OUR EDUCATION SYSTEM NEEDS HELP

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the education system in our country needs help. But instead of helping education through additional funding, the sequester, which I voted against as a bad idea, cuts education services to the children in our country who are most at risk.

$740 million will be cut from Title I education programs that provide financial assistance to improve academic achievement of disadvantaged students. Tennessee would receive $14.5 million less and, in Memphis, almost every single school relies on those funds. Head Start would be stripped of $406 million.

These programs are relied upon by low-income families, families that need more assistance to assure that their children have a safe place to learn while their parents work to pay their bills.

Nationwide, nearly 1.2 million students are affected by Head Start cuts. Tennessee will lose at least $7 million and, in Memphis, it means 31,000 children will lose access to affordable early education.

As a result of this reduction in Federal funding and the needs to reprioritize our allocation of Title I funding, Memphis City Schools will be forced to eliminate approximately 80 of their pre-K classrooms for the next year. Eighty-two classrooms are being closed, affecting 1,640 children, more than a third of the students.

The sequester needs to go.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States of House of Representatives. And I know that there's issue after issue that comes before this Congress; some calculate those issues in the thousands. But I'm also aware that, across America, we talk about the things that we see in the news. The things that are in the news are the large topics that are emerging here in Congress.

We've heard the gentleman from Texas speak about the Benghazi incident and how that is unfolding here, and another gentleman talked about the immigration issue, which is unfolding within the Senate and the Judiciary Committee as recently as today.

I come to the floor, Mr. Speaker, to raise the issue of immigration and seek to, I think, more broadly inform yourself and those that are listening in, Members of the Congress, as well. And it strikes me that we have been through some intense debates here in this Congress on the immigration issue, and primarily that debate that took place starting in 2005, throughout the duration of 2006 and into 2007, when we saw tens of thousands of people come to the Capitol grounds and fill up the west lawn and call for amnesty.

I recall in those days it was President George W. Bush that was promoting this policy. And I remember a discussion with his political director, I believe, the senior political adviser at the time, and he said to me, Well, if we didn't give them amnesty, would it be okay with you?

And I said, Well, first let's define ''amnesty.''

And he said, Well, it wouldn't be amnesty, for example, if we required people to pay a fine, or if we required them to learn English, or if we required them to get a job, or if we required them to pay their back taxes. And that was the language that emerged here in the middle part of the previous decade.

It happens to also be reflective of the 1986 Amnesty Act, which Ronald Reagan signed. It was one of only two times that that great man let me down in 8 years of the Presidency. Once a term's not too bad. Ronald Reagan intended to follow through on the enforcement of the law and the securing of our border.

I was an employer at the time. I remember the new rules that emerged from the 1986 Amnesty Act. President Reagan was honest enough and direct enough with the American people that he called it amnesty, and we understood that that's what it was.

And we understood the purpose for it, and that was to get an agreement so that we could enforce the law and put away the immigration debate for all time by allowing the people that were illegally in the United States a path to citizenship of full residency status and the path to citizenship, and the tradeoff was that would be the last amnesty. The promise that there would never be another one was the 1986 Amnesty Act.

There was something like 800,000 people originally that were to be the beneficiaries of this plan, and it turned out to be not a million—3 million people. There was a substantial amount of document fraud, and there was a larger universe of people than was anticipated.

Does anybody think today, Mr. Speaker, that this universe of people is not larger than that that's anticipated by the Senate version of the comprehensive immigration reform bill?

Of course, honest people, objective people, they're not going to write into the bill that there's only going to be 11 million people that can be beneficiaries of this bill. Any kind of an amendment like that would put a hard cap on, would be a deal breaker in the United States Senate because they know that number's larger. History shows that number is larger. Data shows the number is larger. That's just the lowest number that they can, with a straight face, talk about, and it's in a calculated way to try to minimize the amount because it minimizes the opposition to this idea that has emerged.

And I understand why it's there for Democrats, Mr. Speaker. I recall this debate. And as likely the year was 2006, I saw it live. I saw it on C–SPAN, but it took place right out here on the west lawn when then-Senator Teddy Kennedy went before throngs of people, speaking through an interpreter, speaking Spanish through an interpreter, he said: Some say report to be deported. I say, report to become an American citizen.

When I heard that, Mr. Speaker, I understood why he said that. This was his clarion call to say to all of them out there: We want to give you citizenship; and the deal is, you need to come and vote. Vote for those who advocate for handing citizenship over in exchange for the implied or implicit.

And we know what has happened with the way that people have been divided, divided from Americanism into special interest groups by using the political science of victimology manufactured in the brain of Antonio Gramsci back in the earlier part of the 20th century, a contemporary of Lenin's who studied in Moscow and went to Italy and sat down and was jailed by Mussolini and wrote his prison notebooks. I've read nearly every word that he has published, Mr. Speaker.

Antonio Gramsci was a brilliant man if you can accept the flawed premise that he started with; and the flawed premise was to accept Karl Marx's theory that they needed to defeat Western civilization and defeat the bourgeoisie and empower the proletariats. That was Marx's.

Gramsci was critical of Marx's theory because he said Marx only isolated himself and focused on just economics, and he didn't believe that the Communist movement could succeed against free enterprise and Western civilization because the proletariats, the common people, the working people, needed the bourgeoisie for jobs, so there was an interdependency there.

So he argued instead, if we're going to defeat them, we have to do the long march through the culture. We have to take on all of these principles that interconnect, that hold Western civilization, Western Christendom, as Winston Churchill described it, or Western Judeo-Christendom, as I would describe it, those values that hold us together completely under assault, strategized by Antonio Gramsci, who was the President of the Communist Party in Italy from 1919 until 1926.

And he was brilliant in his perception. He is the father of multiculturalism. He didn't use the word, that I could find, but he's the father of it.

□ 1240

He created the idea that if you could get people to identify themselves as