

that they have already passed last year. And we all need to keep foremost in our minds that this debate about the wall—we should be talking about the real people and getting to work now, Mr. Speaker.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

CLARIFICATION OF REMARKS

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me here this afternoon.

I come to the floor here of the United States House of Representatives with a specific purpose today, and that is to address an issue that has become a controversy.

I regret that I made a freshman mistake a week ago today when I took a call from a reporter from the New York Times, and that was a 56-minute interview, without a tape, that resulted in a long article. In that article were snippets of the 56-minute interview.

Part of that inquiry was about the history of immigration policy in this country for over the last, say, 18 or so years, of which I have been a significant part, especially in Iowa, as we have a voice to shape policy and help these presidential candidates move on to the Oval Office.

I am grateful that much of the policy that was debated then is in the Oval Office today, and it is being debated all over this country. But one phrase in that long article has created an unnecessary controversy.

That was my mistake, Mr. Speaker, so I want to start this out with some context of that discussion, and that is this: That if you can control the language, you can control the policy.

Labels have been hurled in this country at people like we have never seen in this history of America. I made a point of this in a September 12 tweet that I sent out as a component of this broader dialogue, and here is the tweet, verbatim, Mr. Speaker:

The word "Nazi" is injected into leftist talking points because the worn out and exhausted word "racist" is overused and applied to nearly everyone.

□ 1330

That is the foundation for at least part of that discussion with a New York Times reporter, Mr. Speaker.

In that also was discussion of other terms that had been used, almost always unjustly labeling otherwise innocent people the word "racist," the word "Nazi," the word "fascist," the phrase "white nationalist," the phrase "white supremacist."

They even are derogatory toward Western civilization, which is the foundation for the American civilization, and we are today the flagship.

At this point, I will read the quote that had brought about this controversy, Mr. Speaker, and this is from The New York Times article titled: "Before Trump, Steve King Set the Agenda for the Wall and Anti-Immigrant Politics," which, by the way, is a bit pejorative, because I have never been anti-immigrant. I have been anti-illegal immigrant, and I remain that way.

But here is the quote. It says: "White nationalist, white supremacist"—and this is from me, by the way, Mr. Speaker—"White nationalist, white supremacist, Western civilization—how did that language become offensive?" Mr. KING said. "Why did I sit in classes teaching me about the merits of our history and our civilization?"

That is off of this article, and that is the substance of this heartburn that seems to be churning across the media in America today.

So I look at that and I think, well, what was that conversation? It was about how those words got plugged into our dialogue, not when the words became offensive, which is what the technical interpretation of this is. How did that language become offensive?

It is, how did that offensive language get injected into our political dialogue? Who does that? How does it get done? How do they get by with laying labels like this on people?

When I asked the question, "Why did I sit in classes teaching me about the merits of our history and our civilization?" that response was strictly for: Why did I sit in Western civilization classes to hear about the merits of our history?

I have never sat in a class at any time and heard any merits about any of those other names, including I have never heard a merit about "racist." I have never heard a merit about "Nazi" or "Fascist" or "white nationalist" or "white supremacist," but Western civilization has merit, and I remain a defender.

So I put together a statement, which is public, and I choose to read it into the RECORD now, Mr. Speaker, and it is this:

"Today, the New York Times is suggesting that I am an advocate for white nationalism and white supremacy. I want to make one thing abundantly clear: I reject those labels and the evil ideology that they define. Further, I condemn anyone that supports this evil and bigoted ideology, which saw in its ultimate expression the systematic murder of 6 million innocent Jewish lives.

"It's true that, like the Founding Fathers, I am an advocate for Western civilization's values and that I profoundly believe that America is the greatest tangible expression of these ideals the world has ever seen. Under any fair political definition, I am simply an American nationalist. America's values are expressed in our founding documents. They are attainable by ev-

eryone, and we take pride that people of all races, religions, and creeds from around the globe aspire to achieve them. I am dedicated to keeping America this way.

"This conviction does not make me a white nationalist or a white supremacist. Once again, I reject those labels and the ideology that they define. As I told the New York Times, 'It's not about race. It's never been about race.' One of my most strongly held beliefs is that we are all created in God's image and that human life is sacred in all its forms."

All of my life's work, all of my public record, all of my bills, all of my votes, all of my activities support that statement that human life is sacred in all of its forms and that we are created in God's image.

So, Mr. Speaker, I regret the heartburn that has poured forth upon this Congress and upon this country, and especially in my State and in my congressional district. But the people who know me know I wouldn't have to even make this statement, because they do know me. They know my life. They know my history. They know that I have lived in the same place since 1978. There is nothing about my family or my history or my neighborhood that would suggest that these false allegations could be supported by any activity whatsoever.

I reject that ideology. I defend American civilization, which is an essential component of Western civilization.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas again for the opportunity to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, for his comments. I have traveled with him, been to different parts of the country and different parts of the world with my friend, Mr. KING from Iowa. I have seen him dealing with different races, nationalities around the world. And I have had a lot of private conversations and never seen anything that indicated anything but condemnation for white supremacists.

But he is a proud American. He is an American; he is very proud of it. And he is proud to carry the moniker of being an American in any situation, and I would contend that is not a bad thing.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the speeches on the floor here this week. There has been a great deal of righteous indignation and constant condemnation for a shutdown. It is deeply troubling. There are some people working who are not getting paid. I would like to see that fixed.

But President Trump got his answer this week when he continued to try to compromise with Senator SCHUMER and Speaker PELOSI, trying to get a compromise.

I was delighted to hear Majority Leader HOYER mention that we have to have compromise. It is how things are

supposed to work. I agree with the tone of that comment, but it is not a compromise to say I will give you a dollar for the border wall when it is such a serious matter, and especially when we have a history of people making comments on the Democratic side as well as the Republican side about the need for border security, the need for either a wall, a barrier, a fence, but tough, tight border security for the country, which is the most generous country, not only philanthropically. There has never been a country that has given more, done more, without any request in return, but just out of the goodness of Americans' hearts, for other parts of the world. We do that. We care deeply.

But the only way you can have people who are giving and who have money to share and spare is if we have a vibrant economy here. Otherwise, America continued the move we saw during the last administration where the middle class kept shrinking, the poor got much bigger, and the rich, well, it is easiest to put it this way: We have never had a time in the United States history, never, when the policies of an administration would have the effect that the Obama administration had.

Here is what President Obama acknowledged: For the first time in American history, 95 percent of American income went to the top 1 percent.

But that is what happens as you move more and more toward a socialist form of government. You will have the rich ruling class, virtually no middle class, and then you have everybody equal in the poor ruled class.

That is where socialism goes, and that is where this country has been heading as young people have been miseducated and not been informed that socialism has never worked. It will never work. It always leads to totalitarianism. You can't have socialism without totalitarianism.

One might ask, why do we have so many billionaires supporting socialism, the Democratic cause, the progressivism, as they call it? Well, it is because they see themselves being in the rich ruling class once they get rid of the middle class. It helps to get rid of the middle class if you keep bringing illegal immigrants into the country so they take the jobs of Americans. But never forget the cost of that.

Here are some quotes:

"Well, look, I voted numerous times when I was a Senator to spend money to build a barrier to try to prevent illegal immigrants from coming in. And I do think you have to control your borders." That was Presidential candidate Hillary Clinton.

She was asked: "Would you commit tonight that you would finish the fence and speed up the construction?"

And she said: "Both Senator Obama and I voted for that as part of the immigration debate We were voting for the possibility that, where it was appropriate and made sense, it would be considered."

So she was watering it down already a little bit from where she had been before.

But Senator Barack Obama said: "We fail to protect our Nation if we do not regain control over our immigration system immediately."

It is really heartbreaking to hear people that I like condemn as hateful and immoral a wall like they have around their house. The walls of the houses themselves show that wall works. The fact that so many people in this body at night, the last thing they do, they make sure all the doors are locked. It didn't used to be that way.

If you are in a gated community and you have really tight security in your gated community, you may not need to lock your doors. You may feel safe enough without that. But most will secure their doors, not because a burglar can't break through and get into their home, but because walls work. They are secure in slowing down people who would be trespassers, burglars, long enough, hopefully, for either the police to arrive or for the homeowner to be prepared for the burglar coming in. That is the hope.

I mean, that is why people don't just have a roof. They have walls around their home. People that they don't want to come in and interrupt their families don't come unless they are invited. That is the way the immigration system works.

So I would encourage all my friends who say walls don't work, go home this weekend and get a contractor to destroy your outer walls. If you have a wall or fence around your home, you have a gated community, tell them, demand, that the walls, the gates, they all be destroyed and say: "Walls don't work. I have been saying it over and over on the House floor and in the media, CNN, MSNBC, 'Walls don't work,' so I am going to eliminate the hypocrisy that some could see in my life. I am going to eliminate the outer wall of my home, because walls don't work. I am not going to have a door anymore, no walls, because walls don't work."

That is what needs to happen this weekend to avoid—some people I really care deeply about, I don't want them to look like hypocrites. I want them to look fine and upstanding, but you have to eliminate the walls of your house, because walls don't work, according to you.

The righteous indignation that we have heard this week and in prior weeks about the shutdown, I want to put the focus on people who are working right now and who may not get their next paycheck if Speaker PELOSI and SCHUMER do not at least agree to some compromise, something, not continue to say no to a wall, no to a barrier.

Then when he says: Okay, I will compromise. It won't be concrete. It will be steel. There is a compromise.

They said: Oh, now we see you don't have a definite plan.

Well, yeah. He is trying to compromise with people who disagree with him. Fine, but if you are going to compromise, you are going to do it with the President: Okay, I will compromise. We will make it a steel wall.

Okay, we will compromise, and we will have barriers.

Let's work it out, what we will have.

□ 1345

Oh, see, they say: He doesn't have a plan. We need to see exactly what his plan is.

Oh, he has got a plan, but you said under no circumstances would you agree. He has been compromising. That is what it is called. That is what he is trying to do. And that is what we have been wanting to do here in the House. Let's have a compromise. But don't say under no circumstances will you ever agree to any kind of wall, fence, barrier and then say: There is our compromise. That is not a compromise.

And if people would just go back and look at what they have said in the past, it will be much easier for them to reach this compromise: Oh, I forgot I said that. I did.

And I know they wouldn't have said it in prior years if they hadn't meant it.

Now, some of my friends across the aisle are saying, well, we don't need a wall. We need a virtual wall: the drones, the cameras, and that kind of thing. Well, you also do need a barrier or those things don't work.

And, in fact, under the prior administration that had, as I recall, about \$8 billion to create a virtual wall in support of securing our border, there was one little out that they had to avoid doing any of that, and that was if the administration declared virtual walls wouldn't work, the technology wouldn't work. And that is what Secretary NAPOLITANO did.

I can't find out what they did with the \$8 billion in the prior administration since they didn't spend it on the drones and the technology, but they declared, in the prior administration, that that kind of thing doesn't work, and so they weren't going to spend money on it.

Now they come back some years later and say: Well, do you know what? We think we were wrong before. Those kind of things do work. The technology, that is what we need.

Why they are saying that now, when they disagreed some years back, is because President Trump, who creates PTSD—President Trump stress disorder. They are suffering from the PTSD, the President Trump stress disorder. And now, in that condition, they are saying: It doesn't matter what he wants. We are not agreeing to anything he wants, period. He has to have total capitulation, and that is our offered compromise.

Going back just a little bit again, you had this comment: "When I see Mexican flags waved at pro-immigration demonstrations, I sometimes feel

a flush of patriotic resentment. When I'm forced to use a translator to communicate with a guy fixing my car, I feel a certain frustration."

My friends may recognize the name. That was Senator Barack Obama.

You have another here: "The American people are fundamentally pro-legal immigration. . . ."

And put me in that category, too.

But he said: "The American people are fundamentally pro-legal immigration and anti-illegal immigration. We will only pass comprehensive reform when we recognize this fundamental concept. . . . First, illegal immigration is wrong, and a primary goal of comprehensive immigration reform must be to dramatically curtail future illegal immigration."

That is what President Trump is trying to do. That is what we are trying to do.

By the way, that was Senator SCHUMER who said that.

We had a President that recently said: "I'll tell you what we can't have; it's these parents sending their kids here on a dangerous journey and putting their lives at risk."

That was President Barack Obama in 2015.

I have several pages of quotes from Democratic friends who have been supportive in the past of what we are asking for now. Let's not play politics with this. Let's just help the American people.

I got a great quote from President Clinton in his State of the Union back in 1995, when he felt like the Republicans do now.

Here is a good quote: "It's a competition for space."

I don't buy that, but this is what was said by a Democrat: "It's a competition for space. Whether the space is a job, the space is a home, a place in a classroom, it becomes a competition for space. This is a country that's based on immigration. And we all know that. . . . And yet, at times you become so overtaxed you have to concentrate on saying, 'The people who should be here are those who come legally at this time.' And we've got to, for the time being, enforce our borders."

That was a well-educated Senator named DIANNE FEINSTEIN on a visit to the border. And, yes, it was some years back.

And again, I have got lots of these quotes. Here is one.

"Do we have a commitment to secure the border? Yes. What are the options that we have available to us; let's make sure they work. . . . Because we do need to address the issue of immigration and the challenge we have of undocumented people in our country. We certainly do not want any more coming in."

And I agree with Speaker PELOSI when she said that previously in the last Democratic majority. That was made in 2008. That helped the Democrats keep the majority for a second term.

And now, I think, to put the needs of the American people behind the desires of people who want to come in illegally is a big mistake. You will erode and destroy this country's ability to be the most philanthropic, to be a country that every year produces cleaner air or cleaner water, like Texas has. You erode that ability. Because when people are struggling financially, the thoughts of a cleaner environment and helping others fall behind the desires of just making enough to feed their family. We have seen it throughout history. It is important to secure our border.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Florida (Mr. YOHO), a real patriot. I don't believe he minds being called a patriot.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding, who is a great friend of mine.

I think the pictures you have up there speak a loud picture of the other side of the 21-day shutdown, of what is really going on.

Yesterday and today, we have heard a lot from our Democratic colleagues about what 20 days was, what 21 days was. And, yes, there are people who have been furloughed; and, yes, it is tragic for them if they can't pay their bills. But we know this is a temporary inconvenience.

We passed a bill today, in this Chamber, that will be signed into law that these people will be made whole. So it is a temporary inconvenience, and we don't like it. Neither side likes this.

But when you look at the cause of this, when we go back to the cause of this—and we saw that meeting in the White House with CHUCK SCHUMER, NANCY PELOSI, and President Trump. After that, there was a press conference where she said not one penny will go to a wall.

As you have illustrated so eloquently, how many times have President—or Senator Obama at the time, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator SCHUMER, and Ms. PELOSI supported a wall, border security, and the hypocrisy that it is okay then but it is not okay now because they want to label it "Trump's wall."

What this President is trying to do is fulfill all of our obligations to the Constitution, to uphold the Constitution from foreign and domestic enemies.

Border security is something we all do, border security at our homes. I imagine 90 percent of Americans lock their doors at night because of security to protect their families. Mayors and police chiefs of towns protect their citizens. That is their job.

Mr. GOHMERT. Do they secure their doors and secure their cities because they hate people who are not part of their home or their city?

Mr. YOHO. No, not at all. They do it because they want to protect the people whom they have been tasked to do. That is all we are asking for here is border security.

So 21 days ago the government shut down, a partial shutdown: 76 to 80 per-

cent of the government is funded. There is a small portion that is not funded.

And again, I feel bad for the people who have been furloughed, but today, the legislation passed, as I said, where they are going to be made whole.

Since 21 days ago, the government has been shut down, making this the longest—or we are tying the previous record for the longest shutdown in U.S. history?

Why has it been this long? Because the Democrats refuse to come to the table and negotiate a solution.

When you have two sides, where one is willing to work and compromise and the other one says not one penny, you are not even at a starting point to compromise. Instead, they would rather bring up messaging bills that don't fund the vital programs. Also, that they can say: We didn't support President Trump's border security.

This is hatred at the highest level, yet they talk about tolerance and all this other stuff. They have such a disdain for this President. And again, all he is trying to do is secure this Nation.

Well, let's take a look at the last 21 days; on the other side, as you have brought up here, 21 days.

On average, 2,000 inadmissible migrants arrive at our southern border daily. This means that in the last 21 days, without a secure border, approximately 42,000 migrants have sought illegal entry at our border without going through the proper channels.

If they come through the proper channels, as you said, we allow over a million people in this country, to immigrate here. We have proper channels for people to come through. But over 42,000 immigrants have sought illegal entry at our border without going through the proper channels.

Additionally, in December, 27,518 family unit aliens were apprehended for crossing the border illegally. If those numbers remain consistent, that means over 18,000 family unit aliens have been apprehended for illegal crossings in the last 21 days.

In fiscal year 2018, 2,028 illegal aliens arrested had homicide charges already. If this number remains consistent, that is 115 homicide charges for illegal aliens in the last 21 days.

Further, on an average, 300 Americans die per week from heroin. Ninety percent of all the heroin in the U.S., and marijuana and cocaine, 90 percent of that comes from our southern border.

Secure the border, Ms. PELOSI.

That means that in the last 21 days, if we have 300 dying a week—21 days is 3 weeks—that means at least 900 Americans have died because of heroin illegally crossing our border.

Secure the border, Ms. PELOSI.

This doesn't even include the amount of fentanyl that crossed our southern border in 2017, which the amount that has come in is enough to kill every single American via overdoses.

If you talk to the Democrats, they will tell you that \$5.7 billion is too

much to pay for protection at our southern border. But what they won't tell you is how much more it costs the Federal Government and Americans by not securing our borders.

And again, we want to be sensitive to the people who have been furloughed. As I said, and I know I am going to take some heat for this, it is a temporary inconvenience. But for these people that you have on this picture, for the countless other people we can talk about—Kate Steinle in San Francisco, Mollie Tibbetts, Peter Hacking—all were killed by illegal Mexicans who have come into this country, and I find this very egregious.

□ 1400

Peter Hacking, a father of nine, a blended family, had been married to his wife approximately a year. He and two of his children were killed by a Mexican that came into this country illegally. That person that killed these people, a person who should not have been in this country, got 2 years in prison. It is a sham that the Democrats want to use politics to say this is not about security of this Nation. Ask those people.

For the people who have been furloughed, it is a temporary inconvenience. They are going to be made whole. But for these people, it is a permanent damage, not just to their families, but to their communities and to this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I will be here if he needs me to weigh back in.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida. We have been friends for a long time, and I know how deeply my friend, Representative YOHO, cares about this country and about the people who are under our charge.

This poster has some more recent folks. You have heard about Officer Singh, who was recently killed by a person illegally in the country. That is the charge. Pierce Corcoran, 22 years old, and I was hearing his parents talk about him yesterday; Justin James Dennis Lee, 14 years old, a cute kid; Steven Marler, his family would love to have him back. Some of these were not intentional murders. Some of these were accidents, some by drunk drivers, and some by negligent homicide, but they killed Americans.

Grayson Hacking, she was 22 months old. It is a little harder. Ellie Jean Bryant reminds me of one of mine, killed when she was 4 years old; Blake Michael Zieto, he was 20; Christia Odette, 13; Rocky Jones, 51.

Now, Dominic Durden's mother is a friend of mine, and I know how she has suffered—she is a single mom—at the loss of Dominic. He sounds like he was an absolutely awesome young man. Then there is Shayley Estes and Grant Ronnebeck. He was 21.

I got to see a little bit of my friend Sean Hannity's show last night and I saw these names scrolling, and I was

going: Oh, my gosh. Look at those names. And there is a website his producer, Linda, directed me to that they were using that has lists of names. There are three columns, in case someone can't see, three columns of names.

This isn't everybody that has been killed by illegal immigrants. So knowing people who have lost family members to illegal immigrant homicides, it is difficult to absorb the pious, righteous indignation that we have sometimes heard here on the House floor about the shutdown. It sounds like callousness on this floor, potential callousness to the murders and the deaths of so many Americans that would not have happened if Congress had done its job.

And it breaks my heart to think of the murders and the homicides, negligent homicides and otherwise, that will occur if we continue to fail to do our job, which is, I would submit, a part of our oath.

Our oath is not to protect and defend people who want to break into this country illegally. That is not the people for whom and to whom we took an oath.

I have heard from teachers who were saying: My heart breaks for these groups of kids that are thrown into our classrooms that don't speak English. But my heart also breaks for the American citizens and legal residents who are not getting the education anymore that they would have gotten had we not had so many illegal immigrants thrown into the classroom. We can't take care of both. We can't teach them both because if we try to concentrate on the people who don't speak English that are illegally here—and I am hearing from teachers saying, we are getting them constantly.

We are getting more people, and we are not prejudiced against anybody, but we can't teach them and the students who are legally here because they can't learn at the same level. So what happens? The American citizens, the legal residents, people who are legally here, they are not getting the education that they would get otherwise.

I would just submit, before I yield again to my friend from Florida, this is a compassionate country. It is one of the things I am proud about. But I ask the question, Mr. Speaker: What is more compassionate? Is it to allow people to flood into America illegally when we know 37 percent of the girls are being sexually assaulted, normally multiple times; 17 percent of the young boys are being sexually molested on the way, as they are drawn toward the United States to come in illegally; and every day another girl is pulled into sex trafficking that would not be if our border weren't so porous.

Is that compassionate or is it more compassionate, looking at the situation—and I love Mexico. They have got some of the most beautiful places in the world. My wife and I honeymooned there 40 years ago and we loved it. I got

certified in an hour to scuba dive. It was a great certification process, and I loved scuba diving. It was just beautiful. They have got incredible beauty in Mexico and in Central America.

They have more natural resources than most countries in the world. They have got actually a better location in Mexico and Central America for commerce than North America does. They are between two continents, two oceans. They ought to be one of the very top economies in the world. There is one reason they are not, and that is the corruption.

Where does the corruption come from? It comes from the tens of billions of dollars that Americans pour into the drug cartels. Because they are getting money for people coming up here from human trafficking; they are getting money from sex trafficking; they are getting money from the drug trafficking that is going on in the U.S., and it is funding corruption.

We have got places where the police won't step up because they know they will get killed like the last ones that stepped up. It ought to be a top economy in the world. It ought to have a burgeoning, huge middle class that is thriving and doing so well. It is not because we have a porous border, and we are funding the corruption in Mexico.

They have got some of the hardest working people in the world. I know some. It would be so much better for the people of Mexico if we would secure our border, cut off the money to the drug cartels, and let them become what they could be if we weren't funding the corruption through our porous border.

So I ask my friend from Florida if he would agree that the compassionate thing to do is to secure our border, if our only goal was to help all of the people in Mexico.

Mr. YOHO. Absolutely. And we are going to continue this on—it will be 22 days, 23 days, hopefully, not long, but we are going to highlight what is going on. The compassionate thing is—and as you brought up, this is not anti-immigration. This is not anti-Mexican.

I made reference to three people that were killed by people from Mexico who were here illegally. That doesn't mean all Mexicans are bad.

I have worked with a lot. I come from an agricultural background. They are hardworking people, just like Americans are. This is something that if we don't have rule of law, you can't have a law-abiding society.

I want to address one other point, if you will allow me.

Mr. GOHMERT. Please.

Mr. YOHO. President Trump has taken a lot of heat about Mexico paying for the wall. I talked to the President about this when he was a candidate, and I think that is an issue that we do need to talk about.

When you look at the facts, Mexico, since 2008, has received \$3.2 billion, with a B, in foreign aid. That comes to about \$320 million a year in foreign aid.

I am a proponent of foreign aid. They had also started the Merida Initiative

in 2008. Since that period of time, \$1.6 billion has been invested into that program. That is strictly counterdrugs. It has been \$1.6 billion since 2008, and I ask you: Is the drug problem today better in America or worse?

Mr. GOHMERT. It is worse.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, it is worse. So my proposal is that we, as a body, start looking at rerouting that money. If 90 percent of those drugs are coming through legal ports on our southwest border, in addition to the open, porous border, would it not make more sense to secure our borders, whether it is more screening at the legal entries, but let's also take care of the illegal ones.

And so in reality, that money that was earmarked for Mexico in foreign aid and drug initiatives, I propose that we reroute that and let's do those things that we know we can do. That will stop the amount of deaths, the 300 deaths a week that are happening from fentanyl, or heroin, and then the cocaine and the marijuana coming in. A border wall and beefed up border security will do that.

And I ask Ms. PELOSI to please negotiate and get off the moral high horse that you are caving into the President. This is not a partisan issue. This is an American issue, and it deals with our constitutional responsibility.

I thank Representative GOHMERT for his leadership on this.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend, Representative YOHO from Florida, not just for his eloquent comments, but also for his friendship and his deep, abiding love for America.

There are three rows of names on each of these, and these are just a part of the people who have been killed by people who came into the United States illegally.

I would like to go back to the place I honeymooned with my wife, one of the prettiest places on Earth, Las Hadas.

□ 1415

For our 25th anniversary we went to Cancun. But I am not comfortable going back now. I read recently near Cancun cartels had some people killed. I want Mexico to return to being a safe place to go. There was a time when the cartels would not do anything like murder around any of the tourist attractions because tourism was so important to Mexico. That has gone by the way. The corruption is terrible. People who stand up many times pay with their lives or family members' lives.

I have heard people here on the floor say that this is a manufactured crisis and that, of course, the megaphone that is used in places like CNN, MSNBC, and others repeat the same exact talking points. I don't have any talking points here from the President, the White House, or from Republicans. This is just coming from the heart and from the facts.

We are in trouble. This little experiment in self-government our Founders

knew would not go on forever. They knew it would go on for only so long as we could keep it. As Ben Franklin said:

It is a Republic, madam, if you can keep it.

I know a lot of my friends across the aisle think they are acting from compassion when they say: let's leave these borders wide open, and let's do a blanket amnesty for everybody who can get here.

But as someone who has worked in our legal system, our judicial system, much of my adult life, I do believe with all its faults—and there are plenty—it is the best legal system the world has ever known.

One of those legal doctrines that has evolved over the years because it is fair, it has been deemed to be fair by Americans, I think it exists in every State, it has a strange name for a doctrine, attractive nuisance.

Mr. Speaker, most Americans know inherently or through education that if you have something like a swimming pool or a really cool playground and you don't put a fence around it, then if someone comes and is hurt in that swimming pool or drowns or falls in the playground, or is killed or hurt in some way, the landowner that refused to put up a fence or a wall or something to keep people from getting to that attraction are held financially liable, and they have to pay financially to those who have suffered, or, in the case of a death, to the family of those who have suffered. That has been considered one of the great doctrines of our legal system.

But thankfully for people here in the House and Senate, we haven't applied that sound doctrine to the fact that America has become a lure, a draw, and it is drawing people by the thousands and tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands. Some die on the way here or when they get here. Some are pulled into sex trafficking, their lives are destroyed.

I have been there so many times when it is not on their lists of questions to ask, but many times they ask: How much did you pay to get into this country?

The response was 5, 6, 7, \$8,000.

Where did you get that kind of money?

Well, \$1,000 here, \$1,500 there.

Where are you getting the rest from?

The drug cartels are who get the money.

They are going to let me work it off when I get where I am going.

I have watched them hand over different addresses. 2, 3 in the morning, while the Border Patrol is coming down and asking the questions, getting the information; they pass around a different address.

I have seen them say, basically: Do you want to claim this child?

No, you claim the child.

Mr. Speaker, you don't know how many are unaccompanied and who are accompanied by people who they shouldn't be.

Let's stop luring people to their demise or to their despair. Let's continue

to be the most generous country in the world when it comes to allowing people in legally, as we do. As my friend, Congressman YOHO, pointed out, over 1 million visas legally a year. Nobody else does that. China? Russia? Nobody does that. We do.

But let's make sure it is legal; that it is not MS-13 gang members who are going to repeatedly stab a young boy or girl and rape women. Let's make sure that it is not drug cartels sending people in.

I hear people say: well, there is not that much drugs that comes across our border on the south.

Mr. Speaker, I have been there too many times, and the Border Patrol will tell you, down there at 2 and 3 in the morning: look, they just sent over 20 in a raft.

You hear it on the radio. They call all the Border Patrolmen in. They start processing the people, and as the Border Patrolmen will tell you, that is when they send in the illegal drugs.

The two guys who said that we got pinned down a while ago by a 50-caliber—there is no mistake about that 50-caliber when it is fired—and we were hunkered down behind the tanks wondering what high value individual or what big drug shipment are they bringing across right now when they know we don't have anything that stops a 50-caliber.

Look, the drugs are coming in. We have been there when we used thermal technology—I say, we, it was the Texas Department of Public Safety that gave that information by radio to the Border Patrol. They float up a balloon. They use their thermal technology.

They say: oh, yeah, we see those two or three people here. Apparently they are carrying drugs, some big thing they are bringing in. Here are 17, 18 people, they are not carrying anything; they are clearly just trying to come in illegally.

They would find the people that we would tell them about as they float up the balloons and get to zoom in. In the end, they said: okay, we have got all the people. We are processing all the groups that you saw that appear to be just trying to come in illegally. But the ones who appeared to be bringing in drugs, they knew some little way and they got away, so we didn't catch any of those guys.

That goes on every day, every night. Who dies from those illegal drugs coming in?

The compassionate thing for Mexico, for Central America, and for the people to whom we owe our oath, is to secure the border. Build a barrier where we have got to have it to secure the border, and let's stop Americans dying unnecessarily, so we can save the righteous indignation in this room for those who have died because we did not do our job.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRIFFITH (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of family matters.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 14, 2019, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

53. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Certain Archaeological Material From China [CBP Dec. 19-02] (RIN: 1515-AE42) received January 10, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

54. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Certain Archaeological and Ecclesiastical Ethnological Material From Bulgaria [CBP Dec. 19-01] (RIN: 1515-AE41) received January 9, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 488. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that an employee's 'regular rate' for purposes of calculating overtime compensation will not be affected by certain additional payments; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 489. A bill to prioritize the payment of pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces and Federal law enforcement officers in the event the debt ceiling is reached or there is a funding gap; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Armed Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. PALMER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. JONES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr.

CHABOT, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LONG, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. EMMER, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WALKER, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BACON, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ESTES, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. BUDD, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DUNN, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia):

H.R. 490. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit abortion in cases where a fetal heartbeat is detectable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. JONES, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. COLE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 491. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the continuance of pay and allowances for members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, during lapses in appropriations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 492. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that an owner or operator of a social media service that hinders the display of user-generated content shall be treated as a publisher or speaker of such content, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 493. A bill to direct the Attorney General, in enforcing the provisions of the Controlled Substances Act relating to marijuana, to focus on certain enforcement priorities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 494. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to reauthorize the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 495. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require an annual report on the Office for State and Local Law Enforcement; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself, Mr. CRIST, and Mrs. MURPHY):

H.R. 496. A bill to direct the Director of the United States Geological Survey to establish a program to map zones that are at greater risk of sinkhole formation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 497. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to increase certain veteran funeral benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 498. A bill to eliminate unused sections of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. DELGADO, and Mr. CORREA):

H.R. 499. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to clarify the treatment of certain surviving spouses under the definition of small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. KATKO, and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 500. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Christa McAuliffe; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER):

H.R. 501. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and enhance the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 502. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to carry out a study on how virtual currencies and online marketplaces are used to buy, sell, or facilitate the financing of goods or services associated with sex trafficking or drug trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 503. A bill to prohibit pay raises for the Vice President and any senior political appointee of at a Federal agency subject to a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. BACON (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 504. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Department of Homeland Security to develop an engagement strategy with fusion centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 505. A bill to amend the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 to reauthorize the grant program for education, training, and enhanced services to end violence against and abuse of women with disabilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKKES (for himself and Mr. WESTERMAN):

H.R. 506. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase hospital