

This legislation would make criminals out of law-abiding citizens, instead, and infringe upon Second Amendment gun rights. I urge my colleagues to protect the constitutional right of the American people to keep and bear arms.

GUN LAWS THAT MAKE AMERICA SAFE

(Mr. CÁRDENAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I have the honor and the privilege of being a Member of the House of Representatives.

I also am speaking without notes because, over 40 years ago, I lost a teenage friend of mine just a few yards from my front door in what was perhaps one of the first drive-bys in the history of Los Angeles, a senseless killing where a young man on drugs decided to shoot through a wall of someone's home—my friend's home. With one shot, Rudy died at the age of 16.

Today, I had the honor and the privilege of voting on a bill that would make our streets safer—not solve every problem, but reduce the amount of crying and dying that goes on in too many communities around America.

I must say this—and it is unfortunate to have to clarify—because I am Latino, people are assuming that the person who shot Rudy was a Latino or a Black male or what have you. He was not. He was a young man—a victim, himself, of drug abuse—a White young man.

It should never happen to anyone, and people should never assume that it only happens to certain people in certain communities. Tens of thousands of human lives are lost every year in the greatest country, America, and we need to make it better.

□ 1215

IN COMMEMORATION OF JUDGE JAMES DEAN

(Mr. SPANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to an unsung hero in Florida's history.

In 1858, James Dean was born into slavery in Ocala, Florida. In pursuit of his dream to enter public office, Dean entered Howard University School of Law working part time as a clerk to put himself through school.

He earned a bachelor's and master's of law, graduating as the valedictorian in both degrees. After graduating, Dean returned home to Florida in 1887, taking a position as a school principal and establishing a law practice in Key West.

His practice grew so quick that he had to resign from the school within a

year to care for his clients. As his business grew, so did his standing in the community. In 1888, just a year after moving to Key West, he was nominated to serve as a county judge.

This didn't sit well with many White political leaders in Key West who conspired to have him removed from the bench. They fabricated a story that Judge Dean illegally married an interracial couple and the Governor of Florida removed him from office.

As Black History Month comes to a close today, it is important to not shy away from uncomfortable moments in our history. And while Governor Bush posthumously reinstating his judgeship in 2002 can never make up for the harm suffered, remembering his story makes us all more sensitive to current injustices suffered by our friends in the Black community.

PRESERVING QUINDARO TOWNSITE

(Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Representatives CLEAVER, WATKINS, and LARSEN, for cosponsoring this bipartisan piece of legislation to designate the Quindaro Townsite in Kansas City, Kansas, as a national commemorative site. I would also like to thank Senator PAT ROBERTS for his important leadership on this issue.

The bill that passed this week honors the significant history of Quindaro, which served as a key stop on the Underground Railroad and helps preserve the site for future generations.

Quindaro is an important part of United States and Kansas history in the fight for freedom and equality. It serves as a reminder of a dark chapter in our Nation's history.

Sadly, for too long, the Quindaro Townsite has lacked proper investments needed to preserve it as a historic site. But the community leaders in Kansas never gave up on fighting for Quindaro, people like Marvin Robinson a Kansas City, Kansas, native who spent over 30 years working for this legislation to pass.

He now plans to use the site to improve racial relations in the community and to educate people about our shared history.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to protect Quindaro's history and keep its stories alive for future generations.

ENDANGERING AMERICANS WITH GUN CONTROL

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, this week the new Democrat majority has endangered more Americans with its push for more and more gun control.

By definition, criminals don't follow the law. Criminals don't honor gun

laws. They steal. They commit murder, all sorts of crimes without permission. They don't seek permission when they take something from you, when they enter your home.

They don't seek permission to become gun owners. Yet, what happens here in the legislation this week, limits the rights, limits the ability for people to defend themselves, defend their own homes, defend their own families, by having less options or less ability to get a weapon if they need it, especially timely.

These measures do not work. They do not work to stop the shootings that are often cited as the reason to deny people their Second Amendment rights in this country.

Indeed, it is a political agenda that gets pushed in every election, every possible time in legislation, and finally, with the majority they have, they are able to push this stuff through and harm innocent Americans and their ability to defend themselves.

This has to come to a stop. I hope the Senate will defeat this measure.

IMPORTANT ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FINKENAUER). 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. Madam Speaker, I do appreciate the Speaker's new policy that says a Member of Congress can only have one Special Order in which they are in charge of the time each week once a week. I have been trying to get Republicans to take our time, much in the way my colleague, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and the group they call the "30 Somethings" did in 2005 and 2006.

I have not had a great deal of success in getting a lot of people to take Special Order time. But with this new rule and some of the terrific freshmen that we have got who have come in—some of the folks who have been here a term or two—they are stepping up and taking our time to discuss critically important issues for our country. Today, I am it from our party, and I am honored to be here.

We have heard a lot of talk, and the reason we say have heard a lot of talk is because there is truth in seeing a double standard at the Department of Justice for a number of years now.

There was a time when it was the Department of Justice that Jeff Sessions remembered back in the 1980s during his time as U.S. attorney. That time changed with top people in the FBI and top people in the DOJ; it became no longer about justice, but just us and what we want at the DOJ and the FBI.

In talking to former Justice attorneys, prosecutors, one dear friend in Texas—not in my district, but a very dear friend—we were talking about how the things that were done by people, including Rosenstein, the former U.S.

attorney, McCabe, Strzok, Page, all of these other people, Ohr, were incredible, just incredible, and I would include Mueller in that.

Mueller as FBI Director, I continue to believe did more damage to the FBI during his 12 years as the director of the FBI than anyone, even the problems that J. Edgar Hoover created, especially in his later years, the wiretapping that he did of people who should not have been wiretapped. Of course, he didn't just do it on his own. As I recall, Attorney General Kennedy had supported wiretapping of Martin Luther King, Jr., if I remember correctly.

But what we have seen in the unmasking of American citizens who have been followed by email, by wire—not taps, but just following their conversations as the NSA and our intelligence community is able to do these days, is absolutely incredible. Hundreds and hundreds of Americans were unmasked. We were assured with the PATRIOT Act when it was up for being reauthorized, oh, no, we are so careful to make sure that we don't capture Americans that should not be captured unless they are involved with a terrorist organization or a known foreign terrorist. They don't get picked up.

But now, if they are talking to a terrorist, a known foreign agent, then it is possible they could be picked up, but those names are masked. They are never unmasked. That is too big of a burden. And then we find out under the Obama administration, the American people have had their privacy violated, like Democrats and Republicans alike swore to us would not happen. Well, it has happened. And it has continued to go on.

I had hoped that Christopher Wray would clean things up at the FBI, but he appears to be more concerned about covering up problems rather than cleaning up the problems. I saw a good example of that at the end of August when, once again, the intelligence community had made clear they sent their investigator, Frank Rucker, over to explain to Peter Strzok, as head of the FBI's counterintelligence—and also Dean Chappell, their liaison—to explain that we now have 100 percent proof, there is no question, Hillary Clinton's private email server was hacked.

They embedded a direction into her server that forced every email coming in and going out into what has now been disclosed publicly by others as a Chinese intelligence agency front.

They were getting every one of Hillary Clinton's—over 30,000 emails to and from. There were four that were glitches, but otherwise, over 30,000 emails. So that must include the ones that President Obama sent using another name so people wouldn't realize it was him using a private server.

But there were also the President's daily intelligence briefings that went through her home. She had somebody at the home print them out for her

without any security clearance. There were all kinds of violations, what appeared from the code to be outright crimes, but the double standard appears to continue.

This is from February 25, an article from CNS News, Terence Jeffrey reported that the inspector general says, "Prosecution Was Declined for Senior DOJ Official Who Sexually Assaulted a Subordinate."

And it goes on to talk about that. The name is not disclosed. He sexually harassed subordinates, sexually assaulted yet another subordinate, and then lacked candor. That is the DOJ's explanation for people they don't want to prosecute when they are actually saying that he lied, committed a crime, but lied when the IG investigated this matter.

So the unnamed prosecutor or prosecutors were not disclosed, but allowed to retire, no consequences, though guilty of sexual assault in the DOJ.

Now, there were a lot of things I disagreed on with a late, former Federal judge in Texas named William Wayne Justice, but one thing I agreed with him on, and I heard him tell people: "You, of all people, especially, knew better."

And he would come down harder on somebody like this who had been part of the DOJ. I would imagine Judge Justice, if he were around, he would throw the book at somebody who worked at Justice and still committed crime and abused the system. I can just hear him still today coming after somebody like that.

But not in the DOJ. We have got lots of carryover from the Obama years, and I know my friend, Jeff Sessions, called them career people because they were in career slots. But he was talking about people who loved Sally Yates, thought she did the right thing in refusing to defend constitutional positions taken by the Trump administration.

Yet, many of those people are still there undercutting President Trump, undercutting Matt Whitaker when he was acting, and will, no doubt, be undercutting Attorney General Barr.

□ 1230

So this is a real problem when the Justice Department, the one we counted on for many decades now, if there was something wrong, whether it is civil rights or others, and justice could not be found, the Department of Justice could be counted on to come in and pursue real justice, to their credit.

FBI agents and prosecutors, some retired now from the Department of Justice, have privately conveyed to me their broken hearts over the damage done to the Department of Justice and to the FBI because they became so caloused, so self-absorbed, and so political that they have damaged not only the FBI and not only the Department of Justice, but this country.

But when you have willing allies in the alt-left media—or some call them

the mainstream media; certainly, alt-left these days—it is understandable that same feeling of desperation is felt by the American people: Where do we turn when the Justice Department is not honest?

It used to be you could trust the media. You could find somebody who would do such great investigative journalism that they would get to the heart of it and bring something to the forefront, to the point that the American people would justifiably become outraged, and that would force either elected or appointed Federal officials with the Federal Government to do something.

But here we have alt-left, lamestream media saying that there is no crisis on our border. Yet if you look at the same things said by Obama officials about the same problems, except now exacerbated on our border with all the caravans that have come, are coming, and are continuing to be established in Central America, it is amazing how some of these media outlets can even continue to call themselves journalists.

An article from Brian Flood, January 10, this year, points out that: "News outlets readily described a 'crisis' at the border under then-President Barack Obama when he sought funding to deal with a surge of migrants, many of them women and children. But now that President Trump is in the White House, the mainstream media seem far more reluctant to use the word.

"Back in the summer of 2014, the headlines and stories referring to the C-word"—apparently the crisis word—"were plentiful as the border surge was taken seriously along the Acela corridor.

"The Washington Post"—now an alt-left medium—"wrote in 2014, 'White House requests \$3.7 billion in emergency funds for border crisis'"—there is that C-word, crisis—"while CNN published a feature, 'Daniel's journey: How thousands of children are creating a crisis in America.' It described a problem of 'epic proportions.'"

Now, they point out that: "Around the same time, the Huffington Post declared that 'photos of the humanitarian crisis'"—even Huffington called it a crisis—"along the southern border were 'shocking,' and ABC News reported that Obama requested '\$3.7 billion to cope with the humanitarian crisis on the border and the spike in illegal crossings by unaccompanied minors from Central America.'"

The ABC News story even mentioned this word to deal with plans for \$3.7 billion. This was ABC's headline: "Immigration crisis funds." Incredible.

NBC, June 2014, Andrea Mitchell said the undocumented children flooding the border were, in her words, "creating a crisis" for authorities.

How these news outlets can turn around and now say that there is no crisis when the testimony and the evidence is clear that the overall numbers for last year may have been down, but

as the testimony and evidence makes clear, in October, November, December, and January, those numbers spiked to numbers that our Border Patrol has not dealt with before for minors and family units.

Why would they all of a sudden spike during that time? Because it appeared the Democrats had a chance of taking the majority here in the House, and in so doing, Democrats have made clear they wanted to continue to allow illegal immigration. They welcomed the families. Naturally, you were going to see a spike.

These people below our southern border in Mexico, Central America, South America, and now coming from the Middle East and other continents, have been coming for some time from other countries. They are being lured in.

The head of the Border Patrol testified this week in our committee that they were being pulled in. But really, it is being lured. They hear: Gee, if we will just come now, we have people who are in charge of the House of Representatives who want us there, and they are going to try to stop the President from enforcing and securing the border, so now is the time to come.

And they are coming. We heard the testimony that about 80 percent of the people who came across our borders in decades past were normally male adults. It made sense. Usually, it was people who were coming looking for work, and they were going to send money to their families back in Mexico. But the word got out the end of last year and this year that if you will come and bring a minor child, whether it is your child or not, then you have a good chance of staying in the country.

We know that nobody crosses our border illegally on the south unless they have gotten permission by paying the drug cartels. Over and over during the nights I have spent on the border, the question has been asked: Where did you get the money to pay to come?

Oh, 1,000 here, 1,000 from people in the U.S.

Well, what about the rest of the money you have to pay?

The drug cartels are going to let me work it off when I get where I am going.

They would normally have an address. As I understand it, that is often the address the drug cartel told them where they would need to go get set up and work off what they owed to the drug cartels.

But, Madam Speaker, you shouldn't be surprised when you see headlines like: Meth lab in major U.S. city busted, run by drug cartels.

As the Department of Homeland Security folks have pointed out to me before, the drug cartels call us their logistics. All they have to do is get somebody illegally into the country, and they hand us the address of somebody supposedly that they know where they can go live, and we handle the shipping for them. We ship them to wherever they want to go. Sometimes, they are

detained, but we have shipped millions of people around, all over the country.

If what they have told the Border Patrol about working off what they owe the drug cartels is true—I haven't seen or heard any reason it wouldn't be—then our Homeland Security Department for a decade or so has been shipping people to the location where the drug cartels want them. The drug cartels are making billions and billions of dollars a year.

When you hear any Mexican or Central American official who says they want to keep the American border open, you can just pretty well guarantee they are getting money from the drug cartels.

The best thing, the most caring and loving thing, we could do for our neighbors to the south would be to secure our border, put border barriers where they need it, whether it is a wall, a 30-foot barrier, whatever. Secure the border and then that will cut off the billions of dollars of American money going to the drug cartels for them to terrorize people in Mexico and people in Central America.

You care about people south of our border. Of course, we can't bring in all those millions who are suffering under drug cartel rule and reign, but we could secure our border and cut off the domestic terrorists called the drug cartels, cut off their funding so they won't be able to pay people to cut off the heads of police chiefs or mayors who take a strong stand against the drug cartels and put those heads on a pike as an example to anybody who tries to stand up against the cartels.

It used to be that the drug cartels had a deal. It was just kind of a policy that they are not going to allow any kind of crime or violence to tourists because that is too important for Mexico to have those tourists' money coming in. That has long since gone by the way. Tourists are killed and terrorized.

I long for the day when my wife and I can go back to where we honeymooned in Mexico, back to where we celebrated anniversaries. It was wonderful. We don't believe we can do that now.

If we secure our border and dry up the money to the drug cartels, then the money can begin flowing to Mexico for something besides drugs, and we can cut off the fentanyl and the massive amount of drugs that pours across our southern border undetected.

I know some people say the majority of drugs are coming through the ports of entry. That is where they catch more of it. But as it was explained to me and STEVE CHABOT some years back down in Colombia, when they were showing us—we had DEA. The British had people who were helping. They were doing a great job fighting the FARC's drugs down in Colombia under then-President Uribe. They were saying that this guy is fearless. It is hard keeping him alive, but he is amazing. He is fighting the drug cartels down there.

I said, well, so you are saying about two-thirds of the cocaine, the drugs from Colombia, goes up through the Gulf of Mexico into Mexico, so it can cross our southern border. Another one-third apparently goes up to California, trying to cross the border, it goes into Mexico across our southern border. I mean, if they have boats that will go that far, why not just have them pull up to a Texas or California beach that is deserted?

These Colombian, American, and British drug experts explained that it is because the drug cartels are businesspeople. They have a business model. They have a business plan. They play the odds. They know the odds are many times better to get the drugs into America if they don't go to a port of entry and they don't go to an abandoned beach somewhere. They bring it into Mexico, have it cross the Mexico-U.S. border, and they will get most of their drugs in. So that is their business plan.

□ 1245

That is still going on. It was going on during President Bush's administration, probably back to Clinton and the former Bush and even Reagan, to a lesser extent. But it is sure going on in the 21st century.

With all the discussion about there not being a crisis when clearly there has been and is—it is a humanitarian crisis, but it is also a crisis of U.S. sovereignty.

We cannot have a country that is based on laws if we cannot control our own borders. We will be overwhelmed, as we have been, by more and more people who do not observe the laws, do not think the laws are important. They do not understand. They have not been educated how important it is to enforce the law fairly across the board. They don't know what it is to preserve self-government.

Franklin knew that, Benjamin Franklin, when he said: "It is a Republic, madam, if you can keep it." He knew. He had studied history, as had our Founders. They knew that the Constitution that came together, as Washington referenced, had to have divine providence at work, because no way these guys who started out for 5 weeks doing nothing but yelling at each other could have come up with a document that was the best governing document, the best constitution, put together in the history of mankind.

Here is more about the media's hypocrisy, an article from the Washington Examiner, Eddie Scarry. This has a quote: "We now have an actual humanitarian crisis"—there is that C-word again—"on the border that only underscores the need to drop the politics and fix our immigration system once and for all." That was a quote from then-President Barack Obama in the Rose Garden in 2014.

He went on to say—that is, President Obama—"In recent weeks, we've seen a surge of unaccompanied children arrive

at the border, brought here and to other countries by smugglers and traffickers.”

That is basically, as the Examiner points out, what President Trump said. He said: “Last month, 20,000 migrant children were illegally brought into the United States, a dramatic increase. These children are used as human pawns by vicious coyotes and ruthless gangs.”

This article says: “The only difference is how the media are covering it.”

The Washington Post said, 2014—this is The Washington Post’s words—“The current crisis on the Southwest border, where authorities have apprehended tens of thousands of unaccompanied Central American children since October”—well, there you are. There is that C-word they used then and belittle the word being used now.

Anyway, this is an article from The New York Times from 2014 by Michael Shear and Jeremy Peters. They said, talking about the border crossing into Texas, it is “an urgent humanitarian situation.”

Their article said, and this is from Senator MARCO RUBIO: “Let’s remember, this administration”—talking about the Obama administration—“went around for years saying the border has never been more secure than it is now. I think,” and this is MARCO RUBIO, “that’s been exposed as a fallacy over the last 3 weeks.” That is because people were realizing it was a border crisis during the Obama years.

Just the fact that it has gone on for years and years does not diminish the crisis. It actually exacerbates the crisis. When you put the October, November, December, January numbers, record numbers, of people coming in claiming to be family units—why? Because they have heard, if they have minor children, then they will be allowed to stay, and they will be allowed to keep the minor children. It is encouraging a dark market, a criminal market, in children.

Make sure, if you are coming to America, you have a child in your group, because then you claim: Oh, we can’t be separated.

As the Director of Border Patrol pointed out this week in testimony under oath, now the huge majority is people coming who are claiming to be family units. Most of them are, but we don’t know. That is why it is important to check.

So this is a time of crisis, and you would hope that major media, whether it is alt-left or whatever, would be reporting what is happening in America. It is a humanitarian crisis, as they acknowledged during President Obama’s term. It is even more of a humanitarian crisis now that there are so many more minor children who are being brought here.

Once again, for those who bring up the term “war on women,” how about the fact that over a third of the young girls, the young women, who are

brought to our southern border illegally are being sexual assaulted, raped, normally multiple times along the way? Do people not care what is happening? Wouldn’t that be a war on women that some of us want to stop?

The estimate by doctors who have been treating these people say that 17 percent of the young boys coming up and crossing into the U.S. illegally have been sexually molested, assaulted.

Where is the outrage? It ought to be from both sides of the aisle.

These are people whose lives are just being terrorized. When we hear about, “Oh, well, people are just caring about their families,” really? You would subject your daughter to being one of the third who is sexually raped numerous times while you want to come into America? You would do that to your daughter?

We ought to be helping Mexico. They are not helping much. They are helping some. But we ought to be shoring up the border. It is the best thing we can do for Mexico, continue to be the most generous country in the world, in the history of the world, in allowing people to come into our country legally.

Keep that going. It is good for America. But stop the drug cartels from controlling our southern border. It ought to be our authorities controlling our border, nobody else.

If that is not enough, here comes what has been called a Green New Deal. Some have accurately called it more of a green socialist manifesto, a green raw deal.

Rick Manning has a great article this month: “Everyone is talking about the Green New Deal and how it would end domestic airline travel, the internal combustion engine, fossil fuel usage, most electricity generation, and even ban cow flatulence. You have groups guessing what the cost of the Green New Deal would be in terms of dollars on an annual basis. . . . To everyone seeking to normalize this Green New Deal, please just shut up.

“The Green New Deal is the baring of teeth by the new American communist, a new breed unleashed that we have seen in the streets, attacking people attending Trump rallies, screaming at teenagers wearing Make America Great Again hats, shouting down and rioting against conservative speakers on college campuses.

“Here is the truth. Socialism and communism are evil. Putting a shroud of legitimacy and normalcy to the destruction of the American ideal is being a Menshevik in a Bolshevik revolution. You cannot moderate the bloodlust of those who seek to enslave you by trying to come up with common ground or discuss alternatives to meet their needs. The revolution demands immediate payment.

“So let’s stop talking about the symptoms which the Green New Deal represents and actually begin to dissect the disease that is collectivism. First, definitionally, the only dif-

ference between socialism and communism is if you voluntarily surrender your freedom and wealth or have it confiscated. Either alternative ultimately comes from the coercive power of the gun and are based upon the premise that those who have attained wealth used ill-gotten means to get it. As a result, they have no moral authority to keep it from those from whom it presumably was stolen.

“In socialism and communism, individual rights are not derived from God and guaranteed by the Constitution. Instead, everything you have and can expect comes from the goodwill of the government. It is no mistake that John Lennon’s socialist anthem ‘Imagine’ starts with the following words: ‘Imagine there’s no heaven. It’s easy if you try. No hell below us; above us, only sky. Imagine all the people living for today.’

“In order to achieve a kingdom ruled by man, unfettered by morality or rules, you have to nix a sovereign God from the equation. If there is no God, then all rights are nothing more than those that the government chooses to allow you to have, and the only protections that exist are those which they grant. The only question is who gets to be the one holding the keys over everyone else’s life.”

This is what, on one hand, surprises me about billionaires in America funding a move toward socialism. Obviously, these are not stupid people. They can look at the history of socialism, communism. They know that, whether it is socialists or communists, you have two classes. You eliminate the middle class. There is no middle class. You have this small group of ruling class, and then you have everybody else, all the miserables.

I guess they think they get us to socialism and they will be part of that elite socialist class that rules over everybody else.

I have seen it. The summer I lived in the Soviet Union, when it was the real Soviet Union, there were some nice things, but it was clear they didn’t have freedom. The government watched, through spies, everything that those people did.

I asked, on one occasion: Why is that lady running off?

Well, she is going to go report me, he said.

Why would she go report you? You are not anything to her.

No. In your country you can get ahead by making money. In my country, he said, we get ahead by stepping on others. So anybody you can turn in for anything, anybody that you can step on, it elevates you in our system here in the Soviet Union.

He was right. And that is where we are headed with people thinking socialism is a good way to go.

The bumper sticker is true. The big problem with socialism is you can vote your way into it, but you will have to shoot your way out.

That is what we are seeing play out in Venezuela. They voted themselves

into it, and now they are having to shoot their way out. Unfortunately for most of them, they don't have guns, so they are pretty empty-handed in fighting a government that has the guns.

□ 1300

It is a tragic situation. It should be one of the most prosperous countries in the world. It was until socialism took over. And again, as Rick Manning is trying to point out, that is where we are headed.

"It makes one wonder if Ono," he said, "has given up 100 percent of her songwriter royalties to the song to the government as a show of solidarity for the dream.

"And here is what they don't say," he says, "in order for the world to 'live as one' with no possessions, someone is going to have to take all the stuff and hold it collectively for the common good.

"In order for there to be stuff to take and most importantly eat in the future, someone is going to have to do the hard work to produce it. Someone is going to have to figure out how to produce it, and someone is going to have to get it from where it is produced to where the brotherhood is living. And then someone is going to have to distribute it, being certain that everyone gets the same amount of gruel."

And I saw that, too, in the stores back in the Soviet Union. If you were part of that elite ruling class, they would keep back a really nice pair of shoes, maybe the only pair they got, for the highest ranking person that they dealt with.

In the stores, the Soviets would tell me: We never find toilet paper; they hold it in the back for the ruling class. We never find good, fresh vegetables. They hold that back for the ruling class.

It is really tragic the way people are treated, ultimately, in a socialist or communist society, or now called progressivist.

So, good article by Brad Polumbo, February 26, How Socialism Destroys Private Charity and Hurts the Poor. It is tragic.

Between what we see destroying the rule of law in America, coming across our southern border illegally, overwhelming our schools—how fair is it? If you really care about children, how fair is it to this big group of children in school?

And as teachers have pointed out to me: I love my kids. I love the kids that come in and don't speak English. But they throw them into a class of English speakers because we are required to educate them, and we have to stop teaching, basically, the English-speaking citizens and residents and go to teaching the new kids that just got thrown in, no fault of their own. But those that suffer are the kids.

They have dreams, but, unfortunately for them, they were either born here or came here legally and speak English. But their dreams are going to

be put on hold. They are not going to be able to be educated as well because we have not secured our southern border. And children who don't speak the same language are thrown into their classes, and they are harming the dreams and the hopes of the children who were here.

So is the solution to welcome in 30 million or so people from Mexico? No. It would overwhelm this country, and there would be no place for people to flee to when they are trying to find real asylum from danger.

The better thing is just enforce the law. Secure the border. Cut off the flow of money to the drug cartels, and allow people to live freely here, without worrying about extra crime that wouldn't be here if people weren't here illegally.

It is about preserving the Republic that the Founders gave us. It is about acknowledging that we have, as a nation, been more blessed than any nation in the history of the world. Solomon's Israel didn't have the individual opportunities, the individual assets, the freedoms that we have.

When a majority of Americans fail to recognize that we have been blessed by God and His protective hand has secured our Nation, then those blessings and that protective hand will disappear; and we will be the once-great Camelot, where people could live free, and they could work and keep what they grew, built, earned, that once-great country where people were treated the same, whether poor or rich. They were treated the same under the law.

That once-great country. Wow, what a dream. How did it go wrong?

Well, we just talked about it, and it is time we did something together to stop it.

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

STATEHOOD FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, this week was, for all intents and purposes, D.C. Statehood Week in the Capital. I am pleased that, today, Senator CARPER has announced that he is introducing the Washington, D.C. Admission Act to make the District of Columbia the 51st State. I am grateful to Senator CARPER, who garnered a record number of Senate cosponsors last year and has been a most vigorous champion of statehood for the District of Columbia.

I come to the floor for my first time this session to discuss D.C. statehood because we have many new Members who may be under the mistaken impression that the 700,000 people who live in your Nation's Capital are treated in the same rights that your own residents are. I beg to differ.

In this city, the citizens do not have each and every right in this Congress. To be sure, we have what is called home rule, and I will later indicate that even that is limited.

The reasons for this unique place, for our Capital, left without the full rights of other citizens, has to do with a quirk, an accident, where the Framers came to believe that the Capital should not be part of a State because they were, in the beginning, parts of various States, and they felt that they could not then control what the Capital would do.

Well, of course, they don't want a Capital to be part of a State, but they didn't really envision statehood, the Capital as a State, because they were thinking of the Thirteen Colonies. And since every city had to be in a State, they could only envision putting the city in a State.

We are about 218 years beyond that, and it is time, way past time—shall I say, overdue in time—to understand how the Nation's Capital of the greatest nation in the world should be viewed and what rights its citizens should have.

So I am very grateful to Senator CARPER for the work he has done and for his introduction of the bill in the Senate this week, the counterpart of the D.C. statehood bill, which I have already introduced in the House.

The bill I have introduced already has 198 cosponsors. I bet—I haven't looked closely, but there is probably no bill in the hopper that has more cosponsors than the D.C. statehood bill. It is not bipartisan yet. That will happen, because this is how we make progress on matters in the House of Representatives. We go one House at a time.

Remember, the District doesn't have any representation in the Senate; yet we have gotten a distinguished Senator introducing the statehood bill, and he has been most energetic, getting the majority of the Democratic Senators on the bill last session.

I am particularly moved today because of the record number of D.C. residents and their colleagues who came to the Congress yesterday to demand that they have equal rights with all other American citizens. I greeted a room full of residents who had visited every office to tell Members what they don't know.

I am grateful particularly that the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, has strongly endorsed D.C. statehood. I believe that means that D.C. statehood will be on the floor this session. I want to thank our Speaker for making D.C. statehood a priority, and indicating in her own words how important it is that every citizen be treated equally.

In the same way, Oversight and Reform Committee Chairman ELIJAH CUMMINGS has committed to holding a hearing on D.C. statehood, and I will predict this afternoon on the floor that that bill will get out of committee and come to the floor of the House for a vote.