

Her son Jim recalled that her biggest lesson was: No matter what is going on at that time, as long as you keep hope, you keep believing things will change, and you are doing your best to help change, it will change.

Those words guided Jerry's life. Those words have inspired me and should inspire us all as we keep fighting for the things we believe in.

We will miss you, Jerry.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the members of the Arizona delegation for those beautiful words about Jerry Emmett.

Now the rest of the country can see why she was such a treasure to those of us in Arizona and what an honor it was today to honor her life.

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

#### OUR SINGULAR AMERICAN REVOLUTION

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, it is wonderful to hear the great tributes to those who have served this country well, as we just heard. In fact, we have so many people to whom we should be eternally grateful.

As Abraham Lincoln said, they gave their last full measure of devotion for the freedom of this country, not for some wishy-washy government in Washington, D.C., that can't figure out what it should do or not do, but for the idea of freedom.

I heard more discussion again recently about the Revolution. I have read a few new books I hadn't read this year about the Revolution, the victory at Yorktown, and other aspects of the Revolution.

And, still, there are so many historians who wonder why there was such a dramatic difference between the outcome of the United States Revolution, 1775 to 1783, and the French Revolution which followed.

I think the historians have it right who have said that the key difference, the reason the U.S. Revolution lasted and was unlike the French, which resulted in so many heads being cut off and eventually resulted in a monarchy again, the key difference was that the U.S. Revolution was about liberty and freedom.

It wasn't about vengeance. They weren't out to cut off as many of the British heads as possible. It was about liberty. Unfortunately, too many in the French Revolution, not all, but too many in the French Revolution were about revenge and not about liberty.

So the great efforts of great heroes in France got hijacked. Many people lost their lives, and then they lost their effort to have a republican form of government, as we have had.

A lot of people don't understand the difference between democracy and a re-

public. I think it is fair to say, as most historians do, we have a democratic republic.

Democracy would mean the majority always rules, and our Founders realized that sometimes you can have too much passion and not enough time for clear reflection. You are better off, especially among a majority that really doesn't understand the total aspects and factors involved in a decision, selecting and electing representatives with majority votes, except for President.

We set up the electoral college so all States would have a say in who was President, not just the few that had the most people.

But all the other elections were about a majority—so a democracy—electing representatives to their governmental entities locally, State, and Federal. So, really, we have a democratic republic.

□ 1215

It is interesting, as we saw this week, the Speaker of the House getting ready to go meet with a President of the United States from the other party, and he really wanted to talk about infrastructure and making this country stronger.

I think probably most everybody on both sides of the aisle has seen the surveys regarding the permanent structures, the infrastructure of this country that helps tie us together as a nation, and most of the scores are D-minus, D, D-plus at best. And that is about all you see.

We are better in some areas than we are in others, but whether it is dams, bridges, or highways, we have a lot of infrastructure needs. And that is something that I would hope that we could come together on and work out, as those who went before us were able to do.

We are told in Proverbs that, where there is no vision, the people perish. And it is interesting, when you see towns that had community leaders with visions who could see certain things needed to be done to have a vibrant community 10, 50, 100 years later, you saw how blessed that community was to have leaders with vision.

You go to some communities, and you find, gee, they haven't progressed very well. They seem to be eternally declining and holding on to what they have. Normally, you will find leaders in a community like that who have been spiteful, who didn't want somebody else to get credit for what was being done. And they prevented a community from flourishing for years into the future just because they were small-minded and had petty differences and didn't want somebody else to get the credit.

One of my heroes, Ronald Reagan, is often credited with the line that actually had been around for a great deal longer than President Reagan, but he used the line: It is amazing what you can get accomplished if you don't care

who gets the credit. And that has been true since the beginning here in Washington and, even before Washington became the capital, in Philadelphia and New York.

But the Speaker announced at a press event, before going over to the White House to talk about infrastructure, that the President of the United States had been engaged in a coverup. We weren't told a coverup of what. We were not told what was done to cover up.

"Coverup" is a very ingenious term to be using, almost as brilliant as the term "collusion," because neither the term "collusion" nor "coverup" are crimes. There is no law that says it is a crime to cover up. There is no crime that says it is a violation of the law to collude.

So words like that have been chosen and used and repeated over and over and over so that the public thinks, "Oh, my goodness, crimes have been committed. There was collusion. There was a coverup." Well, of what?

We now know that, after 2½ years of hearing about collusion with the Russian Government—and I am certainly no fan of Robert Mueller. He did more damage to the FBI than any FBI Director ever, including the worst of J. Edgar Hoover, when he was spying on Americans.

We had Mueller's FBI that took innocent people, destroyed their lives. In the case of the longest serving Senator, Republican Senator, at the time, he even saw to it that he was convicted immediately before his election, and then that cost him the election.

And then he was killed in a plane accident that he would never have been involved in if Mueller's FBI hadn't framed him for a crime he didn't commit and gotten him voted out of office right before or at his election. That was, of course, Senator Ted Stevens from Alaska.

And Dr. Hatfill, who Mueller accused of committing the crimes of murder using anthrax right after the 9/11 attacks. There was no evidence to support that Dr. Hatfill committed the crimes.

We are told that, at one point—though Mueller kept pursuing Hatfill and questioning his neighbors, telling the neighbors, through Mueller's minions, that Hatfill had committed murder with anthrax and they needed to be careful and report anything. They basically ruined the Hatfill family's lives.

But, at one point, President Bush is reported to have called him in and said: There is no evidence that Dr. Hatfill is the guy who did this. Are you sure? I mean, there is just no evidence. And Mueller stated: I am 100 percent certain.

So, when it turned out he was not the guy that had been involved with anthrax and should have been cleared—by anybody but Mueller—Mueller was asked if he had any regrets about destroying the life of an innocent man. He said, "Absolutely not," and never apologized.

Unfortunately, U.S. taxpayers paid millions of dollars in settlement for Mueller's vindictiveness with no evidence.

Curt Weldon stood right here at this podium making speech after speech in my freshman term. This was obviously well after 9/11. I didn't get here until 2005. But in 2005, 2006, he was talking about a program through which information had gotten to the FBI, and, according to Curt Weldon—Able Danger, I think, was the name of the program that had identified some radical Islamist terrorists, wannabes, and that they were planning an attack in the United States.

And according to Curt Weldon's speeches right here at this podium where I am standing, the FBI, if they acted, they probably could have prevented 9/11, but they didn't act.

And I kept thinking: I don't know if what he is saying is true. I was not familiar with the Able Danger program at that time. But what I kept thinking was: Gosh, these are really serious allegations about the leadership of the FBI. Surely Mueller is going to have to come out and address these allegations from Congressman Curt Weldon of Pennsylvania. And the FBI never publicly addressed those issues, not that I have been able to find.

But they did address them. Mueller's FBI, in fact, raided Weldon's adult daughter, a lawyer, her office, early in the morning. And, gee, somebody in the FBI committed a crime, apparently, and leaked it to the media so they could be there when the warrant was run early in the morning. And somebody alerted Democratic operatives. They had signs that morning around the office talking about, you know, Curt Weldon is caught red-handed, he is a thief, alleging all kinds of crimes.

It turns out he hadn't committed any crimes. It turns out, some months later, they notified the Weldon family they could come get all the stuff that Mueller's FBI had collected during the raid. They were told: It has never been presented to a grand jury. We just did the raid. No prosecution, no grand jury, no indictment.

But since they did that 2 weeks before his election, he narrowly lost that election.

So it appeared to me pretty clear that Mueller's way of responding to allegations that his FBI—and, in fairness to him, he hadn't been there that long before 9/11, so he had plausible deniability: "Gee, I just got there. I didn't know about Able Danger at the time." But, instead, what he chose to do was have his FBI affect an election adversely, causing a critic to lose.

So these are all part of Robert Mueller's background.

But even as much as he wanted to ruin Donald J. Trump, later President Trump, the guy that he begged for a second appointment as Director of the FBI, just shortly after he was begging Trump for appointment to Director of

the FBI again and President Trump turned him down, he jumped at the chance to investigate and try to destroy the life of the sitting President who refused to hire him. And he spent 2 years, virtually 2 years, on it. I have seen \$25 million, \$35 million that Mueller spent.

Mueller took the unusual step of hiring people to assist him in the Special Counsel's Office who hated Donald Trump. Normally, when there has been a special counsel of integrity, they know they are going to be vilified, so they are careful to hire people that appear will be even-handed.

I can't imagine any person of integrity actually hiring people who contributed to the opponent of the person to be investigated, who would go to what they hoped would be her victory party, who despised the man who got elected. It is surprising he would go out of his way to make sure that he hired people that hated President Trump, whom they were supposed to investigate.

But here again, the one good thing that I can say about Robert Mueller is—and he apparently served honorably and well in Vietnam, so I thank him for that service—the guy is consistent. When he decides he wants to destroy an innocent man, he gets after it.

Weissmann hated President Trump. These other folks that hated Trump, some of them still work at the FBI. Many of them have been fired and run out of the FBI or DOJ in shame. They should have had more than that happen, and hopefully they will.

But there was no crime committed. His report indicates that there were efforts by Russians to reach out and try to pull the Trump campaign into some type of conspiracy, but nobody in the Trump campaign took the opportunity that was presented by Russia, and there was no crime of conspiracy with Russians.

And then, as we go along, the more we find out, we find out that, actually, it is a whole lot worse than Mueller indicated. Mueller indicated no collusion, no conspiracy, no crime that anybody in the Trump campaign committed with Russian agents. But if Mueller had been the man of integrity that I would have hoped, he would have investigated those who did conspire with Russian agents.

Because, now, the information is coming out that the Clinton campaign had hired Fusion GPS. Perkins Coie law firm was helping them negotiate and work through some of these things, using their firm's name in the conspiracy—it sure seems like a conspiracy to me—as they hired a now-disgraced foreign agent who had worked for MI6, Christopher Steele, to do digging to try to find some tie between the Trump campaign and Russia, any kind of dirt they could get.

□ 1230

They tried to lure Don Trump, Jr., into some kind of deal. They said, gee,

there is a Russian person who has all kinds of negative information about Hillary Clinton.

He agreed to meet and found right away that this is not what it was represented to be and got out of the meeting as quickly as he could.

Here again, Christopher Steele was hired, apparently through Fusion GPS, to dig up dirt, true or not true, about Donald Trump. Fusion GPS hired this foreign, disgraced intelligence agent to do digging, using Russian agents.

Fusion GPS also hired the spouse of one of the top FBI people, Bruce Ohr. That was his wife, Nellie. She was hired to dig up dirt, anything she could in Russia about Trump.

I didn't realize until more recently that Christopher Steele was not even traveling to Russia to dig up this dirt. He was simply contacting people in Russia, trying to find somebody who had some dirt on Donald Trump.

Apparently, he has now recently indicated: You know what? I guess there is a good chance that the people I was talking to in Russia who gave the false information about Donald Trump, yeah, they may have been working for Vladimir Putin.

It appears the evidence is now starting to come out, no thanks to Robert Mueller and the tens of millions of dollars he wasted, the years that he wasted. The truth is starting to come out, and it is making people who are in positions of power very uncomfortable.

We have heard Clapper and Brennan making really inappropriate statements for somebody who had been involved in our intelligence-gathering agencies. But it is appearing that it was probably Brennan—we will be finding out in the days ahead—who may have asked England's intelligence agencies to spy on American citizens involved with the Trump campaign because our intelligence community is not authorized to spy on American citizens. So there may be a wink and a nod.

We need to get to the bottom of whether our intelligence community winks and nods, and says: Hey, we want to spy on our own citizens, but we are not allowed to legally. So how about you spy on these citizens, and we will spy on some for you in our country?

We need to know if that kind of thing has really gone on. If it has gone on, if there is a quid pro quo, we need to know. We need to know if some of our top intelligence officials have committed crimes. This is serious stuff.

It turns out there was no collusion, no conspiracy between anybody in the Trump campaign and Vladimir Putin or Russia. But it is appearing more and more that there was a conspiracy between people associated with the Clinton campaign, Fusion GPS, Perkins Coie, Christopher Steele, potential agents of Vladimir Putin, to try to destroy Donald Trump before the election and after the election.

We expect to see more coming out as some of the information that was classified is declassified. It appears now we

are hearing, and we heard previously, that an Australian Ambassador had spoken to a member of the Trump campaign, just tangentially part of the campaign.

But what we have found out now is, apparently, the Australian Ambassador was manipulated through the Democratic effort to defeat Donald Trump, recruited to tell a tangential member of the Trump campaign that the Russians had Hillary Clinton's emails.

Then they set that same Trump marginal official up by asking him questions: Have you heard anything about Russia having information on Hillary?

He said: Well, yes. I heard that Russians had Hillary Clinton's emails.

Then they used that information to help them get a warrant to spy on the Trump campaign. It was a total setup by potentially our intelligence community, potentially British MI6.

We have to get to the bottom of this. People who have committed crimes need to go to prison.

In the meantime, there is all this animosity that has been stirred up against Donald Trump. Now we find out there was nothing to the collusion. He knew that he had not committed any kind of conspiracy with Russia. He knew that this was all bogus. He was hearing rumors that if there was a conspiracy, it involved the other campaign.

What do you do? How do you act? I would submit, you act exactly as President Trump has acted, frustrated. He can't believe that his own United States Government is trying to set him up and say that he committed some crime that he never committed. He can't obstruct justice when he is doing everything he possibly can to ensure that justice gets done.

That is where we have been. We heard the roadblocks, the things that, oh gee, there was collusion. When that didn't materialize, then: Well, there is a coverup.

No allegations other than just the general term "coverup."

Clearly, efforts are being made in this city to prevent President Trump from being successful in getting legislation through this House and through the Senate that could become law and help the country.

Even on issues of securing our border, President Obama talked about the need to secure the border and stop illegal immigration. Senator Clinton had talked about the need to stop illegal immigration and secure the border. Most of the leaders on both sides of the aisle have talked about that at some point.

Why don't we do it? Well, he would get credit for keeping a campaign promise, and apparently, it is more important to stop the President from keeping campaign promises than it is important to some to help the country.

What it reminded me of, as I thought back—and I have been here 14 years. Never expected to be here this long. I feel like I am kind of going to a scary

movie. Get into it and I am sorry I went, but I can't leave until I see how it turns out. I want to make sure that we get on a proper footing here.

I know in the 14 years that I have been here, I have not seen either party work so hard to prevent the other party's President from being successful.

As I majored in history, I have never stopped studying history. American history is my favorite. I have tried to think back, okay, when was the last time, if there ever was a time before, when one party worked so hard to prevent another party's President from being successful and helping the country?

I think it probably goes back to John Quincy Adams' days. John Quincy Adams, he was the first son of a former President to be elected President, and he did not get a majority of the vote. It ended up that he didn't get a majority of the electoral college.

It was thrown here to the House of Representatives to decide, under the Constitution. Henry Clay, so beloved and respected here in the House of Representatives, he decided to throw his support to John Quincy Adams.

I have studied John Quincy Adams, read a very thorough biography. I liked it. I chose it because it incorporated more of John Quincy Adams' own journal, where they kept calling him JQA. John Quincy Adams, apparently, kept more of a journal than any President we have ever had. He started very young, and he went until the last few weeks of his life when he could no longer see to write.

I didn't know until I read that, for example, that his last night at home before he came to the House floor to give a speech against the war with Mexico, because he was concerned that that would perpetuate slavery longer, that the reason he had run for the House of Representatives after being President was to try to do what William Wilberforce had done in England, and that is to use his elected position to fight to end slavery.

Wilberforce got it totally outlawed 3 days before he died in 1833. In 1830, that is what Adams thought he was supposed to do. That is why he ran for Congress.

The night before, he had a massive stroke. The next day, when he tried to stand up and speak against war with Mexico, he couldn't see.

He couldn't sleep, and he asked his precious wife if she would mind reading him any of William Wilberforce's sermons. She chose one. She read it for him, and he finally dozed, listening to William Wilberforce's sermon the last night he slept at home, before he had his massive stroke on the House floor here in the Capitol.

In 1824, John Quincy Adams was still a man of integrity. He was always a man of integrity. Some feel like it is possible that he was the smartest President we have ever had. Certainly, he was one of the top-educated Presidents we have ever had. He spoke a number of languages.

One thing he had in common with our current President, he is the only other President to have had a wife who was not born in America. Much like President Trump's wife, John Quincy Adams' wife spoke multiple languages, very fluent. She herself was brilliant. So we share that with the current First Lady.

John Quincy Adams even wrote some history books in German. His favorite foreign language was French. He was an amazing guy.

He knew he was a man of integrity, and when studying his life, you figure out that he was a man of integrity.

He asked Henry Clay for his support. Henry Clay threw his support behind John Quincy Adams for President. That got him the votes in the House to win the Presidency.

When it came time to pick Cabinet members, President-elect Adams said that he believed the person who would make the best Secretary of State would be Henry Clay.

Those people who were close to him, who loved him, said, yes, he was right, that Henry Clay would make a fabulous Secretary of State, but that if he appoints Henry Clay to be Secretary of State, it will look like he cut a deal with Clay in return for his support for him for President, which gave him the election. If he agreed to make him Secretary of State, people would think he made an illegal deal.

□ 1245

He said: He is the best person for the job. I didn't make any kind of deal with him. He threw his support behind me. I never mentioned Secretary of State to him. I never mentioned making him a Cabinet official, but I think the world of the man. I think he would be the best Secretary of State. People know I am a man of integrity. I wouldn't do an illegal deal to be elected President, so they just need to get over it. He is the best man. I am going to appoint the best man to be Secretary of State. People who know me will know that I never made a deal, promised him Secretary of State in return for throwing his House support behind me. That is just a lie, and I am not going to be prevented from appointing the best man for Secretary of State by my fear about what somebody might think.

So he appointed Henry Clay to be Secretary of State, and people got really upset: There must have been a deal. He must have cut a deal with Henry Clay. In return for Henry Clay's support that won him the Presidency, Henry Clay gets to be Secretary of State.

Apparently, there was no deal, but people thought there was. People felt like: This looks terrible. It looks like he made a deal. He must have made a deal. We know Adams is an honest guy, and so if he made a deal with Clay, he surely would have kept his end of the deal.

There was no deal, but there were so many in the opposition party who were

mad about it, they just decided they were not going to let John Quincy Adams accomplish anything as President.

He was elected in 1824, sworn in, in 1825. His term was 1825 to 1829. He was defeated by Andrew Jackson and defeated fairly easily because people thought he had cheated to win by making a deal he didn't make with Henry Clay.

During those 4 years—anyone can do the research—he couldn't get much of anything done. There were even cases of Members of this House who were of the opposition party, the Democratic Party, there were Democrats who had actually written and sponsored bills they desperately wanted to get passed. When John Quincy Adams threw his support behind the bills because he thought they were a good idea, the person who wrote the bill, sponsored the bill, withdrew his support. He did not want John Quincy Adams to get credit for passing some important bill.

He had some great ideas. He wanted a national observatory. He felt like it would be good to have a uniform system of weights and measurements. That had not happened. He wanted to create a naval academy for the country. He wanted to have a code, a systemized national bankruptcy law.

Bankruptcy is mentioned in the Constitution. There were finally some laws passed before he was President, but it wasn't a uniform national bankruptcy law as it needed to be.

He had some great ideas, but they weren't passed because people did not want him to get credit. They were willing to hurt the country to prevent John Quincy Adams from having a great victory.

That is what went through my mind. Somebody may be able to find a case in which one party did everything it could to prevent a President from having any big successes.

It is a little late. President Trump got a great tax bill. It wasn't as good as I had hoped it would be, but it was helpful to the country overall. He got that passed, signed into law.

Hopefully, we are going to vote on the Mexico-Canada trade agreement. It is better than NAFTA was. Hopefully, we will get that done, and we won't keep harming the country by failing to bring that for a vote.

For Adams, there was a tariff that was passed. That was about the biggest piece of legislation passed during his 4 years, but it didn't even get enacted until Andrew Jackson took over as President.

So Adams, a man of integrity, was accused of making an illegal deal with Henry Clay to get himself elected President. The country suffered for 4 years. Those who despised John Quincy Adams, they were able to hurt the country for 4 years just to keep John Quincy Adams from having a major victory.

It is important to learn from history. As we know from the old adage, those

who refuse to learn from history are destined to repeat it. Of course, I also grew up learning there is a corollary to that, that those who do learn from history will find new ways to screw up. We have seen both of those play out in this country.

I am hoping it will come together, and we will be able to pass some of the critical legislation to secure our border and to get some infrastructure built so we don't give a country to our children and grandchildren that has infrastructure crumbling and with so much debt that they can't afford to rebuild the infrastructure. We already know that we are the first generation in American history that didn't have as our driving goal to give a country to our children better than we had it.

The debts continue to skyrocket, over \$23 trillion now. We really need to come together on these important issues.

With regard to the President's effort to try to secure the border, I continue to believe with all my heart, the most compassionate, caring thing we could do for the people of Mexico—and I was talking to the Ambassador from Guatemala yesterday. I sure like him. Guatemala, of course, was the only country to immediately recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, as it was 3,000 years ago, and should be and is today, and will be for the future. Guatemala had the courage to back us up on that.

Apparently, MS-13ers come mainly from El Salvador, but Guatemala wants to help. We ought to help Guatemala to help us. I hope that will be occurring.

If we really want to be compassionate for the people of Mexico and Central America, the best thing we could do is secure the border, cut off the tens of billions of dollars every year, maybe into the hundred-plus billion, that go to the drug cartels. It funds corruption in Mexico. It is the one thing that keeps Mexico from being one of the very top economies in the world.

They have fantastic natural resources. They have a better location geographically than the United States does. They are between North America and South America. They are between two oceans. They have a great location. They have some of the most hard-working people in the world.

I also am thrilled that the huge majority have faith in God. I think we could stand another boost of people who have faith in God, a devotion to family, a hard work ethic like we generally find among the huge majority of Hispanic people from Mexico and Central America. We could afford more of that here, but we have to enforce the law.

If we secure the border, Mexico ought to be able to put down the drug cartel corruption and become a top economy. Then you won't have people doing everything they can, risking their lives, having their daughters raped repeatedly coming up here from Mexico or

through Mexico to the United States. We can go back to having the kind of vibrant tourism that we once had in support of Mexico.

But there are efforts that are being undertaken here in the House by friends across the aisle who do not want Donald Trump to have success in helping the United States, and, really, it would greatly help Mexico.

What is the result? Well, here is a story from May 21, Washington Times, Steven Dinan: ICE says Prince George's County released illegal murder suspects.

The story says: "Two teens arrested last week on charges stemming from a horrific killing in Maryland were supposed to be deported last year, but local authorities didn't turn them over to ICE, the immigration agency said Tuesday.

"Prosecutors say the teens, Josue Rafael Fuentes-Ponce, 16, and Joel Ernesto Escobar, 17—suspected of being MS-13 gang members—feared they would be ratted out for an April robbery, so they and an accomplice snuffed out a 14-year-old suspected snitch. They made her strip before beating her with a baseball bat and chopping her with a machete. The girl's body was found in a creek this month."

This is in Prince George's County.

"U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, in a pointed statement Tuesday, said the crime could have been averted"—could have been completely prevented—"but for Prince George's County's sanctuary city policy."

That is what stopped it, or it is what kept our ICE agents from preventing the baseball bat and machete mutilation of this 14-year-old girl.

"Mr. Fuentes-Ponce and Mr. Escobar were in county custody last year on attempted murder charges for another crime. ICE placed a detainer on them, asking to be notified when they would be released so agents could deport them. ICE said the Prince George's County Department of Corrections defied the request.

"These individuals had demonstrated violent criminal behavior before, and because they were released in spite of the lawful detainer, they were afforded an opportunity to take a life."

And not just take a life. They beat her, stripped her, beat her with a baseball bat and then chopped her up with a machete.

Thank you very much, Prince George's County, for your sanctuary city. No telling how many people will have to lose their lives while you defy Federal law.

This article says: "ICE has placed new detainers for both teens after the murder charges. Prince George's corrections spokesman Andrew Cephas said the agency didn't release the teens into the community. He said the Corrections Department did have custody last year but remanded the teens to

Cheltenham Youth Detention Center, a State facility, after a judge's ruling.

"Neither of these individuals were released to the public from Prince George's County Department of Corrections. They remained detained in the juvenile facility until the disposition of their cases earlier this year."

Yeah, right. The cases were disposed of, a little slap on the wrist for their attempted murders. But this says the county department does inform ICE—or the Prince George's County spokesman said they inform ICE about upcoming releases but did not provide notification in this case.

"ICE says the county should have given notification of any transfer out of custody so the agency could lodge a detainer with the new prison or jail."

□ 1300

"Under a 2014 Department of Corrections policy, county jails say they will notify ICE of impending releases but won't hold the migrants for pickup unless ICE has a signed warrant from a judge.

"Mark Krikorian, executive director of the Center for Immigration Studies, which advocates for stricter immigration controls, said the teens are at the center of several raging immigration debates.

"Mr. Fuentes-Ponce came to the U.S. in late 2015 as part of the surge of families from Central America who have overwhelmed the border in recent years.

"Under the Obama administration, the family was paroled into the U.S. to await its immigration case. Like many other families, Mr. Fuentes-Ponce didn't appear for his hearing and was ordered deported in absentia, ICE said.

"Mr. Escobar, meanwhile, entered the U.S. in 2016 as an unaccompanied alien child, the other major demographic in the border surge."

That is one of the things we debated for hours and hours yesterday in our Judiciary Committee. The committee's majority wants to have even more widespread amnesty than DACA, which President Obama had said 20-something times it would be unconstitutional for him to do what he ultimately did creating the DACA program. He didn't even sign executive orders, I understand. He had the Secretary of Homeland Security do a couple of memos.

So he changed Federal law without the bill being passed by the House and Senate, without signing it into law. He didn't even sign an executive order. He just had a couple of memos that changed the policy.

"Mr. Krikorian wondered whether the killing of the 14-year-old girl would receive as much attention as the death of an illegal immigrant teen in Border Patrol custody this week."

There was a teen who died from an apparent flu.

"That case prompted reporters to question Mr. Trump about what steps he would take.

"The antiborder activists are quick to blame the Border Patrol for deaths

that are out of their control, but rationalizes the crimes committed by people who would be removed if the law were enforced. There really is a double standard here."

"The D.C. area has long had a large Central American population, making it one of the top destinations for families and unaccompanied alien children involved in the surge. Prince George's, Fairfax, and Montgomery Counties are among the top 10 locations.

"More than 5,660 unaccompanied alien children have been placed with sponsors in Prince George's County over the past 5 years, topping Fairfax at about 5,200 and Montgomery at about 4,300.

"The unaccompanied alien children have strained schools and, security experts say, created a breeding ground for gang recruitment.

"Most of the Central Americans coming across the border are not criminals, but gangs have used this flow of people across the border to bring their members into the U.S., and others who weren't gang members in Central America have become gang members here," Mr. Krikorian said."

So it would really help if we could come together, if the President wouldn't have to be building the wall without any help from a Democrat-controlled House.

It is a shame they want to do all they can to try to prevent the President from protecting the country, but we ought to learn a lesson from the damage that was done between 1825 and 1829 during the Presidency of John Quincy Adams, and we ought to come together, get the border secure.

Let's not have any amnesties until the border is secure, then we can talk about them, debate them. But every time we talk about amnesty—I got a picture this week from a friend on the border, a 6-year-old and an 8-year-old, unaccompanied children, yet we are told: Oh, no. We are doing this DACA amnesty because the children were brought into the United States by their parents, and so these children were drug into the United States without their choice, and so we need to give them legal status.

And yet you have got a 6-year-old and an 8-year-old that are coming in, as my friend across the aisle said yesterday: Well, they don't come in without help. She is right. The parents weren't with them. The parents weren't with them, forcing them.

We also have been hearing that, since there is so much fuss made about allowing people to stay that had children with them, the children have now become a negotiable commodity. I have been there when children were passed back and forth between different adults—you know, who is going to claim these kids—and they are waiting for the border patrolmen to get down to them so they can answer the questions.

But the drug cartels have figured out, the gangs have figured out—gangs

are often paid to bring people in illegally, and the gangs get paid by the drug cartels because, as we know, every inch of the border of the United States is controlled by some drug cartel.

So the gangs make money, the drug cartels make money by bringing people in. And since they have learned they have a better chance of staying in if they bring somebody's kid with them, then more kids are coming in now.

But it is interesting. I am wondering how the debates will go when we say, well, here is a person we want to give amnesty to because their parents dragged them into America, even though there were no parents with them. Well, so the gangs brought them in.

Anybody in the drug cartel brings in a child, that means we are supposed to give them amnesty?

At some point, we have got to secure the border. It is the most compassionate thing we can do. Mexico will become a great economy in the world, one of the top, and the wonderful people of Mexico, Central America will have a better standard of living. Heck, you might have United States citizens thinking maybe they would like to go work in a vibrant economy in Mexico if and when we can help stop the drug cartels with all the money that they have got coming in.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. Since we are going into Memorial Day weekend, I am thrilled Sergeant Derrick Miller has been released. I testified at two different hearings for him. I am thrilled he is released. He shouldn't have been incarcerated.

Lieutenant Clint Lorange, hopefully that can be brought to an end and he can be released like American Taliban John Walker Lindh was.

But I want to finish by mentioning Ross McGinnis. I promised his father, Tom, I would never forget him, and I haven't.

Ross was 19 when he was in Iraq. Ross loved the Army. Ross finished high school in Knox, Pennsylvania, joined the Army. He loved it, and his platoon sergeant said everybody loved Ross. Ross helped energize people.

Ross was a machine gunner up in the turret of a Humvee going through a village in Iraq. A grenade was projected into the bed of the Humvee, and Ross was the only one in a position to jump out and save himself. He yelled, "Grenade." Ross saw the four people in the bed crouch. Ross knew they were going to die, so Ross jumped down, covered the grenade, and saved four people's lives.

I went to Ross' funeral, his graveside in Arlington Cemetery, because two of the four people Ross saved were my constituents.

Ross' sergeant and the two others who made it back from Iraq for the funeral came up after the ceremony,

knelt before Ross' remains, put their hands on Ross' remains, and as they told me, they thank God for Ross McGinnis, and they thank Ross for saving their lives.

We should thank God for all of those who have served and protected us and thank the families of those that lost a loved one protecting us.

Mr. 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 Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the House will not be in session next Monday, Memorial Day. That day has very special meaning for the 700,000 residents in the Nation's Capital.

The District of Columbia is one of the oldest jurisdictions in the United States. That means that residents of the Nation's Capital have fought and died in every war, including the war that created the United States of America: the Revolutionary War.

I have come to the House floor today to particularly recognize, on Memorial Day coming, the denial of full participation in their government through statehood, not only to the District of Columbia's residents, but to our present Active-Duty servicemembers, our National Guard members, our reservists, our many veterans and their families who are residents of the District of Columbia.

Their service and sacrifice, along with that of Americans across the breadth of this land, but especially their sacrifice, is unparalleled and, therefore, deserves special mention: unparalleled because those who served, those who died, those who continue to serve to protect our country do so without full and equal rights in their own country.

Later, I will be speaking about what their sacrifices have meant to our country, but as I come to the floor, I start by paying special tribute to the sacrifices that the residents of the Nation's Capital have made for 218 years.

I will be going, this coming week, with the Mayor of the District of Columbia, with the city council chair, with the entire government, to what is called the D.C. War Memorial. This pristine, beautiful memorial is dedicated to those who lost their lives in World War I.

It is the only memorial—indeed, it is the only edifice—on The Mall that is dedicated to people in one district, and for very good reason: because that district is our Nation's Capital; because those whose names appear on that memorial—I think there are 400- or so names—died without full representation and died giving that kind of representation, the kind of democracy, the kind of democracy that others have.

□ 1315

Our country, of course, prides itself on its democratic traditions, but we must remember that the country was founded seeking democracy, not as a democracy.

When it was founded, only White men who held property could vote. That means that the majority then could not vote and did not have their democratic rights. So we have to, with some humility, approach our own standing as a democracy. May I remind us all today that it took 132 years after the Nation's founding for women to get the right to vote.

When half the population didn't have the right to vote, I am sure Members came to this House floor saying what a wonderful democracy it was. Well, it wasn't.

What is important about our country is our aspiration to become the democracy that the Framers themselves hoped we would come—they hoped we would become because even they had created a constitution where an African American was counted as three-fifths of a man. That was a compromise.

They created this country knowing, believing, that those of us who sit in this House, in the Senate, and Americans throughout the country would make our democracy a real democracy over time.

It has taken 218 years, and still counting, for the District of Columbia and its residents to achieve statehood, including voting rights and all the rights that come with equal citizenship.

We are the only democracy in the world where the residents who live in the Nation's Capital don't have the same rights as everyone else in that country.

I am not pessimistic today. We are just 5 months into the new Congress, and we are already beginning to break ground with those old traditions.

In March, the House passed H.R. 1, as we call it. That is our all-democracy, prodemocracy bill, still trying to achieve full democracy throughout the United States. I will say a bit about H.R. 1 shortly.

It has findings, extensive findings for D.C. statehood, which means, since it passed by more than a majority, that most Members of the House are already on track and on the Record for D.C. statehood.

I am grateful that Speaker NANCY PELOSI 3 days into the new term issued a very powerful statement, the head of the House, endorsing statehood.

I am grateful to Senate Minority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER, who unveiled a sweeping proposal to bring democracy to our country. His proposal is interesting because it included only three issues: combating voter disenfranchisement through the Voting Rights Act, establishing national automatic voter registration laws; and the third one, support of D.C. statehood.

I think that says a great deal about what the priority of bringing full de-

mocracy to the Nation's Capital means to the Nation.

I am grateful to Chairman ELIJAH CUMMINGS, the chairman of the House Committee on Oversight and Reform, who has announced that he will hold a hearing on D.C. statehood and will bring the bill to the floor this year.

It is worth hearing a few words from Speaker PELOSI, to show the commitment of our party to full democracy.

The Speaker said: "The right to vote and to equal representation is the foundation of our freedom and a core pillar of our democracy. For too long, the residents of the District of Columbia have served our Nation in uniform, paid taxes, and contributed to the economic power and success of our country while being denied the full enfranchisement that is their right."

I am encouraged today because while it takes 218 votes to pass the D.C. statehood bill, already 5 months into this new majority, we have 204 cosponsors. We are very grateful and very proud of that very strong showing of support for democracy in the Nation's Capital.

To elaborate a bit on the significance of being in H.R. 1, which documented findings for why the District of Columbia should have statehood, to put that in context, just look at the other matters that were in this enhancing democracy bill, because they didn't have anything to do with D.C. statehood.

And yet, D.C. statehood is in this enhancing democracy bill, which includes such matters as supporting the adoption of paper ballots to protect our election infrastructure from cyberattacks, increasing donor disclosure requirements, strengthening campaign oversight, expanding early voting and voting by mail, ending partisan gerrymandering, requiring all Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates to publicly disclose their tax returns—until this President. For decades, others have, of course.

You can see those issues are about enhancing democracy in the larger sense. It says everything about the priority of this Congress that H.R. 1 also includes making sure that the residents of the Nation's Capital have the same and, indeed, equal rights with other Americans.

We are well on our way to nationalizing the fight to D.C. statehood, nationalizing, because my one frustration, that we have faced and continue to face, that most residents, most Americans, think that those who live in their Nation's Capital have the same rights they have. That is what I mean by the need to nationalize this important issue.

What polls show is that it is inconceivable to the average American that there would be any Americans who don't have the same rights that they have. Of course, that is the case.

That is why, periodically, I come to the floor to make sure and remind the House of this anomaly, that we are the only country that does not give those