


A Deceptive Immigration Deal Threatens National Security



by Roger L. Simon

A so-called immigration deal is apparently in the offing that links money to “close” the border with financial support for the wars in Ukraine and Israel.

This is going on while anyone with the proverbial IQ in triple-digits knows the border was opened in the first place via executive fiat from President Biden moments after he assumed office and could be closed again in the same manner at any time he wishes.

President Biden could close the Southern border in one day.

Instead Mr. Biden—[and now his wife, apparently](#)—demands we support legislation that co-mingles three different matters

that have little or nothing to do with each other. Why?

That the Biden administration, with the help of an oddly complaisant Supreme Court, objects to the state of Texas employing razor wire to prevent illegal aliens from entering this country underscores, and then some, the titanic border hypocrisy of the administration.

Their real goal is to mollify the American public that is justifiably upset about the border invasion in order to get reelected and then return to the status quo ante shortly thereafter. If not, why did they wait three years to correct this?

Aiding them in the promotion of this bogus legislation are, shamefully, two leading Republicans, Senate minority leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) and Sen. James Lankford (R-Okla.).

It's hard to believe they would support a proposal that allows up to 5,000 (why any?) illegal aliens to pass through the border per day, which could add up to 1.8 million in a year. How many fentanyl deaths and jihadist entries would that make? How many agents of China, Cuba, Venezuela, and so forth could slip into our country, not to mention, perhaps worst of all, human traffickers?

The mind boggles.

Mr. Lankford has already been censured by his home state GOP.

But it's not just many of their fellow Republicans who are upset with the pair.

Independent presidential candidate Robert F. Kennedy Jr. has deemed the legislation "[insane](#)."

So, what's going on with these people? Why don't they do the obvious and call for Mr. Biden to close the border immediately, by himself, just as he opened it?

In the cases of Mr. McConnell and Mr. Lankford we can find elements of Trump Derangement Symptom. They just don't want

Mr. Trump back in office, for reasons we could only guess at, and are willing to have four more years of Mr. Biden and Vice President Kamala Harris, or just about anybody else, if need be.

No questions would be asked about Mr. Biden's possible connections with Ukraine or China, let alone Russia. That would be the unspoken part of the deal.

For Republicans in the Senate to even consider something like this legislation disturbing. But at least when the votes are recorded, we will know definitively where each senator stands.

This legislation is so consequential, with such an obvious lie built into it, that the votes will not easily be forgotten and in a number of instances will result in electoral changes at the next primary.

The disparity between Mr. McConnell's views and those of GOP voters on this and other issues would appear gigantic.

Why Mr. McConnell remains as minority leader would be a mystery were it not for his well-known control of corporate [donations](#) that fund his and other campaigns.

This does not reflect well on what was once considered "the world's greatest deliberative body" or on our political system in general that seems increasingly out of whack.

But here we are.

As usual, the MSM is doing its best to favor Democratic views, the AP, as per usual, in the lead:

"House Speaker Mike Johnson, a Trump ally and critic of the proposed deal, has argued that presidents already have enough authority to stop illegal border crossings," [It writes](#). "Biden could, in theory, strongly limit asylum claims and restrict crossings, but the effort would almost certainly be challenged in court and would be far more likely to be blocked or curtailed dramatically without a congressional law backing the new changes."

In theory? Why just “in theory” when President Trump had already done much of it without significant or successful objection?

But to give the AP it's due, they are a bit more realistic when it comes to answering the question, “What is the outlook for the proposed deal?”

“Prospects are dim,” they write. “A core group of senators negotiating the deal had hoped to release detailed text this week, but conservatives already say the measures do not go far enough to limit immigration.”

“[House Speaker Mike] Johnson, R-La., on Friday sent a letter to colleagues that aligns him with hardline conservatives determined to sink the compromise. The speaker said the legislation would have been ‘dead on arrival in the House’ if leaked reports about it were true.”

Imagine, in this instance, they are.

Next Tuesday I will be interviewing Tennessee Attorney General Jonathan Skrmetti, one of the most highly regarded public officials in the state.

Mr. Skrmetti was involved in the strong stand against the administration and, alas, the Supreme taken at this writing by a majority 27 of our 50 states supporting the border defense barriers in Texas.

“Securing our border isn't a political or ideological issue, it's a matter of basic governmental competence,” Mr. Skrmetti said in a statement. “The record-breaking number of illegal entries has strained resources in states and cities across the country, even those far removed from the border. Texas is fulfilling its duty to enforce the law and protect its citizens given the federal abdication of serious border enforcement. America would be better off if the federal government worked toward collaboration rather than

confrontation with the states that are working to solve the problem.”

It will be interesting to see what he has to say as this controversy, crucial to the survival of our Republic, continues to evolve.

First published in the [*Epoch Times*](#).