

I yield back the balance of my time.

H. RES. _____

Whereas, the crisis on the Southwest border is of such significance that it demands national attention and urgent action.

Whereas, the President, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Administration have enacted unconstitutional policies, such as the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program and the Morton Memos, that have contributed significantly to a massive increase in illegal immigration.

Whereas, the President has not secured the border.

Whereas, the President has failed to fulfill his Constitutional obligation to protect each state against invasion according to Article IV, Section 4.

Whereas, states have specific authorities under Article I, Section 10 when “actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.”

Whereas, according to U.S. Customs and Border Protection between October 1, 2013 and June 15, 2014, 52,193 unaccompanied children have been apprehended on the Southwest border.

Whereas, according to a June 3, 2014 Homeland Security Intelligence report, only 0.1% of illegal alien, unaccompanied minor children from non-contiguous countries were removed in FY 2013.

Whereas, the Secretary of Homeland Security expects 90,000 unaccompanied alien children to be interdicted by the U.S. government while crossing the border in Fiscal Year 2014.

Whereas, according to the Department of Homeland Security, only twenty percent of those interdicted are and will be children.

Whereas, border security officials estimate the interdiction ratio is twenty-five percent of those attempting to cross the border.

Whereas, according to border security official's testimony before Congress, the likely number of illegal crossing attempts is four times the number of those interdicted.

Whereas, our Southern border is not secure, and this fact represents an immediate danger to every citizen of the United States of America.

Whereas, the Governor of a state is the commander in chief of the National Guard of that state.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes, supports and defends the Constitutional authority of any Governor to deploy his or her state's National Guard division to secure the border;

(2) commits to appropriating the necessary monies to effectively support any such deployment of National Guard troops; and

(3) calls upon the Governors of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California to deploy the National Guard forces under their command to immediately gain effective control of our southern border, to turn back anyone without legal immigration status, and to ensure for the people of their states and the United States a safe and free future.

AMERICA, THE ATTRACTIVE NUISANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my dear friend from Iowa (Mr. KING).

I know we have a good friend here on the other side of the aisle who was re-

cently quoted as saying something along the lines that Mr. KING and I have never met an immigrant that we didn't think was a criminal, something of that sort, and I like the gentleman from Illinois, LUIS GUTIÉRREZ. I think he is a good guy. I think he has a big heart. But the truth is escaping him on such grandiose claims. He doesn't know my heart. I know he is a good guy. He has a big heart. But he doesn't understand the role of government.

When I looked at one of the most beautiful little girls I had ever seen. It was a Saturday night in the wee hours. She had been drug clear across Mexico. She was asked about home. Well, were you anxious to leave home? She starts crying. She didn't want to leave home, she said. She misses her family. But some adult decided that because the administration's policies are luring people here with the promise that they will most likely be able to stay, then people are coming and the children are not afraid of violence in their home country. Some adults may be. But they are adults making decisions to subject a beautiful child like that and so many of the others that our border patrolmen are processing, our border patrolmen and -women are processing out there, especially in the McAllen sector, which is a rough area.

It was interesting seeing my first tarantula in the wild. I have seen plenty of rattlesnakes before in that area of Texas, but I haven't seen any in the last month that I have been down there. I know they are there. The border patrolmen tell me they are there. But I had never seen a tarantula in the wild like that. It was interesting.

But parents are choosing to send their children, bring their children, in some cases put their children in the hands of drug cartel human traffickers hoping that the tremendous money they pay will get them to the United States rather than make them sex slaves. Some make it, some don't. Some die on the way. Some are raped. Some are abused. And it is all because there is what, under the civil law, might be called an attractive nuisance.

We learned in law school that if you have a swimming pool and you have no fence and a child comes over and drowns in your pool because you didn't have a fence, then you would be liable for civil damages for having an attractive nuisance that lured a child to his or her death. Well, this administration has created an attractive nuisance under civil law.

Mr. Speaker, you and I know the United States is not a nuisance. It has been a force for good because it has applied the laws of the Judeo-Christian heritage. That is why George Washington, in the resignation he sent to the 13 Governors, as the first and only general commander to have led the military in revolution, won the revolution, and then resigned and went home, asking nothing further.

But at the end of his resignation that he sent out to the Governors, he had a

prayer for the Nation, praying that he hoped we would never forget those who have served in the field. And I am grateful that both sides of the aisle repeatedly are grateful to our military for their service.

I have, in past years, heard someone say, you know, no liberal ever spit at anybody in uniform. Well, they just don't know; because I served 4 years in the Army after Vietnam, and it was not a good time to be in the Army as far as accolades for your service. I have been spit at.

And when I went through basic at Fort Riley, Kansas, there was a standing order from our commander going through training that we were not to ever wear our uniform off post because—though Kansas is one of the greatest States there is, with wonderful people—there were people who didn't like the military. And if they found you as one or two together, then you would likely get beat up.

□ 1800

They had had instances, and we were ordered—that is what we were told—we were ordered not to ever wear uniforms off post or in basic. Every now and then, even at Fort Benning, Georgia, there would be indications, orders, don't be wearing your uniform off post this weekend. So it was not a good time. And I thank God that people have realized the importance and value of our United States military men and women who take an oath and are willing to lay down their lives for their friends and for their fellow Americans.

But government has a different position from individuals. And that is why some Christians get confused and say, well, I am a Christian. I am supposed to turn the other cheek. I am supposed to love my fellow man. I am supposed to reach out and help sojourners. All of that is true. The beatitudes that Jesus gave are the kinds of things we need to be doing for anyone who is a Christian, and I would humbly submit for anybody who is an atheist, Buddhist. Buddhists practice many of the beatitudes and are very noble in doing so. But for a government, it is different.

The government's role, even when it is composed of Christians, is to make sure that the law is enforced fairly and impartially. Romans talks about the government being an agent for good, for encouraging good, but if you do evil, be afraid because the government is not given the sword in vain. If you do evil, the government is not supposed to turn the other cheek. It is supposed to apply the law fairly across the board.

So when an adult child of one of the wealthier families in all of east Texas who was before my court—and my predecessor had repeatedly given her probation—I couldn't give her probation because I knew I would not do that to anyone else in her situation. So I sent her to prison because I had to be fair and impartial despite knowing the parents, the family, and knowing that that family brought most of my contributors, the biggest contributors I

had, into my courtroom the day of sentencing.

Well, it would be nice to do special favors for friends, and I realized that day there may be nobody in this courtroom that ever supports me for office again, and if that is the way it is, so be it. But I had faith in my friends that they would understand. Some didn't, most did. But it is the job of the government to apply the law fairly across the board, whether it is a very wealthy person, as the girl I sentenced, or whether it is someone of no means whatsoever, the law is supposed to be applied impartially.

In that case, it was some years later, I heard that she had served her time and been released and that she got involved in her father's business, but he had passed away while she was in prison. I knew her parents hated my guts and would probably never speak to me again, but I had heard she got off drugs, cleaned up her act, got involved in the family business after she got out, and was doing well.

When I was walking the neighborhood, I walked by the parents' house. And I thought, well, they may still hate me, but I want to let them know how proud I am of their daughter that has gotten out of prison, has gotten drugs under control and was clean and sober. I knocked on the door. It took a while for her mom to come to the door. Eventually she did. I didn't realize her sight had gotten so bad. She asked who it was. I said, it is LOUIE GOHMERT, and she immediately opened the door and said, please, please come in and sit down.

We sat down there in the foyer of their beautiful home. She said, I feel a bit guilty. And I said, I don't know why you would feel guilty. She said, because I owed you an apology and a thank you. And I said, you don't owe me anything. I just stopped by to tell—I was hoping your daughter would be here to let her know how proud I am that she was able to overcome her addiction. I know it is a daily fight, but that she is doing so well. I just wanted to encourage. I was hoping you didn't still hate me like I knew you once did. And she said, no, my husband and I were visiting our daughter. In one of our trips to see her in prison, we realized you gave us our daughter back. You saved her life.

I didn't do anything special. I just stood up to those who wanted me to act partially and give special favor to very wealthy friends. I couldn't do that as a judge because I had the role of government. I had to treat people impartially and fairly across the board, and that is what I did.

Someone once raised the issue that perhaps judges—and I know they had gotten it at a seminar—raised the issue that maybe your judge—since judges, even though they don't select the grand jurors, they select the grand jury foreman, the one that leads the grand jury—raised the issue, especially in death penalty cases, that judges have

been unfair racially and that there would be racial disparity in their appointments.

So I got a subpoena to appear to talk about my appointments. But then the criminal defense lawyer got my grand jury records and found that there was a great racial disparity in my appointments of grand jury foremen, men and women both, that I had appointed, and the great racial disparity was that I had appointed significantly more African Americans to be grand jury foremen, men and women, given the racial components of our district. And so I was notified I was no longer needed and was not wanted to testify.

Well, I didn't pick grand jury foremen because of their skin color. I could have cared less. I looked at all of those people, the 12 that were on the grand jury each time—and I knew so many of them—and I picked people I knew were upright, good, and smart leaders. And each time I selected grand jury foremen, I would ultimately have people come to me that were on the grand jury individually and say, you really made a good choice of your grand jury foreman.

Well, it was because I did so fairly and impartially without any regard for their status in the community. They were good people, they were leaders, and I knew they would do a good job leading the grand jury without regard to their race, creed, color, national origin, or gender. It didn't matter. It was who would be the best. That is what government is supposed to be about.

Mr. Speaker, it breaks down a government's effectiveness when the leaders of a government use partiality to make decisions. It may have been humorous, but, as it is often said, humor usually has a little element of truth, but I sarcastically and cynically sent out a tweet yesterday that since basically we knew the President—according to the United States CIS, they said that the President had given amnesty to 553,000 or so people who were here illegally, and that there had recently been another surge, we were told by sources like The New York Times, of another 300,000, and then we hear yesterday that 38 people were being deported. And so my cynical tweet was, in essence, that the Obama administration had dramatically lowered the chances of anyone coming in illegally being able to stay from 100 percent to 99.9955 percent, and that should scare people.

Dana Loesch responded that the administration must have found 38 Republicans, which is rather funny and amusing. But the little element of truth is that this administration has been partial, and they have been unfair.

This administration, through its Internal Revenue Service, has gone after conservatives and Republicans even to the point of demanding to know the contents of their prayers and demanding to know information they had no business knowing. Actually, they were

violating the law and committing crimes by turning over information to other entities. That was a violation of the law, and they did so knowingly. Crimes have been committed, and it is important we have a special prosecutor because this Attorney General has made clear his Justice Department is about "just us." It is more a Department of Injustice.

So it is time to make a change.

Through all of this, the story yesterday from The Hill, by Alexander Bolton:

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, Democrat from Nevada, on Tuesday asserted the southern border is secure despite the massive surge of illegal minors from Central America that has overwhelmed federal agencies. "The border is secure," he told reporters after the Senate Democrats' weekly policy lunch. Senator Martin Heinrich, Democrat from New Mexico, talked to the caucus today. He is a border State Senator. He said he can say without any equivocation the border is secure.

Well, it is not. And anybody who will be fair and impartial and with the least semblance of objectivity who has eyes to see and ears to hear will go to the border, as I have a number of times now, and find the border is not secure. That is how you have 550,000 people that this President gives amnesty to.

Then this article from NetRight Daily by Robert Romano:

Last September, the National Council of La Raza issued comments in favor of a Department of Housing and Urban Development regulation. Under the regulation, in October the Obama administration will be empowered to condition eligibility for community development block grants on redrawing zoning maps to create evenly distributed neighborhoods based on racial composition and income.

Mr. Speaker, this article is exactly what I am talking about. The Bible warns against, and wise people throughout time have warned against, if you want to have peace in a nation, you must have a leader or a government that is fair and impartial across the board, that you do not look at people's race, you don't look at their income, you do as I had to do to that very rich lady when I sent her to prison. Why? She was white, and she was rich. But I knew anybody else in her circumstance I would have sent to prison, so I sent her. That is why perhaps she was able to turn her life around.

□ 1815

One of the saddest things I ever heard during a sentencing was during her sentencing. They put on quite a dog and pony show, some impressive evidence about the family and the upbringing and she never really had discipline growing up, never had to make up her bed, study for school, and all kinds of things.

At the end of the hearing her lawyer basically said: Is there anything left you want to tell the judge?

She looked up at me with tears in her eyes because she knew what I was going to do because I was going to do what I would do to anybody in her situation with the priors she had, the

chances she had already had, she looked up at me with tears in her eyes and said: I just wish someone had told me no before today and meant it.

It was tragic. Nobody had told her no before today. She was raised so wealthy. She said I was the first one who ever told her no because I was being fair and impartial and treating her like any other defendant.

Well, this government, this administration, wants to look and be unfair and partial and make decisions based on the color of people's skin, rather than on the content of the character, and in fact, this administration is taking us away from the dream of Martin Luther King, Jr.

He is the one who said those fantastic words. He had a dream, and part of the dream was that people would be judged by the content of their character and not by the color of their skin.

We have made so much progress in America, and the President that went abroad and criticized America for being divisive, he has divided this country more than any President in my lifetime—along gender lines, along racial lines—by playing partial politics.

It looks, from this article, as if it is going to happen again:

In 2012, HUD dispersed about \$3.8 billion of these grants to almost 1,200 municipalities.

According to La Raza's comment in favor of the regulation, Hispanic families often do not know their housing rights and have cited fear of deportation as reason for not reporting rights violations.

This is telling. By La Raza's own analysis, then, HUD implementation of the racial rezoning rule will benefit those who have cited fear of deportation—that is, low-skilled, low-income illegal immigrants, either those who are outright illegal the moment they set foot in the United States or who have simply overstayed their visas. After all, who else would fear deportation?

Therefore, one of the sure effects of HUD's regime will be to flood unwilling communities with a significant percentage of illegal immigrants.

While the current relocation of thousands, including children, from detention centers on the U.S.-Mexico border has garnered national headlines and the ire of elected Republicans, including Senator Mark Kirk, Republican of Illinois, and Governor Dave Heineman, Republican of Nebraska, the HUD regulation has largely flown under the radar.

But it is every bit as important. It is not enough to arbitrarily implement amnesty, whether through refusal to enforce existing law or congressional action. The Federal Government wants to draw the maps of where the new residents will live, forcing local communities to make room whether they like it or not.

It is no secret that Republicans, with their low tax message, tend to do better among the middle and upper middle classes, while Democrats with their social welfare regime tend to do better among the poor. The political effect of the HUD rule will invariably be to gerrymander Republican districts at the local level.

Take a Republican State like Texas as a prime example of how this might work. Houston, currently controlled by Democrats, has accepted \$38.5 million of these community development block grants. Harris County has accepted another \$10.3 million. Dallas,

another Democratic stronghold, has accepted \$16.6 million, and Dallas County took \$2.1 million. Austin, too controlled by Democrats, took \$7.5 million of the grants.

Republicans at the State level cannot block these grants going to these municipalities, and now, thanks to the HUD rule, by virtue of accepting these grants, bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., will get to redraw zoning maps along racial and income boundaries to include more affordable "units and combat discrimination."

It has all the hallmarks of a master plan. Too conspiratorial? It does not take a cynic to see who the winners and losers will be in implement the racial housing quotas.

In the case of La Raza and illegal immigration amnesty proponents, the likely beneficiaries of the HUD rezoning rule will be Democrat parties across the country. Both U.S. and immigrant-born Hispanics favor Democrats by nearly 2 to 1, according to Gallup.

What emerges is a plan to resettle as many as 20 million illegal immigrants in specific communities as a pretext to tilt the political scales on the national and local political scenes to favor Democrats.

Fortunately, the House of Representatives has already acted, passing an amendment to the Transportation and HUD Appropriations bill by Representative Paul Gosar, Republican of Arizona, in a close 219 to 207 vote to defund implementation of the regulation.

Anyway, I keep coming back to true peace in a country can come from a government that treats everyone impartially, and the great genius of America has been free enterprise, the ability of somebody like DARRELL ISSA that is a captain in the United States Army, who comes up with a brilliant idea of a door lock that would go up and down automatically, which idea was apparently stolen, as I recall, and then he figures, well, I can spend 20 years in litigation or so, or if I can come up with something smart then—I can come up with something else smart, and he comes up with the idea of the automatic car alarm, and my friend DARRELL has done quite well with that.

This is America. It is the genius of American free enterprise. Let people profit when they have good ideas, when they work hard and do well. America is a stronger place to be.

But the results of failing to enforce the law fairly and impartially as it is written, also brought about this headline today from Breitbart, "Released Alien from Border Crisis Arrested for Alleged Murder, Kidnapping in Texas."

An illegal immigrant who was released by U.S. authorities with a notice to appear has been arrested for the alleged murder of a woman and kidnapping of children on U.S. soil. The alleged crimes occurred after the man was released.

It goes on in the article and talks about the AP actually reported this, but they neglected to say the man was an illegal alien. It is time for the AP, for the media, for this administration, to start following and enforcing the law, and this country will be a better place in which to live.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

VIOLENCE IN CHICAGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTINGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor now because of a serious concern, a deadly concern even, that the people of my district, the First Congressional District of Illinois, the citizens of the great city of Chicago, and indeed those from around our country, that they are experiencing and that they are witnessing, and that is the preponderance of violence, killings, young people killing each other, and innocent bystanders shot down on the streets of my city.

They leave victims of gun violence perpetrated by young men, older citizens, retirees, victims of gun violence in my city.

One will get the notion that the name attributed to my city is apropos, that it is a worthy name, Chiraq, a nickname that has been associated with my city.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to say that this great city that I love, these people—worthy people of the First Congressional District, these hardworking Americans who have contributed greatly to the greatness of this Nation, they don't live in a place called Chiraq. Chiraq is not apropos.

We wholeheartedly and determinedly resist and repudiate any references to our city with the inappropriate—grossly inappropriate name of Chiraq. We don't embrace Chiraq and none of its implications.

Yes, there is a focus on the violence that occurs in our city, but, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that this functionality in Chicago and in other places across the country is a direct result of decades-long failed governmental policies, failed public policies, policies that have emanated out of this very institution, this Federal Government, policies that have emanated out of State capitals all across this Nation and city halls, village halls, all across this Nation, decades-long.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about just the vestiges of slavery and that dark period of American history. We are not just speaking about segregation and all of the abuses and all of the trauma that segregation has caused upon African Americans.

□ 1830

We are not just talking about Jim Crow laws that were a result of public policies. Mr. Speaker, we are not just talking about all of the policies that emanated out of this institution, the housing policies in my very city that until the seventies denied African Americans in my city to actually acquire a mortgage which was and still is the foundation of a middle class lifestyle, a foundation for the American Dream. Without the ability to get a mortgage, to own a home, the American Dream becomes an American nightmare.