

free from persecution, provide stable lives for their friends and families free from violence, be able to speak freely in peace. At one point, I believe that the United States had the will to stand up to tyrants, dictators, and oppressive regimes, but the stories I hear from constituents about what is happening in Egypt contradict that belief.

If we aren't pressing hard to encourage a stable society in Egypt, one that won't persecute religious and ethnic minorities, then Egypt, itself, will never really realize stability. Egypt will always be in flux, vulnerable to radical elements that would seek to undermine and destroy any progress that is made.

We should be worried greatly about the Coptics in Egypt. They shouldn't have to flee their homes and leave their country behind because of their faith. They shouldn't have to worry about car bombings, suicide bombers, shootings, abductions, or any other kind of violence for which they have been targeted.

We should support Egypt in its transition to a more democratic state but also keep in mind that religious persecution is still very real. As I said in a previous floor speech, if we want friends in the Middle East, then we have to encourage respect for religious freedom and diversity, not just build strong governments and militaries. If we do this in Egypt, they will be more stable, and its people can live in greater peace.

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

#### BEYOND THE FEARS OF THE FOUNDING FATHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, this great deliberative body that we are in. We have had a lot of debates and discussions here on the floor over the time that I have had the privilege to serve Americans and Iowans in the Fourth District of Iowa.

Coming into this year, early in the year—in late January—we held a conference in Cambridge, Maryland, a conference to get together and discuss our best legislative strategy for this calendar year, which is the balance of the 113th Congress that we are in, Mr. Speaker. The discussion, invariably, came around to the immigration issue. Now, the immigration issue is a political issue. It is, perhaps, the most complex issue that we have dealt with in the time that I have been here in Congress. It has implications and ramifications that go well beyond things that seem to be simplistic on their face.

In that discussion, it became very clear that House Republicans, at least,

didn't want to move on anything that would give the opportunity of the majority leader in the Senate—Senator HARRY REID—and those who advocated for the Senate Gang of Eight bill to be able to attach any of that language on any bill that might emerge from the House. The consensus clearly—and it was 3 or 4-1, Mr. Speaker—was not to take up the immigration issue this year because the very sovereignty of the United States was put at risk, and there was no upside. The only beneficiaries out of it would be people who are unlawfully present in the United States, the people who are hiring cheap labor and profiting from that cheap labor, and the people who are on the other side of the aisle in the political party that recognizes that this country has 11 or more million people in it who are undocumented Democrats. They would like that number to be larger, and they would like to then document those Democrats so that they can be voting Democrats. I understand the motive, I believe, of the people on the other side of the aisle.

Without assigning a motive to the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that the policies that he has advocated for bring in millions of people who are unlawful to the United States, who have an unlawful presence. I will say that his DACA policy—his Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals is what he names it, and what I declare it to be is the Deferred Action for Criminal Aliens—has turned into a huge magnet. It is a magnet that has been attracting people from south of the border for a long time. The President issued the order in June of 2012.

It is an unconstitutional order, in my opinion. It is a considered constitutional opinion, Mr. Speaker, and I have put my own personal capital on the line to assert such points in the past and have prevailed. I do understand this “separation of powers” issue and this constitutional issue. When the Congress establishes immigration law, part of that law says that Federal immigration enforcement officers, when they encounter someone who is unlawfully present in the United States, have an obligation. The language is they “shall” place him in removal proceedings. Yet the President has issued an order that commands the Federal officers, including the ICE agents, to violate the law or to, say, ignore the law, which is the equivalent of violating the law, Mr. Speaker. This is what we are up against.

We have a President who taught constitutional law for 10 years at the University of Chicago's school of law as an adjunct professor—10 years of teaching the Constitution and all of these years to contemplate his oath of office to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States of America, so help him God, and to take care—this is linked to the President's oath. It is not exactly the verbiage, but it is exactly the language in our Con-

stitution that he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed. Instead, it appears that he has misinterpreted the words “faithfully executed,” and he has faithfully killed off the law. It didn't mean when written in the Constitution, “faithfully executed,” to kill off the law. What it meant was carry out the law, implement the law, enforce the law. That is what “faithfully execute” means. You would think that any adjunct professor, especially a constitutional law professor, would know that, Mr. Speaker, and I know that he does. Yet he still issued the DACA language. He still issued the Morton Memos.

When Janet Napolitano, then the Secretary of Homeland Security, came before the Judiciary Committee to testify on this DACA language and on the Morton Memos, she repeated many times in her testimony the language that is in the memo that came out, which is on an individual basis only. They created with the Morton Memos four different classes of people, Mr. Speaker, and if people came into the United States of America before their 18th birthdays—or successfully alleged that they did—and if they arrived here before December 31 of 2011, which conforms with the Senate Gang of Eight language, I might add, then they would be granted temporary legal status for 2 years in this country, and they were granted work permits—manufactured out of thin air. I say “out of thin air” because it is unconstitutional for the President to manufacture immigration law. The Constitution reserves immigration law for the United States Congress, not for the President of the United States.

In fact, there is a reason that we are article I. The Congress is article I because we are the most important of the three branches of government. They wanted the voice of the people to set the policy for America, and they wanted the President to carry it out. By the way, the President has lectured to that effect over here at a high school not very far from us. I believe the date was March 28 of 2011.

I know it was March 28 when they asked him: Why don't you pass the DREAM Act by executive order or executive edict?

The President said to them: You have been studying the Constitution. You are smart people. You know that Congress' job is to pass the laws, and my job is to enforce the laws, and the judiciary branch's job is to interpret the laws.

It was a very clean and concise analysis of the three branches of government. The President delivered that in a lecture on March 28, 2011. By June of 2012—I think that is how those dates worked out—the President had already gone back on the lecture he had given to the high school students and had decided that he could, after all, manufacture immigration law out of thin air. It is lawless to do that. The law doesn't allow him to do that. The supreme law

of the land doesn't allow him to do that, but he pulled it off anyway.

What is the restraint, Mr. Speaker? What is the restraint that this Congress has?

These Members of Congress go home, and their constituents stand up in a town hall meeting, and they say: Restrain this President. Put the immigration law back in order. Enforce the law. Do not let this President defy the law or change the law.

They believe somehow that this Congress has the tools to restrain a President who has so little respect for the language that we have passed into law here in this Congress. Now, there is no way to get around certain pieces of language. There is no way to get around it. He will go around everything that there is a way around. He has checked the fences constantly—he has got minions of lawyers who are doing that—but he gets to a certain place where the law doesn't allow it any longer.

For example, the work component of welfare to work only existed within TANF, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. The President decided he would manufacture waivers so that the people who were collecting TANF benefits didn't have to work. The work requirement was suspended even though that language was written so that then-President Clinton couldn't suspend the work component of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. That was a big part of welfare reform; yet President Obama simply granted waivers and suspended the work component, so now there is no longer a work component that is effective in TANF.

That is not lawful. That is not constitutional. You have to litigate this thing through the courts to no end, and to get an answer back out of the courts before the President goes off to his never-never land of perpetual golfing outings is very, very difficult to do. The longer that we are in court, the more Federal judges are appointed by this President who are selected to agree with him. That is just Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and the work component.

Also, as to No Child Left Behind, waiver, waiver, waiver to the point where No Child Left Behind no longer has anything left. It has all been left behind, and the President has nullified it by executive edict even though it was a big piece of legislation that was passed in this Congress in a bipartisan way, negotiated and supported by then-Senator Teddy Kennedy and signed by President George Bush. This reflected at the time the will of the people.

Now, I am not taking any position, Mr. Speaker, that I support this, but I am suggesting this: the Constitution is the supreme law of the land. When Congress passes a law and a President signs the law, that is the law, and any subsequent President has an obligation to enforce that law and to carry it out unless and until the Congress should amend it. If the President should want

to see the Congress repeal or amend a law, it is pretty easy for the President to find a Member of the House of Representatives to introduce a piece of legislation that reflects the wish and, perhaps, the will of the President. So there is a means to change it in the same way that there is a means to amend this Constitution that I carry in my jacket pocket each day.

This Constitution is the supreme law of the land. It guides us, and there is a provision to amend it. If we don't like the policy that results from this Constitution—the base document or the various amendments that are attached to it now after this course of history—we can amend the Constitution. We can bring it before the House and the Senate with a two-thirds vote, and we can message it to the States in its having been approved by the House and the Senate, and the States can set about ratifying an amendment to the Constitution.

Until then, I would say this, Mr. Speaker, to the President of the United States and to all who aspire to be President, to all who aspire to serve in the United States House, in the United States Senate, or in any capacity of trust with the people: understand that this is the supreme law of the land. You are bound by it until such time as it might be amended. You cannot redefine it, and you cannot wish it away, and you cannot ignore it. You cannot violate this supreme law of the land. It is the framework upon which all of our laws are written. It is an important, important document that sets about and defines the separation of powers—the legislative branch, the executive branch, and the judicial branch of government.

We have a President who has gone beyond the imagination of our Founding Fathers. He has gone beyond the fears that our Founding Fathers used when they drafted such a beautiful document, which has survived in pretty good health for these centuries that we have had it. The President has now gone to a place where he decides whether he is going to enforce a law or not, and he has the audacity to step up and just seek to change the law by press conference. He did this on ObamaCare. He stood out in the Rose Garden with the Great Seal of the United States, and he said he was now going to make an accommodation to the religious organizations in the country. Rather than requiring them to do what the rules of ObamaCare were written to require them to do, he was now going to require the insurance companies to do that with no charge—the insurance companies, no charge.

□ 2045

Now, I went back and checked, checked the law, ObamaCare. I checked all the rules that had been written. I checked to see if they had amended the rule in any way, if there had been a public comment period, if they followed the Administrative Procedures

Act. Nothing. There is not an I dotted differently; there is not a T crossed differently.

The insurance companies stepped up to do what the President had commanded them to do by voice, verbally, in a press conference. That is not law. That is not a republic. That doesn't result even in a civilization.

Now we have this tragedy going on on the southern border that is a result of the President deciding that he could suspend law and decide not to enforce the law, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa has 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I will try to conform my comments into that time period.

Mr. Speaker, the immigration issue has emerged now as the number one topic in front of the American people again. I had hoped that we had set it aside. I had hoped that we would go through this year and that we would be focusing on the things that are so important to us.

This is a topic that has emerged because of the human trafficking and the human suffering that is taking place, and I would like to deliver a report on what I have seen just over this past weekend and how it fits in with some of the other things I have been involved in, especially on our border.

As I listened to the dialogue emerge and I heard ideas emerging in our conference, it was important that I go down to the border and take a fresh look at the most porous component of our border, where they have the most illegal crossings along our 2,000-mile border with Mexico. This was a portion of the border that I had not traveled in the past.

When I add up the places that I have traveled for border inspection, it covers, I believe, every mile of California and Arizona and New Mexico in one fashion or another, whether it is by air or whether it is on the ground. Some of those times it is sitting down there at night listening and waiting for people to come across the border. I have been involved in the interdiction of illegal drugs. I have unloaded drugs out of the false beds of trucks and been there as part of the—I will say an observer in the team that is interdicting illegal aliens who are drug smugglers, who are MS-13.

That carries me on over into the Texas border where I have done several segments of it, but I had not been to the southern tip of Texas. I hadn't been to McAllen. I hadn't been to Brownsville and the region down there. So, since that is the most porous section now—or, I should say, the highest trafficking section now—I headed down that way last Friday night and arrived there relatively late Friday evening.

I got up early in the morning and went out to the mouth of the Rio Grande River. Of course the Rio Grande

River is the dividing line through there between the United States and Mexico, between Texas and Mexico. There is a road that leads out to the gulf, and once you get out to the gulf, you can take about a 3-mile drive down the beach to the south to get to the outlet of the Rio Grande River.

So we drove down that 3 miles of sandy beach and down to the mouth of the Rio Grande River to observe that location where I would say, once we are forced into and once this Congress concludes that we should build a fence, a wall, and a fence on our southern border, I wanted to go to the place where you would set the furthest, most easterly cornerpost in order to start building the fence, the wall, and the fence. That is near the mouth of the Rio Grande River.

I went there, looked at that, set a flag there to locate the perimeter of the United States of America, observed as people from Mexico were waiting around out around the outlet of the Rio Grande River and easily can wade across that into the United States, as they can in many places along the river up and down the Rio Grande.

From there, I traveled back again and into Brownsville, where we visited three ports of entry in Brownsville and also a not-for-profit entity that was working under the auspices of Health and Human Services that was in the business of housing unaccompanied alien children until such time as they were relocated someplace into the United States.

From there, we traveled then to McAllen, where we received a briefing at the sector center, the border patrol sector, McAllen sector center, in a conference room with good people at the table; then from there, out into the detention area where they are incarcerating individuals that they are interdicting along the border.

Those numbers have diminished substantially over the last 3 to 4 weeks, Mr. Speaker, into some number that I recognize to be a little bit less than half of the peak amount that were pouring through into the United States illegally.

Then from there, we went into the holding facilities. We were freely able to walk through and look at everything that was there. Then we went over to a location of a large building that the Border Patrol had retrofitted in a very fast and, looked to me, like a very efficient setup turnaround to be prepared to handle a lot of unaccompanied alien children who were in a huge building with dividing segments in there, all of it air-conditioned, with Health and Human Services workers there playing barefoot soccer indoors in air-conditioning, which I am sure was a new experience for those kids that were there.

From there, we went out for a briefing with the Department of Public Safety and the Texas Rangers to get a different perspective, a perspective from the State and the State officials,

the law enforcement officers that are eyes-on, hands-on, and they are engaged and they are working hand-in-glove with the Border Patrol, Customs, Border Protection, and ICE.

I have been impressed with our professional officers all the way along the way. Everybody in a uniform that I encountered was a good, solid, squared-away, professional individual that input good information to us.

After the Texas Department of Public Safety and Texas Rangers gave us their briefing, which lasted nearly 2 hours, then we went on out and rode with a Department of Public Safety officer who took us out to observe the night operations of helicopter surveillance overhead and the spotlights from the helicopters and the other devices that they have that help them locate people that are sneaking into America, whether they are being trafficked as human or whether they are drug trafficking going in.

Then, the next morning, we picked up and began to poke our way upstream towards Laredo. Well, first I should mention that I went to church at Sacred Heart Church there in McAllen, Texas, a Spanish mass, and went over next door to the parish center and the church parking lot where they have converted that into a relief center where they are processing people through and giving them a shower if they need it, medication if they need it, a light meal, and a bag of goodies to travel with before they go to the bus station to be bused up into the United States.

From that location, then we went out to a park where it has been in the national news consistently. The name of the park starts with the letter A. I can't repeat it from memory, Mr. Speaker, but there we saw many, many enforcement officers. We saw Border Patrol. We saw county sheriffs, a constable, and we also saw unmarked undercover officers that were there. They had the park pretty well covered.

There were a lot of people, a lot of Mexicans on the other side of the river who were playing in the water in the river, and jet skis were going back and forth. We know those jets ski are often used to ferry people across to the United States. It was unlikely for that to happen there that day because there was so much cover from law enforcement, but they were posted so consistently along that they did provide a deterrent.

So from there, we poked our way up the river to a small town. "Ramos" is pretty close to the spelling of it. It is a small. It is a short-lettered town, a relatively small town and an old town.

There, as we pulled up to the port of entry and took a look across the bridge into Mexico, there was an officer there that gave us a piece of information which is: If you are here from the United States Congress, thank you. Thank you for coming to see what is going on. If you want to see illegals crossing into the United States, take a

right down there and drive up along that ridge, and there will be a place there where you can look out over the river. And if you sit there and wait an hour or so, you will see people crossing the river into the United States.

So we did pull up there and met with a couple of police officers, and then the Border Patrol came along. While we were there waiting, we were able to watch on the other side of the river, where a team of two on the Mexico side inflated a relatively large inflatable raft, larger than I expected at least. About the size of a pool table would be my guess.

They loaded a female, it turned out to be a pregnant female, into this raft. And you could watch as they just, late afternoon, roughly 4 or 4:30, just brazenly started across the river and ran that raft right on over into the United States side where they go out of sight because of the brush. They came directly over across the river.

The Border Patrol knew where they were. They would watch them. The city police could watch them.

That illegal immigrant that came into America in that raft, was helped onto the shore by one of the two coyotes that were in the raft, and was handed the two bags of her personal items that she had with her. The coyote who got off on the shore got back in the raft, and they pulled away from the shore and went back to Mexico.

The Border Patrol didn't get there in time to interdict the raft. They didn't seem to be as animated as I thought they would, which told me that it is a regular experience, not an irregular experience.

They did interdict the illegal, who appeared to be pregnant, and likely came over to the United States to claim credible fear and asylum. And of course, if she has the baby here, that baby will be an American citizen. As soon as that baby is of age, that child can then start the reunification process to bring all of its family over here into the United States.

That is what is going on on the border. And the officers that we were with while that happened said that they believe that the distraction that was created by bringing her over was a distraction that likely gave them an opportunity to smuggle a significant amount of illegal drugs across the river, probably upstream a ways, just out of sight of where we were and at a place where you can't drive.

That was, I think, the most significant observation that we had, to see that brazen crossing of the river. They knew the Border Patrol was watching them. They knew the city police were watching them. They could see us up there, and that didn't deter them. They went across the river anyway and dropped her off and skedaddled back to the Mexican side.

We even have video of them deflating the raft and folding it up and putting it in their vehicle. So surveillance would put a license number on that vehicle,

and it should be traceable, and it should be easy enough to identify the people that are doing this. But we don't have the level of cooperation across the river in Mexico, according to the questions that I asked. We have a border that is not completely open, but it is a long, long ways from being closed, Mr. Speaker.

From there, we went on up the river and followed the border clear on into Laredo, where we took a tour from Customs and Border Protection in that very busy Laredo crossing there at Laredo, of the land freight, the semitrailers, as I took it, that are coming into the United States or leaving the United States. Forty-six percent of them in the southwest border come through Laredo. It is a huge crossing. The people there are professional. They use new technology to the extent that they can. There is just a lot of traffic.

As I look at this overall policy, we also visited with or were able to observe the processing of people who are, let's say, interdicted and apprehended for illegal entry into the United States. Here is what it comes down to, Mr. Speaker, along these lines:

The high number of unaccompanied alien children has been a problem that we have not encountered anywhere near to this magnitude before. There was a situation that about 10 to 11 percent used to be unaccompanied alien children. That number now has jumped up to 20 percent. At times, it runs substantially more than that.

When you have an unaccompanied alien child that comes into the United States, they are often smuggled across Mexico by a coyote.

So think of this, Mr. Speaker. A girl or a boy in a family—and the boys are 80 percent, and the girls are 20 percent of the overall universe that are coming into the United States—that little boy or that little girl, the family will come up with a number that is in the area of \$6,000 each. The coyote often lives in the same neighborhood. He will gather together a group as large as he thinks he can manage, and they will pay him his \$6,000 per child, and then they start about transporting these unaccompanied alien children who are accompanied by—actually accompanied by—a coyote. So they are accompanied.

□ 2100

It is 2,500 miles, they tell me, from El Salvador up to Brownsville. It is about 2,000 miles of Mexico altogether and about 500 miles through the jungle of El Salvador into Mexico.

So let's just say 2,000 miles. They will get on the train, called The Train of Death, The Beast, and ride on top of the train. They will perhaps get in the cars of the train, hang on to the sides of the train, and ride that train on up towards the United States.

We have been advised here in this Congress by people who have been on the ground before I arrived there that as many as 100 percent of the girls that are being transported are given birth

control because the anticipation that they will be subjected to rape is so high that they want to be as sure as they can that even though they think that she will be raped, they don't want her pregnant with the product of rape. So they will go to the local pharmacy, where it doesn't require a prescription in those countries, and buy birth control pills and start their daughter on this—their 12-year-old daughter, their 13-year-old daughter their 14-, 15-, 16- or 17-year-old daughter, put her on birth control pills and put her on the train, all the while having an understanding that there was a high risk that she would be raped.

And the data that we got, the judgment that we got from the people that are taking care of these unaccompanied alien children, gave us these numbers: The lowest number they gave us on those that were raped on the way up was one-third. The highest number they gave was 70 percent. In one place, they told us that it makes no difference, boys or girls; they are victimized in the same proportion. Boys are victimized in the same proportion as the girls. I am not convinced that that is a reliable response, but it was repeated several times back to us. But I am convinced that it is a reliable response on the girls.

What kind of compassion is it, Mr. Speaker, that supports a policy, that is attracted by DACA, that would cause a family member—whether it is a mother and a father in, say, Guatemala, El Salvador, or Honduras, or an aunt and uncle, a grandparent, to go down to the pharmacy and buy birth control pills and bring them back and start the prescription of the birth control pills to your 12-year-old daughter, your 12-year-old granddaughter, your 12-year-old niece—13, 14, 15—and then hand her over to a coyote who is, by definition, a human trafficker and put her out there in the custody of the coyote. And she ends up on a bus. She ends up on a truck. She ends up on a train. She ends up raped. And if she gets to the United States alive, traumatized, she has still got to get across the river. She still has to get into the United States. And maybe she goes across on a boat. Maybe she goes across on a jet ski. Maybe the water is low and she is able to get across. Right now, it is too deep in that area for that to happen.

Swimming is a chance, but sometimes they drown. Sometimes they pick up sexually transmitted diseases. Sometimes they are killed along the way. Many, many, many times they are raped.

This is the product of DACA. This is the product of a feckless policy that is also a lawless policy, a policy that violates the existing law that says, you shall place them into removal proceedings. But the President has ordered, you shall not do so. He has ordered ICE to violate the law. And the result of that is, an advertisement, a magnet that goes down into Central America, that reminds them, if you can

get to the United States, you get to stay. And especially if you send your children up, and they are unaccompanied by a family member or an adult. But there are also a good number of children who come with adults.

And they told us that often, it is a mother with one, two, or three children who has come all the way across Mexico through drug cartel land on the train of death, on the beast, or riding in some other form of transportation to arrive at the United States.

So here is what happens: if they live, if they get here, even though they are traumatized and they may have disease—although I didn't find evidence of the magnitude of the incidence of the disease that I had been advised that there was—if they get here, and they are turning themselves over to the Border Patrol or surrendering to the first person they find—you might be walking along, watching birds along the Rio Grande river and have one or multiple illegals come out of the brush and surrender to you. They want to turn themselves over to the United States, especially the women and especially the children, but not so much the men.

And then what happens is, they are picked up by the Border Patrol. They are taken down to the station. They are identified as much as they can. A lot of them do have birth certificates on them. A lot of them have a phone number of them of some family member, some friend, some destination they want to go to in America. They are processed. They are put into a holding cell, along with—sometimes it is a whole mix of different ages, men and women, nursing mothers, little kids. They might all be put in there together while they identify them, before they sort them. And then they will be sorted out in these holding cells with young girls there, older girls here, mothers with babies here, and mothers with babies and kids here, adult males here, young males here. That mix is there.

Here is what this also comes to: If you look at the unaccompanied alien children that come into the United States, this number that is roughly 20 percent of the population of those that are interdicted now, here is the data from the Health and Human Services Web site, Office of Refugee Resettlement: it is 80 percent male. These are the unaccompanied alien children. So they are under the age of 18, up to and including 17. They are 80 percent male, and they are 83 percent older than 14, younger than 18. That means they are 15, 16, and 17 years old, Mr. Speaker. That is a high percentage in that range.

So here is how you calculate this. And that is, if you take 0.8, the 80 percent for male, and you multiply it by the percentage that are older teenagers—that is 83 percent that are 15, 16, and 17—multiply those two together, and you get 64 percent, which is right in that two-thirds category.

We have already crossed the line of more than 57,000 unaccompanied alien

children who are interdicted down on the southern border, and that happened on June 15. So now we have got another month and a couple of weeks that have been racked up. We are easily over 60,000.

But here is a number to think about, Mr. Speaker: 60,000 unaccompanied alien children. And out of that 60,000, two-thirds of them are males of prime gang recruitment age. So that means that of the 60,000, 40,000 are right there for MS-13 to recruit or right there for the Gulf Cartel to recruit, right there to be part of those who go into the crime syndicates, as opposed to those who might have had an opportunity and might have had a different approach if they were not exposed to this kind of life.

You can go to any country in the world and identify the most dangerous demographic in any population and it is going to be young males. Young males cause the most trouble. They are the most violent. They commit the most crimes, whether they are sexual assault crimes or whether it is homicide, whether it is assault, whether it is theft, that comes out of that universe of young males.

You could go to a place where I think there is a low crime rate—and I haven't looked this up. I just don't hear of anything coming out of Iceland. So you could go to Iceland and pick the Icelandic boys that are 15, 16, and 17 years old. They are going to be the prime age where they are committing crimes—that and older, the 18 to 25 to 30 to 32, and then it starts to taper off again.

This is the universe that is coming out of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras, the high gang recruitment age from some of the most violent countries in the world. As a matter of fact, the six most violent countries in the world with the highest homicide rates are south of Mexico. Eight of the top 10 countries with the highest homicide rates in the world are south of Mexico. We are bringing in young males to the tune of two-thirds of those that are coming across as unaccompanied alien children, two-thirds of them—40,000 of 60,000 at least since the beginning of this fiscal year, 15, 16, and 17 years old.

Now, there is one side of this that says, have compassion. They are only kids. There is another side that says, we should have some compassion for the American people. The American people are paying a price. They will pay a price in blood for these acts of this President. And the policy that they have is, they are just scattering them across the country. They will put them in a holding place until they can process them. Health and Human Services takes them into their custody. If they have a phone number in their pocket, they will call that phone number and say, can you send us a bus ticket? If you send us a bus ticket, we will put this person on the bus and send them to where you want them to go.

There is not a very reliable method of identifying any background checks

on the people that are—let's say they are the recipients of the unaccompanied alien children that are here, those 17-year-old potential gang recruits. They could be crack houses. They could be meth houses. They could be cat houses. They could be stash houses. It could be an MS-13 headquarters. They get delivered there. They get put on a bus to get sent there. Sometimes they get escorted there. Sometimes Customs and Border Protection puts them in a car and drives them across the State of Texas to another location.

And when they do that, they have got two officers there. Sometimes those two officers are flying as few as one—they like to get a few more but as few as one of these individuals—to a place like Los Angeles from Laredo.

Laredo to Los Angeles, two Federal officers escorting a 14-, 15-, 16-, 17-year-old to Los Angeles. We are ending up with two round-trip plane tickets—often three round-trip plane tickets—and tie in a couple of hotel rooms to deliver and complete the crime.

And what has happened is—I read a case that was decided in December of 2013. So, December of last year, Mr. Speaker, and it was a Federal judge who had to rule on a case of human trafficking, human smuggling prosecution. And what had happened was, there was a mother in Virginia, an illegal alien mother who had unlawfully entered the United States and was living illegally in Virginia, who had collected some money and sent that off to a coyote in El Salvador. It might have been Guatemala, but I believe it was El Salvador. And she paid the human smuggler to smuggle her 10-year-old daughter from El Salvador to Virginia.

And so as the human smuggler, the coyote, smuggled the 10-year-old girl across the southern border to the United States, they were interdicted by the Border Patrol. And they have brought charges against the coyote, the human smuggler. And those were the Federal charges that the judge wrote his opinion on.

As he wrote in this opinion, and I will summarize, he said: This is the fourth case I have had in as many weeks of ICE—this child was turned over to Immigration and Customs Enforcement. ICE had taken this child and delivered her to the illegal household of her biological mother in Virginia. That was the objective of the crime in the first place, to get her daughter illegally delivered into the illegal mother's household in the illegal household in Virginia. And as the coyote was interdicted with the 10-year-old at the border, and the Border Patrol caught them up and processed them over into ICE, and they filed charges for human trafficking, when the smuggler came across in front of the judge, he said: This is the fourth case that I have had in as many weeks, and it is appalling that the Federal Government—in this case, ICE—would complete the crime. Take the 10-year-

old daughter and deliver her another 1,000 miles across America into the arms of her illegal mother, into an illegal household.

Now, that sounds like there are four cases that are an anomaly, Mr. Speaker. But those four cases, I wish they were an anomaly. They are not. That is the standard today. And it is happening—not four times, not 40 times, not 400 times—thousands and thousands of times, this Federal Government is completing the crime of unlawful entry into the United States.

So if you are under 18—or you say you are under 18—and you come into America with your birth certificate and a phone number of where you would like to be delivered, the process becomes, you get processed. If you are under 14, they don't even take your fingerprints. Neither do they take a photograph that is attached to your identification to identify you by. So we don't know who these kids are.

□ 2115

If they have a phone number, Border Patrol will process them. They try to get them turned over to Health and Human Services within 72 hours, and when there is a backlog, it took longer. They were doing the best they could to comply with the law.

Health and Human Services hired nongovernment contractors to house, process, deliver, and distribute, and so this unaccompanied alien child then—no fingerprints, no pictures, but a shower, food, and a fresh set of clothes, and they will send that unaccompanied alien child then anywhere in America that they request to go.

Sometimes, they will get a bus ticket that is sent—that is paid for by the recipient household, and sometimes, they don't. They tell us they try not to have to buy those tickets out of your tax dollars, Mr. Speaker, but we know that is going on.

It is a welcome mat—it is a welcoming party for people that come into America, and by the way, if they have a birth certificate, Border Patrol then will take their identifying documents, stick them in a file, and give them a piece of paper that is printed off on a Border Patrol printer, the size of this piece of typing paper and the same texture.

It is a permission slip, or permiso, as they are calling it, that allows that illegal alien to stay in the United States, and they are supposed to promise that they are going to appear for a hearing.

Well, we know that not very many of them do appear for hearings, but if they do, they have already been coached to say that they have a credible fear of being persecuted in their home country for whatever reason. They make the argument that they have this credible fear, and then they are allowed to stay in America, essentially, as asylees.

This happens in a very, very high percentage of them, whether they are

unaccompanied alien children—that is the highest percent that gets to stay. Mothers with children is the next highest percent that gets to stay.

When people are leaving the countries in Central America, Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras in massive numbers by the thousands and nobody shows up having been deported to those countries, then what happens is they understand that the promises are true, your odds of being deported are now down to this—now, it is well less than 1 percent, and the promise of America will take care of you, America will give you your heat subsidy, your rent subsidy, your housing, your food stamps, your Obama phone, your ObamaCare, and now, the President wants to give you your lawyer.

All of that is part of the promise. Until we send people back, they are going to keep coming. The common denominator message that we received over and over again, Mr. Speaker, was that unless you send them back, that is the only way you can send the message “don’t come.” is for people to lose their \$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000, \$8,000 that they have invested in paying a coyote and being back in their home country, trying to save up some more money to come into America. That is a big chunk of money for people that are averaging less than \$3,000 a year, on average, for their income.

We have a government policy that is a complete mess and a calamity. I believe that each of the law enforcement there are doing the job as best they can, and the rules of engagement prevent them from having a cohesive strategy that can actually secure the border.

We need to build a fence and a wall and a fence on the southern border to keep them on the other side of it, so they can’t get in, and we need to call upon the border State Governors, in particular the Governor of Texas, to continue to do what he is doing—that is call up forces to secure the border, that is call up his National Guard—the Texas National Guard—to secure the border.

This Congress has an obligation to pass a resolution that calls upon the border State Governors to call up their National Guard to circumvent the Commander in Chief of the United States—constitutionally, I might add. It is the only way to secure the border. This President will not. He will not secure the border. The border State Governors can do this, I believe they will do this, and Congress has an obligation to fund them.

So I put a message out, Mr. Speaker, that we first need to pass a resolution in this Congress, and the resolution needs to say the President’s DACA language, coupled with mostly the excuse of the 2008 legislation, his refusal to enforce immigration law, and his advertisement that we are not going to enforce the law that has penetrated deeply into Mexico and Central America has got to stop. The President has to

reverse it. He has to start enforcing the law. That is job one.

The second one is—it is not going to happen, I don’t believe he is going to do it, I don’t think it is in his head or his heart, he has got another agenda, and so we call upon the border State Governors to call up their National Guard and enforce the border and commit the House at least to funding the border State Governors, so they can keep them on the line, and they can go to the other States for reinforcements, especially with sympathetic Governors.

Pass the little fix of the 2008 law, set it as a stand-alone bill, and send it over to the Senate because they are hiding behind it now and using that as an excuse not to enforce the law.

Another one, do not let these illegal aliens go north of the border any more than 50 miles. Keep them contained. Put them in housing that, if it is good enough for the United States military, it is good enough for those who have come into the United States illegally—yes, even if it is canvas, even if it is a tent city, we cannot be rewarding them with air-conditioned buildings and opulent digs scattered across the countryside.

Mr. Speaker, there are solutions to this. They are in the hands of the President. We need to call upon him to enforce the law.

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

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o’clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2326

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLORES) at 11 o’clock and 26 minutes p.m.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Mr. MILLER of Florida submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 3230) making continuing appropriations during a government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT H. REPT. 113-564

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3230), making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components

of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

#### TITLE I—IMPROVEMENT OF ACCESS TO CARE FROM NON-DEPARTMENT OF VET- ERANS AFFAIRS PROVIDERS

Sec. 101. Expanded availability of hospital care and medical services for veterans through the use of agreements with non-Department of Veterans Affairs entities.

Sec. 102. Enhancement of collaboration between Department of Veterans Affairs and Indian Health Service.

Sec. 103. Enhancement of collaboration between Department of Veterans Affairs and Native Hawaiian health care systems.

Sec. 104. Reauthorization and modification of pilot program of enhanced contract care authority for health care needs of veterans.

Sec. 105. Prompt payment by Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 106. Transfer of authority for payments for hospital care, medical services, and other health care from non-Department of Veterans Affairs providers to the chief business office of the Veterans Health Administration.

#### TITLE II—HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Sec. 201. Independent assessment of the health care delivery systems and management processes of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 202. Commission on Care.

Sec. 203. Technology task force on review of scheduling system and software of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 204. Improvement of access of veterans to mobile vet centers and mobile medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 205. Improved performance metrics for health care provided by Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 206. Improved transparency concerning health care provided by Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 207. Information for veterans on the credentials of Department of Veterans Affairs physicians.

Sec. 208. Information in annual budget of the President on hospital care and medical services furnished through expanded use of contracts for such care.

Sec. 209. Prohibition on falsification of data concerning wait times and quality measures at Department of Veterans Affairs.

#### TITLE III—HEALTH CARE STAFFING, RECRUITMENT, AND TRAINING MATTERS

Sec. 301. Treatment of staffing shortage and biennial report on staffing of medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs.