week old, 1 month old, 1 year old, or 10 years old, whenever that time comes, when they become of age and they realize that they're unlawfully present in the United States, the law requires that they remove themselves. It's just the law. So we expect them to accept this responsibility, whether it was the intent that they had when they came in or the intent that they have to stay tomorrow. If we don't do that, then we've absolved a whole class of people from a responsibility and rewarded them with the objective of their crime.

These are the things that trouble me. If we destroy the rule of law, an essential pillar of American exceptionalism—we could not be a great Nation without the rule of law. If we destroy that even in the narrower version of immigration or the even narrower version of the DREAM kids, if we do that, then it expands into all people that are here illegally because age is the only difference, and you cannot draw a bright line.

Furthermore, then you have expanded the amnesty throughout all immigration, and you've destroyed the rule of law. And if we can't restore it in this time, since we've been struggling to do so since the 1986 Amnesty Act, we could not restore the rule of law with regard to immigration for all time. And we could therefore, then, not control immigration in this country any longer, only by trying to keep people out by barriers at the borders. But we then couldn't enforce the law against anybody that got in.

□ 2145

Can you imagine, turning over the immigration law in the United States to everybody but those who are in America? If you're not in America, you get to decide immigration law; and if you're in America, you don't get to decide immigration law. That's what we're dealing with.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you so much. One thing that I wanted to mention as well, in speaking with one of

the experts, Mr. Speaker, Robert ReCTOR from the Heritage Foundation, we asked him: What is the average age of the average illegal immigrant into the United States? He said it is age 34. Isn't it a coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation being proposed is to grant amnesty to anyone 35 or below. And again, they would instantaneously be able to apply for legal permanent residence for their parents, and it would be granted automatically.

So we are talking not about a tiny subset. We're talking about a tremendously huge subset. But here's the other identifying feature that Mr. ReCTOR had said: the average age being about 34, the average education level being something less than 10th grade. Now, that's not to make fun of anyone that they don't have the education level, but I'm talking about the impact now not on the illegal immigrant, I'm talking about the impact on the American people, on American citizens who are senior citizens, American citizens who are in the working age population, and also the young people who will shoulder the burden for all of the debt that is being handed to them right now.

I'm thinking also, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that when an individual comes into this country and they have less than a 10th grade education, the statistics bear it out, Mr. Speaker, according to Heritage Foundation, that those individuals over the course of their lifetime are revenue consumers. In other words, they take more out of the United States Treasury than they pay in.

And so if we allow the DREAM Act, which is three-fourths of the way amnesty, which is backdoor amnesty, for all practical purposes full-on amnesty, if we allow that, we are bringing into this country legally tens of millions of individuals who would be taking out of the Treasury at the worst possible time—when we have pensions to pay, when we have health care to pay, when we have education to pay for, police, fire protection. And the estimate is that we're looking at over \$30,000 a year in annual subsidy, direct payout for the average illegal alien that's coming into the United States.

Now, they do pay taxes. They might pay about \$10,000 in taxes, but they are a net minus. They are a cost to the Treasury of about \$10,000. Why is this important? Because we are talking about people. Yes, we are, Mr. Speaker. We're talking about American people, American senior citizens who worked their whole life for their Social Security and their Medicare and who are nervous about the fact that we are going into bankruptcy.

And yes, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about people all right. We're talking about the American worker, 22 million of whom can't find full-time employment. And now we have James Hoffa from the Teamsters Union who wrote a letter this last week, and he said, Mr. President, what's wrong with you? Mr.

Speaker, he said we worked hard for a 40-hour workweek, and now the new norm is 30 hours a week or less, and no benefits package. So where's the jobs? Where's the wages? Where's the benefits packages? Are the jobs all fleeing to illegal aliens that we're making legal? Or are we going to think about our senior citizens who are Americans who fought and bled and died for this country, for the workers of this country, and for the people that we are about to hand the baton to, the next generation, who are going to take over this country?

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentlelady.

I think we have some intelligent and some responsible Members of Congress that probably haven't contemplated something that I'm about to say. I hear them talking about they're okay with increasing the workforce, especially in the low-skilled categories because they believe that agriculture needs laborers and food processing needs laborers. I hear that from agriculture and I hear that from food processors, too. But here are the facts. The double-digit unemployment, the highest unemployment levels that we have, are in the lowest skilled jobs.

So when you go into double-digit unemployment and the low-skilled people are in oversupply, you have to believe that labor is a commodity like corn or beans or gold or oil, and it is determined by supply and demand in the marketplace. And if you have an oversupply of people that are willing to work in unskilled or underskilled jobs, then the wages go down and get suppressed.

An example would be like this. In the packing plant in the town where I was born, people that worked in the packing plant 25 or perhaps 30 years ago made equivalent to the salary of a college-educated teacher working in the same town, and they could raise their family and pay for a modest home. Those children would have an opportunity to go to college, if they chose, and they could live a happy life by punching the clock and going to work every day and cashing the check and paying the bills.

Today, people working in the same plant are making about half of what the teachers are making; and the teachers aren't overpaid in that community, either. That's what we're dealing with. The difference is that the people who used to work in that plant 30 years ago, they're not there anymore. But people who came to work in the plants have been recruited from foreign countries and put into that workforce, and there has been such an oversupply that they've driven the wages down—supply and demand.

So why would we as a Nation, when we have an oversupply of people who are willing to do low and unskilled work, and the wages are suppressed and the unemployment rate is up, why would we go out and legalize another 11

or 22 or 33 or 44 or 55 million people? Why would any nation do that? Why would a nation that has 100 million people of working age that are simply not in the workforce decide we don't want to pull those people to work, we're going to let them collect the 80 different means-tested welfare benefits, and instead we're going to go over here and import tens of millions of people to do this work, then realize that you've got a double liability here because people working in the lower skilled jobs can't sustain themselves in this society with the wages that they're getting because they're suppressed by oversupply. And on the other side of this, you've got these 100 million people, a lot of them are drawing from the public Treasury and we're paying them not to work. You put that all together, we've got a double liability here instead of a double asset.

I spent part of my life in the trucking business. We always say we want a payload both ways. We don't want to go empty two directions. We want a payload both ways.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's true.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we can underscore enough the fact that when we are looking at the DREAM Act, people think we are talking about a very small group of people. This is a large group of people, and we're talking about amnesty, three-quarters of the way of amnesty. So the Senate bill is 100 percent amnesty for all illegal aliens in the United States. The DREAM Act is three-fourths of the way toward full amnesty. It isn't just children. We're talking about 35-year-olds, with the average age being 34 of an illegal alien, and we're talking about them having an immediate ability to make their parents legal.

So the \$6 trillion cost is pretty darn close with the DREAM Act as well. Again, just realize politically what happens here. We're looking at 100 percent amnesty in conference committee with three-quarters of the way amnesty in conference committee. Does anybody think we're going to have anything less than full-on 100 percent amnesty and no border security.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I think the gentlelady has described it very accurately. We have to be very careful what vehicles get sent over to the United States Senate that could eventually be turned into a conference report.

I know that we have an assurance that it's not going to be such a thing, but we also know that there are things that come up that surprise us. So I ask people that are advocating for different pieces of legislation that would come off of this floor, paint for me the path through which enforcement legislation could get to the President's desk without amnesty attached. And even if it did get to the President's desk with the best enforcement model that you could imagine, that amnesty attached, the President would sign it and he wouldn't enforce the law; he would just grant the amnesty.

I had a statement that I would like to introduce into the RECORD just for clarity purposes. And I want to say that I appreciate the gentlelady coming down here and leading on this event here tonight and taking such a strong voice. We have a great country still, and we can be a greater country yet, but we must reanchor and reestablish ourselves to the principles and the pillars of American exceptionalism. We cannot do it without holding the rule of law intact.

[From the Associated Press]

MEXICO CHILDREN USED AS "MULES" BY DRUG GANGS

(By Omar Millan)

TIJUANA, MEXICO.—Luis Alberto is only 14 but has the wizened gaze of a grown-up hardened by life. He never met his father, worked as a child, was hired by a gang to sell drugs and then got addicted to them. In October he checked into Cirad, a rehab center west of this border city that handles about 500 drug addicts at a time, a fifth of them younger than 17.

"They brought me here because I was using and selling 'criloco,'" Luis Alberto said, referring to methamphetamine, the drug of choice for 90 percent of adolescents in detox because of its low cost and easy availability.

Luis Alberto is just one of an increasing number of young people being used as "mules" to ferry drugs across the border into the U.S. or sell them in nearby Mexican towns, said Victor Clark, an anthropologist who studies drug trafficking.

"Minors are cheap labor and expendable for organized crime in an area where there are few job opportunities or places for recreation, and where the distribution and consumption of drugs have grown fast," Clark said.

Mexican authorities say they are aware of the problem, but there are no official figures on the number of adolescents detained for selling or distributing drugs because the law forbids keeping criminal records for minors.

The U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement says that between 2008 and 2011, the number of youths aged 14 to 18 caught trying to cross the border between Tijuana and San Diego to sell drugs has grown tenfold. Lauren Mack, spokeswoman for ICE in San Diego, said 19 minors were arrested in 2008, 165 in 2009, 190 in 2010 and 190 again last year.

Most of them were high school students who carried drugs, usually methamphetamine or cocaine, hidden in their bodies or in their cars, Mack said.

Clark said similar things are being seen all along the border, at Mexican cities like Nogales, Ciudad Juarez and Reynosa. "It's growing at a worrying pace," he said.

Officials at drug rehab centers across Tijuana estimate that of the approximately 500 adolescents now undergoing treatment, about a tenth of them are like Luis Alberto, not only addicted to a drug but also used by cartels to sell it.

Luis Alberto, whose last name cannot be published because he is a minor, said he started selling drugs about two years ago in a neighborhood of east Tijuana along with other minors who were hired by "a boss." He made about 200 pesos (\$16) a day, which he says he spent on food and drugs.

"Between me and my friends we sold about 40 packets a day. My boss kept 1,100 pesos (about \$88) per packet and the rest was for us. Sometimes there were about three or four packets left over and we just divided them among ourselves," he said.

Sometimes the drug bosses used the children as lookouts in case police or soldiers approached, he added.

Mexico's cartels have also employed children for their hit squads.

In what may be the most shocking case involving a youth in Mexico's drug war, a 14-year-old boy born in San Diego and known only as "El Ponchis" was arrested in December 2010 in central Mexico and told reporters he had been kidnapped at age 11 and forced to work for a cartel. He said he participated in at least four beheadings.

The number of youths 18 and younger detained for drug-related crimes in Mexico has climbed from 482 in 2006, when President Felipe Calderon launched his offensive against drug traffickers, to 810 by 2009. The latest available numbers indicate 562 youths under age 18 were arrested in the first eight months of 2010.

In Tijuana, officials grew aware of the growing involvement of young people at the end of 2008 as more and more youths turned up at drug rehab centers and told their stories, said Jose Luis Serrano, director of the El Mezon rehab center.

Serrano said that on average 70 adolescents come to his center each month with addiction problems, and about a tenth of them have also worked in the drug trade.

Jose Ramon Arreola, director of the department for children and adolescents at the Cirad center, has seen a similar trend. "There are a lot of drugs on the street; anybody can tell you how easy it is to get some," he said.

Serrano said drugs became extremely cheap by the end of 2008, with methamphetamine easily available and selling for about 15 pesos (a little over \$1).

Due to increased border vigilance, "it became harder for the drug traffickers to cross the border into the U.S., and they started paying their employees with merchandise, which the employees then had to distribute along the border. That was when we noted an increase in teen drug use, mainly crystal (methamphetamine)," Serrano said.

According to the National Survey on Addictions, Tijuana has Mexico's worst methamphetamine addiction problem. The Tijuana Psychiatric Institute says it has about 22,000 meth addicts.

Serrano and Arreola point to outdated laws as one reason gangs have recruited young people to help push drugs. In Baja California, children under 17 can be jailed for no more than seven years even if they are convicted of serious crimes such as murder, violent robbery or involvement in a drug cartel.

Tijuana was one of the first cities to which Calderon sent troops to fight the cartels five years ago, yet hundreds of kilos of drugs still arrive each week for local consumption or for sale in other cities, military and police officials said.

The Sinaloa cartel, considered Mexico's most powerful crime organization, is mainly responsible for bringing in heroin, cocaine and marijuana, said Gen. Gilberto Landeros, the military official in charge of Baja California. Other gangs from Jalisco and Michoacan bring in mainly methamphetamine, he said.

"We are fighting the supply but not the demand, and as long as there is demand, there will be people producing and distributing the drugs," said Jose Hector Acosta, director of the treatment department at the Youth Integration Center, an organization that has been treating drug addicts for 37 years.

John: "A moment ago you mentioned the issue of amnesty here, and this seems to be a big sticking point in the House on what to do moving forward. Would you describe amnesty as anything that allows people who are

in this country illegally for any amount of time, for any reason, that if those folks are allowed to gain full citizenship you would define as amnesty?"

SK: "That's pretty close, John, I mean you know I defined it as a pardon and a reward for immigration lawbreakers coupled with the reward of the objective of their crime. I think that your definition's very close to that of mine."

That doesn't mean there aren't groups of people in this country that I have sympathy for, I do. And there are kids that were brought into this country by their parents unknowing that they were breaking the law. And they will say to me and others who defend the rule of law "we have to do something about the 11 million." And some of them are valedictorians—well my answer to that is—and by the way their parents brought them in. It wasn't their fault. It's true in some cases, but they aren't all valedictorians. They weren't all brought in by their parents.

For everyone who's a valedictorian, there's another 100 out there that they weigh 130 pounds—and they've got calves the size of cantaloupes because they're hauling 75 pounds of marijuana across the desert.

Those people would be legalized with the same act. And until the folks that want to open the borders and grant this amnesty can define the difference between the innocent ones who have deep ties with America and those who have been, I'll say have been undermining our culture and civilization and profiting from criminal acts, until they can define that difference they should not advocate for amnesty for both good and evil."

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa, and I am grateful that he is putting into the RECORD the pillars of American exceptionalism. That is our Nation. Again, what we are concerned about is America first; the American people first; American jobs first; American wages first; American benefits first. And unfortunately, a study came out in April from Harvard that said illegal aliens have contributed to a loss of income of \$1,300 a year. Let's not drive that number any further. So I am very grateful to have had this opportunity to discuss this with the American people this evening.

I yield back the balance of my time.

WHAT AMNESTY FOR ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS
WILL COST AMERICA

(By Jim DeMint and Robert Rector, Heritage Foundation)

The economist Milton Friedman warned that the United States cannot have open borders and an extensive welfare state. He was right, and his reasoning extends to amnesty for the more than 11 million unlawful immigrants in this country. In addition to being unfair to those who follow the law and encouraging more unlawful immigration in the future, amnesty has a substantial price tag.

An exhaustive study by the Heritage Foundation has found that after amnesty, current unlawful immigrants would receive \$9.4 trillion in government benefits and services and pay more than \$3 trillion in taxes over their lifetimes. That leaves a net fiscal deficit (benefits minus taxes) of \$6.3 trillion. That deficit would have to be financed by increasing the government debt or raising taxes on U.S. citizens.

For centuries immigration has been vital to our nation's health, and it will be essential to our future success. Yet immigrants should come to our nation lawfully and

should not impose additional fiscal costs on our overburdened taxpayers. An efficient and merit-based system would help our economy and lessen the burden on taxpayers, strengthening our nation.

A properly structured lawful immigration system holds the potential to drive positive economic growth and job creation. But amnesty for those here unlawfully is not necessary to capture those benefits.

We estimate that when those who broke our laws to come here start having access to the same benefits as citizens do—as is called for by the Senate "Gang of Eight" immigration bill—the average unlawful immigrant household will receive nearly \$3 in benefits for every dollar in taxes paid. The net annual cost is \$28,000 per unlawful immigrant household.

Given the U.S. debt of \$17 trillion, the fiscal effects detailed in our study should be at the forefront of legislators' minds as they consider immigration reform.

Already, illegal immigrants impose costs on police, hospitals, schools and other services. Putting them on a path to citizenship means that within a few years, they will qualify for the full panoply of government programs: more than 80 means-tested welfare programs, as well as Social Security, Medicare and Obamacare. The lifetime fiscal cost (benefits received minus taxes paid) for the average unlawful immigrant after amnesty would be around \$590,000. Who is going to pay that tab?

Our government is now in the business of redistribution. As Nicholas Eberstadt, an economist at the American Enterprise Institute, has pointed out, federal transfer payments, or taking from one American to give to another, grew from 3 percent of spending in 1935 to about two-thirds of all spending in 2010. Adding millions of unlawful immigrants to U.S. programs will have a massive negative fiscal effect.

Our findings are based on empirical research and reflect common sense. Unlawful immigrants have relatively low earning potential because, on average, they have 10th-grade educations and low skills. Heads of households like that, whether from the Midwest or Central America, will receive, on average, about four times as much in government services and benefits as they pay in taxes. Adding millions more to bloated welfare and overburdened entitlement programs would deepen the fiscal hole our country is in.

In addition to costing taxpayers, amnesty is unfair to those who came to this country lawfully. More than 4 million people are waiting to come to the United States lawfully, but our dysfunctional bureaucracy makes it easier to break the law than to follow it.

Our cost estimates are in some ways very conservative: The \$6.3 trillion figure does not factor in the waves of unlawful immigrants who could pour into this country hoping for another future amnesty. As scholars at the Heritage Foundation and elsewhere have explained, the comprehensive immigration bill being considered in the Senate differs little from previous empty promises to secure our borders and enforce immigration laws on the books. When amnesty was granted under a similar plan in 1986, there were about 3 million unlawful immigrants; now we have more than 11 million.

Instead of forcing through a complicated, lengthy bill, Congress ought to advance piece-by-piece immigration solutions that enjoy broad support and build trust with the American people. We should move to streamline our legal immigration system, encourage patriotic assimilation to unite new immigrants with America's vibrant civil society, fulfill promises to secure our borders and strengthen workplace enforcement.

We are proudly a nation of immigrants. People the world over are attracted to the United States because we are a nation of laws. Granting amnesty to those who broke the law and putting them on a path to citizenship would be unfair, would encourage more bad behavior and would impose significant costs on American families.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BARLETTA (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and July 25 on account of a family emergency.

Mr. HORSFORD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medical-mandated recovery.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 25, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2323. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2012 Annual Report regarding the Department's enforcement activities under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1691f; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2324. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report pursuant to Pub. L. 106-569; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2325. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rescission of Supervised Investment Bank Holding Company Rules [Release No.: 34-69979] (RIN: 3235-AL35) received July 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2326. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Programs: Essential Health Benefits in Alternative Benefit Plans, Eligibility Notices, Fair Hearing and Appeal Process, and Premiums and Cost Sharing; Exchanges: Eligibility and Enrollment [CMS-2334-F] (RIN: 0938-AR04) received July 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2327. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 10-90] received July 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2328. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-39, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.